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Mondays are...well...Mondays.

After the weekend, we get back to the routine and, for a lot of people, Sunday afternoon or evening might as well be part of Monday anyway. First, though, comes a brief respite over the weekend – some household chores, shopping, maybe a Saturday evening DVD with the spouse, church in the a.m. and maybe snoozing away forty-five minutes of a golf tournament on television in the afternoon with the Sunday paper on the floor next to the recliner. In our house, this short-lived period of indolence is occasionally broken by a phone call from the daughter away at college. Those doggoned cell phones don’t always provide the best connection, but it’s always good to hear her voice.

Then, later, it all starts again. All of the zillion details of what the work week will bring, comparing calendars, working out who’s got a meeting on which night and all of the rest dominates the late afternoon and evening. Sunday, April 15, 2007 was probably very similar for five faculty members and twenty-seven of their students at Virginia Tech and all of the parents, spouses and family members to whom they were connected.

The longer the time the son or daughter has been away at school, the less frequent the phone calls – that’s the way it’s supposed to be if they’re really growing up and we parents are really letting go – but usually the worst kind of phone call one gets is from a kid who has come down with strep and even though she knows she can go to the campus health center in the morning, still just wants to talk to (not Dad) – Mom. One doesn’t ever expect or want to even conceptualize that the last phone call was the final conversation one would have with one’s child.

We talked about it in my classes here at Concordia on the Tuesday morning after we’d all watched the CNN coverage: the repeated video clips of SWAT teams rushing into position and of the shattered young bodies being carried from classroom buildings and had the read the
horrific news in the morning papers. For many in my undergraduate classes, the Columbine High School shootings were a part of their childhood – they remembered, certainly, but they were really pretty young at the time. We had a moment of silent prayer in each class for the families of the victims and for healing to begin in a distant campus community but it didn't strike me just how close we all really were to each other until, during that quiet moment, I looked out at the group in my afternoon class and realized that the attendance on that particular day was thirty-three.

The event hit people at different levels, of course. For those of us with children in college far from home, we suddenly just needed to hear their voices. My students had a quick response for the TV “talking heads” who asked, “How could the gunman get into the dorm?” The reply? “Aw, c’mon, you just wait for someone to walk out and you walk right in.” But maybe they’ll be a bit more cautious now. Their questions of me were more viable. “What would we do here on our campus?” I replied, “We have contingency plans and backup contingency plans.” And we do, thanks to administrators who foresaw the need for a 24/7 campus security force decades ago, long before campuses were required to publicly report crime statistics.

The photos of the Virginia Tech students in their dorm rooms, with friends or all of the other images, whether more formal or completely casual and college student crazy – and probably taken at 1 a.m. – could be of anyone’s kid on Facebook.com. For those of us who teach, the faces of the lost ones pictured in Time and Newsweek could have been our own students, whether at the college level for people like me and my colleagues or those of the kids we had in pre-school, elementary or high school classes of years ago, now enjoying the challenges and freedoms of being college students. I get to see it every day around here; you may only see them on breaks from school or over the summer. They sure do grow up, don’t they? Even if they had some of that growing to do when you had them in your class, you willingly put up with them because you knew this experience was coming and was worth it and you helped them get there. That’s what we’re Called to do.

All of that time, all of the effort, the struggles, the accomplish-
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ments, the mess, the awards and troublesome behavior, adolescent indiscrections with resulting phone calls to parents, grading their work, listening to beginner band students, coaching them to wins or losses or in those leading or supporting roles and then – finally – sitting in a hot gymnasium and watching them cross the stage at graduation to yet another variation on the “We-made-it-we’ve-got-the-world-by-the-tail!” commencement message, carefully crafted to pass inspection but laced with coded meanings that only an eighteen year old would really want to understand.

All gone? All wasted?

It is said that the hardest loss to bear is that of a parent who loses a child. I think that for a teacher to lose a student has to be very close, especially when it occurs in the prime of their academic years, the time for which we all worked to prepare them, from pre-kindergarten through high school. I’ve lost three that I’m aware of. You too? It’s really hard, isn’t it?

The questions and investigations will go on for a long time. The simple, single present truth in all of this though is that, for all of the families who lost a daughter or a son, there won’t be a college-beater-style car pulling up to the house this spring to disgorge all of the musty, dusty earthly possessions at the semi-permanent home base; no one still on Undergraduate Standard Time, sleeping until 1 p.m., then going out until 2 a.m. for the three days before they have to start the same summer job again; nobody pulling up a chair to the refrigerator to eat what they call “real food,” even leftovers that are three suppers old.

It will be quiet and unbearable and utterly hopeless.

Losing a child is like that. God knows. He lost one too and, for him, he knew the time and the date and the very place it would happen long beforehand. He would know the cause of death and even names of the killers without forensic evidence. There would be no contingency plan, security backup or emergency responders. But the news got out on that occasion, too. We’re still trying to comprehend that, too, in our own human ways. Not the death itself – we understand that part all too well, whether from events like the Virginia Tech tragedy or in our own personal losses. But, in the elegance of his plan, God provided the answer to all of it, the Victory, the Hope in hopeless times while we were still in our sins, for all of his lost daughters and sons whom he created, gifted, sustained and loved so much that he was willing to give up his own son.
for them. We can start to understand how much it cost.

That's why we share the news with our students and, through the collective prayers of many, many Christians that week in April, we shared that hope and asked that God grant it and his peace to the families and classmates of Ross, Brian, Ryan, Austin, Matthew, Caitlin, Jeremy, Rachael, Emily, Jarrett, Matthew, Henry, Partabi, Lauren, Daniel, Juan, Minal, Daniel, Erin, Michael, Julia, Mary, Reema, Waleed, Leslie, Maxine, Nicole...and Seung...and to the families, spouses and colleagues of Christopher, Jocelyne, Kevin, G.V., Liviu...and to all of the other teachers they ever had. LEJ
Lutherans and Race: In the Vanguard or Behind the Times?
by Kathryn M. Galchutt

Editor's Note: Concordia University Chicago has established a tradition of recognizing the contributions of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. each January with a day of programs that examine his legacy and the unfinished business of matters of race in America. The following is the adapted text of Dr. Galchutt's sectional presentation on January 15, 2007 to students, faculty, staff and friends of Concordia.

Portions of this presentation were drawn directly from her recent book, The Career of Andrew Schulze, 1924-1968: Lutherans and Race in the Civil Rights Era (2005). The Journal thanks her publisher, Mercer-Books, for permission to share these remarks and the direct references to that text therein.

First of all, I want to thank you for inviting me here to speak at Concordia, Chicago. I also want to commend your institution for sponsoring various events to remember the life and legacy of Martin Luther King, Jr. Martin Luther King Day is not meant to be just another “day off,” but is intended to be a day of education, service, and community building. In the spirit of the Civil Rights Movement, it is a time to analyze our place as Christians and as Americans in our society and in our world. It is a time to look back and reflect on what has been accomplished in terms of race relations and also a time to look around to determine what remains to be accomplished.

So in that spirit, I am here to discuss the topic of “Lutherans and Race.” I came to know much about the history of Lutheran race relations through the story of Andrew Schulze. Andrew Schulze was a white Lutheran pastor who ministered to black Lutheran congregations during the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s. After seeing how his own parishioners were treated, by both church and society, he became an advocate and an activist for better race relations. In the later years of his ministry, he was the leading figure in founding the Lutheran Human Relations Association of America and also became involved in the Civil Rights Movement. By learning more about the life and ministry of Andrew
Schulze, we can also learn about the state of Lutheran race relations in twentieth-century American society.

But before I discuss Andrew Schulze, and particularly his ministry in St. Louis and Chicago, I want to give some broader background on the history of “Lutherans and Race.” Though Lutheranism today is a worldwide phenomenon, it began in northern Europe. Martin Luther was born and lived in the area of Germany and Lutheranism first took hold in Germany and Scandinavia as well as other parts of central and northern Europe. The Reformation took place in the 1500s, the same time that Europeans were exploring and expanding into all parts of the world. Through immigration and evangelism, Lutheranism gradually spread from northern Europe to other peoples and other parts of the world.

