

CHANGING WORLD,
CHANGELESS CHRIST

*The American Lutheran
Publicity Bureau, 1914-2014*



RICHARD O. JOHNSON

ALPB Books
Delhi, NY

Cover Images Acknowledgements

Top row, left to right: Henry P. Eckhardt (image courtesy of Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis, MO); Paul Lindemann (image courtesy of Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis, MO); J. F. E. Nickelsburg (image courtesy of Dr. George Nickelsburg); Adolf F. Meyer (image courtesy of William and Marie Meyer); Fred H. Lindemann (image courtesy of Jim Lindemann); August F. Bobzin (ALPB Archives).

Center row, left to right: Theodore Wittrock (image courtesy of Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis, MO); Glenn C. Stone (image courtesy of ELCA Archives); Richard E. Koenig (image courtesy of ELCA Archives); Richard John Neuhaus (image courtesy of ELCA Archives); Paul R. Hinlicky, image courtesy of ELCA Archives); Dorothy A. Zelenko (ALPB Archives).

Bottom row, left to right: Russell E. Saltzman (image courtesy of ELCA Archives); Donna Kathmann Roche (image courtesy of Mrs. Roche); Frederick J. Schumacher (image courtesy of Pr. Schumacher); John R. Hannah (image courtesy of Pr. Hannah); Sarah Hinlicky Wilson (image courtesy of Dr. Wilson); Paul Robert Sauer (image courtesy of Pr. Sauer).

The American Lutheran Publicity Bureau wishes to acknowledge with deep appreciation the work of John Hannah, Linda Shipman, Dorothy A. Zelenko and Jeff Zell for their expert assistance in proofreading.

Paul Robert Sauer
Executive Director, ALPB

2018 © ALPB Books

All rights reserved in the United States of America

ISBN 1-892921-36-7

American Lutheran Publicity Bureau
PO Box 327
Delhi, NY 13753

Changing World, Changeless Christ:
The American Lutheran Publicity Bureau, 1914-2014
(Delhi, NY: ALPB Books, 2018), xiv + 512 pp. [+16 image pages]

THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF
THOSE COURAGEOUS EDITORS OF THE ALPB'S PUBLICATIONS
WHO ARE NOW IN THE CHURCH TRIUMPHANT:

PAUL LINDEMANN

ADOLF MEYER

JOHN TIETJEN

GLENN C. STONE

RICHARD KOENIG

RICHARD JOHN NEUHAUS

Chapter 19

CALLING THE CHURCH TO FAITHFULNESS

The Neuhaus/Chilstrom brouhaha was only one challenge facing the ALPB in the late 1980s. Financial struggles, conflict within the board of directors over the purpose and tone of its publications, some rather angry resignations from the board, anxiety about the direction of the new ELCA and the Bureau's responsibility in addressing it—all these things made for continued turbulence for the ALPB. Nevertheless, there were also some exciting and creative new initiatives as the Bureau adjusted to a very new situation in American Lutheranism.

Editorial change

"my tone would be more urgent"

The Bureau had seldom been a financially secure operation, but now another crisis developed. The 1986 fiscal year showed a loss of more than \$2,500. The death of assistant treasurer Chester Edelman necessitated some regrouping in the ALPB's financial management and reporting. An emergency appeal for funds that summer brought in some \$13,000, but the Christmas appeal, a regular ALPB program for many years, was not as successful as usual—perhaps because of the summer appeal. Samples of the

Forum package were sent to all LCA and ALC pastors, hoping to increase circulation, but the best that could be said is that the "mailings have paid for themselves in terms of response."¹

Glenn Stone was now editing *Lutheran Forum* in a year-to-year appointment. In September 1987, Stone indicated he was willing to serve for another year, but some members thought it was time for a change. President Leonard Roellig suggested that the executive committee bring a specific proposal to the next meeting; in the meantime, Thomas Sluberski was asked to "discuss the matter of change in content and editor of the magazine" with Stone. Some at the meeting expressed frustration with *Forum Letter*. Board member Cecile Johnson "objected to criticisms of church officials by Neuhaus." Another member, Keith Wulff, noted that the two most recent issues had not included a "guest editorial"—something the board had requested four years earlier. Others complained that Neuhaus was habitually late in publishing the newsletter. After much discussion, a motion was approved "that the Board continue its present relationship with Neuhaus as editor of *Forum Letter* with two provisos: 1) *Forum Letter* is to be written on schedule, and 2) a guest editor is to be included in each issue."²

The next meeting took up again the question of who would edit *Lutheran Forum*. Despite Stone's willingness to continue, the board decided to conduct a formal search with the executive committee serving as a search committee. Stone was asked to edit the Lent 1988 issue, and Sluberski was named managing editor for the next two issues. When the board met in January 1988, the executive committee came with something of a surprise. They had interviewed three candidates for the position of editor—Glenn Stone, Charles Lutz, and Paul Hinlicky. Their recommendation was that Paul Hinlicky be named as the new editor of *Lutheran Forum*. Hinlicky was a Christ Seminary—Seminex graduate with a PhD in theology from Union Theological Seminary in New York. He had been ordained by the AELC, transferred to the LCA's Slovak Zion Synod for a few years, then returned to the AELC when he accepted a call to Immanuel Lutheran Church in Delhi, NY. He had also served for three years as a research associate for the LCA's Department for Church in Society. At the age of 36 he already had a long list of journal articles and other publications.

Hinlicky was frank about what he thought should be the direction of *Lutheran Forum*. "A sharper vision is needed of Lutheranism rising to fill the void of vacating liberal Protestantism in American life," he told the executive committee. "Just as all change is not for the good, likewise not every point of view that happens to have been baptized in a Lutheran church merits expression." He was forthright about what his editorship would mean.

My interests and abilities are in theology and my viewpoint in theology is not uncontroverial. I am, at root, a Niebuhrian; my axe cuts roughly. While I am sure in my own mind that the aforementioned is the right direction for *Forum* to go, I am

not so sure that I would be the best person to do it. My tone would be more urgent. I have no patience for dilettantism in theology, for cost-free piety or for ecclesiastical self-preoccupation.

This was certainly a different approach from that of the irenic Glenn Stone, but it struck a chord with the board of directors, and they voted unanimously (with one abstention) to offer Hinlicky a two-year contract beginning with the Reformation 1988 issue.³

Hinlicky was introduced to *Lutheran Forum*'s readers in the Lent issue with a slightly revised version of a sermon he had preached a few months before. Entitled "A Time of Decision," the sermon manifested the "more urgent" tone he had acknowledged to the board. "I believe," he wrote, "that our Church today is in danger of apostasy, of wholesale secularization, of trading the power of worship for the worship of power." He excoriated the CNLC's report which "commits the new Church to studying 'the root causes of social injustice' and remedial action informed by such study." This objective, he predicted, "promises ... more pastors appointing themselves prophets ... [and] further movement in the direction of the national church acting like a partisan political lobby." Even worse, the stated objective verges on apostasy. Christians already know the "root causes of injustice"—it's "the power of sin." "The last thing our troubled world needs," he concluded, "is for the Church to act as one power bloc alongside others."⁴

Meanwhile, Thomas Sluberski had been anxious to make some physical changes in both *Lutheran Forum* and *Forum Letter*, and the period of transition seemed a good time to do it. The Lent issue of the journal displayed a new cover. Rather than a photograph illustrating the theme of one of the articles—the standard cover for years—this issue's cover was all text. Several boxes served as a kind of table of contents for the issue, each including a quotation from one article. When the board of directors saw it, they were not impressed. "Sleazy," said one. "Looks as if [the cover] has been ripped off," added another. The next issue went in a more traditional direction, featuring an Albrecht Dürer woodcut.⁵

Sluberski also presented to the board a proposed new design for *Forum Letter*, utilizing two columns (rather than the single column that had been the design from the beginning). Neuhaus wasn't enthusiastic about it. He explained the change to readers:

We hope you think it is an improvement. Improvement or not, it was probably inevitable, what with the 'revolution' in desktop publishing and all that. Then too, Pr Tom Sluberski, ALPB's new director, is incorrigibly devoted to 'progress.' Ten years ago they took away our quill pen, then the old Remington went, and now there's this. If you really don't like the new look, let your editor know and maybe together we can change Pr Sluberski's mind.

The ALPB board rather liked the new design, in spite of Neuhaus; but apparently *Forum Letter* readers agreed with the editor, and after two issues, the newsletter returned to the old format (with a slightly updated typeface).⁶

With Hinlicky not set to come on board until the fall, it fell to Sluberski to edit the Pentecost issue. He made its theme "Essays in Honor of Glenn C. Stone: *A Festschrift*." It seemed an appropriate tribute to the man who had edited the publication since its inception with only a brief hiatus—all but six of 120 issues, Stone had written, "with an important part of those exceptional six." Sluberski led with a gracious tribute to Stone:

His pastoral way of dealing with people, events, and issues, his editorial skills, his range of knowledge and insight, are proverbial. His is a hard act to follow. We've all heard people say they never met a man they didn't like (and some of us were duly skeptical), but I think those who know Glenn would probably agree that they never met anyone who didn't like Glenn Stone.

The issue contained several laudatory essays by a variety of writers who had known Stone either personally or professionally over the course of his life. Commenting on Stone's departure in *Forum Letter*, Neuhaus called him "a courageous voice of quiet sanity in American Lutheranism."⁷

Ironically, the first issue under the new editor contained the announcement of the death of Adolf Meyer, the long-time editor of the *American Lutheran*. Meyer, 89, had died just hours before a planned worship service honoring the 65th anniversary of his ordination. The service had gone on with a special poignancy as the gathered friends and family celebrated Meyer's entering the Church Triumphant. Meyer had served on the ALPB board of directors for 44 years, most of that time as either managing editor or editor of the *American Lutheran*. He was, Sluberski wrote, "one of the great pastors of Lutheranism in our century. ... Others can point to many areas of service, but the ALPB wants to indicate how much we cherish his memory and want to continue his work."⁸

The church political

"the adjective 'modest' is nothing short of breathtaking"

The ALPB's skepticism toward the "new church" did not abate as the ELCA began operations. In January 1989, Neuhaus began a three-part series in *Forum Letter* which he called "The Church Political." The ELCA, he suggested, is "getting things badly confused" regarding the church and politics. He proposed to consider the ELCA's World Hunger Appeal as a kind of case study. He began by excoriating the claim that the ELCA was engaged in "advocacy" but not "lobbying." They are pretty much the same thing, he insisted, noting that a good slice of the Hunger Appeal's funds had gone to Bread for World—an organization that Neuhaus himself had helped found, but which frankly described itself as "A Christian Citizens Lobby." "It is obvious," Neuhaus argued, "that the ELCA is engaged in political lobbying." Denying it "can only breed further distrust in the church."⁹

Furthermore, lobbying is, by its very nature, a partisan activity, and the ELCA's lobbying "on issue after issue ... supports the Democratic position, usually coming down in favor of the leftward side of the party of liberalism." The church's advocacy programs also offer "constituency education on the issues"—which, Neuhaus wrote, is nothing more than trying to persuade church members to "support the political positions favored" by church leaders.

[In] the view of many church members, the offense is thus compounded. That their offerings are used to promote public policies that they oppose is the one half of it. The other half is that their offerings are used to 'educate' them into approving this arrangement.¹⁰

Neuhaus insisted that his objection was not to the specific policies being advocated, but to "the church becoming the servant of any political party or program." He observed that church officials who make these decisions are in fact clueless about the complex issues involved; they are not aware of "the major arguments and literature shaping the current debate about policy alternatives" and they "talk mainly with other activists in other agencies and denominations who share the same assumptions, the same posture, the same jargon."¹¹

An exception, Neuhaus noted, was Richard Niebanck, a former church and society staff member in the LCA. Niebanck had been carrying on an extensive correspondence with a current ELCA staff member, trying to understand what was meant by "root causes" of hunger. Niebanck had shared this correspondence with Neuhaus, who quoted the ELCA official:

'We are now identifying three ... areas that will receive special attention by staff. They will also receive hunger monies! These three are: the Third World debt crisis, war/arms race/militarism, and environmental degradation/misuse. Together this constitutes a modest attempt for the Hunger Program through [Commission for Church and Society] to highlight three areas involving causes.' [*sic*]

He also quoted Niebanck's response that "the adjective 'modest' is nothing short of breathtaking. The proposal is about as modest as an ant ascending the leg of an elephant with rape on its mind." Allowing that Pr. Niebanck "was getting a little excited there," Neuhaus wondered how a handful of church staff people with "no notable qualifications for the task, and with many other duties to perform" could possibly make a significant contribution to issues on which thousands of actual experts in universities, think tanks, and government agencies were already working.¹²

Why, Neuhaus asked, is it necessary for the ELCA to take positions on these matters? Are the real experts in government and private institutions clamoring for an ELCA policy paper? Of course not. The only people who need such things are church bureaucrats who want justification for the positions they want to take and political

activists who want to invoke the church's authority for their positions. "Meanwhile, the alienation of the membership deepens, the churchwide financial crisis becomes more acute, the understanding of the Church's mission in the world is ever more confused, and those who are called to be leaders complain that they are unappreciated."¹³

The article caused great consternation in the office of the Hunger Appeal, which sent a letter to ELCA pastors and leaders complaining that "Lutheran Forum has printed some very misleading statements" (though, as Neuhaus observed, "it cites not one"). ALPB board member Cecile Johnson, who had grown increasingly critical of Neuhaus, rather noisily resigned, complaining about "the current series of tirades against the ELCA World Hunger Fund" in *Forum Letter*. In a letter made public and reported in the *Lutheran*, Johnson said that the Bureau "must face the fact that we could be the principal cause for any break in confidence which may occur" between ELCA members and their national church leaders. The article in the *Lutheran* hinted that "other board members earlier left more quietly, and at least one other member was reportedly considering quitting for similar reasons." Another former board member, William Greutz, told the *Lutheran* that he had resigned "primarily because of 'right-wing' stands of Neuhaus and 'his very critical attitude toward most of what's going on in the church.'" Greutz also cited Neuhaus's "irresponsible" remark about Corinne Chilstrom.¹⁴

A time of crisis

"the ALPB office is not functioning"

As if this controversy wasn't enough, the board faced still other problems. Sluberski had accomplished the important goal of computerizing operations in the ALPB office. The office itself, however, was suddenly forced to find a new physical home. St. Luke's Lutheran Church, ALPB headquarters since 1980, needed to utilize the space the Bureau had occupied; after investigating some possibilities, the operation relocated to the Wartburg, a Lutheran senior living facility in Mt. Vernon, NY.

