

Proceedings
of the
Second
General Pastoral Conference
of the
Synod of Missouri, Ohio, et al.
on the
Doctrine of the Election of Grace.
Fort Wayne, Ind. on May 23 and 24, 1881.
(Printed in manuscript form.)
St. Louis, Mo.
Printers of the "Lutheran Concordia Publishing House."
1881.

First meeting.

Monday forenoon, May 23.

The 2nd General Pastoral Conference of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States met on Monday, May 23, at 8:30 in St. Paul's Church, Fort Wayne, Ind. The meeting was opened with a liturgical service. The meeting elected Pastor C. Groß as chairman, Pastors J. Fackler and M. Hein as secretaries, and Pastor Adam Schmidt as chaplain.

In response to the question as to whether the students of the two upper classes of the grammar school, as well as others from the audience, would be permitted to attend the proceedings, it was

resolved: No one should be excluded from the audience.

The chairman then put the question before the conference as to how the proceedings on the doctrine of election by grace, which had already taken place last fall, should be continued; whether to continue with the discussion of the [p 152] 11th article of the Formula of Concord, or to consider and answer the objections raised against us, or what other way of discussing the doctrine should be chosen.

Dr. Walther: The right way is to continue with the 11th article of our Formula of Concord. We already have a clear exposition of the doctrine of the election of grace, which our church has given in the Confession, stating that it is especially for the posterity, so that no controversy may arise. The Formula of Concord is now often spoken of as if it were obscure. No, it is not dark, it is as bright as the midday sun. It would be a disgrace for our church if it had a dark, ambiguous confession! Only through glosses does the Formula of Concord become dark; but if we stick to the words, it is bright and clear. We must not allow this weapon to be wrung out of our hands. We are not the people who could now, apart from Confession, present this doctrine to Christendom. Rather, we want to be faithful confessors of the doctrine that our church has established. We would have a terrible responsibility before God in that day if we allowed our Confession to be made doubtful and uncertain; we would thereby rob the Lutheran Church of the future of an unspeakably glorious treasure! **[CONFSSIONALISM!]**

Pastor Allwardt: I also wish that we could go further in discussing the Formula of Concord. We have voluntarily placed ourselves on both sides under <page 4> the Confession, and as long as each party claims to be under the Confession, each also wants to be judged according to it. Whoever does not agree with it is no longer a Lutheran.

It was then decided to base the negotiations on the doctrine of election of grace on the 11th article of the Formula of Concord and to continue discussing it.

Pastor Stöckhardt: Would it not be most appropriate to begin with §§ 5 and 8? Before their content had become sufficiently clear, we moved on to later points and did not return to them. These paragraphs in particular are fundamental.

Prof. Crämer: That was what weighed so heavily on everyone's hearts that we had to part without this Confession having been made, that these words were simply understood. However, the opposing side acted in such a way that we had to fight against it to the utmost, as if

the Confession in these two paragraphs was unclear and the right understanding had to be obtained elsewhere.

[p 153]

Pastor Rohe: I believe that if one wants to understand the Confession and what it says about election, one must be clear about what it means by election; one must make the concept completely clear, and only then can one understand what the Formula of Concord says about it. In § 5 it says something about it; likewise in § 8, where it says what relation this concept has to its object in relation to providence. In both paragraphs there is no mention of what election is. The Formula of Concord does not say what it wants to be understood by it, but then goes on in § 13-24 to explain what election is to it. It does not say this once, but half a dozen times. First we must be clear what election is according to the Formula of Concord, and only then can we see what it extends to and what its relation to the object is.

Dr. Walther: That is not so. It says quite simply and clearly already in § 5 what it understands by election, namely the ordering to salvation. We do not want to allow anything to be shoehorned into it. That is election, and now the question arises as to how the Formula of Concord wants the doctrine of election to be presented. What it is is no secret, it is so clear that the whole of Christendom knows it, but it is very often misunderstood in the way the doctrine of election is presented. Before the Formula of Concord, it was often presented very wrongly. It was only said to be a pattern. This had the terrible consequence that godly Christians fell into despair and carnal people were strengthened in their carnal mind and security. The Formula of Concord, after laying the foundation of how this doctrine should be presented, says: "He who teaches simply that God has chosen a number of men, who must be saved; others he has determined to condemn, teaches very < page 5 > ungodly; instead of making men certain of their salvation, which stands on solid ground, he plunges them into the most terrible peril of soul. — After §§ 5 and 8 there is no more definition of election. To claim this is an illusion, a sweet dream. Instead, there is now a description of how the election should be presented. One should not only preach about the secret counsel of the decree of salvation, but above all about universal grace, universal redemption, universal calling, etc.; one should preach about conversion, justification, sanctification, the cross and finally about glory. When this has been properly memorized, then one can also say: Behold, he who now stands in faith should believe the promise of God that God will preserve him and save him eternally. Every believer should consider himself to be an elect person, i.e. one whom God has certainly decided to save. In addition, it must also be taught that all those who do not believe or fall away are themselves to blame; that God also wanted to bring them to faith and keep them in it; that he also gave them all the means to do so [p 154] and worked earnestly on them with his Spirit. They alone are to blame for this, not that God denied them the election. — It is said of us that we teach that if someone does not come to faith, it is because God has not chosen to give him faith. We object to this. Of course, we cannot understand the connection. This is the mystery of conversion, which also affects the doctrine of the

election of grace, indeed is a main point in this doctrine. If I were to preach about salvation, I would not merely say: Christ suffered, died, rose again; I would also have to teach that man has fallen into sin, that he is dead in sins; all this is part of it; otherwise no one can understand the doctrine of salvation. So also here. No one can understand the doctrine of the secret counsel unless all that is taught is contained in §§ 13 and 14. But there it is not said: This is election. Where does it say that? If the 8 points were to begin with the words: Election is that the human race may be redeemed, called, etc., then the opponents would be right, but it is not there. **Just don't read anything into it, but look at the words quite simply!** Here our church has accustomed us to be careful in presenting the mystery of God's election to salvation; to accept everything that must be accepted, so that those who are under attack are not led into despair and evil men are not led into even greater carnal security. In § 23 this is again defined in more detail: "And may God strengthen and preserve us in his counsel"

Prof. Pieper: It has been said that we can dispense with §§ 5 and 8 if we are dealing with what kind of thing election is. In any case, this is a completely different manner of proceeding [*modus procedendi*] than that which the authors of the **<page 6>** Formula of Concord wanted. They also wanted to say what election is; and in order to clarify this, they first considered it necessary to distinguish the term election from the term foreknowledge [*praescientia*]. The latter is about all people, election only about the well-pleasing children of God. Therefore, nothing can occur in the concept of election that has a further object than that stated in § 5. This must be conceded. If this is not admitted, then it must be admitted that the Formula of Concord is confused.

Pastor Allwardt: I have no objection if we start with §§ 5 and 8. But one cannot say that § 5 alone is the definition of the election. The two paragraphs are connected with §§ 3, 4, 6, and 7. In § 5 there are statements about the election; what is said there already belongs to the concept of election. But § 5 must not be taken alone, § 8 belongs to it. § 5 says about whom the election is about, about those who will be saved. I would consider it nonsense to say that election is taken in a broader sense, so that others also belong to it. But § 8 says that election is a cause that creates our salvation and what belongs to it, and so on. This must be taken together, and it is only in this sense that I, and others, have said that election is taken in a wider sense. § 5 [**p 155**] corresponds to § 23 and § 8 to the eight resolutions [the eight points]. For when it says here: "The eternal election of God sees and knows not only... a cause", this corresponds to the 8 points. The real point of contention is not whether this belongs in the concept of election or in the doctrine of election, but whether what is said in the 8 points is said merely in relation to the elect, or whether the general counsel of grace is taught and then shown how election finally came about. I subscribe to § 5 in the fullest sense of the word.

Prof. Crämer: I am quite astonished to hear that it has always been said by opponents that the Formula of Concord speaks of election in only one sense. I have heard it said that now the Formula of Concord speaks of election in a narrower sense, now in a broader sense. That is a

fact. If our opponents are no longer of this opinion, they must first retract it and admit that we were mistaken.

Dr. Walther: We cannot, of course, go back to what each individual person has said, but we know what has been said in your circle. Either you must break away from each other, or each of you must take on board what the other has said. That has been said: here is election of grace in a narrower sense, there in a broader sense. Everyone who was present in Chicago knows that. But if you now say: we cannot express what we believe in this way, that is fine; but you should not deny the facts, that would not be sincere.

Pastor Allardt: Is it really our opinion that the Formula of Concord sometimes speaks of the election in a twofold sense? That has never been said. We have said that it is incontrovertible that § 5 speaks of the election of the children of God, and as far as it concerns persons, it is impossible to speak of election in the narrower and broader sense.

Dr. Walther: That is not what was spoken of. In Milwaukee it was asserted that in a certain sense all men are elected. From the words that a man should seek his election in Christ, the conclusion was drawn: therefore there is an election over all men. But that would be to contradict the Lord Christ, who says: "Many are called, but few are chosen. What one person says, you must all take upon yourselves, because you stick together and also conspire with our enemies. That is not unfair. You are a party and must not complain if we treat you as party members.

Pastor Ernst: I know nothing of the fact that it was said in Chicago: here we speak of election in the narrower sense, and there in the broader sense. Prof. Stellhorn said: This election, of which the Confession speaks, is an election that includes certain persons and a [p 156] factual object. At one time, however, the personal object is more prominent, at another time the objective object. We are not speaking of two different elections, but of one and the same election. — Surely we are not entitled to include what was said in Milwaukee, because there is no printed record of it. I think you could only do that if we had acknowledged all this. When it was said that all should seek their election in Christ, etc., I understood that to mean that grace is universal. The grace of election is acquired by Christ and extends to all men. The fact that not all are elect is due to human guilt. Through Christ's merit it was made possible that all could have been elected. The fact that not all were elected is because not all believed. I need say nothing about how faith comes about.

Pastor J. Große: In the printed record it is said dozens of times that election is taken in the wider and narrower sense. Thus page 18: "Prof. Stellhorn: As to the Formula of Concord.... be meant in the narrowest sense."

Pastor Rohe: I certainly remember that I expressly referred to § 9 and said that the Formula of Concord speaks of one and the same election; but of this election something more is said after the first, and then more after the second part.

Dr. Walther: It has already been said in Chicago that it is impossible to speak of an election of means. Where in the Scriptures, when election is spoken of, are the <PAGE 8> means mentioned as an object? That is an empty fiction, a completely new invention of our time. No, where there is talk of election, it says: he has elected us, you. People, not baptism, communion etc., are elected. This is the way in which the opponents have brought everything into the greatest confusion, that they did not simply stick to the fact that Scripture only knows of election to salvation. They want to introduce a doctrine into the Formula of Concord that is not there. May God in mercy help them

to refrain from doing so! We remain with the Formula of Concord, even if all the world and all Christians were to fall away from it!

Pastor O. Hanser: If one were to hold a survey here, one would hear general astonishment and amazement expressed as to how our opponents can dare to deny that they have made this distinction. Prof. Stellhorn was a vocal leader in Chicago, and in his first presentation he explicitly made this distinction and set it apart. Then he wrote theses for the Fort Wayne Conference, in which he stated that [p 157] the Formula of Concord teaches an election in the narrower and broader sense, an designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] and designation of the persons [*electio pesrsonarum*]. Then, in the pamphlet just published, he claimed that the Formula of Concord clearly and unambiguously speaks of election in the broader sense. If the opponents did not agree with him on this, they had to say so. They did not say so, but left the conference under the impression that they were voting with Stellhorn. If they do not wish to accept this, let them confess it.

Pastor Allwardt: I do not understand the speeches that are now being made. I said this morning that I do not recognize this difference, that election is sometimes taken in the broader, sometimes in the narrower sense. Did I speak as if I had recognized it before? I used to say only this: the dogmatists use the word election in a narrower sense than the Formula of Concord. If a word is taken differently, one must, when one has a book before one which uses this word, see in what sense it takes it. And here we maintain that the Formula of Concord takes "election" in a wider sense than the dogmatists. By election it does not merely speak of the fact that God has ordained certain people to salvation, but also of how people are justified and saved. That's all we said last year. I am sorry if our sincerity is called into question. We may be to blame because we may not have spoken out clearly enough. I would honestly recant my position if I saw that I could not keep it. I think this expression, "election of the means of grace", is a misnomer and I do not subscribe to it. I have not laid so much stress on it. Scripture does not speak in this way. — §§ 5 and 8 are to be taken together. Nor do they speak merely of separation [*Scheidung*], but also of how one comes to salvation.

Prof. Pieper: However, the paragraphs do not speak of election in the strictest sense, which is merely separation [*Scheidung*]. When we speak of election, we are at the same time dealing with everything by which the saved is led to salvation, as the Formula of Concord in § 8 says. Thus election does not merely involve the final separation, but it includes the persons in such a way that it concludes them in the sanctification of the Spirit and in the faith of the truth. This is summed up in the concept of election. But as to the other point: we are making an accusation that cannot be sustained; I must say that I cannot understand the talk of the opponents in any other way than that they speak of election in two senses. It has been said that electing grace is universal. Is not electing grace the election of grace? Furthermore, it has been said that the first of the 8 points does not yet speak of election, but that election comes later. I cannot make sense of this.

Pastor J. Große: I could not understand Pastor Ernst other than that he denied that it had been said that sometimes election was spoken of in the narrower, sometimes in the broader sense. I refer to Prof. Stelhorn's debate on [page 16 of the Chicago minutes](#). [p 158]

Pastor Ernst: It seems to me that people think we claimed that in Chicago there was never any talk of elections in the narrower and broader sense. We do not say that. The dogmatists talked about it and that has been mentioned. So if I have a book that talks about election, I have to see how it speaks. But that is not the point here; the question is: did Prof. Stelhorn claim that the Formula of Concord speaks of election in the broad sense and then of election in the narrow sense, that it has no fixed concept of election? I am not aware of this. He claimed that the Formula of Concord, when it speaks of election, always understands it in a broader sense. This is also clear from [page 30 of the minutes](#). We say: the Formula of Concord speaks of an election that consists of two parts, the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] and the designation of the persons [*ordinatio personarum*].