Lutheranism was brought to the Americas primarily through German and Scandinavian immigration. Even today, Lutherans in the United States are primarily from German-American and Scandinavian-American descent. Only an estimated 2 percent of Lutherans in the United States come from a non-European background (Galchutt, 2005, p. 1-7).

Still, there is a rich and deep history of black Lutheranism. The history of black Lutheranism began in colonial days. In the North, there were sporadic contacts between Lutherans and free blacks since the 1600s. Occasionally, a free black would become Lutheran. The first record of this is a baptism that took place in 1669 in a Lutheran congregation in New York City. In the South, blacks became Lutherans wherever Lutherans practiced slavery, in places such as Georgia, Virginia, and the Carolinas. But the number of Lutheran slaveholders and slaves was very small. The one exception to this was the Danish West Indies, today the U.S. Virgin Islands. As this was once a colony of the Lutheran country of Denmark, this was one place where Lutherans practiced slavery in larger numbers (Galchutt, 2005, p. 39).

Large numbers of German and Scandinavian immigrants did not come to the United States until the 1800s and then they tended to settle in the northern states, particularly in the Midwest. The Lutheran presence in the American South, which was home to the vast majority of black Americans, was small. Baptists and Methodists had stronger roots in the American South and Baptist and Methodist denominations led in the development of African American Christianity.
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Still, some Lutherans also wished to do mission work among African Americans in the American South. In 1877, an organization of conservative Lutherans, known as the Synodical Conference (which included the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod), began a mission effort to spread Lutheranism among the black population in the South. For decades, the work of the Synodical Conference in the South had very limited success. Then in 1915, the Synodical Conference connected with a Methodist educator, Rosa J. Young. Rosa Young had a lifelong determination to improve educational opportunities for black children in Alabama. When boll weevils hit the Alabama cotton fields in 1915 and wiped out her financial support, Young contacted the famous black educator, Booker T. Washington, for help. Booker T. Washington referred Young to the Lutherans and soon she became Lutheran. Shortly after connecting with Rosa Young, Alabama became the fastest growing mission field of the Synodical Conference. Young's work in Alabama set the foundation for Concordia College, Selma, the only historically black Lutheran college in the United States (Galchutt, 2005, p. 38-41).

While there were many who, during the 1800s and early 1900s, opposed the interracial contact necessary for mission outreach to black Americans, mission outreach, in itself, was not a threat to the pervasive racial attitudes of white superiority and black inferiority found throughout the world. Much of the mission work conducted during these times, by various Christian denominations, was not conducted with a sense of equality. The Lutherans of the Synodical Conference worked within the racial culture of the American South and made no attempt to change the basic nature of race relations in America (Galchutt, 2005, p. 42).

However, over the course of the twentieth century, the racial situation in the United States dramatically changed due to a variety of different forces. One major change in American race relations came with the Great Migration. The Great Migration was the movement of large numbers of black Americans from the rural South to the urban North. This made race relations a national, not just regional, concern. This movement began due to labor shortages during World War I and continued for the next few decades of the twentieth century as the United States placed greater restrictions on immigration from abroad (Galchutt, 2005, p. 43).
As black Americans moved to northern and western regions of the United States for new economic and social opportunities, they joined new churches and some switched denominations. Lutherans opened 34 new black mission congregations between 1920 and 1950. Some of these congregations were organized around groups of black Lutherans who were migrating from Alabama and other parts of the South (Galchutt, 2005, p. 43).

Though these new Lutheran mission congregations were located in northern and western parts of the United States, they were organized on a segregated basis. Their "mission" status implied that they were not equal to white Lutheran congregations. It was often assumed that mission congregations were made up of new believers, and therefore they did not hold the same stature as mature Lutheran congregations. Though a part of the mission effort of the Synodical Conference, black Lutherans did not share full membership in the Lutheran Church, just as black Americans lacked full rights as American citizens. In many ways, the situation in American churches in the early twentieth century, paralleled the same patterns of segregation and discrimination found in American society. Later, Martin Luther King, Jr. repeatedly pointed out that Sunday mornings were the most segregated time in America. Jeff Johnson, who wrote a history of black Lutheranism explained, "These were not just organizational problems, these were theological problems" (Galchutt, 2005, p. 43-44; Johnson, 1991, p. 195).

This is the context in which Andrew Schulze began his ministry as a pastor of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod. Andrew Schulze was born in 1896 to a German-American family in Cincinnati, Ohio. He and his family were active members of Trinity Lutheran Church in downtown Cincinnati. At beginning of the twentieth century, Cincinnati was an important Midwestern city with a significant black population. Located across the Ohio River from Kentucky, a former slave state, Cincinnati had played an important role in the Underground Railroad. Still, Schulze grew up immersed in a German-American Lutheran community and there was little in his early years that made him distinct from other Lutherans with immigrant roots (Galchutt, 2005, p. 9-30).

After serving in the navy during World War I, Schulze planned to attend the Lutheran seminary in Springfield, Illinois. Just after arriving in Springfield in 1919, Schulze had the experience which changed his life. As he was riding a streetcar and finding his way to Concordia Theological Seminary, a black man, Mr. George Bates, invited him to...
worship at Holy Trinity Lutheran Church, the small black Lutheran church in town. Throughout his seminary studies in Springfield, Andrew Schulze attended and assisted at Holy Trinity Lutheran Church (Galchutt, 2005, p. 31-32).

While Schulze was actively involved with this black Lutheran mission, there was a “theological vacuum” that existed in his seminary studies. As Schulze recalled, “segregation with all the...ethical problems [it] involved...the generally assumed innate superiority of one race and the inferiority of another, all running counter to the doctrine of creation [was] not a matter of classroom discussion or debate” (Schulze, 1972, p. 10; p. 8).

After graduating from seminary in 1924, Schulze served as pastor of Holy Trinity Lutheran Church. In his first years of full-time ministry, he became painfully aware of how members of his congregation were treated differently from white Lutherans. In 1926, a member of Holy Trinity, Ms. Phyllis Jones, was refused admission to Lutheran colleges in Seward, Nebraska, and New Ulm, Minnesota, simply because she was black. Schulze wrote a letter of protest to the Synodical Conference regarding this situation, but it did not bring about any immediate change. By 1928, Schulze was writing letters and proposals to try to end the isolation and separation of black Lutheran congregations from white Lutheran congregations. But his early efforts met with little success (Galchutt, 2005, p. 51; p. 55-56).

In 1928, the Mission Board of the Synodical Conference transferred Schulze from his congregation in Springfield to be pastor of St. Philip’s Lutheran Church in St. Louis. Schulze remained as pastor of St. Philip’s for nearly two decades, until 1947. In those years, St. Philip’s grew from a congregation of about 100 members to about 500 members and, in addition, St. Philip’s transferred members to help start two other new congregations in St. Louis. Schulze attributed the growth of St. Philip’s to three factors. One was some strife and dissatisfaction found with other African American churches in the area. Another factor was the popularity of “The Lutheran Hour” radio program. And third was the useful and attractive church building that was home to St. Philip’s (Galchutt, 2005, p. 64-66).

St. Philips was located in the best black neighborhood (“The Ville” for Eilleardsville) in St. Louis. Though the vast majority of black Americans were at this time excluded from opportunities to be a part of the American middle class, some black Americans in this neighborhood
had achieved remarkable levels of success. One indication of this was the fact that in 1933, in the midst of the Great Depression, St. Philip's Lutheran Church became the first financially self-supporting black Lutheran congregation of the Synodical Conference. Shortly after Schulze's congregation in St. Louis became financially independent, another black Lutheran church, with a black Lutheran pastor, St. Philip's in Chicago, under the pastorate of the Rev. Marmaduke Carter also became self-sufficient (Galchutt, 2005, p. 67; p. 72).

But despite the independence and success of these congregations, black Lutheran churches and their members were not treated as equal members of church or society. Structurally, black Lutheran churches remained separated from white Lutheran churches. At a Synodical Conference convention in 1936, it was proposed that self-supporting black Lutheran congregations be allowed to join the synodical districts in which they were located. But the newly elected president of the Missouri Synod, the Rev. John W. Behnken (1935-1962), reminded the convention that he was from the South and stated that the proposal “will never do” (Galchutt, 2005, p. 75; Schulze, 1972, p. 42).