But a new facility and a new computer system could not disguise underlying disorganization. In early 1989, the board received letters from both Hinlicky and Neuhaus, from advertising manager Ruth Taylor, and from office assistant Patti Young, complaining that "the ALPB office is not functioning in a satisfactory way." There were bills going unpaid, production problems, a lack of clear procedures. It became so bad that both Taylor and Young resigned—each citing "lack of a 'stable office situation'" as "one of several reasons for their resignations." The *Lutheran* reported Taylor's resignation in the same article in which it had recounted Cecile Johnson's quitting over Neuhaus's criticism of the World Hunger Appeal, commenting that "she would not make public her reasons for leaving"—but the implication was clear that she, too, was unhappy about Neuhaus.¹⁵

The financial situation was also continuing to deteriorate. In March 1989, president Leonard Roellig told the board they were facing a budget deficit of some \$25,000. Subscription renewal notices were far behind schedule; the board would later learn that about a third of the copies of *Lutheran Forum/Forum Letter* were being mailed to people in arrears on their subscriptions. The annual Christmas appeal letter, for decades a significant source of income, had simply not gone out in 1988.¹⁶

As things seemed to go from bad to worse, Sluberski resigned as executive director, effective June 1, 1989. He reported that he had not been reimbursed for his expenses in 1988, and his salary had not been paid thus far in 1989; the Bureau at that point had only about \$4,000 in the bank. The office secretary, Christine Huebsch, also announced her resignation as of July 1. Board minutes of May 1989 noted administrative tasks left undone—subscription renewal notices not up to date, thank you letters for contributions not sent. The Bureau had again been invited to cosponsor the St. Olaf Choir's New York concert in 1990, but given the financial situation, the board declined.¹⁷

Hoping to bring some order to this chaos, board member Dorothy Zelenko took a leave of absence from her job and volunteered full time in the ALPB office to straighten things out administratively and financially. A mostly new slate of officers was elected in May 1989. Hans Quitmeyer, an attorney, took the reins as president, Pr. James Corgee would be the new vice-president, and Ms. Zelenko agreed to serve as treasurer; Elaine Abrahamson would continue as secretary.¹⁸

Over the next few months, the situation improved dramatically. There were a few more resignations from the board, but some energetic and supportive new members were welcomed. Ms. Zelenko spent two months in the office, thoroughly reorganizing, catching up on things left undone and establishing new procedures. A new office manager, Donna Kathmann, was hired. Paul Hinlicky was asked to take on some of the tasks of executive director on an interim basis. By September both the financial situation and the morale of the Bureau had improved dramatically, and in November the new president told the board that the financial situation was now stable.¹⁹

Called to faithfulness

"we fight for that evangelical and catholic future"

It wasn't only the ALPB editors who were concerned about the ELCA's direction. In March 1989, Hinlicky and Neuhaus met in Chicago with Carl Braaten and Robert Jenson, editors of *dialog*, and Oliver Olson and Paul Rorem, editors of *Lutheran Quarterly*. They agreed that their independent journals would sponsor a free conference to discuss what they described as "the crisis in American Lutheranism." It would be known as "A Call to Faithfulness," and it was set for June 1990 at St. Olaf College. The announcement published in *Lutheran Forum* laid out the purpose:

Those who call the Conference are not of one mind in the issues before us—special ministry, ecumenical direction, mission, and social posture—but we are one in concern for the theological and confessional integrity of Lutheranism. To that end, discussion will be informed and led by theological leaders representing opposing positions. ... In the name of Christ and for the sake of His church, this invitation to theological deliberation is issued, in prayer that it will be for us all a call to faithfulness.

Neuhaus promoted the conference each month in *Forum Letter*, suggesting that it had “the potential of being one of the most important gatherings of Lutherans in the last half-century.”²⁰

“A Call to Faithfulness” was a great success. The planners anticipated 300 participants, but the registrations numbered 895 and perhaps another 100 attended without registering. It was, Neuhaus reported, “overwhelmingly a gathering of parish pastors.” The topics included ministry, ecumenism, mission, and church and society—four “areas of major disagreement” among Lutherans. *Forum Letter* summarized the contributions of each of the several speakers: Jenson, Braaten, William Lazareth, George Lindbeck, Gerhard Forde, Joseph Burgess, John Johnson, Paul Sponheim, Larry Rasmussen, and Neuhaus. The most dramatic moment came when Hinlicky, as preacher at the Eucharist, hurled a copy of the *Lutheran* from the pulpit of Boe Chapel, warning against the ELCA’s “impending apostasy.”²¹

Neuhaus reported that evaluations of the conference “ranged from solid affirmation to wild excitement.” It was, he said, “an extraordinary instance of what Luther called the fifth sacrament, ‘the mutual consolation of the brethren.’ (Meaning, of course, the sisters as well).” Yet there was a weary tone in Neuhaus’s account. The St. Olaf conference, he wrote, “was, in equal measure, heartening and sobering. It lucidly portrayed the contending forces in the struggle for the Lutheran soul and for the direction of the ELCA.” He then reflected on the meaning of the “evangelical catholic” movement within Lutheranism.

The Lutheran Reformation was a corrective. It was not intended, and it is not possible, to build the fullness of the life of the Church on a corrective. The reality of Roman Catholicism almost five centuries after Augsburg suggests that the separate ecclesial existence of Lutheranism is no longer necessary—and, if no longer necessary, then no longer justified. That, say evangelical catholics, is why working to heal the breach of the 16th century between Rome and the Reformation is a matter of gospel fidelity for confessional Lutherans.²²

Neuhaus mused that he had been ordained 30 years ago and that the “evangelical catholic understanding of Lutheranism seemed, at times, to be gaining ground over those years.” Still, that understanding had always been that of a minority. The ELCA merger, he lamented, has “shifted dramatically the dominant influence to the side of the religion managers, the ideological activists, and the confessional pietists of denominationalism.”

The first years of the ‘new church’ suggest that the shift may be irreversible. In view of the regnant sociological, institutional, and even theological dynamics, the evangelical catholic position becomes increasingly hard to advance within the ELCA. So, as we said, St Olaf was both heartening and sobering. It powerfully clarified the arguments and interests that are contending for the future of Lutheranism.

He then dropped a bombshell: after sixteen years of editing *Forum Letter*, he had decided that “it is time to move on.” He thanked his readers for their faithful support through the years, and announced that his successor would be Pr. Russell Saltzman.²³

Neuhaus had already told the ALPB board much the same thing in April, prior to “A Call to Faithfulness”—it was “time to move on.” He cited the heavy responsibility entailed in starting up his new journal, *First Things*, which had debuted in March 1990. Saltzman, then a pastor in South Carolina, had been serving on the board since 1984 (though because of distance, he did not regularly attend meetings). He had written occasionally for *Forum Letter*, and he was also at that time editing *Lutheran Commentator*, a newsletter published by a group called Lutherans for Political and Religious Freedom. When Neuhaus announced his resignation, Saltzman offered to take over the editorship of *Forum Letter*—suggesting as well that perhaps the newsletter might merge with *Lutheran Commentator*. Paul Hinlicky was reticent; in his view, *Lutheran Commentator* was too concerned with political issues—often from a neo-conservative perspective (with which he decidedly did not agree). A bit gun shy after the controversy engendered by Neuhaus through the years, the board decided they were not prepared at that point to name Saltzman editor. They did agree that there should be an editor and “several associate/contributing editors,” and they asked the executive committee to develop a specific proposal in consultation with Neuhaus, Saltzman and Hinlicky.²⁴

A few days later Hinlicky acquiesced. In a memo to the executive committee, he agreed that Saltzman was “the best qualified candidate available without making an extensive and long search.” He was still concerned about Saltzman’s *Lutheran Commentator* association, but decided that a quick and smooth transition was essential. “So I think we should appoint him and get on with that.” He was willing to consider the proposed merger with *Lutheran Commentator*, but he wanted it “explicitly understood that the ALPB, as an organization promoting confessional Lutheranism, is not committed to any particular political system or ideology ... but to the Two Kingdoms doctrine.” As it turned out, others at *Lutheran Commentator* were not as enthusiastic as Saltzman about the proposed merger, and the idea was quietly dropped. Saltzman was appointed editor for a two-year term, with the understanding that Neuhaus would be associate editor for a year, that Saltzman would recruit a team of contributing editors, and that Saltzman would be Hinlicky’s subordinate.²⁵

Saltzman accepted the position—though not without expressing privately his unhappiness at Hinlicky’s characterization of *Lutheran Commentator*. “I don’t like

the suggestion," he wrote to Hinlicky, "that *LC* has adopted one side of the political spectrum." In fact, "all the *LC* leadership would be appalled at the thought. And if that's the impression I've given as *LC* editor, I should be taken out and shot." He told Hinlicky he had no objection "with you as my, uh, superior (but just remember, I've fathered five children)." He did "expect final editorial control" of *Forum Letter* ("I'm the editor, not a copy boy"), but he assured Hinlicky that he had "a regular habit of advancing copy for critique and refinement." He suggested that he would ask both Hinlicky and Neuhaus (who had already agreed to the post of associate editor) to be his pre-publication critics.²⁶

But Neuhaus never served as associate editor. Only weeks after turning the reins over to Saltzman, he dropped another bombshell: on September 8, 1990, he was received into the Roman Catholic Church. This announcement, while not surprising in retrospect, stunned the ALPB for which he had so long been a prominent voice. The new editor of *Forum Letter* was particularly shocked. "When we began negotiations for the editorship of this *Letter*," he wrote, "we asked Richard pointedly if his resignation was prelude to 'pulling a Newman.' He said not." (Saltzman was alluding to John Henry Newman, the Anglo-Catholic leader of the Church of England's 19th century Oxford Movement, who in 1845 converted to Catholicism.) Saltzman's initial reaction to Neuhaus's announcement, he admitted, "was unrestrained anger, accompanied by an unrestrained series of sharp Anglo-Saxon words utterly appropriate to this provocation, as well as a keen sense of, yes, betrayal is not too strong a word." But then he reflected on what Neuhaus's action meant for "the Lutheran evangelical catholic movement in America, a camp in which this *Letter* has pitched its tent." He was convinced that evangelical catholics still had a vital role to play in Lutheranism. "That precisely is why we have signed on for the duration of the trip. We are sorry, more, much more than we can say, that Richard Neuhaus will not be along for the rest of the ride. To our brother in Christ, peace, and God bless."²⁷

The Reformation issue of *Lutheran Forum* was already in production when Neuhaus made his announcement, and it contained Neuhaus's lengthy critique of the "church growth movement." The article, entitled "The Lutheran Difference," argued passionately against proposals made by David Luecke and others to "modernize" Lutheran worship and teaching to make it more attractive to newcomers. Neuhaus insisted that this movement was a repudiation of Lutheran teaching on the nature of the church, the sacraments, and justification by grace. His conclusion was ironic, given his recent decision:

Whatever may be the institutional future of Lutheranism in this culture ... we should face it with banners unfurled. I do believe that, if we choose the course of faithfulness, if we cultivate excellence in preaching, teaching, liturgy and pastoral care, if we lift up the Lutheran difference; if, in sum, we become the evangelical catholics that we claim to be—well, the outgrowth of such a renewal might bring many surprises.