Prof. Lange: Prof. Loy in Columbus has described the doctrine of our opponents in detail in the [second issue of his "Magazine"](#). He expressly says that the Formula of Concord speaks of election in the wider sense, namely of the determination of the means to salvation, which are intended for all men; [and in this sense all men are elect](#). Then it also speaks of election in the narrower sense, where only those who are finally saved are objects. Prof. Stelhorn also argued this. The determination of the means is present for all men in election; in election in the broader sense all men are elected; and then there is election in the narrower sense, where those who are usually called elect are the object of election. This has been said clearly and distinctly. Our opponents assume two elections, which are to be found in the Confession. <page 10> If our opponents do not recognize this, let them explain themselves.

Pastor Rohe: The accusation against us is that we have made the assertion that the Formula of Concord speaks of two different elections, one in the broader and one in the narrower sense. I refer to [page 15 of](#)

[the minutes](#): "If I summarize everything briefly ... not of different elections of grace."

Dr. Walther: Here he does not speak of such an election of grace; but otherwise he has asserted it, and his theses show it. He was shown that the Formula of Concord is not worthy to be called a Confession if it is so confusing. It was further shown that the 8 points always speak of persons, and in the following again of persons. This has been repeatedly said by opponents that the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] is the main part, the substance of the doctrine of election of grace. Schmidt said [p 159] in Milwaukee, for example, that the other part is the accidents. They can be dropped without changing the matter. If our opponents were sober, they would see that they have lost their way. I do not know what their attitude is towards the theologians of the 17th and 18th centuries. On the one hand, they profess them completely, saying: that is exactly our doctrine. Then they say again: they were only talking about election by grace in the narrowest sense. But when the Formula of Concord deals with their doctrine, which is supposedly to be understood in a broader sense, it says: All this must be added; so our opponents, if they wish to be consistent, must say: the dogmatists are wrong. Thus it is said in § 24, page 708: "All this is added according to Scripture . . . the ordinance of God unto salvation." So they themselves should say: we cannot go along with the dogmatists.

Pastor Stöckhardt: With regard to what Pastor Rohe said, it is clear that our opponents in Chicago tried to prove that there was unity in their concept of election. They did not want to be accused of teaching a double election. Prof. Stellhorn's meaning, however, was this: The Formula of Concord teaches election in the broader sense. But it has two parts. One is the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*]. This extends to all. The other is the election of persons. He called the second part election by grace in the narrower sense. This has often been said, election of grace in the broader and narrower sense. But it should be understood as two parts of one concept. Prof. Stellhorn has constantly said that the Formula of Concord speaks differently, sometimes of the first, sometimes of the second part. When it was then said that this was a contradiction, he expressed himself thus: By deduction, the first part could also be included in the second; by deduction, the selection of persons also belonged to the first part. He did this in order to preserve the unity of the concept. Seen in the light of day, however, there are always two <pages 11> different concepts. Stellhorn continues to say that election of grace in the narrower sense, i.e. the second part, also occurs in the Formula of Concord. Opponents today, however, believe that the Formula of Concord always speaks of election by grace in the broader sense, which of course always includes the narrower sense. That is the main question, whether the opponents still recognize this whole division of the term today. That was the main thing for us, that we could not find ourselves in this ambiguity. This distinction contradicts the unity and clarity of all concepts.

Pastor Allwardt: It was said before that we would be contradicting ourselves if we said that the dogmatists teach what we teach about

election, and that they speak of election in a narrower sense than the Formula of Concord. It is true that the dogmatists teach election in a different way. When they speak of it briefly, they do not say how faith is produced; they say: God has chosen in view of faith. In the doctrine of election they do not speak of how faith is generated and maintained. The Formula of Concord includes this. This is stated in the 8 points, how man comes to faith, indeed how he was redeemed, how he is preserved until the end. Here the [p 160] Formula of Concord speaks of election in a broader sense than the dogmatists; but when they say: in view of faith, they presuppose all this. The Formula of Concord speaks of it more edifyingly.

Pastor Ernst: We did not say that the Formula of Concord speaks of election in one sense or another. We have said that we have a unified concept of election. The only question is whether we have succeeded in proving this. It has been claimed here that we have said that the Formula of Concord speaks sometimes of this election, sometimes of that election, that we are being dishonest. On the other hand, I must return to the written minutes and refer to [page 42 of the same](#): "Pastor Allwardt: We must be careful ... are included." This proves that we have rejected that imputation. One can still argue about whether it is proven that we have a unified concept of election; but there can be no doubt that we have asserted it.

Prof. Pieper: Our dear opponents think that they have a unified concept of election. I am firmly convinced that they are mistaken. There is really no glue that glues these two things together. Election by its first and principal part is about all men. People are cited here, and all people. If one says that election is also about the elect, one admits that it is also about other people. In their view, however, election according to the second part only applies to some people. The foresight of faith [*praevisio fidei*] establishes a connection. But election is now merely the final result. We must therefore not call it an imputation when we say that the <pages 12> dear opponents speak of two elections. They may believe they are talking about one election, but the unified concept disappears completely.

Pastor J. Große: Would it not be better to put the direct question to the opponents, whether the Formula of Concord in § 5 speaks of election in the wider sense? And then we want to have it proven.

Dr. Walther: It is certainly known to the brethren that Olearius expressly says that the Württemberg theologian Thummus claimed that God wanted to elect all men; [that would basically be Huberian](#). One could say that God wanted to save all, but not elect all. That is nonsense. [One could not elect everyone from everyone](#). But only in passing. I think I could say it; but those who have the second doctrinal trope cannot say it. I can prove that too. — Very many in our time no [p 161] longer believe in election by grace. That's why the newer theologians don't talk about it either. In your [the opponents] case I consider it to be the *πρότον ψεύδος*, the fundamental error that you say: [the 8 points](#) describe the election. Please, how can there be any talk of election if there is no talk of persons whom God elects? In this we are in complete agreement with you, these teachings must first be taken

as a basis. If there were no general redemption, reconciliation, calling, etc., there would be no election, because God has not reached into the pot of happiness, or as Leyser says, has not locked people in a coop like partridges, and now takes whoever he happens to grab. But the election would be like this if you left out the 8 points. If you start with the election of grace, you take the top first and the root, the base last. Just think — I wish I could call you brothers, I secretly think you are brothers, if you don't throw our churches into confusion — what good would it do if one person meant well and wanted to heal everyone, and yet gave them poison? And you give poison when you deny that all people who are saved are only saved because God has destined them to eternal life for the sake of Christ's merit and out of mercy. We cannot allow this truth to be taken away from us. You do not want this in principle, but you do it in deed. If our congregations were not confused in this way, I would say: let us debate for another twenty years, that should not divide us. But *Altes und Neues* is brought into our churches and people become full of doubt. Fanaticism arises. Those who don't like their preacher say he is a Calvinist. The poor people are often not ready to decide in this deep dispute.

Pastor Lindemann: I was pleased to hear Pastor Große's discussion. I would like to know what kind of people we are dealing with. In their eyes, are we false teachers who have fallen into Calvinism? I would also like to know if they confess to what others have written against us.

President Schwan: The argument as to whether what the opponents say is two elections or one seems to me to be something like this: A train pulls into the station. One signal appears, then another, and the train is in danger. When it arrives, you ask the person who gave the signals why he gave such different signals, sometimes red, sometimes green. But he says it was one and the same, it was one signal light, only one side is red, the other green. That's how our opponents do it too, sometimes they show us a red light, sometimes a green one, and then they say: they're just two sides of the same light. But I would ask the dear opponents to consider how far they get with such an explanation. It can cause mishaps, it can ruin things if you play with signals like that!

[p 162]

Moderator: Should we not now ask our opponents a specific question: how do they understand the Formula of Concord in certain paragraphs? Furthermore: whether they know themselves to be one with Professors Schmidt, Stellhorn and Loy, or whether they take a different position from them? So that when we deal with them, we know whether we have to lump them together with those who fight our Synod from the outside.

Resolved, that the first question, concerning the understanding of certain passages in the Formula of Concord, be settled first.

Moderator: So how is § 5 to be understood: "But the eternal election of God ... to adoption"?

Pastor Allwardt: Do you expect an answer from us?

Moderator: We submit to you the question, what you understand by the words: "God's ordering for salvation"? for, according to the Formula of Concord, this is only another word for the same concept.

Pastor Allwardt: We have already answered that. We find that the Formula of Concord speaks only of a certain election, and that in this paragraph it is election of which the Confession speaks. But here it means not only separation, but also how people come to salvation. This is not expressly stated here, but in § 8 it speaks of the same election. It says that election is a cause of salvation. I must understand this in § 5.

Pastor J. Große: Is election taken here in the wider sense?

Pastor Allwardt: In the wider sense. The Formula of Concord speaks here not only of the separation of persons, but also of the means and causes of our salvation. In this we agree that in § 5 it is said that election is only about the people who are saved; but these are redeemed, called, and so on. So throughout I take election in the Formula of Concord in a broader sense. In § 5 is not stated what is said in § 8, but it is one and the same election in both paragraphs. Everything is God's work, salvation, calling, conversion, etc. Those who are saved must be in God's hands from beginning to end. **<Page 14>** In short: we understand election here in the broader sense, but not in such a way that it applies to more persons than those who are saved.

Dr. Walther: I did not answer Pastor Allwardt in his first answer otherwise than that he answered as the Zwinglians did with regard to the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. They say: It is the body in the Lord's Supper that Christ means. That makes me as clear as

before. We want to know: Do you hold that § 5 speaks of election in the wider or broadest sense, or of election in the narrower sense. If you say: in the broadest sense, I do not accept it. There is no election by grace of salvation, of baptism, of preaching, of calling, etc., therefore no election by grace of means. When you speak of election, you can only speak of an act of God that relates to persons. It may be that we are closer to each other than it seems; and according to Pastor Allwardt's pronouncement it seems so to me. This is precisely what we teach, that election by grace [p 163] is not merely God's declaration that one shall go to heaven. We teach that the good Lord first redeemed the human race; and in the work of redemption all human sin is blotted out. Now God can, without violating his justice, have mercy on the human race. Now he can also elect people for salvation, namely that they come to repentance, have faith, live in sanctification and persevere in the cross. Only that we say that God did not, so to speak, wait to see whether people would be such pious people, but at the same time decided to give this grace to the poor sinner himself. If we teach that, you say we have a Calvinistic election. But you agree with us that conversion is God's work alone. What can prevent you from putting conversion after election, since God must work it? — It is to be feared that a new synergistic party will arise. It is said that a person must first fulfill all these conditions, and then God concludes: I will take him to heaven. That is where one gets into synergistic ways. God could not choose a man for salvation if he had not decided to work faith in him. Faith belongs to the election of grace, but not in so far as man produces faith in himself, or allows it to work in him.

Moderator: Would Mr. Pastor Allwardt briefly answer the question: What do you understand by the word: the eternal election of God, i.e. God's decree for salvation?

Pastor Allwardt: I take the word "election" here in the sense in which it is used in the whole Formula of Concord.

Prof. Pieper: I would like to formulate the question a little more precisely. The *ordinatio mediorum* is part of the concept of election used by the opponents. Are there more persons involved here than those you have occasionally referred to as the final election?

Does the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*], in so far as it belongs to the election, apply to more persons than to the elect?

Pastor Allwardt: In § 5 I do not exclude the decree of calling. It is quite clear that the elect must be called.

Prof. Pieper: That is what we always mean. When we speak of God's ordering for salvation, we also understand the ordering for calling, conversion, etc., but we do not think of all people when we speak of election.

Pastor Allwardt: I don't know how to answer the question. I know it is only a ordering: Go into all the world, etc. The fact that the Word is also preached to others is not a consideration in the election; but it is the same calling that is given to others. I believe that in point 2 the matter comes up by itself.

Dr. Walther: You always have to slip into point 2 or 3 or 4 to give us an answer.

Pastor J. Große: After all, Prof. Pieper's question is posed in such a way that anyone can answer either yes or no. Anyone who is on the opposing side and votes with Schmidt, Stellhorn and Loy will answer yes; the election goes even further. Anyone who cannot accept their teaching will answer no. God's ordering of salvation goes no further than the elect. For it is [p 164] pure nonsense: God has ordered people to salvation who will not be saved at all.

Pastor Allwardt: The question is very simple. But I am afraid that by answering yes or no I will be admitting something that I cannot admit, namely that there are two different purposes for the calling of men. I do not like to answer so briefly.

Dr. Walther: If one can say yes, one can confidently say yes. I would laugh at anyone who wanted to construct error out of my truth. Only truth follows from truth. — You know that we condemn the fact that God wanted to bring the elect to salvation in a different way from all men. The difference is only this: you say that God must first see whether people will follow this path to the end, and then he says: you shall go to heaven. We, on the other hand, say: if I go to heaven, I have God's eternal counsel to thank for everything, from the beginning to the end. This pure grace you deny, and we defend it, while you accuse us of being against universal grace; and yet nowhere in America is the doctrine of universal grace more brightly propounded than here.

Pastor Allwardt: I do not deny that God's grace alone saves us. The point of controversy is only this, whether calling, conversion, preservation, etc. come from general grace or from the election of grace, as from a particular grace. I agree with you on the question as such, whether it is God <pages 16> who calls, etc. I only say that universal grace is the source of faith.

Pastor Stöckhardt: I wondered whether it would not serve to clarify matters if this question were also linked to the related question: Is the ordering of God for salvation in § 5 identical with the universal will of grace?

Pastor Allwardt: To this I answer briefly no; otherwise it would not be the election of grace.

The conference wished that the question formulated by Prof. Pieper should also be answered.