John W. Behnken was the first American-born president of the Missouri Synod. Behnken was the great Americanizer of this largely German-American church, but on the race issue, he was not only American, but Texan. Behnken had gone on record stating it would be “impossible [for southern Lutherans to] sanction social equality” (Galchutt, 2005, p. 74-75; Schulze, 1972, p. 45; Andrew Schulze Papers).

Individually, black Lutherans often faced discrimination at the parish level. Some were turned away from worship, being told that the church did not offer “colored services.” One of Schulze's parishioners, who was stationed in the South for military service, attended a Lutheran church where he was asked to sit in the sacristy out of sight from the rest of the congregation, where he could be communed last, after all the other members of the church (Galchutt, 2005, p. 72-73).

After witnessing such discriminatory attitudes and treatment within the church, Andrew Schulze became more active in trying to bring about change in the church. During the mid-to-late 1930s, he began to see racial problems from a larger perspective. Besides the commitment he had to his individual parishioners, Schulze became concerned and committed to the idea of racial justice for all. He began to look beyond his own parishioners and became concerned with the dilemma facing the synod and the church at large. As a prophet to the synod, Schulze called
the church to be the Church, regardless of race (Galchutt, 2005, p. 73).

In the fall of 1938, Schulze presented a paper on the church and the race issue to a district pastoral conference. This presentation generated a great deal of discussion, which included both positive and negative responses. It was the response to this conference presentation that finalized Schulze’s decision to write his first book, titled *My Neighbor of Another Color*. Schulze was not only interested in criticizing old racial concepts, but was interested in developing a new theological outlook that embraced the ideal of Christian equality (Galchutt, 2005, p. 80).

As Schulze developed his position on race, he drew on his Lutheran background. However, since Martin Luther and the other sixteenth-century Lutheran reformers did not comment on racial matters, race did not appear to be a particularly Lutheran topic. There was nothing in the sixteenth-century Lutheran confessions that was especially helpful to Schulze. Still, there were other aspects of the Lutheran tradition that did help Schulze as he became committed to racial justice. The Lutheran emphasis and ethos of personal pastoral care helped Schulze to see the world through the eyes of his black parishioners. The Lutheran emphasis on the Bible enabled Schulze to develop a theological framework that stressed the worth and the dignity of all humankind. (Galchutt, 2005, p. 44-45).

Schulze’s book, *My Neighbor of Another Color*, expressed concerns that Schulze expanded on over the next three decades of his career. One major theme of the book and his career was that the church should be in the forefront of racial change. He worried that the church was failing behind society in its racial attitudes. He believed that the church should lead, rather than follow, society in social and ethical matters (Galchutt, 2005, p. 85-86).

Schulze recognized that there were liberal and Catholic voices calling for racial change, but stressed that conservative, evangelical Christians, such as Missouri Synod Lutherans, were not doing enough to bring about better racial relations. This was very upsetting to Schulze as he believed that the Lutheran views of Law and Gospel were the means to better race relations. As Schulze and others understood, “Prejudice must be cured by repentance, not simply by enlightenment” and it was the Gospel that had the power to change people’s lives (Galchutt, 2005, p.

---

He believed that the church should lead, rather than follow, society in social and ethical matters.
But despite the fact that Schulze wrote his perspective grounded in the Lutheran tradition, the book was not well-received by Missouri Synod officials. Concordia Publishing House, the official publishing agency of the Missouri Synod, refused to publish the book because it was “controversial.” Then after it was self-published in 1941, the editor of The Lutheran Witness consciously chose not to give the book any publicity or attention. And The Concordia Theological Monthly, a publication for pastors, included criticisms of the book. A St. Louis seminary professor and member of the Synodical Conference Mission Board, the Rev. Dr. J. T. Mueller, was the most outspoken critic of the book. Mueller accused Schulze of promoting the “social gospel” rather than the spiritual gospel and accused him of confusing social equality with spiritual equality. Mueller particularly objected to Schulze’s approval of interracial marriage. Mueller viewed racial segregation as *adulphoria*, a matter of theological indifference (Galchutt, 2005, p. 86-90; Andrew Schulze Papers).

Mueller’s criticism reflected a Lutheran hesitation to get involved with political or social matters. Lutherans had a history of being cautious when it came to social issues and social action. Martin Luther’s theology of the “two kingdoms,” which made distinctions between spiritual and secular realms, was sometimes misunderstood by American Lutherans to support a complete separation between church and society. But Andrew Schulze and other American Lutherans were a part of an awakening Lutheran social consciousness that emerged in the middle decades of the twentieth century. This new concern for the role of Christians in society was supported by new study and scholarship in Luther’s thought which promoted responsible Christian activism. (Galchutt, 2005, p. 92-94).

Amid the controversy surrounding My Neighbor of Another Color, Paul Amt, a pastor in Fort Wayne, Indiana, wrote Schulze with a comparison to Martin Luther. Amt wrote, “I suppose you’ve been doing some Reformation ruminating these days... Have the courage to stand your ground, like Luther at Worms... You can be certain that God’s Word is on your side. Hence the cause cannot possibly suffer defeat” (Galchutt, 2005, p. 91; Andrew Schulze Papers).

In spite of the criticism of Schulze’s book from many sources, Schulze gained supporters, who shared his commitment to racial justice. The Walther League, the Missouri Synod’s youth organization, advertised and sold the book to Lutherans all over the United States. Several of
Schulze's early supporters were associated with the Walther League or were among the synod's military chaplains. Just as American youth and the American military tended to have better records on race than the general public, similar tendencies existed in the church (Galchutt, 2005, p. 86-87).

And there were positive aspects to the controversy surrounding *My Neighbor of Another Color*. It generated increased attention for Schulze and racial issues. The book became a topic of discussion at many pastoral conferences and in other parts of synod. It was the publication of *My Neighbor of Another Color* that helped to transform Schulze from a very successful pastor and leader within the Synodical Conference's program of black missions to a spokesperson for race relations among Lutherans all over America (Galchutt, 2005, p. 94-95).

In his last years in St. Louis, Schulze worked to start the St. Louis Lutheran Society for Better Race Relations. The purpose of the organization was to foster better race relations and eliminate discrimination in the church. Around the same time, one of Schulze's colleagues and friends, the Rev. Clemonce Sabourin, was the prime leader in pushing to end the administrative separation between black and white congregations. Sabourin was the black pastor of Mount Zion Lutheran Church in Harlem who again proposed that black congregations should be able to join the synodical districts in which they operate (Galchutt, 2005, p. 108-113).

This resolution for administrative integration was passed by the Missouri Synod in convention in 1947. Administrative integration was a step in the right direction, a theoretical acknowledgment that all congregations, whether black or white, were equal. However, the Missouri Synod was still years away from promoting integration at the local level, in the local parish (Galchutt, 2005, p. 114).

That same year, in 1947, Andrew Schulze ended his ministry in St. Louis and accepted a call to a new ministry opportunity on the South Side of Chicago. The Mission Board of the Northern Illinois District called him as the Director of Black Missions in Chicago. Chicago had a growing black population as one of the most popular destinations during The Great Migration. Before accepting the call to Chicago, Schulze had a frank discussion with the Northern Illinois District Mission Board about his views of race relations in the church. Though there were disagreements, Schulze understood that he would be able to speak on matters of race as his conscience dictated (Galchutt, 2005, p. 120-121).

Shortly after he arrived in Chicago, Schulze received invitations to...
preach and speak at local white congregations. Schulze was warm and soft-spoken in talking with others; he continually stressed the need to be evangelical when it came to improving race relations. He usually concluded his sermons and speeches, stating thanks for prayers and support, and also asking church members to welcome black visitors to their congregation. But soon after he began speaking to local churches the Northern Illinois District Mission Board asked that he stop “disturbing” congregations with his views on race (Galchutt, 2005, p. 121; Schulze, 1972, p. 48).

This was just the first of many conflicts that Schulze had with the district during his years in Chicago. The mission board was interested in having Schulze establish black congregations. But Schulze saw his calling as both to “establish new congregations where geography dictated and to help prepare already established Lutheran congregations accept [racial change]...in their communities” (Galchutt, 2005, p. 121; Schulze, 1972, p. 52).