Such outgrowth might even include—not least importantly, but surely not most importantly—church growth.²⁸

In the following issue, Paul Hinlicky printed without editorial comment Neuhaus's open letter regarding his decision, followed by an open letter to Neuhaus from George Lindbeck. The Yale ecumenist (and a longtime friend both of Neuhaus and the ALPB) lamented Neuhaus's decision, but tried to cast it in a rather different light. Perhaps, he wrote, Neuhaus would "now be better placed to help Roman Catholics take the ecumenical initiative." He also suggested that Neuhaus's departure might provide a benefit for "evangelical catholic Lutherans."

You know better than I that many people confuse your politics and your theology. You exemplify for them 'neoconservatism,' on the one hand, and 'evangelical catholicism,' on the other, and they are inclined to mix the two. It is in vain that you insist on the distinction between the Two Kingdoms. ... Will your departure make it easier to fight against this distortion of Lutheran evangelical catholicism? I don't know the answer; but I hope that it does.²⁹

Hinlicky did take notice of Neuhaus's departure in an editorial entitled "Our Troubled Ministry." He saw Neuhaus as an extreme example of what he believed too many faithful pastors were experiencing.

It should go without saying that I bear a decent respect, and urge others to the same, for Richard's plight: how long can anyone endure character assassination at the hands of the intellectually dishonest and incompetent? How often I myself witnessed the spectacle of church politicians who would privately enjoy his advice and counsel only then publicly to disown him! As I see it, Richard endured a very long trial, and when he saw the Lord opening to him a better way to fulfill his vocation, he risked in faith.

Nonetheless, Hinlicky called on others to stay the course. "We at **Lutheran Forum** will persevere. We are undeterred. We fight for that evangelical and catholic future. God will prevail. Jesus is Lord!"³⁰

The new *Forum Letter* editor

"the ELCA's top leadership has simply failed to lead"

The ALPB board had asked that the new editor of *Forum Letter* enlist a cadre of contributing editors. They were listed on the masthead of Saltzman's first issue, and nearly every issue featured a piece by one or another of them. The original four included Pr. Richard Niebanck (now serving a parish in New Jersey), Pr. Melinda Heppe (a Pennsylvania parish pastor), Pr. John Pless (LCMS campus pastor at the University of Minnesota), and Dr. Christa Klein (a consultant on theological education to the Lilly Endowment, Inc.). But if the board hoped that *Forum Letter* would change direction with a new editor and a collection of contributing editors, they were quickly disabused

of that notion. Under Saltzman, the newsletter continued to be a sharp critic of church leaders and institutions—though he wrote with a kind of whimsy that tempered his barbs and brought a rather different tone to the publication.

His first issue reported on a major controversy at Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago over a faculty appointment to a post in Christian ethics. The two finalists were Reinhard Huetter, a white male, and Elizabeth Bettenhausen, a white female. The latter, however, was “said by critics to be somewhat inarticulate on Christological subjects,” while the former was described by one faculty member as “a once in a generation candidate.” The faculty agreed, and it was the man who was chosen. Saltzman reported:

[This situation] rapidly escalated to a grab bag of inclusivity issues, personalities, and *de rigueur* charges of: racism (from black students; Huetter and Bettenhausen are white), sexism (from women students; Huetter is male), racism and sexism (from black women students; Bettenhausen is a woman but not black), and ageism and sexism (leveled by older second-career women students; Huetter is male and younger than Bettenhausen). Doubtless we have left someone out, but, honest, it wasn't intentional.

The “moral of the story,” he observed, is the observation of one faculty member that “this is the future of the ELCA. More fights. Count on it.”³¹

In subsequent issues, Saltzman blasted an ELCA draft statement on capital punishment (“plunging the ELCA into a partisan fray”). He reported with some bafflement on discrimination lawsuits filed by Robert Preus after his forced retirement from the presidency of Concordia Theological Seminary, Ft. Wayne, IN. He wrote extensively on the draft statement of the ELCA’s “Abortion: A Call to Deliberate” (the report is “dismally impaired,” he concluded). He analyzed the Gulf War (“a lamentable necessity”) and found fault with the *Lutheran’s* editorial opposition to the conflict.³²

He was particularly critical of the ELCA’s leadership. The denomination was experiencing a budget crisis in 1991, and Saltzman had a diagnosis: “To put it as delicately as possible, the ELCA has an image problem. Chicago seems to limp along getting itself shot in the foot every couple months or so.” But the deeper issue, he said, “and truly we say this with the utmost reluctance and regret—[is] the ELCA’s top leadership has simply failed to lead.” He offered an example of what he described as “confusion in Chicago”:

Budget cuts two years ago were across the board. The axe fell indiscriminately upon corporate headquarters with no due regard for the relative importance of one division or commission over another. The ELCA’s 11th floor offered a crass defense for its slash-and-burn budgeting. What, as one ELCA official reportedly asked, makes the Division for Outreach better than the Commission for Women? Mark this: a leadership unable to distinguish the comparable weight of the Division for Outreach compared to the Commission for Women is indeed a rare and wondrous thing. ... If it has not occurred to anyone, the Division for Outreach and, we shall not forget,

Global Mission are the bureaucratic embodiments of the biblical imperative to ‘teach all nations.’ And the Commission for Women? That is the bureaucratic consequence of providing a box on the organizational chart for an ideological interest group.³³

In Saltzman’s view, the ELCA’s crisis should be laid at the doorstep of Bp. Chilstrom. He surveyed a select group of ELCA executive staff, seminary presidents, bishops, and parish pastors, asking four questions about Chilstrom’s leadership. The results astonished him. He first asked “what grade between A and F” they would give Chilstrom. The executives gave him a B+, the seminary presidents a B, the bishops a B-; but among parish pastors (25 selected at random from the *ELCA Yearbook*), the average was a D+, and none rated him higher than C+. Saltzman offered a thoughtful reflection on this disparity; the bottom line, he wrote, is that “attitudes toward the ELCA have undergone a breath-taking transition since its inception. ... Within the space of time it takes most people to pay off a car loan, the ELCA has lost its credit rating.”³⁴

Saltzman was not entirely negative, however. Reporting on the second ELCA assembly in Orlando, he sensed “a new spirit—even confidence—among delegates, ELCA staff and leadership.” There was an “agreeable cheer, patience, sincerity and, well, simple trust” that was “most winsome.” All of this “bodes well for the ELCA.” He believed that Chilstrom’s re-election was largely a matter of not wanting to “sow further seeds of confusion within the ELCA” but acknowledged that Chilstrom had heard and was responding to criticisms. In summary, the ELCA “is not yet a cohesive community, but it may be getting there.”³⁵

Forum Letter appeared to be “getting there” as well, gaining a solid footing in the post-Neuhaus era. But then readers were startled by an announcement in December that Saltzman had resigned because he was going through a divorce that he called a “personal catastrophe.” Paul Hinlicky informed readers of the board’s hope that “some-day Pastor Saltzman could return to service in the ALPB’s ministry of publication.”³⁶

There were rumors, however, that Hinlicky was not entirely unhappy to see Saltzman go. The interdenominational *Christian Century’s* column “The Underground Ecumenist,” a widely-read source of gossip about various American denominations, reported that Saltzman had been “more or less forced out” by Hinlicky.

The ostensible reason was a marriage in crisis. Sources say the real motive was the desire to get rid of a too-independent voice. The monthly newsletter gained circulation under Saltzman, pastor of a Charleston, South Carolina, congregation. He’s as deft as his predecessor at turning a phrase, but his caustic, witty critiques are not spiteful. He’s adopted a kinder, gentler tone than either Neuhaus or Hinlicky in skewering the failings of the [ELCA].

Hinlicky adamantly insisted that these charges were unfounded; he personally suspected that the unnamed “sources” were ELCA personnel in Chicago who wanted to discredit both him and the ALPB, though he refrained from making the accusation publicly.³⁷

At the time the item appeared, in fact, Saltzman and the board had already agreed that he would resume the editorship in July. Saltzman wrote to the *Christian Century*:

The Underground Ecumenist has things wrong. While the outward circumstances of my resignation ... unfortunately lent themselves to the interpretation posited ... the fact is I have been reappointed editor with the enthusiastic endorsement of Paul Hinlicky. ... We remain firm colleagues in the fullest sense of the term.

Otherwise, [the] description of me as a 'perceptive writer,' 'deft at turning a phrase,' and 'witty' was uncannily accurate. For an even more accurate portrayal, add the words 'handsome' and 'humble.'

ALPB president Hans Quitmeyer also wrote to the *Century*, telling them they had it wrong. "The 'ostensible reason' [for Saltzman's resignation], as your writer put it, was *the* reason. ... I was there, and I know."³⁸

More events and conferences

"Lutheranism is at the center of the storm"

The ALPB board had been planning another Inter-Lutheran Forum dinner for the fall of 1990, but the success of "A Call to Faithfulness" led them instead to sponsor a day-long event that would include worship, a keynote presentation and a luncheon, with various workshops in the morning and afternoon. It was advertised as "St. Olaf—East: Continuing the Call," and the announced theme was "The Future of Lutheranism."

They invited Paul Hinlicky and Richard John Neuhaus to be the speakers. This took a problematic turn when Neuhaus was received into the Roman Catholic Church two months prior to the event; even more awkward, the board had intended to recognize Neuhaus's long service to the ALPB as part of the program. In a decision Hinlicky called "historic," the board proceeded with the plans both to honor Neuhaus and to ask him to provide one of the keynote addresses. In view of the changed situation, the conference theme was changed to "The Future of Reformation." More than 150 participants gathered November 3 at the Wartburg, and the presentations were published in the February 1991 issue of *Lutheran Forum*.³⁹

Neuhaus was gracious. He thanked the Bureau and the attendees for their greatness of spirit and reflected on his own decision. He argued that the "living tradition of Catholicism has internalized the authentic concerns of the Reformation"—a truth amply demonstrated by the results of Lutheran/Roman Catholic dialogue over the past decades. "I do not pretend to know what this means for the relationship between our two communions," he admitted.

A year before his death, the distinguished Orthodox theologian, Alexander Schmemmann, told me that Americans will never understand ecumenism. Why is that? I

asked. Because, Schmemmann answered, Americans cannot understand anything that does not have a schedule attached to it.

We have neither the schedule nor clear scenario for what, over many years, I have called healing of the breach of the 16th Century between Rome and the Reformation. ...

Ecumenism requires neither schedules nor sure scenarios. Because there is one Christ, the ecumenical imperative is intrinsic to Christian existence. To be Christian is to be ecumenically Christian.

"And this I know," he concluded. "However imperfect our communion, God in Christ has given us to one another, and we must never, we can never, let one another go."⁴⁰

Hinlicky was less sanguine and more acerbic. He argued that contemporary Lutheran leaders have abandoned the doctrine of justification by grace through faith—the article on which the church stands and falls. They prefer "to focus energy on earthly happiness, be it in therapeutic counseling or therapeutic politics, rather than eternal destiny; on human agency rather than human bondage; on our experience and fulfillment rather than the means of grace and discipleship." This dilemma, he argued, is the result of a marriage between the "individualistic religious impulses" of Zwingli and the Lockean liberalism so influential in American cultural life. In truth, it is Christianity itself that is in trouble in North America, and "for good or for ill ... Lutheranism is at the center of the storm."⁴¹

Hinlicky was convinced that a continuing series of free conferences of one sort or another was the best way to keep these concerns before the church, and work began almost at once on a second "Call to Faithfulness" conference to be held in 1992, again at St. Olaf College. Hinlicky also urged the ALPB board to combine its June 1991 meeting with a consultation to which would be invited a group of "younger pastors and teachers." Planned by Hinlicky and new board member Pr. Sharon Zanter Ross, the invitation went to about three dozen persons. The purpose, Ross told them, was "to begin to concretely construct an agenda which will assist evangelical catholicism to enter the next century with vitality." Some additional ALPB supporters were also invited to join the conversation.⁴²

When the consultation convened at St. Matthew's Lutheran Church in White Plains, NY, those gathered (including ALPB board members) heard papers by Pr. Leonard Klein, Pr. Richard Ballard, Pr. Jonathan Jenkins, Dr. Bruce Marshall, and Prof. David Yeago. Marshall's paper was particularly provocative. "In our present situation," he argued, efforts for evangelical catholic reform "are meeting with resistance— theological, bureaucratic, and otherwise."

We should expect that this will continue, and may worsen. Faced with this prospect we will likely find ourselves tempted to anxiety, despair, and perhaps rage. This is in

fact temptation, and it is as such to be resisted. If the church is part of the gospel, then the church will be reformed. It's in the bag. We may perform our little labors in utter confidence of this, no matter how meager the immediate results may seem.⁴³

Some board members expressed surprise at the direction this consultation had taken. They had expected the invited guests would be advising them about the future direction of the ALPB, and instead there appeared to be a much larger agenda. Dorothy Zelenko would later recall that the theologians "argued enthusiastically among themselves about the church, largely oblivious to the ALPB people who were there." Hinlicky, hearing rumblings about the unhappiness, wrote to Fred Schumacher, ALPB secretary and pastor of St. Matthew's, that it "was not exactly what I had anticipated."