Pastor Allwardt: There are questions that cannot be answered so briefly. The universal will of grace is about all people, the election of grace is about those who are truly saved. It is dangerous for me to answer the question, because it could come out that God has ordained the Word and Sacrament in a special way for the elect alone.

The opponents were then given until the afternoon to formulate their answer, and concluded with the Holy Our Father, after Mr. Beyer had been elected vice-president of the conference.

M. Hein, Secretary.

[p 165]

Second Session.

Monday afternoon, May 23rd.

In the first session the following question was put to the opponents: "Does the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*], in so far as it belongs to the election of grace, pass over more persons than the elect?"

In answer to this question, Pastor Allwardt: "I can give the following answer: The designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] is a general one and as such it also comes into consideration in the election.

Thereupon the assembly *resolved* that the other gentlemen opponents should also answer the above question, and at the request of the chairman declared

Pastor Ernst: "I fully agree with what Pastor Allwardt has said. Since the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] is a general one, it also comes into consideration here as a general one. I cannot understand the Formula of Concord in any other way than that the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] comes into consideration here as a general one. This is clear above all from § 23. — At these words, Pastor Ernst was interrupted by the Conference when he was told that the Pastoral Conference did not wish any further discussion or justification, but only a short, concise answer to the above question in the affirmative or negative, whereupon Pastor Ernst did not speak further.

Pastor Rohe stated: I must give the same answer that Mr. Pastor Allwardt gave.

Pastor Dörmann: I also give the same answer.

After the opponents had answered in this way, Prof. Crämer stated: I cannot understand why they did not simply answer "no", but described and paraphrased this "no".

Pastor Allwardt: Shall I give a short answer to that?

Answer from the Conference: Yes.

Pastor Allwardt: I did not simply say "no" because there is a sentence in the question whose scope I cannot measure; I mean the sentence: "insofar as it belongs to the election of grace."

Pastor Stöckhardt: Is it permissible to answer this?

After receiving consent: The matter seems to me as simple and easy to understand as the question is meant; but I cannot understand the answer. The meaning of the question is: Who are we talking about when we speak of election? Of the elect, or of all people? If only the elect are spoken of, then everything that is said about election can only refer to the elect and not to all men. Consequently, the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*], when speaking of election, can [p 166] only refer to the elect. As soon as we speak of the general counsel of grace, we speak of all men; but when we speak of election, we speak only of the elect.

Pastor Allwardt: This brings us to the issue we have already discussed today: whether we can speak of election to the faith. Word and Sacrament are always the same, whether they are before the elect or the non-elect. But the question is whether it is an election to the means of grace. However, it is not only the means of grace that come into consideration, but also how they are used. Not everyone uses the means of grace correctly.

Pastor Stöckhardt: I would like to suggest that you apply the concept of predestination of the means [*praedestinatio mediorum*] to § 5 of the Formula of Concord and look at the words in this 5th paragraph. The next question is: In what sense can it be said here that election, which includes the general determination of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*], extends only to the children of God who are elected to eternal life? What is the meaning of the Formula of Concord? I see no sense in it.

Pastor Allwardt: It doesn't seem difficult to me. The elect — I am talking about the elect in the same sense as you — must be redeemed, called, kept in the faith; and the means that God has ordained for this are in and of themselves quite general. Therefore the elect cannot be brought to it by any other means <page 18> than those by which all are to be brought to it. There always remains, therefore, only a part that uses these means rightly. But when I speak of election, I must speak of the means by which the elect are brought to it. And I mean precisely, if we want to speak quite unequivocally, that it is precisely in election that it is shown that the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] is a universal one and that most people only fail to attain salvation through their own fault.

Dr. Walther: I think the difficulty arises from the expression: "under consideration." That is a big, open barn door. Who will deny that the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] can also come into consideration? But that is not the question which we are ventilating here; but this is the question: to which does it belong [*ad quem pertinet*], or to whom does election apply? does it apply only to the pious, elect children of God, who are elected to eternal life? I do not see why we should not stick to the words of the Confession. Of course, if we want to present the doctrine of election by grace correctly, we must also teach the general counsel of grace. To that extent, of course, this "comes into consideration." But this is not the question of what we must teach if we want to teach it beneficially, but: who is affected by the election of grace? Does it also concern those who will not be saved, or only those who will certainly be saved? If you admit the latter, then also accept this paragraph (5). It is not a question of all the doctrines which are also "under consideration", but of the election of grace itself.

Pastor Stöckhardt: How this (5th) § must be understood is clear. But now the question is: to what extent does the definition [p 167] of the opponents agree with this paragraph, or how can it be accommodated in it at all? It says: "But the eternal election of God predestination [*vel praedestinatio*], i.e. God's ordering for salvation, is not especially for the pious and the wicked, but only for the children of God who are chosen and ordained to eternal life." This means that election is for the children of God alone. This is characteristic of predestination. That is its characteristic: "over the children of God alone." Now you introduce a general moment when you say: the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] comes into consideration as general. So this way of salvation comes into consideration here, insofar as it is there for all people, indeed it is the main part of the election of grace. So the general ordinance of the means of salvation for all men, how can this consist in a definition of election apart from this paragraph, which expressly says: election is for the children of God alone?

Pastor Allwardt: May I read a short passage from a report to show how the general and the particular are connected here? The theologian <page 19>

Wandalinus writes: "Predestination or election is the eternal act of God, by which, according to the good pleasure of his will, and solely for the merit of Christ, he has chosen out of the whole mass of the fallen human race all those men to eternal life of whom he foreknew that by the means of salvation, which in time should be offered to all without distinction, they would truly and unto the end believe in Christ, the Savior of all men, that by virtue of this infallible and unchangeable counsel and act they might attain salvation to the praise of his glorious grace."

On the one hand, we have the particular election of specific persons: "all those people ... of whom he foreknew"; and on the other hand the general grace: "to be offered to all without distinction." So Wandal also brings in the latter in order to show how election is indeed a particular election, but grace is not a particular grace. When I speak

of election and show that election through the fault of men is particular, it is necessary that I emphasize the other side: namely, that according to God's will salvation is prepared for all.

Pastor Ernst: For my part, I can be satisfied if we establish the unity of the concept in this way: Election embraces the means of salvation [*media salutis*], which, however, considered by themselves, pass over all. But as designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] alone it is not yet election. If it is to be election, the election of the persons [*electio personarum*] must be added. This twofold concept as a whole now covers the persons who are finally saved. Thus, as election, it only includes the persons who are ultimately saved. Through the means of grace God wants to bring out all. But he succeeds in doing this with only a few; and these are, in spite of the fact that those means, those counsels are general, only those persons who alone remain as the personal object of election. And I think that is what the Confession says. [p 168] It presents these counsels in their generality as the first part of the election. § 23 expressly says: "God has not only prepared salvation in general, but also all and every person ... considered." "Not only — but also" — thus the confession summarizes these two parts: The preparation of the general way of salvation and the election of particular persons. If we were now to assume that the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] is meant here only in its relation to the persons of the elect, I believe that the Confession should express it precisely the other way around. It should read: God has not only considered the individual persons, but has also determined ways and means by which he can lead the individual persons to salvation. The previous [*prius*] would be the selection of the individual persons and only then — at least conceptually — would the determination follow as to how these individual persons are to be led to salvation <pages 20>. That first decree would have already determined everything. The first decision would have already accepted them for life. I think — don't hold this against me — that this would be an absolute election, as the Confession rejects and cuts off when it says: "One should not therefore consider the eternal election of God merely in the secret, inscrutable counsel of God", the election would not consist merely in the foreknowledge of God, nor in a military selection. According to this assumption, election would have to be placed conceptually before the determination of the way of salvation. But this rejects the confession, which says: "not all things in general are prepared for salvation, but also ... considered." The preparation of salvation precedes it, the particular election follows. It thus unites the concept of election into a unity, and the auxiliary line is, however, the foreknowledge of God.

Pastor Rohe: In § 8 it says: "But the eternal election of God not only stands and knows beforehand the salvation of the elect, but is also a cause by the gracious will and pleasure of God in Christ Jesus, so that our salvation, and what belongs to it, creates, works, helps and promotes" and so on. This passage is repeatedly referred to in order to prove this — here Dr. Walther protested against the fact that one now speaks of the 8th §, while we are still at the 5th.

Pastor Rohe: That's where I want to go.

Dr. Walther: You should take what is first in the Confession. The Confession also has its reason for putting this first.

Pastor Rohe: I said this morning: If I am to understand individual statements of the Confession correctly, I must first know what the Confession understands by election. Now the Confession does not say in § 5 what is to be understood by election, but says so only in §§ 23 and 24. And in § 5 it merely says: what kind of persons the election is about, "is... over", that is the time word, on which persons it extends. So here it makes a statement about election, and if I want to understand this statement, I must first know what the Confession means by election. The Confession says that nothing should be omitted if one wants to think rightly about it; that is, not only if one wants to preach; I must [p 169] not exclude anything from the idea of election, otherwise I have something else in mind than the Formula of Concord. An example: I can say that man is visible, for by man I understand a creature consisting of body and soul. But if someone else says: man is only the soul, and then wants to say: man is visible, that is wrong.

Dr. Walther: Because the statement was false.

Pastor Rohe: So the Formula of Concord understands election to mean designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] and designation of the persons [*ordinatio personarum*]. Now the <page 21> Formula of Concord says something in different places, sometimes more to one side, and then again more to the other. Just as one says: Christ is God, was born of the Virgin Mary, etc., which can actually only be said of one nature. Thus the Formula of Concord with regard to the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] and designation of the persons [*ordinatio personarum*]. It says of this whole concept: on the one hand: election is the cause of our salvation, etc., and on the other hand it says of this whole concept: it extends only to the pious children of God. Inasmuch, then, as it is designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*], it is the cause of salvation, etc., and inasmuch as it is designation of the persons [*ordinatio personarum*], it does not extend to the wicked, but only to the children of God who are elected to eternal life.

Dr. Walther: Of course the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] comes into consideration. For how could I believe that I am elect if I did not know that there is a general counsel of grace, that I am certainly redeemed, that when I am called, the good God indicates that he wants to give me his grace? So of course the order of salvation comes into consideration. But that is not the question; rather, to whom does election apply? *ad quem pertinet*, or on whom does it apply? For it is not true that the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*], i.e. the ordering of the means of grace, is election. I do not understand how a man can say that the disposition of the means of grace is election. Election concerns persons, nothing else. A completely different question is how God has decided to carry out his election. The latter is mentioned in § 8.

Prof. Pieper: The doctrine of election by grace also includes the term conversion. Let us take this term out for a moment. The question is, in what sense does conversion come into consideration here? Is election only about the conversion of the elect, or also about the

conversion of other people, of all people? We say that if election is about conversion, it is only about the conversion of the elect. I note the concern of Pastor Allwardt. He shies away from referring the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediiorum*] to specific persons from the outset; he does not like to say: God has already ordained me from eternity to be called, converted, to come to faith, etc. He fears that in this way the general will of grace will be weakened. But to argue this way is wrong. [p 170] I am firmly convinced that if it were carried out, our whole Christian doctrine could be thrown overboard in half an hour. For one could argue in the same way about the doctrine of conversion. Reason cannot conclude otherwise than thus: All men are in the same perdition. Now God approaches these people with his grace. One part is converted, another part is not converted. If it is not admitted that a so-called point of connection is found in those who are converted, but that the grace of God alone works everything, <pages 22> then reason concludes that God is not serious about the conversion of others. So here. One shies away from allowing calling, conversion, sanctification, and preservation to be determined by election, because one fears that the universal will of grace will be overshadowed. But what does Scripture say about this? Scripture says quite clearly that the Christian should ascribe calling, conversion, faith, etc. back to eternal election as the source. The Scripture says: "Us", us, these particular persons, "God has blessed, with all kinds of spiritual blessings in heavenly things through Christ. As he has elected us ... that we should be holy and blameless ... and has ordered us to adoption" ... (Eph. 1). By defining the persons in eternal election, God also determined calling, conversion, etc. at the same time. And it is precisely from this that our Formula of Concord draws the comforting aspect of election, that the Christian can know, as a result of election, that God has already from eternity, before the foundation of the world, considered his conversion, has decreed to give him faith. So precisely that in which the Formula of Concord places the consolation of election is what one wants to reject. I believe that all synergism is to be avoided. But it brings this argumentation to these thoughts: Election is to be kept in abeyance in its relation to certain persons. The grace of God should first be held in abeyance, and only become specialized when faith is added to it from the side of man; or if one wants to go further immediately, when man remains in faith to the end, i.e. on the basis of persevering faith.

Pastor Engelbrecht: The main confusion has been brought about by the opponents through their concept of election in a narrower and broader sense. The result is a very peculiar concept. One often speaks of certain things in a narrower and broader sense. But that is a quite different thing. There are then similar things. For example, Austria in the narrower sense, which means German Austria. And Austria in the broader sense, which also includes the other, non-German provinces of this empire. However, both are similar things, namely provinces. It is no different when one speaks of sanctification in the narrower and broader sense; in both cases one understands acts of God by it. There would be no dispute if we were to proceed in the same way with the

concept of election of grace in a narrower and broader sense. But what is meant by election of grace in the narrower sense? Answer: A selection of persons. And what is meant by election of grace in the broader sense? Answer: The designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*], the ordering of the means of grace, i.e. something quite foreign. We should at least take a [p 171] smaller number of people on the one hand and a larger number on the other. Then alone would this distinction make sense.

Pastor C. Schmidt: Wouldn't it be better if we left off the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediourum*] now until we come to § 13? In § 5 two things are stated, 1) election is an ordering unto salvation, 2) it is only for the children of God. Would this not be the place to ask the opponents: Do you believe that others than the elect are decreed to salvation? They should answer this question for us.

Pastor Allwardt: We have often answered this question in the negative.