When Schulze first began serving the Northern Illinois District Mission Board, it was clear that his work on the South Side was not work he could do alone. There was talk from the beginning about providing not only office support, but also finding another pastor to work with Schulze. But Schulze’s work in Chicago was always underfinanced and understaffed. Eventually, Schulze concentrated his efforts on one congregation, The Lutheran Church of Christ the King and served more as a part-time advisor to the Northern Illinois District (Galchutt, 2005, p. 124).

During this time, there were a few other Lutheran congregations in Chicago that reached out to the growing black population of the city. This included the first black Lutheran church in the city, St. Philip’s. Another black Lutheran church, Resurrection, under the pastorate of the Rev. Moses Dickinson emerged as a model congregation during these years. And one historically white Lutheran church, on the West Side of the city, Immanuel Lutheran Church, under the pastoral leader of the Rev. Ralph Luther Moellering, began to accept black members. Still, most Lutherans in Chicago, and other major urban areas, were slow to adjust to the rapidly changing racial situation in America in the 1940s and 1950s.
Schulze continued to press the Northern Illinois District to do more. In addition, he continued to be involved with the Synodical Conference and its Mission Board. As he continued to promote integration in the church, he met resistance. At one point, the Executive Secretary of the Synodical Conference’s Mission Board, the Rev. Karl Kurth, advised Schulze not to worry or do anything about integration. As Kurth explained, “It’s coming,” Schulze believed that others in positions of leadership in the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod held similar attitudes. Schulze was disheartened by this stance. He believed this was a time for vigorous and active leadership in the church, not a time for passivity (Galchutt, 2005, p. 132-133; Schulze, 1972, p. 79).

This was a time when some inner-city congregations closed or moved to other parts of the city. Some congregations debated and voted on whether they should accept black members. Schulze was disturbed by how some were using their “Christian freedom” to avoid integration. As he explained, “There are no two sides to the question. Christ’s answer is clear and emphatic...God in His holy word does not give a congregation the power to choose its brethren in faith.” Maintaining peace within the congregation is no excuse for avoiding integration. Schulze compared that peace with the peace that the priest and the Levite had as they passed the injured man in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Galchutt, 2005, 140; Schulze, 1952, 12).

Just as he had in St. Louis, Schulze also began a Chicago Lutheran Society for Better Race Relations. In the early 1950s, other Lutheran supporters of better race relations began discussing the possibility of a national organization. As various local Lutheran groups came together, they formed the Lutheran Human Relations Association of America (LHRAA). This national organization was founded in 1953 and became based at Valparaiso University in Valparaiso, Indiana. A year later, Andrew Schulze was called to lead the organization and also serve as part-time theology professor at Valparaiso. (Galchutt, 2005, p. 141).

The Lutheran Human Relations Association of America became a pan-Lutheran organization that grew to have over fifty local chapters and a few thousand members. While this was a small group in comparison to the nine million Lutherans in America, members of this organization actively worked to improve race relations in the church and to support the emerging Civil Rights Movement. The organization sponsored educational and inspirational institutes each summer, supported local chapters of the organization, and published related materials. Andrew
Schulze organized and edited the LHRAA’s newsletter, which he named “The Vanguard.” His column in “The Vanguard” was titled “That The Church May Lead.” The first newsletter came out in January-February 1954 (Galchutt, 2005, p. 141-142).

Just a few months later, on May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled in the case of Brown v. Board of Education that the practice of “separate but equal” was inherently unequal. The “Brown” decision laid the framework for the emerging Civil Rights Movement and brought dramatic changes to American society. Schulze hoped that it would also bring dramatic changes to the church. Schulze wrote a short article on the Supreme Court’s decision for The Lutheran Witness. In his article, he included a quote from another Lutheran organization, the National Lutheran Council, which stated, “The Church has trailed the conscience of the courts too long. Here is a chance to remedy the weakness of our witness.” (Galchutt, 2005, 142; Schulze, 1954, 10.)

Then in 1956, the Missouri Synod took an historic step at its national convention held in St. Paul, Minnesota. At this time, the Missouri Synod held national conventions once every three years and this was the first national convention since the Supreme Court’s “Brown” decision. The LHRAA was behind a resolution to end discrimination in both church and society. Schulze was advised to include a biblical reference as a part of the resolution. He chose Micah 6:8, “And what does the Lord require of you? To act justly and love mercy and to walk humbly with your God.” At its convention in 1956, the Missouri Synod resolved with near unanimity that “since Christians are constrained to do justice and love mercy, we acknowledge our responsibility as a church to provide guidance for our members to work in the capacity of Christian citizens for the elimination of discrimination, wherever it may exist in community, city, state, nation, and world” (Galchutt, 2005, p. 151-152.)

It must have been a bittersweet experience for Andrew Schulze. His church body did take a stand for racial justice, but like most other Christian denominations with regard to race, Lutherans had followed rather than led society. In an article published a few months later in The Lutheran Witness, Schulze stressed the importance of the 1956 resolution. As Schulze wrote, “The Missouri Synod is not living in a vacuum, but in a very real world and is related to the world by the commandment of love...In the area of race relations we have a long way to go [to truly] be the church as Christ would have us be, but...we are, by His grace, on the way.” (Galchutt, 2005, p. 152-153; Schulze, 1956, p. 15).

Schulze and the LHRAA continued to be active in the 1950s and
1960s, during the height of the Civil Rights Movement. Lutherans interacted in interesting ways with the Movement. These years include more examples of both progress and setbacks in Lutheran race relations.

The title of my presentation posed the question of whether Lutherans were “in the vanguard or behind the times” when it came to race. As the story of Andrew Schulze demonstrates, the vast majority of Lutherans moved “with the times” or “behind the times” when it came to racial matters. However, there was a small group of Lutherans who were “in the vanguard,” trying to prod and encourage the church to practice what it preached. It is their example that can serve us today as we, by the grace of God, live out lives of justice, mercy, and humility in both church and society. LEJ
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The Place of the Devil in Lutheran Catechesis
by Tom Von Hagel

“From the crafts and assaults of the devil...Good Lord, deliver us”
(Lutheran Worship, 280).

Martin Luther’s Small Catechism (1529) and Large Catechism (1529) inform contemporary Lutheran catechesis. The latter wholeheartedly embraces the theological content of the former. At the very least, the six chief parts of the Small Catechism – Commandments, Creed, Prayer, Baptism, Absolution, and Supper – serve as the outline in Lutheran catechetical classes today. In addition, the three introductions to the two catechisms provide preeminent pedagogical counsel that cannot be easily dismissed. For example, since the Small Catechism was penned to be memorized, according to Theodore Tappert (1959), then it can only be beneficial for the catechumen in the long term to stick with one text and/or translation. It must be granted that pedagogical contexts change; however, the catechetical content and particular catechetical methods of Martin Luther’s catechisms transcend time for Lutheran catechesis.

A related catechetical issue is the correlation of content and style. The catechisms not only teach the doctrine of the Christian Faith, but they do so in a particular manner. For example, the placement of the Ten Commandments (first) and the Lord’s Supper (last) among the chief parts ensures their respective prominence. Also, the placement of Confession and Absolution between Holy Baptism and the Lord’s Supper in the Small Catechism speaks volumes to its sacramentality. Consequently, contemporary Lutheran catechists look not only to the content or the style of their sixteenth century catechetical heritage, but to the correlation of both.

The doctrine concerning the devil is one locus in the large corpus of Christian doctrine. According to the above paradigm, a Lutheran catechumen not only learns of the devil from the content of Lutheran doctrine taught, but also according to the manner in which it is taught. The doctrine of the devil is generally but briefly addressed in dogmatic text-
books and only occasionally in theological lectures and writings.
Continuing in a downward spiral, the devil is rarely mentioned, if at all, in sermons and the liturgy today. Both affect the contemporary Lutheran's understanding of the devil. This essay will examine the place (content and style) of the devil in Luther's catechisms for the purpose of producing a pedagogical paradigm in which to place the devil in contemporary Lutheran catechesis.

The Reality of the Devil

Late medieval Catholicism very much impressed the reality and ferocity of the devil and his demonic militia upon Luther. The church penned books against the satanic arts and performed exorcisms. Luther's mother was certain that a woman in her neighborhood was a witch and responsible for the many physical ailments among the local children. Luther himself encountered satanic specters in his own life. It was not a matter of if the devil existed, but rather, when and where he would next rear up his horned head and attack the people of God.