Yet I think the end result was a solid achievement: schism talk was stopped, the moderates are in charge of drafting the statement of grievances to the ELCA on the basis of commonly accepted Lutheran norms, and the controversial questions of the doctrine of the church are subjected to a study process that I personally will oversee. While I wish the ALPB had more directly benefited and more immediately, let us consider this: that if St. Olaf II and this statement play a catalytic role in changing the ELCA's direction, as sure we must pray God that they do, the ALPB and St. Matthew's will have played a not insignificant role in the history of the Kingdom.

Schumacher replied that he had been expecting "papers on the future direction of ALPB and how best we could ... serve the church," but he insisted that he did "not question ... the value of the conference especially in the light of the results."⁴⁴

Those results, however, turned out to be significantly less than had been hoped. Many years later Hinlicky would reflect on the consultation. "I don't recall," he acknowledged, "that anything ever came of the study project mentioned to Fred [Schumacher]." He did remember that the event ended on a positive note with a "delightful sermon" by ELCA bishop Michael McDaniel, who had recently joined the ALPB board; but McDaniel "saved the day, but not the project." Nothing further appears in the ALPB board minutes about the consultation. The only significant follow-up seems to have been the publication—some 18 months later—of Marshall's paper in *Lutheran Forum*.⁴⁵

That fall the ALPB resumed the older format of an Inter-Lutheran Forum dinner. The 1991 banquet featured Carl Braaten on "Building a Theological Agenda for Lutherans." He outlined what he called "three dilemmas" facing the church. The first, he said, was the question of "whether they are the original Protestants breaking away to start a new and true church or reforming Catholics pushing the cause of evangelical renewal." This has led to "a kind of civil war" between what George Lindbeck calls "denominational confessionalists and evangelical catholics." The second was that Lutherans had "fought for the right and necessity to use the historical critical method [of Biblical study], but it is turning out to be a pyrrhic victory" because the method has "[separated] itself from the paradigm of the church's trinitarian and christological dog-

mas" and become captive to the *Zeitgeist*. The third was the conflict over the meaning of justification. Braaten argued that "the badge of Lutheran identity has become badly smudged." "One gets the distinct impression," he suggested, "that [some] Lutherans feel the necessity to soft pedal justification to commend it to our times," while others are such "resolute champions of justification" that in their thinking it becomes not the chief article but the *only* article.⁴⁶

To address these dilemmas, Braaten insisted that Lutherans must take the Trinity "as the paradigmatic framework for all Christian theology." They must rescue the Bible from its "Babylonian captivity to scholarly specializations" and read the Bible whole again. This will entail learning "to think again in concert with the entire *Una Sancta* in space and time." It will require battling the "theocentric Unitarianism flooding the academy, and just [learning] how to say No!" Lutherans must "find better ways to parse our justification doctrine to set it free from Lutheran jingoism." They must also be willing to grant a "real but limited respect for reason even apart from and prior to faith." This agenda, Braaten concluded, keeps the Lutheran confessions "in continuity with the entire sweep of the catholic tradition," always "for the sake of an evangelical witness within Western Christianity."⁴⁷

These events were all building up to "St. Olaf II" in June 1992. Once again *dialog* and *Lutheran Quarterly* joined *Lutheran Forum/Forum Letter* as sponsors, and once again an impressive array of speakers was announced, representing both "evangelical catholics" and "denominational confessionalists" (now more generally being called "radical Lutherans"). The topics were more focused on specific issues facing the ELCA. Carl Braaten agreed to give the keynote address, which he entitled "The Gospel or What?" Luther Seminary's Walter Sundberg, one of the sharpest critics of the evangelical catholic understanding of Lutheranism, would respond. Several other pairs of speakers (George Lindbeck and Gerhard Forde, David Yeago and Joseph Burgess, Robert Jenson and Meg Madson) were chosen to represent both the "evangelical catholic" and the "radical Lutheran" perspectives—both groups anxious about what they saw as looming apostasy in the ELCA, but with sharply different perspectives on the root of the problem and what to do about it. Finally, Paul Hinlicky, Gracia Grindal, and Robert Benne would critique the ELCA's quota system, each from his or her own point of view.

Braaten's keynote offered the red meat that many attendees expected. "There is a spiritual battle being waged in our church today," he began, calling it the age-old battle between light and darkness, life and death. He asked a profound question: "What did we organize this church to do?" For Braaten, the "one thing needful" is to preach the gospel. But the gospel is proclaimed precisely by the church, and it is in its understanding of the church that the ELCA is deficient.

Lutheranism should recognize that it cannot solve the problem of the doctrine of the ministry as long as it has a deficient doctrine of the church. The *satis est* clause of

Article VII of the Augsburg Confession is a teaching aimed to defend the purity of Article IV on justification by faith apart from works; it is a soteriological statement and not the blueprint for an ecclesiology. By historical accident Lutherans have suffered the separation of the gospel and the church, and so they have tried desperately to re-invent the church from the doctrine of justification by faith alone. It cannot work. So every ten years or so Lutherans engage in a comprehensive study of the doctrine of the ministry, and wonder why they have made no progress.⁴⁸

But Sundberg had a very different view of what "cannot work." After thanking Braaten for his forthrightness and clarity, he condemned those who elevate the doctrines of the church and the ministry "to all-determining principles."

There are some in the church who say: 'If we only had a sufficient doctrine of the church with an ecumenically correct doctrine of ministry (this means, of course, the so-called "historic episcopate" and a threefold office of ministry) we will be true to the call to faithfulness.' As a way through the forest of our troubles, I am afraid this will not work.

Sundberg insisted that Luther and his colleagues "did away with what they called 'human traditions,' including much of what was taught in the 16th century about the church. The Lutheran ecclesiology of *satis est* "was not an 'historical accident'; it was intended."⁴⁹

One interesting aspect of the conference was the appearance of Bp. Herbert Chilstrom, who had accepted an invitation to be present and to speak. He was received warmly, but his message was disappointing to many. He proclaimed his love for "the whole church." He gamely defended what many of those present thought problematic: the quota system, the vesting of ultimate authority in a lay-dominated representational assembly. He admitted that church structures, including even "independent organizations and publications, are imperfect and faulty expressions of what we might hope... yet for all that we are together the church of Christ."⁵⁰

"It took courage [for Chilstrom] just to show up in the midst of 700+ people, the vast majority of whom think he is leading their church down the primrose path," Leonard Klein admitted in *Forum Letter*. Clearly the bishop is a man of "faith, piety, and deep Lutheran commitments." Still, Chilstrom's words did little to reassure those present that their church was on the right track.⁵¹

But the rest of the presentations, like the Braaten/Sundberg exchange, also evidenced the sharply different perspectives of evangelical catholics and radical Lutherans. This made many despair of the possibility of the two groups making common cause, despite their shared anxiety about the ELCA's direction. It had been, Hinlicky admitted, "a worthy idea, an experiment that had to be tried." But it seems doomed to fail.

A year ago, *LF* took no little heat for calling a spade a spade when we devoted an issue to the theme of *ecumenical gridlock*. In this edition, readers will discover and verify that gridlock of the ecumenical movement right smack in the middle of our American Lutheranism.⁵²

Klein, too, saw as "sobering" the "continuing impasse" between the two views of Lutheran confessionalism. He left little question where he stood—and he was in fact speaking for the ALPB, or at least for its publications. Despite some positive contributions, "radical Lutheranism has not produced what it hoped for."

The better road forward leads more directly out of older confessionalism and right through—you won't be surprised to hear me say this—the nexus of arguments and concerns loosely collected under the label 'evangelical catholic.' Constructive trinitarian and liturgical theology, ecumenical engagement, reflection on the church as an ethical community, and a fair confrontation with the catholic claims as to order and ministry hold out far more hope for shaping a church life that can meet the challenge of three centuries of assault on Christian faith.

"The conversation needs to continue," Klein wrote, "and it will continue ... in these pages. ... But I trust that both sides see the futility of structuring the debate into any future events like the two gatherings at Northfield."⁵³

So there were no more "Call to Faithfulness" events. The Bureau did have a minor role in another theological conference at St. Olaf, "Reclaiming the Bible for the Church," held in conjunction with the Center for Catholic and Evangelical Theology. The June 1994 event was co-sponsored by the ALPB, but it was planned and executed by the CCET. There were announcements of the conference in *Lutheran Forum*, but not much more ALPB involvement even in promotion. A brief editorial note in *Lutheran Forum* put it in context:

Readers will note that this conference is not a *Call to Faithfulness III*. That effort has run its course and a further public debate between the two major confession-alist factions in the ELCA will do no one any good. We need to move on to constructive theology; that makes this conference as critical a witness as those two earlier events for those who would call the ELCA back to faithfulness. We urge your attendance.

The conference featured an ecumenical group of theologians addressing the crisis of Biblical authority and interpretation; it was heavy with Lutherans, though there were several prominent scholars from other traditions. The papers were later published by William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. This would be the ALPB's last direct involvement, at least for a while, in such an ambitious theological conference. There were, however, other even more ambitious endeavors on the horizon.⁵⁴

Notes

1. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 22 Sept. 1987.
2. Ibid.
3. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 18 Jan, 1988 (with attachment, Paul Hinlicky, "Statement").
4. Paul R. Hinlicky, "A Time for Decision," *LF* 22, no. 1 (Lent 1988), 17-19.
5. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 24 May 1988.
6. *FL* 16, no. 11 (29 Feb. 1988), 8.
7. Thomas R. Sluberski, "Essays in Honor of Glenn C. Stone: A Festschrift," *LF* 22, no. 2 (Pentecost 1988), 4; *FL* 16, no. 11 (29 Feb. 1988), 8.

8. "In Memoriam: Pastor Adolf F. Meyer, D.D.," *LF* 22, no. 3 (Reformation 1988), 7.
9. *FL* 17, no. 12 (8 Jan. 1989), 1-3.
10. *Ibid.*, 5-7.
11. *FL* 18, no. 1 (5 Feb. 1989), 2.
12. *Ibid.*, 4-5.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *FL* 18, no. 8 (28 Aug. 1989), 4; "Two quit 'Lutheran Forum,'" *Lutheran*, 22 Mar. 1989, 35.
15. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 7 Mar. 1989; "Two quit 'Lutheran Forum.'"
16. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 7 Mar. 1989.
17. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 23 May 1989.
18. *Ibid.*
19. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 16 Sept. 1989 and 21 Nov. 1989.
20. *LF* 23, no. 4 (Advent 1989), 40; *FL* 18, no. 8 (28 Aug. 1989), 7.
21. *FL* 19, no. 7 (25 July 1990), 1ff.
22. *Ibid.*, 7.
23. *Ibid.*, 8.
24. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 24 Apr. 1990.
25. Paul Hinlicky to Executive Committee, 30 Apr. 1990, ALPB Archives.
26. Russell E. Saltzman to Paul Hinlicky, 3 May 1990, ALPB Archives.
27. *FL*, 19, no. 9 (14 Sept. 1990), 1-4.
28. Richard John Neuhaus, "The Lutheran Difference," *LF* 24, no. 3 (Reformation 1990), 24.
29. George Lindbeck, "To Richard J. Neuhaus," *LF* 24, no. 4 (Advent 1990), 44.
30. Paul R. Hinlicky, "Our Troubled Ministry," *LF* 24, no. 4 (Advent 1990), 4-5.
31. *FL* 19, no. 8 (15 Aug. 1990), 1-2.
32. *FL* 19, no. 11 (23 Nov. 1990), 2; *FL* 19, no. 12 (25 Dec. 1990), 1ff.; *FL* 20, no. 2 (23 Feb. 1991), 3; *FL* 20, no. 3 (24 Mar. 1991), 1ff.
33. *FL* 20, no. 5 (26 May 1991), 2-4.
34. *FL* 20, no. 6 (24 June 1991), 6.
35. *FL* 20, no. 10 (31 Oct. 1991), 1ff.
36. *FL* 20, no. 12 (25 Dec. 1991), 1.
37. Paul R. Hinlicky, telephone conversation with Richard O. Johnson, 20 May 2016.
38. Kate Anders Marlin, "The Underground Ecumenist," *Christian Century* 109, no. 17 (13 May 1992), 509; Letters to the Editor, *Christian Century* 109, no. 21 (1-8 July 1992), 662.
39. "St. Olaf East—Continuing the Call: Editor's Introduction," *LF* 25, no. 1 (Feb. 1991), 4.
40. Richard John Neuhaus, "The Future of the Reformation," *LF* 25, no. 1 (Feb. 1991), 6-7.
41. Paul R. Hinlicky, "The Future of Reformation," *LF* 25, no. 1 (Feb. 1991), 9-10.
42. Sharon Zanter Ross to unspecified recipients, n.d. [ca 1991], ALPB Archives. Paul Hinlicky also signed the letter, but it was written in Zanter's voice.
43. Bruce D. Marshall, "The Church in the Gospel," *LF* 27, no. 1 (Feb. 1993), 24ff.
44. Dorothy Zelenko, e-mail message to Richard O. Johnson, 4 May 2016; Paul Hinlicky to Fred Schumacher, 7 June 1991; Fred Schumacher to Paul Hinlicky, 10 June 1991, ALPB Archives.
45. Paul R. Hinlicky, e-mail message to Richard O. Johnson, 17 Mar. 2016.
46. Carl E. Braaten, "Building a Theological Agenda for Lutherans," *LF* 26, no. 1 (Feb. 1992), 21-22.
47. *Ibid.*, 25.
48. Carl E. Braaten, "The Gospel—Or What?" *LF* 26, no. 4 (Nov. 1992), 4ff.
49. Walter Sundberg, "A Conflict of Creeds," *LF* 26, no. 4 (Nov. 1992), 11ff.
50. Herbert W. Chilstrom, "We Can Love the Church—the Whole Church," *LF* 26, no. 4 (Nov. 1992), 30.
51. *FL* 21, no. 6 (29 June 1992), 1.
52. Paul R. Hinlicky, "In the Forum," *LF* 26, no. 4 (Nov. 1992), 3.
53. *FL* 21, no. 6 (June 29, 1992), 3-4.
54. *LF* 28, no. 1 (Feb. 1994), 7; Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson, eds. *Reclaiming the Bible for the Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995).