Pastor Stöckhardt was given the floor, but explained that he had wanted to say something similar to what Pastor C. Schmidt had just said, and then continued: "We cannot yet move away from § 5. This does not settle the matter, if one says: the ordering of God extends over the elect. Obviously we are only talking about the ordering of persons. The persons are named. Now we are initially in agreement that only certain persons are meant who will finally be saved. Now I ask: By what right is something else inserted here into the eternal election of God? By what right can an election of means [i.e. not persons] be introduced here?"

Dr. Walther received permission to speak, but ceded it to Pastor Allwardt to answer the previous speaker.

Pastor Allwardt: It is already in the expression "ordering of the children of God unto salvation" that I cannot merely speak of the ordering itself as an act, but must also speak of the end to which it is decreed. This necessarily belongs to the term "election". The question arises quite naturally: How is it that only some are ordered to salvation? You believe that these two things cannot be united: election and the general will of grace. But I believe that we can, according to God's Word, if we show how the means are decreed for all. But if we always have only individuals in mind — those who will ultimately be saved — the matter remains quite obscure. So the word "unto salvation" gives me the right to speak of something more than persons.

Dr. Walther: What concept is important here? The concept of salvation? No, but the concept of election. What does election mean? What does ordering mean? To which persons can and must this be applied? That is our question. That goes without saying: Where the word salvation occurs, I can think a lot of other thoughts by virtue of my association of thoughts. What does this have to do with anything? It looks like a clever evasion. Of course you can talk about the acquisition of salvation. Those who do not know what salvation is must be informed of it. But that is not the question here. That is taken for granted. So I would like to have a simple answer to the question: Does the election of grace pertain to the elect children of God alone, or to others also?

Pastor Allwardt: Only the elect children of God.

Dr. Walther: Then we can go further when we have seen how the others express themselves. When we speak of the path to salvation that the elect take, we are speaking of the general path of grace, conversion, repentance, faith, sanctification, constancy in the cross. We are not talking about a particular way. This is also expressly stated in § 23, that this is the way by which the elect are led to salvation.

Moderator: Do the other opponents agree with the answer of Pastor Allwardt's answer?

Pastor Ernst: I have said that election includes only those persons who will eventually be saved. But I have not yet admitted that the term election does not also include the other term, determination of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*]. But the persons are only those who will be saved.

Dr. Walther: That is enough.

Pastor Rohe: I declare that what the Formula of Concord calls election, decree, is only about the children of God who are saved, unless it is the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*].

Dr. Walther: We'll talk about that later.

Pastor Allwardt: We admitted this in Chicago from the very beginning, that election is only for those who will be saved.

Dr. Walther: It was you, but not the others. The others did not say it; therefore I believe that you are closer to us.

Pastor Ernst: I said it in Chicago.

Pastor J. Große: I would like to make a correction. I asked Prof. Stellhorn in Chicago [*in 1880*] whether he also included the temporary believers. He replied: Yes. But later he modified this answer: for us men they belong in it.

Dr. Walther: He had made a mistake.

Pastor Allwardt: Prof. Stellhorn said that we regard them as such according to love, not conceptually. As I see the people before me as brothers, I regard them as elect according to love; but we have also testified that they are not actually elect.

Dr. Walther: Do you think we asked Prof. Stellhorn about that? Do you think we are such strange brothers to ask someone about this? No. Prof. Stellhorn knew quite well what was meant, namely, whether the election referred to in paragraph 5 also applies to those who believe for a time. Afterwards he modified his yes in this way: for us.

Pastor Stöckhardt: I would like to have information about one thing. Does the election of grace extend only to the children of God? Does election by grace, in the true sense of the word, apply only to the elect children of God? In Chicago Prof. Stellhorn said that in § 5 mainly the second part of the election of grace is meant, which only in a secondary <pages 25> way constitutes the election. It was said that only the 2nd part was meant. But when it is asked whether the election of grace concerns the children of God alone, it means the whole [p 173] election of grace, not only a part of it. Prof. Stellhorn denied this. In Chicago he called the first part, namely the general way of salvation,

the main part. (Cf. [p. 30 f. of the Chicago proceedings](#).) According to the wording here, Prof. Stellhorn could not give this answer, as the opponents do here. He would say: According to the second part the election of grace extends only to the children of God, but according to the main part it extends to all men. So Prof. Stellhorn includes all people in the first and main parts. Therefore, when our opponents say that the actual election of grace concerns only the children of God, this is essentially different. The question, then, is: Does the election of grace in its proper sense concern only the elect children of God?

Pastor Allwardt: Yes. Election by grace in its proper sense is only about the elect children of God. The decree, the determination to give the gospel to the world, is for all people. But this determination in itself is not yet election by grace. Likewise, the decree to convert those who are called must also be taken as such. But this in itself is not an election of grace either. It is true that election in the proper sense is only for the children of God. For what is about others is not election. Even if one is called, he is not yet elected to salvation. Election is an actual decree that God has made in eternity. That is why I say that all those who are not truly saved are not elected.

Dr. Walther: You have justified us with that. That is not your teaching. I am completely satisfied.

Pastor Allwardt: It is wonderful to me that we should vote together at once. We have never called it election, nor Stellhorn, that the means of grace are decreed for all. But when we speak of election, everything must be included, calling, conversion, preservation, etc.

Dr. Walther: That is what we teach.

Pastor Allwardt: But we're going our separate ways..

Dr. Walther: I'll be satisfied if you just admit that for once. — You have a bogeyman before your eyes, you will see that that for yourself when you are clear about the matter. You seem to want to take synergism seriously. That is also what we want. We do not want to give man a share in his salvation, but we want to give all the glory to God alone. That is our interest. As the Formula of Concord says: "By this doctrine and declaration of the eternal and saving election of the elect children of God, God is given his glory wholly and completely, that out of [page 26](#) pure mercy in Christ, without any merit or good work on our part, he saves us according to the counsel of his will" etc. ([§ 87](#)) — If, then, you believe that the whole act of God consists in this, that he not only works this, but also has so decreed from eternity: that is what we want.

[p 174]

Pastor Allwardt: Prof. Stellhorn also said that in Chicago.

Dr. Walther: We don't want to talk about Prof. Stellhorn. He said that the eight points were the main thing. He was told: That does not appear in the *Epitome*. In the summary, it had to be mentioned above all if it was the main thing. According to him, the following could be omitted rather than the preceding. — He could not answer that.

Pastor Allwardt: Prof. Stellhorn cannot answer here. I will therefore answer for him. What Prof. Stellhorn meant is this: In deciding to give the gospel, God did have in mind the individual

persons who really attain salvation, but he thought of applying it to them. We say the same. But we do not teach this "election unto faith"; we do not agree on that.

Dr. Walther: You do not believe what the Formula of Concord says: [§§ 44-45] "All *opiniones* and erroneous doctrine of the powers of our natural will are thereby laid low, because God in his counsel before the time of the world considered and decreed that he himself would create and work in us all that belongs to our conversion by the power of his Holy Spirit through the Word. This doctrine also gives us the beautiful and glorious consolation that God has made the conversion, righteousness and salvation of every Christian so highly important to him and has so faithfully meant it that, before the foundation of the world was laid, he took counsel about it and decreed in his purpose how he would bring me to it and preserve me in it; He has so well and surely purposed to preserve my salvation, because it could easily be lost from our hands through the weakness and wickedness of our flesh, or snatched and taken from us by the cunning and violence of the devil and the world, that He has decreed it in His eternal purpose, which cannot be falsified or overthrown, and has committed it to the almighty hand of our Savior Jesus Christ, from which no one can snatch us, John 10:28." According to your teaching, God has seen how I will act or behave. But according to his omniscience he foreknew it; and because he now knows that I will behave well, he says: he is elect. A terrible doctrine! No, the good Lord has taken such counsel: How shall I bring the poor sinner to heaven? Then he made the decision: he wants to bring me to an acquaintance with the gospel, he wants to work faith, he wants to strengthen faith, to preserve me <pages 27> in temptation and, when I stumble, to lift me up, to preserve me to the end. That is my comfort. I have taken it from Scripture and Confession, and you don't seem to want to admit that. You say: That is part of it. But man must carry it out, and God sees whether he carries it out. But this must be your ruin, that you reject it as Calvinism, when one says: God has not only thought of me in so far as he has imagined how I behave, but in so far as he has decided to show me this grace, as he says: I have chosen you from the world. From the world, he says, not that he has chosen you from among the believers, but from the world. So the disciples were first children of the world, lying in the corruption of the world, and out of this corruption the Savior chose them. And I believe the same about myself. If God had not chosen me, I would not have come to the knowledge of Christ; [175] nor would I have sought out the gospel if it had not sought me out. We count all this as election, not according to our thoughts, but according to Scripture. And the Confession says the same. Cf. §§ 8 and 23.

Pastor Kunz: It has been said that we think and assume that it depends on the behavior of the person. I do not agree with that. Rather, I believe, as the Weimar Bible says, that the Lord God saw his work in man and so chose him. I have never thought or said anything else. I renounce it. It is God's free grace. He has begun His work and sees this work in man; and whosoever He has seen and known that in time he

will take hold of the Lord Christ in faith and persevere in it, he is chosen.

Prof. Crämer: I would be very pleased that the opponents seem to be approaching us in their expressions, if only there were the possibility of recognizing some spirit of truth and a renunciation of the spirit of error and falsehood. Prof. Stellhorn has made reversals where one should not think it possible; now he spoke thus, now the opposite, but has never retracted the other. So here. I can't help but get the impression. First one claims most rigidly: the main part is the predestination of the means [*predestinatio mediorum*] — now one at least says: designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*]. Now they say: We can answer yes and no. Where does one discard the completely false concept of predestination that one used to have: that it is not only certain persons, but the way of salvation and the like? How can this rhyme with the spirit of truth, that one first sets up something erroneous and then something else and then turns around again and finally never renounces the very decided opponents? I can feel no spirit of truth and hope for no reconciliation.

Pastor J. Große: It would be well, after all, if we were careful not to speak in this <page 28> way. It does not make a good impression on someone who is in error and is still trying to save this and that from his statements. It looks as if the opponents are to be portrayed as those who do not mean it honestly. But this intention, which is attributed to the opponent, does not lead to the goal. The opponents are not in a position to take back what they have said without further ado. If they are convinced, they will immediately retract everything they have said; but now we are still in disputation. I don't like that people are talking in this way.

Prof. Crämer: I did not speak of intention.

Pastor C. Schmidt: I wanted to say the same as Pastor Große. I do not agree to speak in this way. Then I would like to point out whether it would not be better if we referred this discussion to the place where it belongs, § 5 says only this: that God has ordained the children of God unto salvation. The opponents have conceded that they agree. We should go further.

[176]

Pastor Ernst: If it was remarked earlier that we had dropped this or that form of expression and seemed to be approaching the concept, which the majority has of election, I cannot admit this for my part. I stand thus: the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] remains as the first component of election, not merely as the way in which the elect are to be led to salvation. I think that the universal way of salvation as such comes into consideration here. And if I have understood Pastor Allwardt correctly, he said nothing other than that all eight points are considered parts of election in the sense of the Formula of Concord. But without the last resolution, which refers to the persons, the Formula of Concord would not call this election. But the Formula of Concord calls all these decrees together election, and I cannot help thinking that this is what the Formula of Concord wants to say. It clearly states: "that the whole doctrine of the decree, counsel, will and

ordinance of God concerning our redemption, calling, justification and sanctification is summed up" (§ 14) in the doctrine of election, and names election of persons [*electio personarum*] as the last of the resolutions listed. I would not say that it was wrong for us to combine designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] and election of persons [*electio personarum*] into one concept and to understand this as the concept of the Formula of Concord of election.

Pastor Strieter: I just wanted to show, before we go any further, that Prof. Stellhorn and we are not in agreement. Prof. Stellhorn said: all men are called. At the first station many depart, at the second many again, at the third again and so on, and finally from the last station God applies the grace of salvation to each individual, and this application is election. We say, because God has elected me, therefore God has called me, converted me, preserved me. Conversely, he says: Because [page 29](#) man comes to this last station, therefore God applies election to him.

Chairman: Wouldn't it be much better to leave Prof. Stellhorn out of it altogether? The fact is that Prof. Stellhorn's oral and written statements cannot be reconciled. He used to speak differently than he does now, and he now writes differently than he used to speak. We might have to deal with Prof. Stellhorn in the Synodical Conference. We should urge our opponents who belong to us to declare: We do not want to be identified with Prof. Schmidt, Stellhorn and Loy, but want to be judged according to our own statements. Then we would get further. And if we then put the question to the brethren: Do you believe that in § 5 this and nothing else is explained, we can go further. The rest is to be found in [§ 8](#). I think they should leave all mental reservations [*reservationes mentales*] behind and explain themselves in such a way that we can understand and grasp them by their words. Why always this expression: "election in the sense of the Formula of Concord"? If they said: the Formula of Concord speaks only of one election, then there is no need to add: the election in the sense of [\[177\]](#) the Formula of Concord. There is no other, and this election is the ordering of salvation which passes over the elect children of God. If they said outright: this is also our teaching, we would reach our goal much sooner. I think the brethren know us well enough to know that we do not hold any of the doctrines that are specifically Calvinistic. Therefore they should not be afraid to unanimously confess [§ 5](#) with us, and should not think: if we admit it here, they will pull the rope over our heads later. That seems to me to be the only concern they have: if they admit something here, they would have lost everything. Now, if they cannot say with us outright: here in § 5 the election of God is known and understood as an ordering to salvation, which only applies to the pious, God-pleasing children of God, then it would be best if they said: we have a different concept of election than the Formula of Concord indicates here. But I don't like this back and forth talk.

Pastor Allwardt: I've explained it many times; why should I explain it any more? I can't get over it; all these points should be summarized. We are both committed to § 5. The point of contention is whether in those points, which must all be included, we are talking

about the calling etc. as such, or in relation to the elect. We do not deny that election is for the children of God alone, otherwise we would be contradicting the Confession. I see no reason why we should linger here. I declare again: Election is only for those who will certainly be saved, and only the elect will be saved.