On more than a few occasions in the catechisms, Luther identified the evil intentions and machinations of the devil. This was done rather briefly in the "Small Catechism." In the third petition of the Lord's Prayer, Luther explained that the divine will is "when God curbs and destroys every evil counsel and purpose of the devil" and in the sixth petition God "guard[s] and preserve[s]" the Christian against the devil. Baptism also "delivers from death and the devil." While Luther pointed to the Savior and his work of protection and redemption in both of these examples (and others to be noted later), he was equally quick to warn the student of the devil's malicious prowess.

The Large Catechism often and much more extensively delineated the wicked nature and toil of the evil one. The devil lies' and enslaves' and plots' and confuses' and destroys.' The devil is a terribly malevolent though deftly subtle force against which Christians must contend:

In the same way those conceited fellows should be chastised who, after hearing a sermon or two, become sick and tired of it and feel that they know it all and need no more instruction. This is precisely the sin that used to be classed among the mortal sins and was called acedia – that is, indolence or satiety – a malignant, pernicious place with which the devil bewitches and befuddles the hearts of many so that he may take them by surprise and stealthily take the Word of God from us."

The devil is a furious enemy; when he sees that we resist him and
attack the old man, and when he cannot rout us by force, he sneaks and skulks about everywhere, trying all kinds of tricks, and does not stop until he has finally worn us out so that we either renounce our faith or yield hand and foot and become indifferent or impatient."

This litany of satanic devices was intended to sober the catechumen. The devil is not easily feinted, but rather, he is a talented and hard-working opponent.

In both catechisms, Luther often included the devil in lists with others miscreants: "the devil and the world,"12 "sin, ... devil... death, and... evil,"13 "devil and all powers,"14 "the devil, along with the world and flesh,"15 "devil, bishops, tyrants, and heretics."16 This cataloging of spiritual enemies showed that though the devil was the "chief enemy" all on these numerous lists were playing for the same team. As such, the foes were myriad and powerful:

For we do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the cosmic powers over this present darkness... the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places” (Eph 6.12).

Any serious examination of the catechisms concerning the devil cannot exclude his many and evil cohorts. As such, Luther’s singular and paired and multiple warnings against evil or the flesh or the world in his catechisms always echoed the devil.

In both catechisms, Luther neither ignored nor tiptoed around the devil. Instead, he clearly identified the character of the devil and repeatedly warned of his heinous misdeeds. In both catechisms, Luther belled the devil and his host of miscreants. Evil is not merely an idea. Instead, it is manifest in this temporal world. In both catechisms, the devil and evil cohorts were out and about and up to no good.

The devil was neither an old wives’ tale nor a childhood bogeyman for Luther. Instead, he was an absolute reality. For Luther, the devil incessantly and powerfully attacked and assaulted, disillusioned and deceived the fallen descendents of Adam and Eve. According to Heiko Oberman (1990), any modern attempt to argue away the devil in the thought of Luther cuts out the very heart of Luther's theology: Luther's world of thought is wholly distorted and apologetically misconstrued if his conception of the Devil is dismissed as a medieval phenomenon and only his faith in Christ retained as relevant or as the only decisive factor. Christ and the devil were equal-
ly important to him: one was the perpetual intercessor for
Christianity, the other a menace to mankind till the end of time.
To argue that Luther never overcame the medieval belief in the
Devil says far too little; he even intensified it and lent to it addi-
tional urgency: Christ and Satan wage a cosmic war for mastery
over church and world. (Oberman, 76)

To understand properly the theological gist of these sixteenth centu-
ry catechisms, the contemporary Lutheran catechist must recognize the
evil reality of the devil for Luther in theology and life.

The Presence of the Devil

The design of the catechisms was quite ordered. In the Small
Catechism, the six chief parts were followed by the Morning and Evening
Prayers, Table Prayers, Table of Duties, and Christian Questions with
their Answers. The order and content in the Large Catechism was similar,
but slightly varied: the Ten Commandments, Apostles’ Creed, and Lord’s
Prayer, Holy Baptism and the Lord’s Supper were fol-
lowed with excurses on
Infant Baptism and A Brief
Exhortation to Confession,
respectively. Doctrines and practices were addressed in their correspon-
ding section. For example, Luther examined prayer under the Lord’s
Prayer and provided examples in the Morning and Evening Prayers and
Table Prayers. Similarly, the doctrine and practice of Baptism was prin-
cipally explained in the same-named chief part.

As previously noted, the doctrine of the devil was too important for
Luther to disregard, and he commented upon the devil in his catechisms.
The question at hand is: how does Luther integrate the devil into his cat-
echisms? To put it another way: what is the place of the devil in Luther’s
catechisms?

Initially, one might expect Luther to locate the devil in a particular
place or possibly two. A pair of rather logical positions would be the
first article of the Apostles’ Creed which touches on the Creation
including the creation of angels and the sixth and last petitions of the
Lord’s Prayer which address temptation and evil. Oddly, Luther failed to
mention the devil and his miscreant allies in his explanation to the first
article of the Apostles’ Creed in the “Small Catechism.” In the same
article in his “Large Catechism,” Luther provided only a single warning
against “evil and misfortune” and “danger and disaster”.
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The sixth and last petitions of the Lord's Prayer strongly contrast the first article of the Apostles' Creed. In the *Small Catechism*, Luther warns of the "devil, the world, and our flesh" and speaks of "all manner of evil." In the "Large Catechism," Luther more demonstrably pointed to the devil. After listing the flesh and world with the devil in his explanation of the sixth petition and commenting upon the flesh and the world, Luther then warned of the devil:

Then comes the devil, who baits and badgers us on all sides, but especially exerts himself where the conscience and spiritual matters are at stake. His purpose is to make us scorn and despise both the Word and the works of God, to tear us away from faith, hope and love, to draw us into unbelief, false security, atheism, blasphemy, and countless other abominable sins.21

In the last petition, Luther heaped reproaches upon the devil: "the Evil One or the Wicked One" and "the devil as the sum of all evil" and "arch-enemy" and "liar" and "murderer."23

Concerning the first article of the Apostles' Creed and the sixth and last petitions of the Lord's Prayer, Luther collected his invectives against the devil and his ilk in the latter. It must also be noted that the devil appeared rather extensively throughout the Lord's Prayer, particularly in the *Large Catechism* with an immodest number of references in the third petition. At the same time, the devil by no means merely made a cameo appearance in the third part of the catechisms. Sundry examples have already been cited, and a more full analysis will follow.

Luther mentioned the devil time and again throughout the catechisms. He did not confine the evil one to a specific catechetical locale. Instead, the devil appeared to be an omnipresent concern. In fact, it is quite difficult to find a part of the catechisms wherein there is no mention of the devil.

The prefaces, though they are often overlooked, provide the starting place for examining the place of the devil in the two catechisms. In the preface to the *Small Catechism*, Luther sounded the alarm against the "horrible purpose" of the devil and included him in the company of sin, flesh, world, death, and hell. In the longer preface to the "Large Catechism," Luther warned of the ambushes and assaults of the devil and paralleling the *Small Catechism* aligned the devil with the world, flesh and evil thoughts. In these prefaces, Luther revealed an integral concern that would be addressed throughout the catechisms: the devil is a real and formidable enemy.
The six chief parts that comprise the heart of the *Small Catechism*
and the five chief parts of the *Large Catechism* did not focus primarily
upon the devil. At the same time, Luther more than liberally sprinkled
comments and warnings concerning the devil throughout both. The
devil and his cohorts – magic, evil, world, flesh, and sin – are mentioned
in each of the six chief parts in the “Small Catechism.” Much more
extensively did Luther cite them in the “Large Catechism.” As noted
previously, there was no mention of the devil in the first article of the
Apostles’ Creed; however, this was not the case for the second and third
articles. Luther’s practice in the Ten Commandments and the Lord’s
Prayer revealed his apt attention toward the evil one. Except for his two
references to “evil” under the sixth commandment, each of the other
commandments mentioned the evil one by name. The devil was noted in
the introduction and each petition of the Lord’s Prayer. In the fifth and
sixth petitions respectively, Luther named him “Satan” and the “ser-
pent.” Both are *hapax legomena* in the catechisms:

Besides, Satan is at our backs, besieging us on every side and, as
we have heard, directing his attacks against all previous petitions,
so that it is not possible always to stand firm in such a ceaseless
conflict."