Chapter 20

A PUBLISHING MINISTRY

The ALPB's 1975 statement of purpose had left its mission somewhat open-ended: "the Bureau shall publish appropriate literature and engage in such other activities as it deems useful." By the 1990s, though, the "other activities" had receded into the background and the focus was once again almost entirely on publication—the *Forum* package, but also a new academic journal, a reinvigorated tract ministry, and an increasingly important book publishing program.

Lutheran Forum under Hinlicky

"the forum of that new generation"

When Paul Hinlicky took charge of *Lutheran Forum*, he told the board that his "tone would be more urgent." As the new ELCA developed, *Lutheran Forum* offered an increasingly harsh critique of what Hinlicky called "the crisis in American Lutheranism." In his very first issue, Hinlicky had already sounded the alarm about "the protestantizing of Lutheranism into conservative and liberal sects." He saw the magazine's task in stark terms:

Lutheran Forum now becomes the forum of that new generation which is sick of tearing down and wants instead to build up. Barring 'war at the gates,' our ambition for our church is better than to see it dive into the bottomless pit of the hermeneutics

of suspicion in which we were schooled. We have found our way back to Christian faith with the help of Luther, and our aim is to master the crisis, not retreat from it. We see in the demise of Protestantism as a Christian church a microcosm of the crisis of Western civilization, of that godlessness of culture which began, as Luther prophesied, when Zwingli tore asunder what God had joined together. So it is time, we think, to return attention to the Catechism of Luther, to the material questions concerning the essential things of life and salvation.¹

Hinlicky's approach was to be based firmly in Lutheran confessional theology. That first issue took as its theme "The Small Catechism and the Formation of Piety," while the next four focused on the four *solas* of the Reformation—Christ alone, grace alone, faith alone, Scripture alone. Within those themes, the magazine published essays by many of the foremost teachers and theologians of the church, as well as commentary by parish pastors.

Real life manifestations of the theological crisis were also presented. The first of several "State of the Church Reports," written by Pennsylvania pastor Mark Chapman, described a conference called "Ecumenical Moment '88." It was sponsored by the World and National Councils of Churches and featured the general secretaries of both organizations, as well as other prominent leaders—hardly the "extremist fringe of conciliar ecumenism," he noted. Yet "what they espoused as 'ecumenism' was simply shocking."

I knew we were in trouble when our first worship 'celebration' found us outdoors at a garden pond offering prayers and water libations to the Seven Spirits of the seven directions of the universe. ... What to any objective observer was sheer paganism, we were told, was simply an exercise in discovering the ecumenical variety of spiritual expression and experience that we must learn to share if we are to be truly one.

"Genuine ecumenism," he concluded, "is not syncretistic religious pluralism ... [but it] is explicitly *Christian*. ... The WCC and NCC have clearly lost grip on this basic and fundamental definition." In the following issue, Amandus Derr told of attending a worship service at ELCA headquarters in which there was not a single mention of God ("neither God nor a person of the Holy Trinity") until the final hymn. "If this was worship," he wrote, "I don't know who was worshiped or why."²

Under Hinlicky's editorship, ecumenism was still often front and center, but sunny support of ecumenical dialogue had turned to caution about specific proposals working their way toward consideration in the ELCA. Moreover, writers were skeptical about whether the ELCA was even capable of serious ecumenical work. The developing declaration of full communion between the ELCA and the Episcopal Church, for example, caused Michael Root to ponder a "disturbing question: Can the ELCA carry out a reasoned debate on a major ecumenical proposal? When a seminary professor publicly describes the proposal as 'necrophilia,' one's expectations cannot be high." (His reference was to a widely-repeated comment by Walter Sundberg that "going to bed with Episcopalians is like ecclesiastical necrophilia." Sundberg's remark was, to

his embarrassment, published in the *Minneapolis Star-Tribune* and then repeated in *Newsweek* magazine.)³

Root was not opposed to full communion with the Episcopalians, though his article was paired with one by Meg Madson sharply criticizing what she called ELCA leaders' attempt to "pressure the ELCA into episcopal succession." But while *Lutheran Forum* writers took different perspectives on the Lutheran/Episcopal proposals, there was almost unanimous opposition to the recommendations of the Lutheran/Reformed dialogues. Guest editorialist Mark Chapman took up *A Common Calling*, which proposed full communion between the ELCA and three Reformed bodies (Presbyterian Church USA, Reformed Church in America, and United Church of Christ). "From the perspective of ecumenical theology," he wrote, 'A Common Calling' is a disaster." It is, however, a "five-star triumph" in "the Realpolitik of denominational mergers."⁴

Lutheran Forum also continued its traditional focus on matters liturgical. The annual *Una Sancta* issue continued, though not quite annually; between 1988 and 1993 it appeared on average every eighteen months. The articles, however, shifted away from the practical liturgical topics of previous years. Now they were often theological treatises or articles about adapting the liturgy in specific ethnic or demographic settings. There was frequent criticism of the "church growth movement" and its "entertainment evangelism" proclivities.

The early years of *Lutheran Forum* had often discussed race relations and civil rights, war and peace, women in church and society, international affairs; under Hinlicky there was a perceptible shift away from social concerns. The editor himself seemed to recognize this. In the Reformation 1989 issue, he suggested that the magazine would now "engage controverted points in our society, beginning with the Advent issue on the theme of 'Abortion and Christian Character.'" It was a good beginning, but the following several issues returned to more internal ecclesiastical matters in preparation for, and following up on, the first "Call to Faithfulness" conference.⁵

He tried again two years later, announcing that "the program of *Lutheran Forum* in 1991 shifts focus from the introspection of the past year on the plight of American Lutheranism to the troubled society in which we live today." The result was still only minimal attention to social issues. The Pentecost 1993 theme was "Quest for a Public Theology," and later that year the magazine took up "The End of Marxism"; but in general, *Lutheran Forum* maintained an introspective stance.⁶

One exception was considerable space given to the topic of sexuality, and especially homosexuality—though this, of course, was a matter that was now convulsing the church itself. When a gay man and two lesbians were illicitly ordained in San Francisco in 1990 ("the latest ELCA disaster," Hinlicky called it), editorial advisor Leonard Klein expressed the magazine's position.

From Bishop Chilstrom on down, the San Francisco ordinations must be rejected not because the church isn't ready for this yet. They must be rejected, and appropriate

discipline of the involved pastors and congregations must follow, because there is no place in the ELCA for a cadre of clergy who at the most profound and intimate levels of their personal life and at the most clear and public center of their vocation declare that Scripture is not applicable.

In the same issue, Martin Heineken, professor emeritus of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, argued that the ordinations themselves were invalid.⁷

The several issues that came before and after the "Call to Faithfulness" conferences cut across all these topics, challenging the ELCA on its social statements, its liturgical and ecumenical initiatives, its theological stances. There were articles dealing with the feminist critique of "God language." The ELCA's quota system came in for regular criticism. *Lutheran Forum* also paid more attention to the Missouri Synod during these years, perhaps because Hinlicky, unlike Glenn Stone, had LCMS roots. But the ELCA and its ills was still the primary topic of discussion.

Sometimes Hinlicky's "more urgent tone" could display an edge of disdain. A promotional offer in 1991 encouraged subscribers to buy bulk copies of *Forum Letter* for congregational leaders as an alternative to the ELCA's *Seeds for the Parish*; the page was headlined, "Tired of *Weeds for the Parish*?" "That's not good," Russ Saltzman wrote to him. "It is simply too provoking and furthers our image, deserved or not, of 'ELCA-bashing.'"

Ultimately, [we all] want the ELCA to be the theological embodiment of what best represents catholic Lutheranism, a worthy bride with as few blemishes as possible. But I fear we risk turning off potential—you might read 'moderate'—listeners if we get really nasty. And 'weeds' purt'n near does that. I did not take it for satire. It just hit me mean.

Apparently Saltzman's view (several others shared it) prevailed, and the next issue contained the same promo piece but without the provocative headline.⁸

The most prevalent theme in *Lutheran Forum* under Hinlicky was the advocacy of the evangelical catholic vision of Lutheranism. It was laced throughout the papers from and pertaining to the St. Olaf conferences. It was discussed forthrightly in editorials and articles throughout this period (including, it must be said, by writers who profoundly disagreed with the evangelical catholic position; in that respect, the magazine maintained its commitment to being a forum). But clearly Hinlicky believed that the evangelical catholic vision was the mission of *Lutheran Forum*. In a "message to subscribers" in 1991, he marveled that the magazine's renewal rate was a remarkable 90%.

We don't mind admitting that we were nervous that the loss of Richard John Neuhaus would adversely affect subscriptions. In fact, we have enjoyed something like a 25% net increase in paid subscriptions during the past two years. It is now clear that there has been no change in the growth rate since Neuhaus' departure, let alone a loss! That is evidence ... that the evangelical catholic understanding of Lutheranism is deep as well as broad.

The actual subscriptions records for this period don't substantiate Hinlicky's assertion of a 25% increase in paid subscriptions; there was a slight increase in circulation, perhaps due to increased promotion in 1990 and 1991, but it was not dramatic. For several months during this period no renewal notices were sent; when that was finally rectified, there was a glut of "renewals" which Hinlicky may have interpreted as an "increase in paid subscriptions." In any event, his essential point was correct: the loss of Richard John Neuhaus had not materially impacted the subscription numbers for the *Forum* package. The support for the "evangelical catholic understanding of Lutheranism" seemed to be intact.⁹

Forum Letter in the interim

"Official gobbledegook"

After Russell Saltzman's resignation, Paul Hinlicky temporarily edited *Forum Letter* as well as *Lutheran Forum*. But while Hinlicky held the title of interim editor, in fact Leonard Klein was primarily responsible for the newsletter during this period. Over the next six months, he would write about half the material in *Forum Letter*. Aside from a few contributions from others, Hinlicky would write the rest.

During this interim, *Forum Letter* continued its role of addressing the political side of the Lutheran churches, leaving theology to *Lutheran Forum*. Sometimes this took the form of investigative journalism. In January 1992, Klein told the story of a clumsy attempt by the ELCA's Division for Outreach to start a new "regional mega-church" in the North Fort Worth area. He revealed that they had done so without any consultation with local pastors in the area, and without prior discussion by the synod council. Even worse from Klein's perspective was the plan itself, which was to start a congregation using the techniques of the church growth movement—i.e., a non-liturgical mission with specific racial and economic targeting. Klein reported that the plug had been pulled on the plan, thanks in part to an outcry from local pastors and congregations. He hoped that this experience might result in "a major reassessment of the plans to pilot test some mega-church starts."¹⁰

The next issue took on the recently released ELCA sexuality study. Hinlicky pulled no punches. "Official gobbledegook," he huffed. "An insult to our intelligence." Klein's longer analysis was hardly more restrained. The report "is another reminder of how bad off the ELCA is." In its "fifty-five tedious pages," the study lists "standard positions on sexual ethics ... alongside other opinions with no hint that one has or should have any priority. Traditional positions are stated in a kind of have-you-stopped-beating-your-wife rhetoric."

Now, we're sinners and we mess this up right well, just like everything else. The ecstatic power and pleasure of sex are more than most of us can handle well. We sin. The

church must deal pastorally and graciously with those whose struggle with *eros* does not go by the book. ... This is not all that hard, folks. We didn't need a self-important task force to teach us this. In point of fact, we didn't need the task force at all. We had all we needed already, lacking only the guts and brains to use it. The test now will be to see whether the church, particularly its ordained leadership and its bishops, will summon the courage and insight to reject the study and to do the right thing.