Pastor Stöckhardt: It would be very nice if we could agree on this paragraph. But I see no profit in going further; for it is clear from everything that we understand these words differently from the opponents. If we could agree on the wording of this paragraph, we would agree on everything else. Of course you confess the wording of § 5; that's what it says. The question here is whether in § 5 with the words "eternal election of God" or "decree to salvation" only the election of persons is mentioned and nothing else. You would say: also something else is referred to.

Pastor Allwardt: I want to ask a counter-question: Do you understand election in the same way as the Confession? According to the same, everything should be taken together. Do you understand the word election in § 5 in this sense? You should answer yes or no! There lies the difficulty! It says: "that the whole doctrine of the purpose, counsel, will and decree of God, concerning our redemption, calling, righteousness and salvation, must be summed up" — do you summarize all this and do you understand it when it says here in § 5: election?

Pastor Stöckhardt: Yes, I understand all of this as referring to the elect. The word election refers to these particular people.

Pastor Allwardt: Also salvation? I ask, does the word election in § 5 also include salvation?

[178]

Pastor Stöckhardt: You define it universally, and for us election covers the particular persons of the elect. Redemption is the basis of the decree of election. We do not place redemption in parallel with calling, etc.

Pastor Allwardt: But that is what it says here in § 14: "the whole doctrine ... and salvation." No distinction is made. And that's where the dispute comes in. This is actually the point of contention, not § 5.

Pastor Stöckhardt: In our case, election coincides with particular persons. But if you bring in the means of salvation, insofar as they are there for all, that contradicts the 'only over the children of God'.

Pastor Allwardt: Redemption is performed in the same way as the other pieces.

Pastor Stöckhardt: Who denies that? But only in so far as it relates to particular persons does it belong to the doctrine of election.

Chairman asks the conference whether this debate should continue and receives the answer: No.

Prof. Pieper: However, we are not at all in agreement on the understanding of § 5, and if we go any further now, it will be a back and forth discussion without getting any further. The main difference lies in § 5. Allwardt once gave up including designation of the means [*ordinatio mediourum*], insofar as it is general, in the election of grace, and then <pages 31> he did it again. He once said: Insofar as the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediourum*] concerns all, it does not belong in election, but only insofar as it concerns the elect. The difference comes to light most clearly in this question: Does the eternal

election of God also refer to the calling, conversion, faith, etc. of others? other than the elect children of God, or only to the calling etc. of certain persons who will certainly be saved? If the latter is denied, then election is understood in such a way that it does not merely apply to the pleasing children of God, but is understood more broadly. But as far as the expression election to conversion, calling, etc. is concerned, reference has already been made repeatedly to § 45 of the Formula of Concord. There it is said that election gives this consolation, that I can know that God has already from eternity considered me for conversion, etc., before the foundation of the world was laid, and that he has taken counsel how to bring me to conversion, righteousness and salvation and to preserve me therein. When Pastor Allwardt says: "Election unto faith" I cannot say, it is obvious that he is diametrically opposed to the Confession. The Confession says: God has taken counsel from eternity and decreed in his decree how he will bring me to conversion, i.e. to faith; Pastor Allwardt says: one should not speak of an election to faith. 1 Pet. 1:2. is thus understood by the opponents: Elected to obedience, in which faith is included. But if faith is included there, then it is conceded that the expression "election to faith" is scriptural. And we cannot depart from these expressions. They are not our expressions, but revealed truths of the faith. This is all connected with § 5. If we take [179] § 5, as the words read, election is the ordering to salvation, the decree which alone extends to the children of God, it is clear that it is not merely the ordering to the final goal, but also the ordering to the way. If this ordering is understood generally, it is no longer an ordering of the children of God. We must stop there.

Pastor Brauer Sr: I cannot understand how one can bring the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediolorum*] into § 5. Here is the definition: "decree unto salvation", that can only be men! It is nonsense to say that the means of grace are also included. For example, Baptism! Baptism is to be saved! The calling is to be saved! We are only talking about the salvation of people. Who is to be saved? The children of God. That is a definition. What is election? The ordering of the children of God to salvation. Here it is said: children of God are elect. But the means of salvation are the means by which the children of God come to salvation. I cannot understand how anyone can want to insert something into this, when we have the clearest definition.

Pastor Rohe: It has been said repeatedly that nothing of the eight points can be found in the *Epitome*. §§ 9-12 of the *Solid Declaration* is <page 32> briefly summarized in § 5 of the *Epitome*. §§ 13-24, which contain the detailed definition, are summarized in §§ 6 and 7 of the *Epitome*. Everything contained in the eight points is summarized there. Moreover, the Formula of Concord says: If one wants to think rightly of election, one must take everything together. But Pastor Stöckhardt said before: salvation is not part of it. Then: calling, make righteous is the way, so again not election. Thus he takes away the first and these other pieces, while the Formula of Concord says: these parts should all be taken together, that is election.

Pastor O. Hanser: For the sake of those who were not in Chicago and have suggested that one should be satisfied with the mere

declaration of the opponents — that they also profess § 5 — I would like to remind you that we debated this point for two days in Chicago, and that it was said from our side: here is the definition, here we want to stop. But we argued for two days in vain and could not bring the opponents to the concession that this was the full definition of election. We then went further and the result was that we made no progress. So we don't want to repeat this experiment. The opponents themselves have said: it all depends on what we understand by the term election. We understand it to mean: the ordering of the children of God to salvation. This alone. If they say that they also accept this definition, in so far as persons are meant, that is right in itself; but we are not satisfied with it. For the ordering of the children of God unto salvation is to them only a piece of election. The opponents must [180] admit nothing more and nothing less than that this is the full concept of election: the ordering of the children of God to salvation.

Dr. Walther: It has been said that the *Epitome* does contain the eight points. Earlier they had said that it was important that the eight points came first as designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*], and then the election of persons. But now it would come afterwards. We were told that if it came afterwards, you would be right. But now it is said: the *Epitome* does not come before, but after. So they beat themselves up. No, what the *Epitome* says is not the eight points, but what follows later in the *Solid Declaration*, from § 25 onwards. If anyone asks whether he can take comfort in the election of grace for his person, I must know that I have a Savior, that I am redeemed, justified and saved by faith. I must know the universality of grace. This is not about the concept of election, but what is necessary on my part if I want to be comforted by the election of grace. This must not be confused. In the same way one mixes up what is said in § 13: If one wishes to think or speak rightly of election, he should accustom himself not to speak <page 33> of the mere secret providence of God, etc. It is not said that all this is election. What election is, is said in the beginning: The ordering of the children of God unto eternal life. But we are warned that we should not speak of mere election when we speak of it in the pulpit; we would only do harm there. Rather, we must take the doctrine of salvation as our basis. And then we can say: "Look, God has decreed that the faithful children of God are to be led to salvation in the way described in the eight points. Here in these eight points we are not talking about election by grace, but about what we must take as a basis if we want to talk about election by grace, so that we do not fall into the perversity into which many have fallen before, even good people, who have talked about it as if everything had been said that should be said: some are elected, they must be saved, others are not elected, they are damned. That would be terrible if a preacher did not want to preach anything else. No, says the Formula of Concord, you would thereby create despair or carnal security. No, if you want to speak rightly and with fruit, you should get used to the fact that it is not just etc. Remember that it says: you should accustom himself. If it belongs to the concept of election of grace, I do not say: you must "get used to it". But where is there a word that election of

grace consists of this? I must not practice the doctrine of election of grace otherwise than in connection with the whole doctrine of salvation, or I become a murderer of souls. But you imagine that it says: "Election of grace is: 1) calling, 2) justification, etc.". There is not a word about it; but: if I want to speak rightly about the election of grace, I must also speak about these points. So the doctrine of election by grace is presupposed. You say that it is only a matter of designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*]. But look at § 22 (No. 8). According to you, it should read: That he finally . . . [181] and make them eternally blessed and glorious in eternal life. So it should read according to you. No, here election is placed before calling and justification: that he will call, etc., those whom he chooses. First election, then calling, justification, etc., as Paul shows this golden chain in Romans 8. [Romans 8:29-30]

Pastor Beyer: Perhaps it would be best to remain silent. I would just like to make a few very brief points. There can only be two kinds of people, those who are saved and those who are not saved. Which are we talking about in § 5? Only those people who will be saved. That is what it says. Now if we speak only of those who will be saved, and it is declared that this is the article of election, that God has chosen them to salvation, then all that which also includes the ungodly can certainly not belong to the article of election, and all that which applies to all <pages 34> cannot, in so far as it is universal, belong to election, but only in so far as it applies to those who will be saved. That is why I also believe that the eight points dealing with order here in this place only concern those who will be saved, insofar as they are led to salvation by God on this path. That is why it always says: "us", "we". Next, I would like to point out that Article 10 of the *Epitome* reads: "Whoever, therefore, concerns himself with the revealed will of God, and follows the order which St. Paul has given in the Epistle to the Romans, who first directs men to repentance, knowledge of sins, faith in Christ, and divine obedience, before he speaks of the mystery of God's eternal election, to him such teaching is useful and comforting." There the doctrine of election is expressly separated from the doctrine of repentance, knowledge of sin, faith in Christ, obedience. These pieces should precede. Insofar as they are preached to all people, they are to be practiced "beforehand". But when it comes to the article on election, then obviously only the children of God are to be spoken of. If we look at this in the right way, it could put us on a path that brings us together.

Pastor Körner: I consider it my duty to say where I stand on this doctrine; or in other words, what conviction I have gained as a result of these negotiations and private conversations. As to my position on the questions put to the opponents, I hold that the election extends only to the children of God who are pleasing to God. As for election itself, it is the ordering of these children of God to salvation, nothing else. And as to the eight points, I hold that they refer only to those whom God has ordered to salvation; as certain as it is, on the other hand, that God's will of grace is universal.

Pastor Engelbrecht: This 5th § should convince the opponents that their concept of election does not fit into it. The designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] is the main part of election, they say, that it is universal, and can also be considered universal. Now § 5 says: The eternal election of God is over the children of God alone; it thus excludes the others, for it says, "is not over the pious and the wicked," "but [182] over the children of God alone." So where does the opponents' concept of election fit in? It does not fit in. It is as clear as the sun.

Prof. Pieper: I would like to respond briefly to what Pastor Rohe said. Pastor Rohe says that this view, according to which redemption is made the basis for election, is a separation of redemption. I do not understand how one can argue in this way. It is presented as if it were arbitrary to assume that redemption is the ground of election. But this view is enforced by the Confession itself. It interprets itself in § 75 in such a way that election is based on Christ's merit: <page 35> "And because our election to eternal life is not founded on our piety or virtue, but solely on Christ's merit and his Father's gracious will" . . . and § 8 states: "the eternal election of God ... is a cause by the gracious will and pleasure of God in Christ Jesus, so that our salvation... on which also our salvation is founded." The merit of Christ is therefore the reason, and it is therefore not at all an arbitrary view if redemption is understood as the reason for the eight points. The eight points only present the individual things that a Christian must consider if he is to think rightly of his election. If I want to think rightly of my election, I must think of my redemption, my justification, etc. It is always "us", "us", "we", namely we Christians who ask about our election. And the general explanation is that Christians cannot even know that they are redeemed if they are not told that the whole human race is redeemed. The point here in the eight points is that we think of the "us": we are redeemed, we are called, justified, etc., and by considering this we recognize God's will and our election. What Dr. Walther quoted from § 22: "that he finally called those whom he elected..." , clearly proves that the person of those who will be saved is set aside from the outset. It is precisely on such words that we must hold fast and not pass over them so quickly.

Pastor P. H. Holtermann: As far as I see the matter, I am one of the "opponents". I do not, of course, agree with all the statements. But I must point out that, according to their conviction, § 5 does not contain the definition. The opponents contradict each other. First it was said that the definition was in §§ 13-24 (*Lehre und Wehre* 1880); in Chicago it was said differently again, that the eight points were an integral part; now it is pretended that the eight points do not belong in the election at all. It has also been said that the main thing that matters is that we lean towards synergism. But we detest it as much as our opponents. Furthermore, we strive to save the honor of God. We want that too. There have been expressions of the other kind, as if God did not earnestly desire the blessedness of all Mensch; one could prove this by a multitude of quotations. And this is just why we think we must apply all earnestness.

Pastor Allwardt: In Chicago the idea was dropped that § 5 contained the whole concept of election. Thus, for example, Pastor Fick spoke out. It is true, if one wants to put it briefly, one can say: election is the ordinance of the children of God to salvation. But that is not all that the Formula of Concord says about it. In § 24 it says: "All this is understood according to Scripture in the doctrine of God's eternal election to adoption and eternal salvation." And in § 9 it says: <page 36> "This same... .. is not to be considered merely in the secret, unsearchable counsel of God, as though nothing more belonged to it." ... So election should not be understood as if there were no more in it: in my opinion, this "more" is precisely the eight points. The word "elect" in the eighth point, however, initially caused me difficulties as to how I should understand it, and I understood it thus: § 5 says that election is only about a number of persons. But this is a sentence which, considered quite nakedly, is terrible in itself. Now the Confession leaves this: election is only for a number, and now lets this thought of particular election run alongside, and shows how it came to an election; and so in point 8 the thought of § 5 is taken up again: he has decided to make these elect saved, it says at the end. If these eight points were to be understood in the way you understand them, then after the first point, namely in the second, it would have to say: that God offers "such merits and benefits of Christ through his word and sacrament" to those whom he has chosen. But it says: "us", simply: "us", i.e. the human race. The other points are not just about the elect, since there is a condition: "if it (the Word) ... is heard and considered." Whoever does not hear the word, does not go to church but to the tavern, should not count himself among the elect. In point 4 it says again: that he calls all those who accept Christ in true repentance through right faith.... If we were only talking about the elect, it would simply have to say: that he wants to accept them — without the "so". But it says: "all those so", namely those who come to faith. So here the way is shown in general, without regard to the elect, but for the purpose of showing how the elect come to salvation.