For he has a serpent’s head; if it finds an opening into which it can
slip, the whole body will irresistibly follow."

Following the pattern, mention of the devil occurred repeatedly in
Baptism, the Lord’s Supper, and their respective excurses. Luther saturat-
ed the six/five chief parts of the catechisms with the devil’s names, evil
cohorts, and malevolent actions.

The *Small Catechism* includes a few components not included in the
*Large Catechism*, and yet, they are hardly ancillary. At the very least, they
follow the pattern so far noted. Both the Morning and Evening Prayers
conclude with the petition, “…Let your holy angel have charge of me
that the wicked one may have no power over me.” Both Table Prayers
include the Lord’s Prayer and its seventh petition against the evil one.
Though the devil is not mentioned in the Bible verses utilized in the
Table of Duties, he was the subject of the third part of a three-fold
answer to the last question:

But what should you do if you are not aware of this need and
have no hunger and thirst for the Sacrament?

Third, he will certainly have the devil also around him, who with
his lying and murdering day and night will let him have no peace.
within or without, as the Scriptures picture him in John 8 and 16; 1 Peter 5; Ephesians 6; and 2 Timothy 2. (Lutheran Worship, 307)

For Luther, the devil was not an inconsequential reality or doctrine that could be silently ignored or quickly passed over in catechesis. As a result, Luther pointed to the devil from the beginning to the end of the catechisms. At the same time, Luther did not necessarily measure carefully and distribute evenly his comments and warnings concerning the devil. Nonetheless, he wrote of the devil at virtually every point within the catechisms. Consequently, the place of the devil in Luther’s world-view corresponded to the place of the devil in his catechisms: the devil is always lurking around every corner, and so, is mentioned in each part of the catechisms.

The Opposition to the Devil

Just as Luther exposed the devil’s purpose, so Luther overtly revealed his own purpose in including the devil in his catechisms: Christ and his own fight against the devil and his own. The devil is a formidable foe; warnings are absolutely necessary. At the same time, the devil is not omnipotent. Luther sounds the battle cry pitting Christ and Christians against the devil and his demons.

Luther juxtaposed the actions of the devil against those of Jesus. The myriad warnings of the heinous wrongs of the devil were contrasted with the repeated promises of the salvific work of Jesus. Luther explained that upon the cross, Jesus defeated the devil:

I believe that Jesus Christ, true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the virgin Mary, is my Lord, who has redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature, delivered me and freed me from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil, not with silver or gold, but with his holy and precious blood and with his innocent suffering and death, in order that I may be his.\(^1\)

In the Large Catechism, Luther expounded further upon the continual counterattacks of Jesus against the devil. “God’s Word . . . routs and destroys [the devil’s] thousand arts.”\(^1\) The Christian “always has enough to do to believe firmly what Baptism promises and brings – victory over death and the devil, forgiveness of sins, God’s grace, the entire Christ, and the Holy Spirit with his gifts.”\(^1\) The Lord’s Supper is the “very gift he has provided for me against my sins, death, and all evils.”\(^1\) For Luther, Jesus vanquished the devil upon the cross and continues to overpower the devil’s dreaded horde.
Christians follow in the train of Jesus battling against the devil in a variety of fashions. "Eagerly read[ing], recit[ing], ponder[ing], and practi[cing] the Catechism... rout[s] the devil and evil thoughts." Calling upon the name of the Lord, "defies the devil." "Prayer can resist [the devil] and drive him back." The Christian must "fight against the devil." The Christian is at the same time in the Kingdom of God and always under fire. Consequently, the Christian constantly counterattacks the devil and myriad miscreants.

Jesus has decisively defeated the devil upon the cross and continues to beat down the devil's evil cohorts. Christians enjoy the salvific benefits of Jesus' victorious work upon the cross. At the same time, they bear the responsibility of joining in on the side of Jesus in the continuing fray against the devil. Luther's myriad remarks concerning the devil are neither a stylistic device nor merely a vestige of an out-dated world view. Instead, the devil provides the context in which the importance of Jesus comes alive. The devil is the cause of all maladies, while Jesus is the source of all hope and salvation. In this dichotomy, the heinous actions of the devil show the need of the salvific works of a Savior, Jesus.

Summary

Luther's placement of the devil in his catechisms was quite simple: the devil appeared throughout the catechisms and in every corner. This ubiquitous placement was based upon the rationale that the devil was an imminent peril. In addition, his numerous evil devices and cohorts augmented his danger. Because of this, Luther included but did not sequester the devil to a particular part of the catechisms. Instead, he repeatedly warned the catechumens about and railed against the devil. Ultimately, the place of the devil stood in contradistinction to Jesus who defeated the devil and his miscreants upon the cross and continues to battle them through his holy Word and blessed Sacraments.

The pedagogical lessons for contemporary Lutheran catechists seem rather obvious. First, they cannot ignore the doctrine of the devil. Because much of the modern world rejects (malevolent) specters, this is not a valid reason to excise such matters. Instead, it provides the impetus to include and even emphasize such spiritual matters. Second, they should not limit their mention of the devil to one lesson in the academic year. The devil is not to be lauded, and so, does not deserve an honored position in the catechisms such as the Apostles' Creed, Holy Baptism, or even Table Prayers. At the same time, the catechumen must be continually warned of the evil one and his malicious intent. Third, they should
not utilize the devil to frighten the catechumens into obedience, but rather, to lead them to trust in the salvific work of Jesus over and against the devil and his foul miscreants. Following in the pedagogical train of Luther, the contemporary Lutheran catechist will integrate his identifications and warnings and pummeling of the devil throughout his catechesis.

The catechisms of Luther serve as the basis for contemporary Lutheran catechesis. The doctrine of the devil is not thoroughly explained in one place in these sixteenth century catechisms. Likewise, the practice of integrating the doctrine of the devil throughout these catechisms is not clearly delineated in the prefaces which address matters of pedagogy. This, though, does not absolve the contemporary catechist from not incorporating the devil into his catechetical lessons. Instead, Luther’s subtle but obvious method of teaching the devil is a pedagogical treasure and provides one more pedagogical tool for the contemporary Lutheran catechist.
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With the new Lutheran Service Book and other publications from Concordia Publishing House, many Missouri Synod pastors, teachers, deaconesses, DCEs, church musicians and others will find themselves face-to-face with a new “default” Bible translation: The English Standard Version (ESV). The LCMS has never had an official Bible translation, preferring instead to view the Scriptures as ultimately authoritative only in their original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts. However, like Christians from the beginning, the LCMS has recognized that the great majority of Christians will never have facility in these languages, but will encounter the Bible in another language, most often their native language.

Nevertheless, in many ways the LCMS can have been said to have a number of “unofficial” or “default” Bible versions that were preferred at various times. During the German language era (up to about 1930) it was the Luther Bible, which was the commonly quoted version in synod publications and catechisms and used as a source for the Psalter and other liturgical texts. From the time of the synod’s first publications in English, the default English translation was the English-language cultural equivalent of the Luther Bible: the King James Version, which not only provided the language for biblical texts in “The Lutheran Hymnal,” but also all of the Bible verses in “Luther’s Small Catechism with Explanation” until it was replaced with a revised version in 1986. During the middle of the twentieth century with the publication of a number of new English versions of the Bible, the venerable but linguistically out-of-date King James Version competed with several of these new translations for use in LCMS congregations. I especially remember during my childhood and adolescence hearing both the “Revised Standard Version” (RSV) and “Good News for Modern Man” (also called “Today’s English Version” [TEV]).

About the time that the synod published Lutheran Worship (1982) and largely adopted the “New International Version” (NIV) for the Psalter...
and liturgical texts of that hymnal, the NIV became synod's default translation and has remained so until very recently. Currently, the ESV provides most liturgical texts in the new hymnal. In some ways this switch is good: the NIV was essentially produced by those who subscribe to Reformed theology, and it has some very Calvinistic-motivated turns of phrase, among its other faults.