The right thing, he concluded, "would be to 'just say thanks' to the committee and send them home. And to fire the prime movers."¹¹

The new, old ministry of leaflets

"an added resource for defining Lutheran"

In the 1970s, the Bureau had returned to its ministry of tracts on a limited basis by reissuing several long-time best sellers among the Bureau's inventory. In the 1990s, a decision was made to reinvigorate this ministry with some new releases. The impetus came primarily from lay members of the board, who viewed the tract ministry as one of the most effective ways for the Bureau to communicate with laity. This led to an extended discussion about tracts in May 1993. Ted Wittrock and Glenn Stone provided a history of the Bureau's tract ministry. There was much conversation about what kinds of tracts might be useful in the new situation in which the churches found themselves, and a task force was appointed to develop a specific proposal.¹²

This group, chaired by Connie Seddon, reported at the next meeting that they had agreed on five tracts on the theme of "Lutheran identity." The term "tract" was dropped because it sounded old-fashioned; the series would be marketed as "leaflets." The five were ready for release in mid-1994. The promotional piece in *Lutheran Forum* explained the purpose:

Need an added resource for defining *Lutheran*? The ALPB would like to help with five new leaflets, planned to focus attention on what is unique about the Lutheran Church. Designed for newcomers to the Lutheran Church, as well as those members who may want a refresher course in subjects central to Lutheranism. Pastors may want to use the brochures as teaching supplements as well as for general distribution. Lay members will value these short, informative pieces about their church.¹³

The leaflets provided very basic introductions to Lutheranism from different perspectives. The first two were written by Christa Klein (though in keeping with longstanding ALPB practice, the authors' names do not appear on any of the tracts). "Lutheran? What's in a Name?" summarized the history of Lutheran Christianity. "Lutherans and Other Christians" provided the foundation for the evangelical catholic view of Lutheranism (without ever using those terms). The intention of the early Lutherans, Klein wrote, "was to be a reforming movement within the Catholic Church,

but "Lutherans found themselves caught between two polarizing sets of Christian belief and practice, Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant, a position that has never been very comfortable and has been the source of internal and external tensions." Lutherans are committed to "protestant principle (justification by grace through faith alone) and catholic substance (that grace is given through Word and Sacrament centered in the church and stewarded by ordained ministers)."¹⁴

A third leaflet, written by Eric Gritsch, briefly recounted the story of "Martin Luther and the Reformation." The last two dealt with worship. "An Invitation to Lutheran Worship" was a revision of an earlier piece written by Glenn Stone; it explained in simple terms what a visitor to a Lutheran church service might expect. The final leaflet, "Lutheran Faith, Lutheran Worship—Two Sides of One Coin," offered an explanation by Phillip Max Johnson of the connection between the liturgy and the Christian faith. It included a repeated refrain: "As we worship, so we believe; as we believe, so we worship."¹⁵

The new series sold well. In late 1995, Ms. Seddon reported that while the most orders had come from Pennsylvania, New York and California, distribution had reached some 40 states, as well as Canada, the United Kingdom, and the Central African Republic. Some 72% of the orders came from ELCA pastors and congregations, 25% from LCMS, and the rest were unidentified. Oddly, there were no orders from Minneapolis, the "most Lutheran of all cities." By the end of 1996, the ALPB had sold 305 sets of 100 each of the five leaflets, as well as many more in smaller quantities—a total of 206,188 individual pieces. These tracts continued to sell well and were reprinted in the next decade. By the end of 2015, the number of individual tracts sold had surpassed half a million.¹⁶

Pro Ecclesia

"we are proud of what we were together able to accomplish"

Paul Hinlicky was a man with many ideas, and as executive director of the ALPB, he often got the Bureau involved in projects that stretched and expanded its own sense of its mission. In the fall of 1990, Hinlicky told the board that he was working on "a very exciting development." "I have a verbal commitment from Robert Jenson and Carl Braaten," he wrote, "to serve as editors of a new, prestigious scholarly journal of theology, under the ALPB umbrella. This will be quite a coup for us."¹⁷

The phrase "under the ALPB umbrella" was perhaps an overstatement. As plans for the new journal developed, Jenson and Braaten established the Center for Catholic and Evangelical theology. This group was primarily responsible for the new journal, which was named *Pro Ecclesia* and made its initial appearance in the fall of 1992. Braaten would describe the relationship between the Center and the Bureau as "a partnership," and the *Pro Ecclesia*'s front matter would say it was published "in cooperation with the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau." In fact, the relationship was primarily a business

arrangement. In 1990 Hinlicky had hired Martin A. Christiansen as managing editor of the ALPB publications to free himself of the details of production. Christiansen, a former Lutheran parochial school teacher with a master's degree in English, would initially work part time, with the expectation that he would eventually take over the production management of *Pro Ecclesia* and his position would become full-time. This would not cost the ALPB anything, Hinlicky told the board, because Christiansen would be picking up tasks currently being subcontracted to other companies or persons.¹⁸

For more than a dozen years, the ALPB acted as the publisher for *Pro Ecclesia*, with ALPB employees and volunteers handling the physical production, managing the subscriptions, and making regular financial and subscription reports to the CCET. There was early conversation about the ALPB having representation on the Center's board, but the CCET was reluctant—though the Bureau's executive director was always invited and frequently attended the annual board meetings as a guest. The relationship between the Center and the Bureau ended in 2005 when the publisher Roman & Littlefield proposed taking over publication of the magazine. The CCET board accepted the offer—primarily, Carl Braaten told the ALPB board, “because this publishing house is believed to have the merchandizing wherewithal to grow the journal.” Braaten was effusive in his appreciation for the partnership between the two organizations. It has been “an unmitigated pleasure, marked by unqualified mutual trust and cooperation between the representatives of ALPB and CCET. ... I am extremely grateful.” For its part, the ALPB was pleased to have been instrumental in the launching and nurturing of what had become a significant academic theological journal. Fred Schumacher, by then the ALPB's executive director, wrote to Braaten:

I think I speak for ... the entire ALPB Board ... in saying that we are proud of what we together were able to accomplish in bringing *Pro Ecclesia* into being and keeping it solvent over the past thirteen years. We continue to pray for your success in bringing it and the vision of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church that it represents to a larger audience.

Pro Ecclesia had shown a net profit over the years of more than \$6,000, which was, in accordance with their original agreement, divided equally between the two organizations.¹⁹

A book publishing program

“theologically responsible books grounded in the gospel”

Paul Hinlicky's vision for the ALPB also included a robust book publishing program. The Bureau had occasionally published books in the past, either under its own imprint or that of the now defunct Lutheran Press; its books, however, had most often consisted of reprints of articles from one of the ALPB periodicals, and they were (with the exception of *Manual of Practical Church Work* in 1942) quite modest in

size. Hinlicky hoped that the Bureau might begin to publish more substantial books, and to do so more regularly. In 1991 he presented a proposal written by himself and Christian von Dehsen, a young scholar then teaching at Carthage College who was book review editor for *Lutheran Forum*. They noted that contemporary theological publishing generally fell into one of two categories: books were either intended for the academy, often focused on the “latest intellectual trends,” or they were intended for a wider, mostly lay, audience looking for their “spiritual needs” to be met. In both cases, they argued, “the theological traditions of the church are frequently abandoned in favor of meeting perceived market trends. Disciplined theological thinking languishes.” Thus “the time is ripe for the expansion of the ALPB ministry of publication by providing theologically responsible books grounded in the gospel and designed for use in congregations.”²⁰

Hinlicky and von Dehsen argued that the advent of desktop publishing made it technologically and financially feasible to consider such a program. They outlined what they had in mind:

Twice a year the ALPB would publish four to six books across the theological fields (e.g., biblical studies, dogmatics, history, liturgics). Authors would be recruited both from the ranks of established scholars ... [as well as] younger scholars. While not overly technical, these books, ranging from 150 to 225 pages in length, would be known as 1) theologically trustworthy, 2) affordable, and 3) oriented to the worshipping and ministering community.

It was an ambitious project, to be sure, one which would require a substantial financial investment. The board had already been discussing a possible capital fund drive, and they decided to incorporate the book publishing proposal into their \$100,000 goal. Half of the total, \$50,000, was designated for a “revolving fund” to provide start-up capital for the book program (as well as for the proposed *Pro Ecclesia*). Another \$15,000 would purchase the new equipment which would be essential if the book program were to go forward. The remaining \$35,000 would be an endowment to provide subscriptions to students, retired pastors, and Third World educational institutions.²¹

The capital campaign, however, fizzled. It was approved by the board in November, 1991, and the executive committee was directed to proceed with securing a campaign director. The person they had in mind proved unavailable, and an alternative candidate never emerged. There is no further mention of the campaign in subsequent minutes. A few contributions were received, mostly from board members, but the campaign itself did not progress beyond the proposal stage.

But at least it planted the idea that the ALPB should publish books. If “four to six twice a year” was out of reach, occasional books seemed a reasonable goal, and for the next several years at least one book a year was published—sometimes as many as four. Most of them were not initiated by the ALPB; rather the Bureau increasingly began to

receive proposals from authors who thought their manuscripts might be a good match for the ALPB's mission.

The first ALPB book in this new publishing endeavor followed the earlier pattern in the sense that it was a reprint of material first published in an ALPB periodical. Robert Jenson had written what he called "A Large Catechism," published in *Lutheran Forum* in several installments beginning in December 1989. Somewhat revised and expanded, it was released in book form in 1991. It sold well and was reprinted in 1999 and 2013.

The next year, ALPB published *Different Voices/Shared Vision: Male and Female in the Trinitarian Community*. This book contained the papers from a conference sponsored by a group of LCMS women to discuss the Biblical understanding of the relationship between men and women. The papers were edited by Paul Hinlicky, who also wrote an afterword. Publication costs were mostly borne by the group which sponsored the conference. *Lutheran Forum* advertised the book as "the most important publishing event in the recent history of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod" and "must reading for every pastor and lay leader" because "it offers a comprehensive alternative to the official theology of the subordination of women held by the synod."²²

A third book appeared in 1993, this one an anthology of writings by Arthur Carl Piepkorn. The late Concordia Seminary professor and long-time editorial associate for the *American Lutheran* was one of the leading architects of the evangelical catholic movement. Piepkorn's scholarly writings had mostly appeared as journal articles rather than monographs; the ALPB's book, entitled *The Church: Selected Writings of Arthur Carl Piepkorn*, brought together sixteen articles from various publications—writings on the church, but also on the holy ministry, the sacraments, and the Blessed Virgin Mary. This book also sold well, and a second edition was published in 2006.²³

As the Bureau waded further into book publishing, new manuscripts and proposals continued to be received; a formal book committee was established to review and recommend potential publications. But before any additional proposals were approved, the Bureau produced what would be one of its most important contributions to the life of American Lutheranism.

For All the Saints

"a timely and welcome gift"

At the 1991 consultation between the ALPB board and several (mostly younger) theologians held at St. Matthew's Lutheran Church in White Plains, NY, a casual conversation led to what would become the Bureau's most ambitious and successful book project. The board's secretary, Pr. Fred Schumacher, was also the *pastor loci*, and he offered his study to fellow board member Bp. Michael McDaniel to make phone calls during breaks in the meeting. McDaniel noticed a copy of the four-volume *The Liturgy of the Hours* on

Schumacher's shelf. This work was a popular Roman Catholic breviary, with Biblical and patristic readings together with the daily prayer offices of the church. McDaniel told Schumacher that he also used *The Liturgy of the Hours* in his own devotional practice. "It had all one needed for a disciplined life of Bible reading and prayer," Schumacher later recounted, "and could be taken with one and used in any location."

We both expressed need for such a breviary in the Lutheran Church that would be of value to pastors and lay people to develop a disciplined prayer-life. Both of us had over the years used books produced by Lutherans but none of them provided in one book all that was needed. ... I said to Bishop McDaniel 'someone in the Lutheran Church should produce a book similar to the Roman breviary' and I asked him if he knew of such a person. He said, 'no,' and then after a pause said, 'Fred, why don't you do it?'

The question kept nagging at Schumacher throughout that day, and he asked Paul Hinlicky what he thought of the idea. Hinlicky encouraged him to raise it with the ALPB board. They responded positively, inviting Schumacher to bring a proposal to the next board meeting.²⁴

Schumacher was so excited that he started working on the project immediately—even before the board had seen a proposal. A few days later he asked Dorothy Zelenko, a member of St. Matthew's as well as ALPB treasurer, if she would help. He recruited other volunteers from his congregation, who began entering material into the congregation's computer system. It was, he would later say, a "haphazard" beginning, with little organization or plan. Ms. Zelenko, meanwhile, had taken a couple of books about saints out of the library and was thinking about which ones might be good to include in the proposed book; but one day she happened to stop by the church office and was shocked to find volunteers hard at work, typing quotes Schumacher had already selected into an older word-processing program. She knew she had to find a more sophisticated program quickly if all the pieces of the project were ever to be brought together. It would become an almost overwhelming task, but work on the project now began in earnest.²⁵

When the ALPB board met in November 1991, Schumacher brought the proposal before them, projecting a 4-volume set (two volumes for each of the two years of the daily lectionary). The board enthusiastically approved the already underway project, but it became apparent that some basic questions had not been addressed—how many copies should be printed and, more importantly, how would this all be financed? But the board was convinced the project would be a success, and they authorized 2,500 copies of the first volume.²⁶

The book was patterned after *The Liturgy of the Hours*. The entry for each day in the two-year daily lectionary cycle included an opening and closing prayer, the three lectionary readings for the day (following the *Lutheran Book of Worship* version of the ecumenical Common Lectionary), and a fourth reading from a non-Biblical source.