Pastor Beyer: I want to draw your attention once again to the fact that here too, in the eight points, it says beforehand: if one speaks of eternal election. . . of the children of God rightly and with fruit. Therefore, not if one wants to speak of the election of means, if one wants to speak of general things, if one wants to speak of the condemnation of the ungodly, but of the election and ordering of the children of God to eternal life, then one should be accustomed to say: what? not merely to speak of the secret counsel of God, but: what then? how the counsel, intercession and ordinance of God in Christ Jesus... concerning our redemption, salvation, righteousness and salvation are summarized. How are they summarized? Answer: that God has redeemed the human race, etc. I want to be certain of my election. How do you know, poor Beyer, that the good Lord has also considered you, and that you will also go to heaven? I am supposed to be involved when I hear [184] that the human race is redeemed through Christ, who earned us eternal life with his innocent <pages 37> obedience... has

earned us eternal life. But if we refer this "us" to the elect, are we denying that Christ died for the ungodly? Not at all. But I am now considering my election. These points are all there to make me certain of my election; they show how God leads me poor sinner through to eternal glory and blessedness by virtue of my election.

Prof. Crämer: It is my heartfelt desire that the brethren be converted, and I did not impute any intention to them, but only held up their facts. If the brothers talk like this or like that, it is also a matter of awakening the dormant conscience. That was my intention. And I did it so simply that every farmer can understand it. I only wanted to appeal to their conscience. I rejoice only if they do not from the spirit of lies—interrupted.

After a short pause spoke:

Prof. Pieper: It's about how the "us" is to be understood here. Pastor Allwardt explained this quite peculiarly. Eight points are mentioned. These eight points could be dealt with in separate *loci* in dogmatics. Let us imagine a dogmatics in which these *loci* of conversion, justification, etc. are dealt with. These *loci* taken together, let us say eight, do they form the doctrine of election, or do they belong in it, inasmuch as it deals with eight different *loci*? Does one have the doctrine of election when one refers to these eight *loci*? Answer: No, but there are eight *loci* which deal with conversion and so on. And yet these eight *loci* come into consideration in election, so that I can say: in speaking of these eight *loci*, I am speaking of election. For if I am asked: What should we consider in the doctrine of election in order to form the right thoughts of election? I answer: You should think of your redemption, calling, justification, sanctification, etc., and by speaking thus of redemption, calling, etc., I am really speaking of election and leading to the right thoughts of election. What follows from this? It follows that here this "us", which occurs in the first point, is not to be understood of the whole human race; but this "us" are those who ask about their election, who are informed of their election, and not the whole human race. Of course I must tell them that the whole human race is redeemed, so that they may apply it to themselves.

Pastor Ernst: That the decrees of redemption, calling, justification and salvation can really be called election, I prove with Chemnitz. He says that these four decrees are the sum total of election. So it cannot be absurd to call those decrees "election". He does not say: I will describe your election to you. He is not speaking here of <pages 38> those who are to become certain that they are elected. In § 5 the definition of election cannot possibly be given. It says: election is God's decree for salvation. This is a mere explanation of words and not a definition. Then attention must be paid to what the confession wants to say in this § 5 and § 8. The difference between foreknowledge [*Präscienz*] [185] and predestination is to be stated, in opposition to Calvinism. The latter considered the two to be identical. For him, foreknowledge was based precisely on predetermination. No, says the Confession; it is not so. Foreknowledge is above all, but election is only for the children of God. Furthermore, it is not the case that foreknowledge is causative, as the Calvinists teach; foreknowledge does not work evil, but God does

work all good. And only now is it stated what the election is. This is not to be considered in the secret counsel of God; then one would not get the right concept of election if one merely said: this one and that one is elected. It is this decree thus considered "*nude*" that the Confession rejects in §§ 9, 10 and 11. If the definition were given in § 5, then the rejected concept (election considered nakedly [*electio nude considerata*]) would be presented as the right concept of election by grace. And now the Formula of Concord in §§ 13-23 says what the concept of election is. And: "all this," it says in § 24, "will still be omitted according to Scripture in the doctrine of eternal election." However, it says here: "in the doctrine of eternal election"; but before it says: "eternal election", therefore the same thing is meant both times. "All this" therefore falls under the concept ("comprehended") of election. It is not the case that in the Formula of Concord redemption is presented as the basis of all other decrees. There is no reason for this view. Redemption is in the same order as the other points. Then it says "us", meaning only the elect. I cannot understand how this "us" can be understood to refer to anything other than the human race. This is the subject. "Us", i.e. all of us humans are redeemed. In point 2, the "us" is again not meant to refer to the human race. After that, however, there is no longer talk of all. The universal gracious decree is not realized in everyone. He who believes will be saved. In point 8 comes: elect. This is because point 7 spoke of the persevering believers. These are the elect.

Dr. Walther: I want to point out very briefly that the Formula of Concord says that the explanation of the election of grace must be given just as the apostle does, Rom. 8, Eph. 1, who does not merely speak of the mystery of election. What are the words there? As follows: "But we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the **<pages 39>** image of his Son" and so on [**Rom. 8:28-29**]. All the doctrines mentioned in the Formula of Concord are also mentioned here. But is it to teach what God generally does to the world? No. The apostle has explained this in the previous chapters. Now he speaks of it in relation to the elect. So also Eph. 1:3 ff. It says here: how he mentioned "us", that is the "us" of the Formula of Concord. "That we should be holy" = sanctification; "unto adoption as sons" = justification. All these counsels and deeds of God are also mentioned, but always in relation to the elect. However, I will explain at once: this would not separate me from the opponents if they could not convince themselves that these passages speak only of the elect. They are mistaken. But, as I said, that would not separate me from **[186]** them; for that does not change the doctrine of election by grace at all. Every one of us does this, that he first speaks of salvation, calling, etc. Everyone begins with the general counsel of grace. It is a misunderstanding of the text of the Formula of Concord on the part of the opponents; but no one believes that I would start a great controversy if someone said: I must also speak of the general counsel of grace. In the *Epitome* it says that before one speaks

of the mystery of God's eternal election, one must speak of repentance, and so on.

As it had become increasingly clear in the course of the negotiations that an agreement between those who were still opposed to each other could not be expected at this conference, both sides were inclined to break off these negotiations now. The registered speakers on both sides therefore refrained from speaking, and only Dr. Walther made the following correction in response to a statement by the opponents concerning Chemnitz:

Dr. Walther: Chemnitz did not deal with predestination in detail in the "*Examen*". He does not want to present it at all; but he has previously spoken of the fact that the papists say that no one can be certain of his state of grace. After refuting them, he says: No one can be sure of his salvation. And now he brings forward no more than is necessary to prove that one can also be certain of his election.

When the question was raised as to how long they wanted to stay together, the answer was given: We want to hold at least two more meetings, and do not want to leave each other until we know: who are our brothers in the faith [*Glaubensgenosse*]?

This proposal made by Dr. Walther was accepted, but another proposal, which was aimed at an evening meeting so that there would only be one morning meeting the following day, was rejected.

Adjourned with the Lord's prayer. G. Fackler, Secr.

Third session.

Tuesday morning, March 24.

The meeting opened with the usual liturgical service. In order not to waste too much time reading out the minutes of the first and second meetings, it was

resolved to hand them over to a committee for review, consisting of Prof. Pieper, Pastor Stöckhardt, Pastor Rohe and Pastor Allwardt.

Pastor Stöckhardt: Would it not be the next best thing, in order to make the most of the short time we have, if we were to stop at § 5 and add § 8? But these two are summarized in § 5 of the *Epitome*, the 4th point. All other points would then have to be excluded.

[187]

Pastor Allwardt: With regard to the question we discussed yesterday, I would like to say the following: If we talk again about how the Formula of Concord, namely Chemnitz, takes the word election, I believe that we have a right to refer to other writings by Chemnitz in particular. Before the Formula of Concord there were no two ways, tropes, of speaking of the election of grace, but precisely this way, as in the Formula of Concord, can be traced back quite far. As early as 1564, Wiegand included the whole work of helping the human race under this term. Then Chemnitz in his "*Examen*"; then the Strasbourg Concordia. All these, when they speak of it, summarize everything, so that they do not take the election according to the narrowest meaning. If we want to apply to them what has been held against us, it applies to them in the same way. — I think the interest you have is this: You want to cut off all synergism and Pelagianism. I have the same interest. But I do not believe that you achieve this by these means. One can believe that God has also elects unto calling, and he can speak of faith synergistically. So that would not be a bar against it. Think of the Calvinists, who wanted to strictly exclude all human work from election, and yet they need expressions in which they speak of the natural powers of man. So that did not prevent them from teaching such Pelagianism.

Prof. Pieper: I don't think we have to judge which is the best way to exclude synergism. We ask: what does Scripture say about this? If Scripture says that election is a decree for calling, conversion, etc., then we simply have to stick to it and we cannot console ourselves with the fact that all synergism is also excluded in other ways. These scriptural passages, which trace all spiritual goods back to the eternal election of God, so that one can rightly speak of an election to calling, conversion, etc., <page 41> are clearly and distinctly before us. Yes, all these passages must be thunderbolts to us. If we take God's Word seriously, we must be afraid and terrified to depart from it. — I have repeatedly referred to § 45, where it is clearly stated that God is concerned about the conversion of every Christian and has taken counsel with him about it, etc. It is precisely this thought that is expressed, election to

conversion, which expression is so offensive to our opponents. — As for the reference to the Scriptures before the Formula of Concord, I am firmly convinced that Pastor Allwardt understands them quite wrongly. But we can't make that out here, we don't have time. However, these passages speak like the Formula of Concord in the 8 points, but they do not intend to indicate the logical order, but that election is based on Christ's merit, on the basis of which the elect are called. To prove this, a brief word from Chemnitz from the locus on the cause of sin [*locus de causa peccati*]. He says that election is the special act of God in the elect, by which he calls them, justifies them, and saves them.

[188]

President Schwan: We agreed in Chicago that we would not now dispute with the authority of the Fathers. We want to stick to that here, since this is the continuation of that conference.

Dr. Walther: It is said that from the opposing side all Calvinism and synergism are to be kept away. But how is it that it is said that it depends on the behavior of man? Why are we condemned for denying this? How is it that it is said that God has elected as a result of foreseen faith? As long as these sayings are not revoked, we cannot believe that there is such an interest. On the contrary, it must be said that synergism is thus decidedly expressed. If one only spoke like the dogmatists of the 17th century, we would believe that nothing synergistic should be accepted. But these theologians did not use these expressions, much less Chemnitz and Selnecker. If Chemnitz had been convinced that this *locus* in the *Enchiridion* was suitable for the Confession, he would have included it. But he has omitted much, e.g. everything that refers to the non-elect.

Pastor Allwardt: If it were said that God looked at our behavior in the election, or chose on the basis of our behavior, then I reject this decisively and do not want to have any church fellowship with those who claim this. When our elders say that God chose in view of faith [*intuitu fidei*], which expression I do not approve, I cannot see that this implies synergism. That faith comes into consideration is not synergism, but here the question is: how does faith come about, how is it maintained?

Pastor Kolbe: Pastor Allwardt is mistaken when he says that our main concern is to protect our opponents from synergism and Pelagianism. <pages 42> We certainly have that in mind, but the main thing for us is to preserve the 11th article of the Formula of Concord and God's Word.

Pastor Rohe: The opposing side claims that God has taken a number of people out of the whole mass of mankind without regard to faith and unbelief and has ordained them to come to faith, etc. This is thought to stay with the Formula of Concord. However, the Formula of Concord says in § 8: "Eternal election . . . promotes." It is to be noted that it does not say: The eternal election of God is a cause of our faith; nor does it say what works faith, but simply our salvation and all that belongs to salvation. I need to know what the Formula of Concord calls election, what it says. It says this in §§ 13 to 24, for there it says: "For this reason, when one speaks of eternal election ... rightly... or speak of

eternal election, one should get used to the fact that ... the whole doctrine ... be summarized." Now I must say that the 8 points also depend on this sentence. This is what the Formula of Concord says, what belongs to this resolution, to the election. Then it repeats this in § 23, and says: not only, but also. Thus it teaches: the first part does not only belong to it, but also the second. Here it says: "And has God in such his counsel ... not only prepared salvation in general, but also all and every person ... to salvation." And this is the cause of our salvation. In § 24 it adds: "All this is understood according to the Scriptures... [189] is understood." Whoever leaves out one of these pieces has a different concept of election. The Formula of Concord does not understand this decree about individual persons as election, but the whole decree about the salvation of the human race. This is also shown to us in §§ 65 and 66. There it says: "This is my beloved Son ... you shall hear him." With these words, election is revealed to us. So what is election, what does the Formula of Concord include in election? This will of the Father, that the Son should be heard. Furthermore: "And Christ says: Come to Me all ... refresh." Here it is further stated how this election is made manifest from heaven. The Son of God expresses His will that He wants to refresh everyone. "And by the Holy Spirit . . . shall be saved." § 67: "But Christ, as the only-begotten Son of God . . . is proclaimed." Thus the Formula of Concord says: by proclaiming the will of the Father, Christ teaches us our election. "Namely, since he says: Repent ... Come near." So this is an essential part of election, that we should believe the Gospel. "Again, he saith, This is the will ... eternal life." These words do not refer to a decree about individual persons that they should come to faith, but it says: whoever believes in the Son shall have life. "And again, God so loved the world, etc." With <page 43> this saying, Christ proclaims our eternal election. What is election in all these passages? Not the decree about individual persons, from which faith flows, but the whole counsel of God concerning our salvation.

Pastor Stöckhardt: It would take too long to refute all these assertions. There are certain points in the Formula of Concord that can be disputed, but there are also points that are so clear that one cannot understand how even an unclear person can defy this clear light in the long run. These include §§ 5 and 8 and § 5 in the Epitome. The latter reads as follows: "But predestination ... gates of hell cannot overpower it." This says two things about God's election. Firstly, that it is only for the pious, i.e. it is particular; secondly, that it is a cause of the salvation of the elect. Here we find the most precise version that can be given. "The one cause is" etc. is even clearer than: and it is etc. The same thing that extends over the children of God is a cause of their salvation. One can be confused by long study, but how one can defy the clear wording in the long run is incomprehensible. If the opponents say that a double concept of election must also be assumed here, then we can no longer negotiate.