However, the ESV is not without its drawbacks. It arose from the dissatisfaction of American Evangelicals with the “New Revised Standard Version” (NRSV). As such, it is as much a revision of the RSV as it is a new translation, and much of its wording is owed to the RSV, which itself was a revision of the King James (as its name implies). Thus, the ESV stands directly in a tradition that goes back to William Tyndale. The King James Version built upon the work of Tyndale and was one of about a dozen sixteenth and seventeenth century English translations that attempted to update Tyndale’s seminal English Bible.

Translation is a difficult art. Revising someone else’s translation is even more difficult. The effort of the ESV translators/revisers is not minimized by the following critique. However, a close examination reveals that they often overlooked some things that should have been obvious to those who are familiar with translation theory and practice. The ESV characterizes its own translation philosophy in part as:

The ESV is an “essentially literal” translation that seeks as far as possible to capture the precise wording of the original text and the personal style of each Bible writer. As such, its emphasis is on “word-for-word” correspondence, at the same time taking into account differences of grammar, syntax, and idiom between current literary English and the original languages. Thus it seeks to be transparent to the original text, letting the reader see as directly as possible the structure and meaning of the original.

In contrast to the ESV, some Bible versions have followed a “thought-for-thought” rather than “word-for-word” translation philosophy, emphasizing “dynamic equivalence” rather than the “essentially literal” meaning of the original. A “thought-for-thought” translation is of necessity more inclined to reflect the interpretive opinions of the translator and the influences of contemporary culture.

Every translation is at many points a trade-off between literal precision and readability, between “formal equivalence” in expression and “functional equivalence” in communication, and the ESV is no exception. Within this framework we have sought to be “as lit-
eral as possible” while maintaining clarity of expression and literary excellence.1

As my comments below will make clear, despite its supposed concession to “differences of grammar, syntax, and idiom between current literary English and the original languages,” the ESV often sacrifices English idiom for the sake of preserving word-for-word correspondence to the original languages, even when it makes little sense to do this. Those who will be using the ESV in teaching the faith in LCMS congregations and schools need to be aware of the consequences of the ESV translation practice, and understand its limitations. They can then modify their pedagogical methods so that their instruction of others does not suffer unduly.

Yet, before we can speak of deficiencies in any translation, we must first ask, “For whom was the translation produced?” If we are producing a translation for those who know the original languages to one extent or another, a very wooden translation will do just fine. However, for any translation that seeks to be mass marketed (as the ESV does), the answer is (or at least should be, in my opinion), “We are translating for the general population.” This means that the typical reader will have no working knowledge of Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek. While the translator will preserve Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek features of the text when possible, the first goal is to produce a text that is idiomatic in the target language as much as possible while distorting the meaning and features of the source text as little as possible. I would argue that ideally a translation should be no harder nor no easier to read in English that it was in Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek for the original readers.2 Therefore, since the target audience will have no knowledge of the source language, preserving the source language’s features merely for the sake of the source language (the ESV’s “emphasis on ‘word-for-word’ correspondence”) is counterproductive for several reasons:

1. It produces awkward target language text, often making the translation harder to read in the target language than it was for the original source language readers.

2. It may distort meaning in the target language text.

3. It gives the mistaken impression that the biblical source text was holy because it was in a somewhat artificial “Bible version” of the language. (Much like the way people today associate Elizabethan English with “biblical English” because of the pervasive influence of the King James Version over the past centuries.)
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The comments that follow are largely a critique of certain translation practices of the ESV, but also apply to a greater or lesser extent other Tyndale-tradition versions (e.g., KJV, RSV, NRSV, and to some degree NIV). While we can excuse Tyndale, since he was breaking new ground in his day, I find it hard to justify continuing some of his translation techniques in our day. Since I am an Old Testament professor, I will discuss a few translation examples from the Old Testament, but these comments are just as relevant to the New Testament of the ESV. Since the headquarters of the ESV staff was in the Chicago area, I will assume that the target language was American English, and my suggestions will suggest idioms in American English, though these may also be familiar to those who speak other forms of English.

To illustrate the limitations of the ESV as an English translation, I will confine my comments to some comments concerning deficient translation of idioms and syntactical features of Hebrew.

A. Failure to translate an idiom or grammatical construction with the corresponding English idiom or grammatical construction, thereby producing distorted meaning, wrong meaning, or text that is more difficult in English than in Hebrew.

Even though the reader can often stop and figure out the meaning when an idiom-for-idiom translation technique is not used, insistence on preserving an alien idiom instead of translating it into idiomatic English produces a stilted and awkward text because the translation is only partial. A complete translation would bring into English not simply the words, but especially the texture of the idiom. If the readers of the original Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek didn't have to stop to think to get the basic meaning of the idiom, neither should the English readers. On the other hand, if the original readers did have to stop and think, the translation should strive to make English-language readers do the same.

Let's look at some examples of failure to recognize and completely or adequately translate idioms:

And a man of the place answered, “And who is their father?”
Therefore it became a proverb, “Is Saul also among the prophets?”
(1 Samuel 10:12)

The Hebrew word commonly translated father corresponds to several words in English: father, grandfather, great-grandfather, ancestor, predecessor, and so forth. When speaking of a guild of prophets the followers are called “sons of the prophets” in Hebrew. The head prophet is
the "father." In this case, father in English probably implies to the reader that someone assumed that these men had the same biological father. However, the Hebrew question is asking who the head prophet is, and perhaps the question should be translated "Who is their leader?" In the same way the ESV's "sons of the prophets" at 1 Kgs 20:35; 2 Kgs 2:3, 5, 7, 15; 4:1, 38 (twice); 5:22; 6:1; 9:1 should probably be translated "disciples of the prophets" or something similar. (At Acts 3:25, the NIV's "heirs of the prophets" or the NRSV's "descendants of the prophets" are preferable.)

Then they ran and took him from there. And when he stood among the people, he was taller than any of the people from his shoulders upward. (1 Sam 10:23)

The ESV's "he was taller than any of the people from his shoulders upward" translates the Hebrew idiom by calquing, that is, translating an idiom word-by-word without regard to the meaning of the idiom. In English the words imply that Saul had an elongated, misshapen head—that up to the shoulders he was the same as most other Israelites, but from the neck upwards he was grotesquely large. Although most English readers will probably figure out that 1 Sam 10:23 means that Saul was taller by a head than everyone else, why not use the equivalent English idiom? "He was a head taller than anyone else." What is the point of preserving the Hebrew idiom for the English reading audience? To make them think the Bible is "old?" (That goes without saying.) To make them think the Bible is quaint or out-of-touch? (That is a dangerous thought, indeed.)

And Samuel said to all Israel, "Behold, I have obeyed your voice in all that you have said to me and have made a king over you." (1 Sam 12:1)

The Hebrew idiom "listen/obey someone's voice" simply means "listen, obey." The ESV's "obeyed your voice" reproduces the Hebrew idiom word-by-word, but is pleonastic in English. Why include "your voice" in English translation? Is it to emphasize that the request was oral instead of written? Anyone who has been reading 1 Samuel 11 will know that. Simply put, the English here is harder for English readers than the
Hebrew was for Hebrew readers. While this does not distort the meaning of the English, the cumulative effect of many of these pleonasm in a translation (and there are quite a few in the ESV) is to produce a quirky, non-idiomatic English that is somewhat artificial for the reader. Good translation is not only translating words, but also knowing when not to translate them, much like a good trial attorney knows that good interrogation involves not only asking questions, but also knowing what not to ask.

They said, “You have not defrauded us or oppressed us or taken anything from the hand of anyone.” And he said to them, “The LORD is witness against you, and his anointed is witness this day, that you have not found anything in my hand.” And they said, “He is witness.” (1 Sam 12:4-5)

The idiom in this case is the use of the Hebrew word commonly translated hand. Again, this is a word with a wide range of meaning. However, to translate it “hand” here (twice) is misleading in English. The ESV communicates that Samuel did not literally grab things out of anyone’s hand, and that his hands were now empty. However, in this case the meaning is “possession” and the translation would be more idiomatic English if it read “or [illicitly] taken anything from anyone... you have not found anything in my possession.” What is the point of “hand” in the ESV text? It adds nothing, and may actually distort the meaning for some readers.