Many of the opening prayers were drawn from *The Liturgy of the Hours*. Because that breviary used a single prayer each week during "ordinary time" (i.e., the "green" seasons of the liturgical year), Schumacher added prayers drawn from the *Book of Common Prayer* and some other sources, primarily Paul Scherer's *Love Is a Spendthrift*.

Unlike *The Liturgy of the Hours*, the new breviary drew the fourth reading not just from patristic writers but from the whole history of the church. The only stipulation Schumacher made was that the fourth reading come from a writer no longer living; this was only rarely violated, usually inadvertently. Each volume would also include the complete Psalter (using the *Book of Common Prayer* translation which had been chosen for the *LBW*) and a slightly revised version of the *LBW*'s liturgies for Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer and Compline (without the musical settings). Volumes I and III included the complete text of Luther's Small Catechism. In place of the Catechism in Volume II, Schumacher included Lancelot Andrewes' classic devotional poem "The Dial." He planned to repeat "The Dial" in Volume IV, but ultimately substituted Luther's "A Simple Way to Pray."

It was the fourth reading that was the most complicated, since the potential choices were unlimited. Schumacher was a voracious reader, with a library full of books in which he had marked favorite passages. He also wrote to seminary professors, bishops and pastors he knew, asking for their suggestions. More suggestions came from users of the book as each volume was published. Potential readings were carefully matched with the daily lectionary so that the fourth reading would serve as a kind of commentary on at least one of the Scripture lessons for the day.

What complicated this project considerably was the need to obtain copyright permission for many of these fourth readings, as well as for many of the prayers—permission that had to come from several different publishers or individuals, each of them with their own policies, paperwork requirements and time frames for response. "We were naïve ... in thinking that most publishers would simply write back 'permission granted,'" Schumacher explained. "Not so!"

Augsburg Fortress, our own Lutheran publishing house, charged us for almost every one of the quotes that came from their books and in one situation in which I had made a mistake in asking for a permission in which we were charged we later discovered that the book from Fortress which they had charged us for was quoting the work in another publication that was now in the public domain. A few quotes from Fortress were free, but [for] most we were charged anywhere from \$5.00 to \$50.00.

The single most expensive quotation was from Martin Luther King Jr.'s *Strength to Love*. The agency representing Dr. King's family asked \$400 for the single quote—so much more than any other publisher that Schumacher was inclined to omit it from the book. When he reported this to the board, one member, Ruth Zerner, felt so strongly that at least one quote from King be included that she offered to pay for the quote personally. Ultimately a price of \$150 was negotiated, and the quotation was included.²⁷

There were other publishers—including Concordia Publishing House and several Roman Catholic companies—who allowed the use of their material without charge. The Roman Catholic Church's International Committee on the Liturgy gave permission to incorporate prayers from *The Liturgy of the Hours*. The Episcopal Church's copyright agent responded that the *Book of Common Prayer* was in the public domain and only its format was under copyright; so along with its translation of the Psalter, many prayers from the *Book of Common Prayer* were used. This generosity allowed the Bureau to keep the cost of the project manageable.

One important decision concerned which Bible translation should be used in the breviary. The National Council of Churches held the copyright for both the Revised Standard Version and the New Revised Standard Version, and there was a significant cost for either. The NRSV was being increasingly used in ELCA congregations, but in the end the decision came down to economics; the National Council of Churches agreed to accept a \$300 payment to use the older RSV, with a promise of an additional payment later if the publication was a success. That promise was ultimately fulfilled with a gift of \$5,000 from the ALPB to the NCC.²⁸

There would not be room in the books for many illustrations, but two varieties were included. Schumacher had long been a fan of Orthodox iconography, and he chose icons for several of the major festivals of the liturgical year and included reproductions—unfortunately, due to cost, in black and white—in each volume, together with a brief explanation of the art. The volumes also included a set of line drawings by Jeffery Neal Larson, a young Lutheran artist whom Schumacher had come to know.

Volume I was ready to go to the printer—Dickenson Press of Grand Rapids, MI, in cooperation with Thomas E. Nelson, the well-known Bible publishers—in mid-1994. Ms. Zelenko loaned the Bureau \$10,000 in July for the down payment, and another \$10,000 a few weeks later for operating expenses and a publicity mailing to all ELCA and LCMS pastors. The orders began to come in—some 700 pre-publication orders, enough that both loans were repaid by October. *For All the Saints: A Prayer Book for and by the Church* clearly met a need felt by hundreds of Lutheran pastors and laity.

The initial run of Volume I was delivered to St. Matthew's on November 2, 1994, where volunteers sorted and mailed the pre-publication orders. Half of the first printing was sold within two weeks. A series of enthusiastic reviews led to a flood of new orders. Frank Senn's evaluation in *Pro Ecclesia* was typical: "*For All the Saints*," he wrote, "is a timely and welcome gift to the people of God. Its material has been carefully (and one might also say lovingly) collected and crafted into a workable prayer book by the church for the church."²⁹

The remaining three volumes were published over the next two years. The first printings of Volumes III and IV were 5,000 copies each, and 2,500 more copies of the first two volumes were reprinted before Advent 1996. Eventually a total of 40,000 copies (10,000 of each volume) were printed. By 2014, when the ALPB celebrated its 100th

anniversary as well as the 20th anniversary of *For All the Saints*, total sales had exceeded one million dollars. The breviary became the all-time best seller among ALPB books; it was so successful financially that it has kept the Bureau solvent up to the present day.

Refocusing the mission

"Lutheran tradition as evangelical and catholic"

Paul Hinlicky had brought a new energy to the Bureau, and much had been accomplished since his appointment as executive director in 1989. In addition to the programmatic initiatives, the Bureau's office had in 1991 been moved from the Wartburg Senior Care Center to Immanuel Lutheran Church in Delhi, NY, where Hinlicky was pastor. This change was made in part for his convenience, but also because the Bureau's office manager, Donna Kathmann (soon to become Donna Roche), was living in Delhi; after a year or so the office was moved to her home.

In 1992, however, Hinlicky was feeling worn out; he told the board he would likely resign within the next year and encouraged them to make plans for an orderly transition. Hinlicky had also been wrestling with the future of the *Forum* package. Subscriptions had been declining; perhaps that could be ascribed to the current recession, but it may also be that "it is impossible to fill Richard John Neuhaus's shoes." Without Neuhaus, he suggested, *Forum Letter* "no longer carries its \$22,000+/year weight." He suggested three options: (1) an intensive search for a new editor of *Forum Letter* "of equal ability to Neuhaus"; (2) reducing *Forum Letter* to eight issues per year (eliminating the months in which *Lutheran Forum* appeared) and utilizing a "pool of writers" rather than a single editor; or (3) eliminating *Forum Letter* altogether, incorporating the journalistic format into a more frequently issued *Lutheran Forum*.³⁰

Just at this time, however, Russ Saltzman asked if he might now resume his editorship, his personal situation having stabilized. The board had heard from readers that they rather liked what *Forum Letter* had become under Saltzman, and several readers urged that he be brought back as editor. Roger Kahle, managing editor of the *Lutheran*, for example, thought Saltzman was "the best editor the *Forum* newsletter has had."

He combines a lively writing style, a good sense of humor and a care for the facts. I certainly don't agree with all his opinions, but if I only wanted to read those things that I already agree with, I would not be subscribing to *Lutheran Forum* newsletter. I think part of its editorial task is to challenge the reader.

Charles Austin, a pastor and professional journalist, had a similar view. He wrote to the board that he missed Saltzman's "extraordinary intellect, wit, insight and critique," and he urged them to bring Saltzman back. The timing of these letters (they all came shortly before the board's executive committee meeting, the date of which was not widely publicized) suggests that someone—Saltzman or someone on the board sympathetic

toward him—did a little pump-priming. In any event, the executive committee got the message, and they invited Saltzman to resume the editorship, effective with the July issue—with the understanding that he would serve the remaining nine months of his original two-year term, and then things would be renegotiated. ALPB president Hans Quitmeyer advised Saltzman that Hinlicky would be proposing a reconfiguration of editorial responsibilities, and while no decision had yet been made, "if we were to accept his proposal, we very likely would no longer have a *Forum Letter* editor, as such." With that understanding, Saltzman agreed to return as editor.³¹

This decision did not sit well with Hinlicky. While he insisted that he had not pressured Saltzman to resign over his divorce, he also was reluctant to have him return. He simply did not feel that they were on the same wavelength. Hinlicky was hoping to achieve greater editorial consistency between the publications, and he was not sure that was possible with Saltzman. In Hinlicky's view, Saltzman had an unhelpful preoccupation with the sexuality issues facing the church. Even more important, Saltzman was too closely tied to Richard John Neuhaus, and in the wake of Neuhaus's reception into the Roman Catholic Church, it seemed best for the ALPB—and the other proponents of evangelical catholicism—to distance themselves from their provocative and media savvy former editor. If the board insisted on the present two-editor structure, Hinlicky's inclination was to ask Leonard Klein to edit *Forum Letter*.

But Hinlicky's preference was that all Bureau publications be editorially managed by a single team of five, with an "editor-in-chief" and four contributing editors with specific portfolios. He proposed that *Forum Letter* be reduced to eight issues per year under the direction of this team. He asked, however, that the board discuss this direction in the context of a larger conversation about the purpose and direction of the Bureau. At the June 1992 board meeting, he invited Klein, Rebecca Frey and Stephen Bouman to help the board reflect on the Bureau's mission. Klein and Frey each gave presentations; Bouman was unable to attend, but sent a written statement.³²

Frey compared the current situation in American Lutheranism to that of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg in the 18th century: a wilderness frontier where Christians need to be nurtured. The role of the Bureau's publications, she suggested, is to provide that nurture through an integrative vision that "holds together doctrine, aesthetics, and behavior." She urged the Bureau to continue to publish materials such as the forthcoming Piepkorn volume and suggested consideration of a reinvigorated program of tract publication. Klein emphasized the importance of the ALPB as the vital center of American Lutheranism, with its moderate confessionalism and its ability to "pull together theology, liturgy and ethics." Bouman's paper spoke of the "evangelical catholic tradition" and the importance to the ALPB's ministry of infusing that tradition into the life of the congregation. "The rough beast on which the messianic hope for the world slouches toward Bethlehem," he wrote, "is always the gathering around Word

and Sacraments, the parish." The presentations engendered a lively discussion in the board, and Frey and Klein were asked to collaborate on a one-page mission statement incorporating their concerns.³³

Hinlicky then presented his proposal for reconfiguring the editorial responsibilities. The board went into executive session to discuss it, and it became apparent that they preferred to maintain both the current publication schedule and the existing division of editorial responsibilities, with separate editors for *Lutheran Forum* and *Forum Letter*—though they postponed final action until the November meeting. Furthermore, they proposed that Leonard Klein be asked to succeed Hinlicky as editor of *Lutheran Forum* whenever Hinlicky decided to step down, and they supported the decision the executive committee had already made to invite Russ Saltzman to reassume the editorship of *Forum Letter*.