Prof. Pieper: Pastor Rohe said that election is not a decree about individual persons. So faith cannot be an effect of it either. I also believe that if that is the conviction of the opponents, we can no longer

negotiate with them. The very fact that the election is about individuals is so clearly stated that if it is denied, there must be a confusion which we cannot now dispel. I must refer again and again to § 45: "How he can bring me to it", surely these are certain persons! — I would also like to reply to Pastor Allwardt's objection that he could not see how the saying that God has elected [190] *intuitu fidei* implies synergism. This becomes immediately clear if the concept of election is correctly understood, so that it does not refer only to certain points in the Christian life or even merely to the final judgment. If one abandons this false concept and understands the concept correctly, as also referring to calling, conversion, etc., then it is immediately obvious that the introduction of faith [*fides*] implies synergism. For example, if I take conversion out of the equation. Then God converts in view of faith. The fact that man believes becomes the cause of his being called, converted. Since, according to that theory, faith must also be inserted here, it is clear that faith is made a work. Conversion is not done by faith, as is justification. Nor is election an act of God which is on the same line with justification or the judgment of the Last Day. If you keep this in mind, it becomes clear how synergism threatens by the *intuitu fidei*. One must always be careful <pages 44> if one does not want to fall into synergism. — Pastor Rohe has forgotten one thing in § 8, namely that it says "in Christ Jesus a cause." So what is presupposed here? What is given as the reason for this election? The merit of Christ. Jesus Christ with his merit must be there, and for Christ's sake election is a cause, etc. According to the Confession, then, election is not to be understood as first bringing about the merit of Christ. Thus one wants to secure a broad concept of election, but this is against the Formula of Concord.

Dr. Walther: I remind you of the following: Pastor Rohe read out § 8 and tried to prove that election is not the cause of faith. In doing so, he excluded faith from the words "and what belongs to it creates... promoted." Faith is not meant here, but that which, when a person stands in faith, helps to salvation, etc. An appalling arbitrariness! And why did he leave out the passage: "And believed as many as were ordained to eternal life" [Acts 13:48]? Why does the Formula of Concord add this? In order to say that faith is the consequence of election and election the cause of constant faith. This is impossible to deny. — On the other hand, Pastor Rohe committed the fallacy of *petitio principii* ["begging the question"] when he introduced the 8 points as a proof that the universal decrees about all men is a part of the decree of election by grace. This must be proved. That is the question. Here under 1) it says "us". Who will be so strange as to believe that this is the human race? If this view were the correct one, would not the Formula of Concord have to continue: the same etc., i.e. the human race? No, it means us. It is implied that the fact that the world is (not would be) redeemed is only accepted and prefixed so that the following words stand as the first point, that we, the believing children of God, have a righteousness in Christ that is valid before God. — But I must say that Pastor Rohe put the crown on his own head when he says that election is the will of the Father, that the Son should be heard, and that

it is not a decree about individual persons. I would not have believed that an opponent would go so far as to confess that he does not believe in election, but only in a universal decree of God. We also believe in it and place it far above [191] the election of grace, for we regard the doctrine of the election of grace only as a doctrine that is especially comforting in temptation; but one can be a good Christian and never have heard of it and come out of all temptation. That we now speak so much of it is because we have been attacked, not because we place the doctrine of election of grace above all doctrines. No, we place it after; first the universal decree of grace. — It would be desirable that Pastor Rohe recant this. For in § 65 ff. and § 27 ff. it is not the concept of election that is explained, <page 45> but how our election is revealed to us. It is revealed to us when we are called, and even more so when we are justified, baptized, receive the Lord's Supper, and are absolved. Then election is revealed, and only the devil keeps people doubting that they are elected when they are called. Everyone should believe that. It seems that the dear opponents believe that very few of those who hear God's Word are elect. They think it makes people insecure when they are told that God has chosen only a certain number. If it is misrepresented, it can certainly have this effect. But we preach: You are called now; if you have any doubt, let it go. How can you doubt that God is serious? As surely as you are called, so surely should you believe that you are elect. Election by grace is not like a dark thundercloud hovering over Christians. No, it is only like that when it is presented in a Calvinistic way, but not when it is presented according to the Formula of Concord. Then it is a comforting doctrine. It remains 1) with the main consolation, the universal gracious decree; then 2) the election of grace adds a special consolation and says: you must not only think that you stand in grace; you also have the promise that you shall be preserved in faith, that nothing shall snatch you out of Christ's hand of grace. God has ordained you to life; you must believe this. The dear apostles do the same. They address all Christians as the elect, so that they may believe that they are chosen.

Pastor Rohe: I have not denied election by grace. I kept talking about it yesterday. But it includes the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] and the election of persons [*electio personarum*].

Pastor Ernst: Pastor Rohe omitted a word, probably not intentionally. I know that he really believes in a selection. He has omitted "merely". The election of grace is not merely a decision about individuals, he should have said. That could easily happen in the debate.

Dr. Walther: Pastor Rohe also said that election is the will of the Father, that the Son should be heard. From this you can see that he completely misunderstands this whole passage. It speaks only of how I can be certain that I am chosen. And he has constructed from it: that is the doctrine of election. I am convinced that Mr. Pastor Rohe did not mean to say what he said. He is so clever that he knew he would betray himself. But he has a different idea of the election. He has a different doctrine in mind. Before he knows it, what lives in his soul comes out. For if the election of grace is nothing more than God's judgment [192]

on a person who he foresees will remain in the faith until the end: he shall be saved — then there is no election. We do not need a election for this. This is what we have in the doctrine of justification. It is only deception, <page 46> when the dear gentlemen call it election. It is only an equivocation [*aequivocatio*] if Pastor Rohe calls that “election.”. The 3rd article of the Formula of Concord has already said this; but we have a special one here, the 11th.

Prof. Pieper: I do not yet give up all hope that we can at least come to an understanding with some of our dear opponents; but I believe that nothing more can be achieved at present. They are stuck on certain things that make it impossible for them to understand us. And again it is the same with us, we do not understand them. They manage to conceive of a unified concept of election, the first part of which is general, but the second part refers only to the elect. We cannot do that. I would like to propose that we now abandon the doctrinal proceedings and briefly discuss the second question we wanted to put to you.

Dr. Walther: In Milwaukee we once heard the same statement. Oh, if only the dear opponents would take this as an opportunity to re-examine their doctrine according to God's Word and the Confession!

Pastor Rohe: I have said that the Formula of Concord understands by election the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] and the election of persons [*electio personarum*]. This is clear from the fact that it quotes such sayings as the one I mentioned, and says that Christ thereby proclaims to us the will of the Father, and thus also our election.

Dr. Walther: What do you think of these two sentences: 1) Election is the will of the Father, that we should hear the Son? 2) it is not a decree about individual persons?

Pastor Rohe: I really take the view that this will of the Father that the Son should be heard is a part of the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*].

Dr. Walther: You have publicly pronounced a false doctrine here. If it is only due to weakness, then we do not want to brand you a heretic, but we also do not want to remain silent about it.

Pastor Allwardt: I have missed the same thing that everyone has missed. Pastor Rohe used these words, among others. His speech was offensive because he left out what was mentioned. The assembly should be satisfied when he explains this. It is difficult to summarize his thoughts clearly in front of such a large assembly.

Pastor Rohe: As to the second sentence, it did not occur to me that there was no decree about individual persons; but what the Formula of Concord in § 8 calls election is not this decree about individual persons alone, but the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*] must be added; and of this whole concept of election it says that it is a cause, etc.

[193]

Prof. Pieper: The matter still stands thus: Pastor Rohe denies that election, which extends over the children of God, over certain persons, is a cause of their salvation and what belongs to it.

Dir. Zucker: Would it not be right for us to take this into consideration: our opponents have a different concept of election. When we think our opponents are ready to concede something, they slip away again. This leads to no result. A public meeting is the most inappropriate place for someone who has gone astray to be put right. Let us therefore rather break off and ask what our relationship to each other should be in the future.

Pastor Beyer: I believe that we should first clear up what has happened, that Pastor Rohe's statement should be taken back in its entirety. He stated twice that election is not God's decree about individual persons, but the universal will of grace. Let him take back this simple expression if he does not believe it; all further explanations are nothing. The simple pronouncement: I do not believe it, would satisfy.

Pastor Rohe: If the sentence read as if I had meant to assert that the election of grace is nothing more than the universal counsel of salvation, then I reject it.

Prof. Pieper: Pastor Rohe cannot explain himself from his point of view in any other way than he has explained himself.

Dr. Walther: But Pastor Rohe also used the words: election is the will of the Father, that one should hear the Son.

Pastor Rohe: These words are wrong as they stand, but I have set them straight. Hearing the will of the Father is an integral part of the designation of the means [*ordinatio mediorum*].

Resolved, that we now break off the doctrinal negotiations and move on to the second question, which concerns our relationship to one another.

Moderator: If we want to talk about our mutual relationship, we must ask the following questions: 1) If you are still members of our Synod, what is your attitude towards those outside our Synod who publicly denounce us? Are they your comrades in spirit or not? 2) Do you see us as those who are Calvinists or who have some beginnings of Calvinism? 3) As long as you are members of the Synod, do you also want to assert your view of the election of grace in the congregations, or do you want to keep quiet about it until we have come to one or the other result?

Prof. Crämer: Shouldn't that also be a point: whether or not they want to continue to circulate the writings of our opponents? It's a fact that it happens, and in such a way that the simple-minded are confused by it.

[194]

Dr. Walther: Especially not in foreign congregations. Because that also happens. We don't want to make them out to be heretics, it hasn't gotten that far yet, but we don't want to have our churches destroyed either. If we believe what we preach, we can't stand by quietly when the opposite is said and our churches are warned against us.

Prof. Crämer: I wish they would also be asked whether they do not want to do anything to be able to talk to us in the same way, or whether they want to negotiate with such men who can help them?

Pastor Stöckhardt: It seems natural to me that this question should be put to them, and that the conference should then decide how to negotiate with them.

Dr. Walther: They could also be asked themselves if and how we can stay together. If it is not against our conscience, we will gladly agree.

Question 1: What is the attitude of our honored opponents to those who are outside our Synod and apparently take a hostile position against us, such as Prof. Schmidt, Stellhorn, Loy?

Pastor Allwardt: With regard to the first question, concerning the doctrine as held by Prof. Schmidt, etc., namely, that God has elected to salvation in foreknowledge of faith, *ex praevisa fide, intuitu fidei*, if one discounts the evil connotation of the word, I must on the whole agree with this side. On the other hand, as far as the doctrine of the Synod is concerned, I cannot agree with it. I cannot teach an election to calling, conversion, faith. I cannot consider it right; I do not find it in the confessional writings of our church, but in the Reformed. As to individual expressions, I cannot say here that I subscribe to all that is written of them; it is not present enough for me. When synergistic expressions are found, I do not go along with them. If man's salvation is to rest on him, he cannot be saved. I think that is a fundamental error. I have not read Loy's writings properly. If I remember, he mentions man's behavior only in the sense that man can hinder God's grace through his behavior against the means of grace. But if he wants to say that man can behave rightly towards grace by his own efforts, I do not agree. — If the Missouri Synod is called Calvinistic, I do not approve of it. But I also say that I consider this teaching to lead to Calvinism. I think it is wrong to attack people harshly. With this I have also answered the second question. — I can find a doctrine in a body that is sound in the faith, and say: this doctrine is an approach to a false doctrine. I think that this expression "election to the faith" is Calvinistic.

Dr. Walther: That is just as the Methodists say when we teach the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper: that is papist. The papists say that Luther's writing against Zwingli is the best that has been written on the subject. Is Luther therefore a papist because they confess to him in this part?

Pastor Allwardt: I must also add: I have been a member of the Missouri Synod for 16 years; I received my instruction in it, and I cannot tear my heart away from it, so that I can regard it as an enemy. As for my future attitude towards the Synod, my aim will still be to reach an agreement. We do not agree on this doctrine, the whole world knows that. I must certainly answer the questions. I will always remain grateful to the Synod and try to see if it is possible to reach an understanding on this doctrine as well.

Pastor Dörmann: I am sorry with all my heart for the intimate fellowship and the many benefits that I have enjoyed from the Synod; but my conscience does not allow me to stand in any other way than what Pastor Allwardt has essentially said.

Pastor Rohe: I must say the same. I was brought up, taught, ordained and inducted into the ministry in this Synod. Next to God, I owe it everything I have of Christian education. I have examined this teaching throughout the year, but I can come to no other conviction. I cannot recognize this election of persons unto faith as anything other than a Calvinist leaven. I will freely say what is in my heart.

Pastor Kunz: As far as doctrine is concerned, I must confess that I do not want to appear any different than I am, that I have a different conviction than the Synod. I have been a member of the Synod for two years now; I thank it for all its blessings. One cannot speak against one's conscience. And as I said, I don't want to appear otherwise, but as I feel in my heart.

Pastor Ernst: I must confess to the doctrine as it is on that side; I cannot, at least today, confess to the election unto faith. I cannot call that doctrine anything other than at least an approach to predestinarianism, as one sees synergism in our position on the other side. Furthermore, I do not subscribe to all the individual expressions that have been written. If Prof. Schmidt means by "behavior" that man has an *aptitudo* for conversion, if he is not referring solely to willful resistance, I cannot subscribe to that expression. I cannot confess to anything personal. I do not believe that anyone here is a Calvinist. I believe that a thought has been expressed that does not correspond to Scripture and the Confession. The whole way in which this dispute has broken out in public is not to my liking.

Dr. Walther: Prof. Schmidt sent me theses and antitheses even before the public controversy broke out. His antithesis to Thesis 3 reads: "As the next reason and norm, however, election in the <pages 50> narrowest sense has as its presupposition the different behavior of man towards universal grace." Is this not synergism?

Pastor Holtermann: I essentially agree with what Pastor Allwardt says. I see election to faith as an approach to Calvinism. I also admit in a certain sense an election to calling and unto faith, but only insofar as God has seen that if I do this to man, he will come to faith. But not that God has first separated the persons. As reluctant as I am to part from

the Synod, to which [196] I owe much, my conscience does not allow me to go along with it.

Pastor Diemer: I committed myself to Stellohorn last fall. I no longer completely agree with what he presented as his teaching at the time. I do not agree that the Formula of Concord teaches election in the broader sense; nor that we are to be uncertain of our election. As for election *intuitu fidei*, I am not yet clear about that. I cannot take the Synod's teaching for Calvinism.

Prof. Crämer: I believe that it was not at all necessary for Pastor Diemer to answer that. He is not on this side; but I am glad that he gives us this explanation; I thank and praise my God for it

Chairman: The 1st and 2nd questions have already been answered. Now follows the third: whether they will remain silent about their doctrine in their congregations until it has come to some decision that they are either one with us, or declare to us that we are against you?

Prof. Pieper: I think the question is out of order. The opponents have stated it clearly and unambiguously, they find in our doctrine approaches to Calvinism. So they must fight this doctrine in their congregations and spread the writings in their congregations which they believe can serve this purpose.

Chairman: The opponents have all declared that, for reasons of conscience, they cannot say anything other than what they have said. The natural consequence of this is that they bring it into their congregations.

Prof. Crämer: As long as they have to hold this for the sake of conscience, and we for the sake of conscience, we cannot be in one ecclesiastical body.

Chairperson: They can speak for themselves, but don't we suspect ourselves when we put the question to them?

Dr. Walther: It is a great thing when our opponents accuse us of Calvinism. If they said: you are mistaken, you are caught up in a false exegesis, we would listen to that with the greatest equanimity. But they have chosen an odious heretical name. When the common man hears that this is Calvinism, he thinks it must be something terrible. Why don't they say: this is your error? They are trying to pin a historical heretic name on us. They know quite well that <page 51> we detest, curse and condemn Calvinism, and that this is only their subjective view, that it belongs to the specific Calvinism. I wish them well, but it is a grave sin that they have attached this heretical name to us. Of course, there is another who is mainly to blame, he is their leader.

The 3rd question was then presented.

Dr. Walther: This should mainly be about the antithesis. The opponents cannot conceal their thesis, but as far as the antithesis is concerned, it is still questionable what their conscience demands. You may think: why should I worry the congregation about it? I am convinced that it will not be put in danger by it.

[197]

Pastor Ernst: I haven't said a word about it in my congregation yet. If others have not brought it in, people in my congregation do not know that there is such a doctrinal dispute. I can only be moved to tell them

about it by the most urgent need. But if I had to deal with the doctrine, I would declare my resignation from the Synod. If I am not urged to do so, I will not say a word about it in my congregation.

Dr. Walther: Do you also reject the doctrine that God has chosen on the basis of foreseen human behavior towards grace?

Pastor. Ernst: Yes, in so far as it should depend on man that one comes to faith.

Dr. Walther: In view of ungodly behavior people are condemned, but not in view of right behavior they come to grace and are saved.

Pastor. Ernst: No, never again.

As the time had passed, they adjourned to pray to the Lord.

M. Hein, Secr.

Fourth meeting.

Tuesday afternoon, May 24.

After the conclusion of the ordinary liturgical service, the opponents, who had not yet spoken out about their conduct in the doctrinal dispute on the present point, were ordered to do so now. Thereupon declared

Pastor Allwardt: "Of course, when I get home, I will say how it went here. I have never dealt with the antithesis in my sermons. Only when the text called for it have I preached on this doctrine; but it goes without saying that I then preach as I think. After the Chicago Conference I had the opportunity to preach about it right away; but I only preached thetically and did not even name the real Calvinists. But now it is different. My congregation **deals with such questions. People deal with it.** **[last line cut off]** **<page 52>** I don't know what is happening now. I cannot treat the Synod as an enemy, but only regard the teaching as such, which is not right. **But I always wish to have a door open back into the Synod.**

Pastor Rohe: The matter is a matter of conscience for me. I will act according to my conscience in future. Everyone will find that right and proper. Where my calling [*Beruf*] requires it, I will speak as openly and freely as I have spoken here.

Pastor Dörmann: I have also declared today that the matter is a matter of conscience for me. I have never preached about the doctrinal dispute in the congregation, never touched on it in the sermon. But the *Der Lutheraner* came into my congregation and in future I will only be able to act according to my convictions.

Prof. Crämer: I know from Pastor Allwardt's congregation that some know the doctrine and agree with us on it, while others knew it and were **[198]** confused. I cannot imagine how the congregation will take it if we have a Missourian pastor who teaches differently.

Dr. Walther: **We must not forget that we are not the church government.** It is only a matter of our personal relationship to the opponents. So I don't think we should talk about the steps to be taken by the church government. That is not our business. But we must, of course, know how we ourselves are to take our stand against the opponents, so that we can justify it before God.

Pastor Stöckhardt: I have the feeling and awareness that the matter has already been decided. If it is the certain conviction of the opponents that our doctrine is Calvinistic, which we hold to be the holy truth of God, then everything else is taken care of. They cannot but give such an answer. It would have been quite different if they had said: you are in error, we consider your doctrine questionable. But if they are already turning this heaviest artillery against us, why negotiate further? It is clear from their own words that they hope to return again.

Mr. Kähler: I am also convinced that our opponents have already cut the cloth in two between us and themselves. They have publicly described our doctrine here as a Calvinist doctrine. But it will be good if we hear their own answer from their own mouths, for it seems to me that there is still a difference between the opponents. It is terrible that our opponents immediately attach such a horrible heretical name to our doctrine. It is so terrible that no words can express it.

The further question was now put to the opponents: Whether they read the writings of our opponents — by which are especially meant: **<page 53>** *Altes und Neues*, Prof. Loy's writings and Prof. Stelhorn's writings — in the congregations.

Pastor Rohe: I also answered this question with the previous one.

Chairman: Because these writings contain your convictions, will you see to it that these writings are distributed in your congregation?

Pastor Rohe: I did not say that.

Chairman: In this context it can't mean anything else.

Pastor Rohe: I ask you not to put anything in there that I don't say myself. I say I will check. [Deceiver!]

Prof. Crämer: He cannot say otherwise according to his conscience.

Pastor Beyer: The questions are asked so that we can see from the answers whether there is a possibility that we can stay together. But if they are asked for this purpose, then the answers must give a guarantee that we ourselves will not be guilty of spreading what we call false teaching in the churches. But there is no guarantee in such an answer. That is why we want a clearer answer. We must know how we stand in relation to one another. All back doors must be closed. We want to part with a full understanding. So don't use vague phrases!

[199]

Mr. Kähler: Pastor Rohe's answer is clear. He says: possibly he will disseminate them if the circumstances somehow make it necessary to disseminate these writings. That is what he said in his answer. He does not threaten; but he cannot promise anything.

Pastor Ernst: I didn't use the term Calvinism. I said predestinarianism because that's what it is. Calvinism is more than that. I will say nothing of it, unless I am pressed to do so; but when it comes to decision, I cannot but act according to my conscience, and call it false doctrine.

Pastor Allwardt, after a special request to explain himself: I thought I had already answered that question. I do not know what the circumstances will be. In any case, I will not spread anything that I am convinced is false. I have already said what I think about Professor

Schmidt's teaching. So far I have not praised *Altes und Neues* to anyone. Some have ordered it; I have ordered it for them. I have not ordered it for anyone outside my congregation. And as for the tract and what is yet to come, I don't know anything about that yet. I don't intend to be aggressive at all.

Pastor Dörmann: In my congregation, no paper is read, no *Altes und Neues*. It therefore depends on the pressure that is exerted on <page 54> us, or on me, whether I will continue to distribute the writings. If my congregation remains calm, I won't make any recommendations.

Pastor Holtermann: I have also only acted in such a way that I have let come what was ordered. Some have ordered Dr. Walther's treatise. Others ordered *Altes und Neues*. I simply ordered that. What will happen in the future? I think that if the circumstances do not change significantly, I will not act much differently.

Pastor Engelbrecht. I understand the opponents as if they would like to remain in the Synod. They are talking about pressure. I can't understand that. I mean, if they call us Calvinist, they've pushed us to the breaking point. We don't want the blame placed on us.

Pastor Hahn: If our opponents act according to a conscience that is caught and bound in God's Word, then they must seriously warn against any writing that they believe contains false teaching. My teacher asked me about *Altes und Neues*. I advised him not to read it. I will do the same in future. But letting *Altes und Neues*, *Der Lutheraner*, and the pamphlets be read, that means: spreading truth and lies together. That is not conscientiousness.

Now the fifth question was raised, whether the opponents seriously want to try to re-establish unity with us at conferences and in other ways?

Mr. Kähler: I must confess that this question is superfluous. The opponents have declared that they may distribute the writings of our enemies. In doing so, they have counted themselves among our enemies. So this question is superfluous. That is over now. Consider what they have said with their vague affirmative answer to our previous question! Think how these opponents write [200] about us. None of our opponents is afraid to call our entire Synod Calvinistic. But our opponents are prepared to spread these blasphemies.

The Chairman asks the opponents: In view of the declaration you have made, are you inclined to regard us, the members of the Missouri Synod, as your brethren?

Pastor Allwardt: I don't know what the question has to do with you. It is a separate thing. We have been asked to declare what we think this doctrine is; and the words have been put into our mouths, whether we think it is Calvinistic, or see Calvinistic beginnings in it? We have explained ourselves about this and at the same time said how sorry we are that we are in such opposition. And I explained that even if I couldn't stay with the synod, I wouldn't consider it an enemy. I can only say that I consider this teaching to be wrong and unbiblical. I do not know how to answer. The brothers and fathers are dear to my heart. But I cannot approve of the doctrine.

Chairman: I, and perhaps many others, have the impression that you would like to remain in the Missouri Synod, despite the fact that you do not consider our doctrine to be the correct one, but rather a Calvinistic one. Therefore I would like to ask you: Despite the declaration that you consider us Calvinists on this point, do you nevertheless want to remain in the Synod and recognize the members of the Synod as your brethren? I believe the question is very justified.

Pastor Stöckhardt: I cannot agree with this question.

Several voices: Neither do I.

Prof. Crämer: We shouldn't push it any further. The position is clear. They have undone the band.

Chairperson: I am satisfied. I did not ask the question without cause. If the opponents don't want to answer, then we are forced to do so. Can we still recognize the opponents under the present circumstances? Shall we leave each other without knowing where we stand?

Pastor Baumhöfener: We should have asked this question in Chicago already; then they wouldn't have been able to do so much. And if we wait any longer, the whole congregations will go with them.

Pastor Holtermann: When I say "beginnings of Calvinism", that is not yet Calvinism. Something could be achieved if such sentences were done away with.

Pastor Stöckhardt: It was necessary to investigate whether there was a basis for further discussions. Your statements have destroyed this basis.

An opponent: We have made a clear confession and have therefore done everything according to it.

Dir. Krauß: We have reached the end and I propose that we adjourn.

Prof. Cramer: That explains it: we can do nothing more; we are finished now.

[201]

Dr. Walther: The only thing that is clear to me is that we can no longer regard the opponents as our collaborators. Whether they are our brothers, I do not yet dare to decide. It remains to be seen, because most of them have not declared themselves absolutely, but have made it dependent on the circumstances. But this much is certain, they promote a different doctrine, and I can no longer work together with such a person if he is repeatedly admonished in private and in public. So I would not open my pulpit to them. We will see what consequences this has for the [district] presidents. I can regard someone as my brother who is mistaken if I have evidence that he is mistaken out of weakness. But I cannot work with him. For we are working against each other. And I cannot justify that before God. [Walther's counsel on fellowship issues such as pulpit sharing, "collaboration", "weakness", etc.]

Pastor Ernst: That is also my point of view. I still consider the members of the conference to be brothers. I believe they are in error. But I do not believe that they are in error with knowledge and will. They are erring brothers. The doctrine is an error; but the persons are erring brethren.

Dr. Walther: My conviction is that a president cannot allow them to work within our synod because they hold a different doctrine.

Moderator: As a conference we cannot take any decisive steps. But it should be declared that the doctrinal difference divides us. The district presidents have to do what follows.

Prof. Pieper: The antitheses put forward by the opponents divide us.

Resolved: that we cannot recognize the opponents as our co-workers.

This was followed by a written statement by Pastor Partenfelder to Prof. Stellhorn (in order to grant him satisfaction) was read out without further explanation.

Finally, the question of whether these conference minutes should be printed was discussed for some time. Opinions were very divided. Some wanted nothing, others only the second part (questions and answers of the opponents) to be printed. In the end, the majority were in favor of printing everything, and this was adopted. However, as the conference had not had time to listen to and criticize the minutes, the two secretaries were instructed to write the minutes in clean copy and to send this fair copy to a committee, which was to examine the minutes on behalf of the conference. This committee was to consist of four pastors, namely 1) Pastor Herzer, 2) Pastor Allwardt; each of these two was to choose a second from his party.

At the same time it was resolved to have the minutes printed "as a manuscript" and distributed among us. It was noted that this was not done with the intention of withholding this printed document from others, but merely for the sake of the small size it would have.

Concerning the limits within which the criticism of the appointed commission was to be kept, it was determined that the members of the same were not allowed to [202] correct anything new in the minutes; but that they were permitted to delete what they considered to be in need of deletion.

After expressing the heartfelt thanks of the conference to the dear churches of Fort Wayne for their hospitality, the meeting adjourned with the prayer of the Lord spoken by the chairman. [Not spoken in unison - no prayer fellowship with opponents!]

J. Fackler, Secr.