Hinlicky was disappointed, but he was not one to damage the Bureau because of his own disagreement. In his public comment in the final *Forum Letter* before Saltzman returned, he played the gracious team player. He was "delighted," he said, at the decision, and he put the best construction on the whole episode:

In a way, the brief interruption in editorial continuity has proven to be something of a blessing. It has shown, foremost, that **Forum Letter** has an institutional life beyond any single personality. The manner in which [Saltzman] assumed the editorship revealed there was a life for **Forum Letter** beyond the 16-year stamp of Richard John Neuhaus. There was at the time, as one can imagine, some considerable doubt about that. ... However, as Russ himself would be the first to say, **Forum Letter** 'survived' not because Saltzman was writing it, but because it was **Forum Letter**, i.e., 'the independent voice for Lutherans.' Leonard Klein, too, in following Saltzman, aided the institutional life of **Forum Letter** not because of who he is, but because of what **Forum Letter** has become through its 21-year history. The pages you hold in your hand from **Lutheran Forum/Forum Letter** are the front line in the struggle for the soul of American Lutheranism.³⁴

Hinlicky would later muse that the executive committee's decision about Saltzman was "the beginning of the parting of the ways" between himself and the ALPB. Indeed, shortly after that decision he wrote a letter of resignation which he did not send. But at the board meeting that fall, Hinlicky resigned from both his position as executive director and as editor of *Lutheran Forum*, effective June 30, 1993. "The time in life has come," he wrote, "for me to concentrate my energies on theology. ... I have every confidence that I leave the ALPB in better shape than I found it. ... With vision and vigor, the ALPB is poised for great things." He agreed to continue as a regular columnist for the magazine for the foreseeable future. The board accepted the resignation "reluctantly and with a great deal of regret," but expressed their "joy in knowing Paul would continue to serve the ALPB as a writer." The board then formally approved the executive committee's recommendation that the two publications retain separate editors,

that Leonard Klein and Russell Saltzman be appointed to two-year terms as editors of *Lutheran Forum* and *Forum Letter* respectively, and that Fred Schumacher be appointed the new executive director of ALPB, effective July 1.³⁵

Hinlicky had no intention of being a lame duck, however, and he worked hard to insure a smooth transition. One priority was the approval of a new ALPB mission statement. The proposal formulated by Klein and Frey had been discussed by the board, but they thought it more appropriate as a statement of editorial policy for *Lutheran Forum* than as a mission statement for the Bureau. One thing was clear: the term "evangelical catholic" had now become an essential part of the Bureau's identity. President Hans Quitmeyer made the point in a letter to the board in June 1992. "Although the ALPB's focus was always confessional and one of fostering Lutheran unity," he wrote, "it is fair say that the ALPB now has become a much more active proponent of evangelical catholicism." Hinlicky agreed, and while admitting that he was "somewhat to credit or to blame for the closer identification of LF with the notion of 'evangelical catholicity,'" he did not believe "that either Richard Neuhaus or Glenn Stone, Richard Koenig or John Tierjen would view that evolution as a departure from the ALPB tradition."³⁶

While Hinlicky hesitated to put too much emphasis on what he admitted was mostly "a slogan," it did appear to him and to the board that the term was useful in describing the ALPB's mission. In February 1993, he offered a proposed statement to the board which was then, with a few minor changes, adopted:

The American Lutheran Publicity Bureau ("ALPB"), established in 1914, is a non-profit organization independent of official church control, linked by faith and confession to the Church it serves. Committed to an understanding of Lutheran tradition as evangelical and catholic the ALPB affirms the Church's scriptural and confessional foundations in order to foster renewal not only with the present Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, and Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada, but also other Lutheran churches in North America and abroad and the wider ecumenical community.

The ALPB maintains that all those under Christ who hold fast the Scriptures and Lutheran Confessions have a common life, with a distinctive role to play in conveying the gospel message. In an era in which the Church in North America must address an increasingly dechristianized society, the ALPB makes the theological, liturgical and devotional resources of our confessional heritage accessible and relevant to all Lutherans as well as to friends in other communions.

There are some remarkable things about this new statement—the first being that it was approved less than seven years after the previous mission statement was adopted. There had been a sea change in the American Lutheran scene in those seven years, and yet the change in the ALPB's self-understanding was almost as dramatic.³⁷

Here for the first time the ALPB officially stated its understanding of Lutheranism as "evangelical and catholic." Here was the first acknowledgement of an "increasingly

dechristianized society." What was lacking is also striking; there was no mention of *Lutheran Forum* and *Forum Letter* as "the major ALPB publications," as they had been dubbed in 1986—perhaps an acknowledgement that with *Pro Ecclesia* and the book publishing program, ALPB had other fish to fry, and so the mission had expanded. There was also no explicit commitment to Lutheran unity or ecumenical relationships, suggesting that the ALPB had come to realize that both can be problematic if they are not based on the Scriptures and the Lutheran confessions. The statement, after approval by the board, was subsequently printed on the title page of *Lutheran Forum* (with a couple of minor editorial changes) in every issue until 1996; it continued to appear elsewhere in each issue through 1998.

Souring on the ELCA

"what compelling reason is there for an ELCA?"

Russell Saltzman was sanguine about the ELCA following the churchwide assembly in Orlando in 1991, but the next two years pushed him back toward a more pessimistic view. The ELCA sexuality study's trajectory, the increasingly loud drumbeat of feminist theology, what he saw as duplicity and/or foolishness on the part of the ELCA's leadership—all these things came to a head at the churchwide assembly in 1993. He could find little positive to say. It was, he said, the "Vengeance of Kansas City."

Inclusivity and multiculturalism, the twin totalitarianisms that have threatened the [ELCA] since its birth, powerfully manifested themselves at the Kansas City assembly. All things ... bowed before these concepts. Every aspect of the proper life of the denomination that comes into play during an assembly was subjected to an insidious fascism to which even an increasingly hapless leadership paid homage.

It was, he raged, "a *déjà vu*, if you will, of the Weimar Republic in its last days. For a churchly analogy one need only turn to the history of the 'German Christians' of that same period who delivered their church into the totalitarianism of the Third Reich."³⁸

In the sharpest language yet from Saltzman's pen, the editor excoriated the assembly's worship (it "did little but trash the central worship tradition of our Lutheran church"), preaching (one preacher "lobbed insults—an accurate phrase—from the pulpit at dissenters from the multicultural myth"), even its deliberations ("the most popular motion at the assembly was to close debate, cut discussion and get on with the agenda"). He lamented the emergence of "The Network," a coalition dedicated to "affirmation of 'committed and faithful same-sex relationships.'" "Our church," Saltzman admitted, "no longer possesses the theological reserves necessary to uphold a lucid ethical tradition." It was so bad that Saltzman was beginning to question the existence of the ELCA itself.

We think it is becoming increasingly crucial to ask why there should be a Lutheran church in 1993. The conviction that Lutheranism has preserved the catholic faith

without a lot of doubtful additions has been, until recently, a pretty firm tenet. ... But the reason for a Lutheran church is to confess what Lutherans believe, and one would think, believe what Lutherans confess. ... But if we no longer believe and teach anything in particular, and if our worship practices increasingly and so evidently contradict what we say we believe ... what compelling reason is there for an ELCA?³⁹

Saltzman would tone down the rhetoric in subsequent issues, and he would again see some optimistic signs; he was not ready to give up on the ELCA. His angry account of the 1993 assembly, however, was gleefully picked up by Herman Otten's *Christian News*. Otten reprinted the entire article and sent that issue to all ELCA congregations. This was the last straw for the ALPB board, which had tried for twenty years simply to ignore Otten. ALPB president Hans Quitmeyer, an attorney, wrote Otten a stern letter. The reprint, he said, "goes far beyond any fair use."

Christian News did not request the ALPB's permission to publish any part of *Forum Letter* and the ALPB did not grant such permission. Please be further advised that the ALPB does not grant such permission to *Christian News*. According, we hereby demand that *Christian News* (1) immediately cease any further unauthorized publication of excerpts [*sic*] from *Forum Letter* and (2) acknowledge in its next issue that the republication of *Forum Letter* was unauthorized.

The ALPB, he warned, "will take all necessary steps to protect its copyrights, including referring any additional violations to the United States Attorney's office." Otten simply printed Quitmeyer's letter (which technically satisfied the second demand), wrote a defense that amounted to "you wouldn't have given me permission anyway, so why bother asking," and noted that *Forum Letter* had full permission to reprint anything from *Christian News*.⁴⁰

Saltzman felt compelled to assure readers (many of whom, since they were ELCA, knew nothing about Otten and his paper) that there was no connection between *Forum Letter* and *Christian News*, that Otten had not asked permission to reproduce the issue, and that if he had asked, it would have been refused. He then took the opportunity to say that "it is our policy ... to grant one-time reprint rights for congregational use. Just drop us a note and we'll be happy to oblige. Better yet, contact Donna Roche at the ALPB office and ask about group subscription rates to *Forum Letter*." Meanwhile, the board of directors returned to its policy of ignoring Otten.⁴¹

Notes

1. Paul R. Hinlicky, "The Crisis in American Lutheranism Today," *LF* 22, no. 3 (Aug. 1988), 12.
2. Mark Chapman, "Ecumenical Paganism?" *LF* 22, no. 4 (Nov. 1988); Amandus J. Derr, "Worshipping the Unknown God on Higgins Road," *LF* 23, no. 1 (Feb. 1989), 7.
3. Michael Root, "The Proposal for Lutheran-Episcopal Fellowship: Unity and the Gospel," *LF* 25, no. 2 (May 1991), 22.
4. Meg Madson, "BEM: What Does Sign Signify?" *LF* 25, no. 2 (May 1991), 21; Mark E. Chapman, "Why Can't We Get This Right?" *LF* 27, no. 2 (May 1993), 11.

5. Paul R. Hinlicky, "In the Forum," *LF* 23, no. 3 (Aug. 1989), 3.
6. Paul R. Hinlicky, "In the Forum," *LF* 24, no. 1 (Feb. 1991), 3.
7. Paul R. Hinlicky, "In the Forum," *LF* 24, no. 2 (May 1990), 3; Leonard Klein, "The San Francisco Churchquake," *ibid.*, 7; Martin Heineken, "Why the Ordinations Were Invalid," *ibid.*, 23-26.
8. *LF* 25, no. 1 (Feb. 1991), 45; Russell E. Saltzman to Paul Hinlicky, 6 Feb. 1991, ALPB Archives.
9. Paul R. Hinlicky, "A Message to Our Subscribers," *LF* 25, no. 2 (May 1991), 44; Dorothy Zelenko, e-mail message to Richard O. Johnson, 4 May 2016.
10. Leonard Klein, "Mega-church Strategy," *FL* 21, no. 1 (25 Jan. 1992), 4.
11. *FL* 21, no. 2 (3 Feb. 1992), 1; Leonard Klein, "Human Sexuality and the Christian Faith?" *FL* 21, no. 2 (3 Feb. 1992), 1ff.
12. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 23 May 1993.
13. *LF*, 28, no. 3 (Aug. 1994), 7.
14. "Lutherans and Other Christians," ALPB, 1994, ALPB Archives.
15. "Lutheran Faith, Lutheran Worship: Two Sides of One Coin," ALPB, 1994, ALPB Archives.
16. "Fascinating but Absolutely Unnecessary Information about the New Tract Series," 21 Oct. 1995, ALPB Archives.
17. Paul R. Hinlicky, "Report to the ALPB Board," 26 Nov. 1990, ALPB Archives.
18. Carl E. Braaten, *Because of Christ: Memoirs of a Lutheran Theologian* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 150; Paul R. Hinlicky, "Report to the ALPB Board," 26 Nov. 1990, ALPB Archives.
19. Carl E. Braaten to Frederick J. Schumacher, 15 Apr. 2005; Frederick J. Schumacher to Carl E. Braaten, 2 June 2005, ALPB Archives.
20. Paul R. Hinlicky and Christian D. von Dehsen, "The ALPB Book Publishing Program: A Proposal," n.d. [1991], ALPB Archives.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Marie Meyer, et. al., *Different Voices/Shared Vision: Male and Female in the Trinitarian Community* (Delhi, NY: ALPB Books), 1992; *LF* 26, no. 1 (Feb. 1992), 25.
23. Arthur Carl Piepkorn, *The Church: Selected Writings of Arthur Carl Piepkorn*, ed. Michael P. Plekon and William S. Wiecher (Delhi, NY: American Lutheran Publicity Bureau, 1993).
24. Frederick J. Schumacher, "For All the Saints: A Creation of Many Saints, for All the Saints, and by the Saints: A History with Many Anecdotes," 2008, ALPB Archives.
25. *Ibid.*; Dorothy Zelenko, e-mail message to Richard O. Johnson, 4 May 2016.
26. The record here is a little unclear. Schumacher's "For All the Saints: A Creation of Many Saints" indicates that the board had approved the project at the November 1991 meeting, but there is no reference at all to this in the minutes (though there is some brief reference to it in some pre-meeting correspondence). The first documentation of a proposed initial order of 2500 copies appears to be a cost estimate dated in 1994.
27. Schumacher, "For All the Saints: A Creation of Many Saints."
28. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 22-23 May 1998.
29. Frank Senn, *For All the Saints* book review, *Pro Ecclesia* 5, no. 2 (Spring 1996), 249.
30. Paul R. Hinlicky, "Report to the ALPB Board's Executive Committee," 9 Jan. 1992, ALPB Archives.
31. Roger R. Kahle to Fred Schumacher, 10 Mar. 1992; Charles Austin to ALPB board members, 22 Feb. 1992; Hans Quitmeyer to Russell E. Saltzman, 15 Mar. 1992, ALPB Archives.
32. Paul R. Hinlicky to ALPB Executive Committee, 15 Mar. 1992, ALPB Archives.
33. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 27 June 1992; Stephen Paul Bouman to Paul Hinlicky and the members of the ALPB Board, 23 June 1992, ALPB Archives.
34. *FL* 21, no. 6 (29 June 1992), 8.
35. Paul Hinlicky, e-mail message to Richard O. Johnson, 2 Apr. 2016; Paul Hinlicky to ALPB Board, 31 Oct. 1992, ALPB Archives; Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 7 Nov. 1992.
36. Hans Quitmeyer to ALPB Board Members, 15 June 1992; Paul Hinlicky, "Report of the Executive Director," 27 June 1992, ALPB Archives.
37. Minutes, ALPB Board of Directors, 20 Feb. 1993.
38. *FL* 22, no. 10 (7 Oct. 1993), 1.
39. *Ibid.*, 2-6.
40. *Christian News* 32, no. 13 (28 Mar. 1994), 3, 17.
41. *FL* 23, no. 1 (19 Jan. 1994), 2; *FL* 23, no. 4 (29 Apr. 1994), 4.