And Samuel said to the people, “The LORD is witness, who appointed Moses and Aaron and brought your fathers up out of the land of Egypt.” (1 Sam 12:6)

The problem here is following normal Hebrew word order and not converting it to standard English word order. The relative pronoun who normally occurs immediately after its antecedent in English. Thus, standard English for this verse would be: “And Samuel said to the people, ‘The LORD who appointed Moses and Aaron and brought your fathers up out of the land of Egypt is witness.’” Again, by following Hebrew word order the ESV has made the English more awkward for its readers than the Hebrew was for its readers. (And it does this consistently with such relative clause constructions.) Again, the English reader can figure this out, but what is the purpose of making the English unnatural here? Certainly the goal of translation is not to teach readers about Hebrew syntax (as if they cared or had a need to know). The real mystery here is why the ESV did not simply make the word order conform to standard
English word order while maintaining its word-for-word correspondence within the relative clause.

And all Israel heard it said that Saul had defeated the garrison of the Philistines, and also that Israel had become a stench to the Philistines. And the people were called out to join Saul at Gilgal. (1 Sam 13:4)

The phrase “garrison of the Philistines” preserves the order of what is known in Hebrew grammar as a construct phrase, but is not flowing English. (Actually, it is something that I would expect from my beginning Hebrew students, but not from a seasoned translator.) Why not “Philistine garrison” as the ESV itself does at 1 Sam 14:1, 4?

And the men of the garrison hailed Jonathan and his armor-bearer and said, “Come up to us, and we will show you a thing.” And Jonathan said to his armor-bearer, “Come up after me, for the LORD has given them into the hand of Israel.” (1 Sam 14:12)

Once again, the ESV’s “come up to us, and we will show you a thing” is a calque of a Hebrew idiom, and this time it produces a rather insipid English translation. The Philistines are issuing a challenge, but the English reader will probably not quite understand the mocking nature of their taunt. The NIV’s “Come up to us and we'll teach you a lesson” is better for meaning, but loses the texture of the Hebrew text altogether. Why not use the (American?) English idiom and say, “Come up to us, and we’ll show you a thing or two.”?

And whenever the evil spirit from God was upon Saul, David took the lyre and played it with his hand. So Saul was refreshed and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him. (1 Sam 16:23)

The ESV’s “David took the lyre and played it with his hand” is almost a calque of the Hebrew. The translators at least added the word it so that it doesn’t read “played with his hand,” which in English reads like he was cracking his knuckles or twiddling his thumbs. However, the ESV almost invites the reader to ask the question, “What else would he have played the lyre with?” (His foot, perhaps?) In English if we wish to express the manner in which an instrument is played, we put the meaning into the verb. Thus, one can “play a horn” or, if we want to emphasize the use of the mouth, one “blows a horn.” In this case a better translation may have been “David took the lyre and strummed it.”

Blessed is the man who walks not in the counsel of the wicked, nor stands in the way of sinners, nor sits in the seat of scoffers; (Ps 1:1)
There are two problems here. First, *walks not* is not normal English word order. Moreover, the Hebrew word order (which follows standard Hebrew syntactical rules) corresponds to normal English word order in this case. If the concern is for following the Hebrew and producing for the English reader the same impression of “normalcy”, why not “does not walk?” Secondly, the English phrase *stand in the way of* is an idiom that means “to impede someone's progress.” Certainly the Psalmist does not mean that one is blessed if one does nothing to impede sinners from their sinning. (If you think that no one would read the text that way, I have had more than one undergraduate student who though that was exactly what the verse meant after reading it in KJV, RSV, etc.) In this case the ESV has reverted to the Tyndale tradition by translating the Hebrew word-by-word and thereby producing an idiom in English where there is none in Hebrew. Perhaps the translators wanted to preserve the sequence “walks...stands...sits.” This can be done without producing the wrong meaning in English. One way would be to translate “…nor stands on the path that sinners take.” (“Path” or “road” is what the Hebrew word often translated way means.)

The angel of the LORD found her by a spring of water in the wilderness, the spring on the way to Shur. (Gen 16:7)

The problem here is a constant one in translations that follow the Tyndale tradition. The words of water are not needed in English and create an awkward text. The reason they are needed in Hebrew has to do with what linguists call “marked meaning.” In Hebrew the unmarked meaning of words like *well*, *spring*, *river*, *stream*, etc. is that they are dry. This is because in the climate of Palestine one could not assume that these geographic features would contain water. Thus, the Hebrew has to mark the meaning when one wants to say that these have water in them. In English, which came from a much wetter climate, the unmarked meaning is that these geographic features normally have water. One marks them only if they are dry (i.e., dry well, dry river bed, etc.) Thus, the words of water should be omitted in English (as well as at Gen 16:7; 21:19, 25; 24:11, 13, 43; 26:18, etc.). On the other hand words such as Hebrew *nabal* should be translated by something like “dry river bed”

In English, which came from a much wetter climate, the unmarked meaning is that these geographic features normally have water.
unless marked by "of water" in Hebrew, where it should be translated simply as "river, stream, creek, etc." Note, however, that one cannot simply always omit "of water." In both Hebrew and English we mark containers when they contain a liquid. Thus the unmarked meaning of "cup" is that it is empty. We mark it as "a cup of water" or "a cup of milk" if it contains something. The same is true in Hebrew (e.g., Gen 21:14; 1 Sam 26:11).

This last example is an important one, since it is so pervasive in the ESV and other Tyndale tradition translations. It signals to the reader that the Bible is unnatural or stilted or out-of-touch or simply quirky, when it isn’t any of those things, though many of its translations are.

B. Places where the ESV translates an idiom without following its own primary word-for-word principle (often in keeping with the Tyndale tradition; often in places where one should not do this)

Then Jacob went on his journey and came to the land of the people of the east. (Gen 29:1)

The Hebrew says "Jacob lifted up his feet and went..." Here ESV translates an idiom without an English idiom and simply omits any word-for-word equivalent. This is an unusual construction, occurring only here in the Old Testament. Perhaps it indicates haste. If this is the case the ESV is an under-translation. But the larger question is this: Why translate this idiom when so many others are calqued or otherwise followed word-for-word?

The king answered and said, "I know with certainty that you are trying to gain time, because you see that the word from me is firm." (Dan 2:8)

Behind "trying to gain time" is an idiom in Aramaic, "trying to buy time." This is a rare case where an Aramaic idiom matches an English idiom exactly. Why not leave it as it is in Aramaic and have the king say "I know for sure that you are trying to buy time."

"...because an excellent spirit, knowledge, and understanding to interpret dreams, explain riddles, and solve problems were found in this Daniel, whom the king named Belteshazzar. Now let Daniel be called, and he will show the interpretation." (Dan 5:12. cf. 5:16)

"Solve problems" is a translation of the Aramaic idiom "untie knots." If the point of the ESV’s dependence on a word-for-word principle is to bring some of the flavor and texture of the original text into English, why did the translators produce such an insipid translation.
here? Why could they not have tried to produce something with a little more of the flair of the Aramaic text, such as “...to interpret dreams, explain riddles, and unravel knotty problems?”

These examples of less-than-adequate translation highlight some of the less-than-obvious limitations of the ESV. Some may object that a good reader will not be deterred by such flaws. However, teachers in classrooms, pastors in confirmation classes, deaconesses, DCE’s, and church musicians are not always ministering to good readers. Since the LCMS appears to be poised to employ the ESV as its default translation into the foreseeable future, we need to be aware of its weaknesses and be prepared to compensate for them. While the ESV is a good translation in many ways, like all translations, it has its limitations. Unfortunately, many of the limitations of the ESV are not easily recognized by those who have been educated in the church and its schools, since we have become used to these types of flaws and accept them as the way the Bible is “supposed to read” (in English). However, young Christians and new converts will often have a different set of expectations that they bring to the reading and study of the Bible, and those expectations do not include the artificial “Bible English” found in the Tyndale tradition of translation. To understand their struggles with the text of the ESV, we need to understand the flaws in its translation technique and practice. Hopefully, lessons learned from the examples given above will help those who teach the faith better able to minister to those who learn. LEJ

Endnotes
2. The ESV errs most often in being harder to read than the original, especially in simple narrative sections such as found in much of the Pentateuch, Old Testament historical books, the Gospels and Acts. Translations such as TEV, or the American Bible Society’s “Contemporary English Version” or even “The New Living Bible” err in being easier to read in than the original, especially in poetical sections such as Psalms or the Wisdom books or in certain of Paul’s letters.
3. Note that both Elijah and Elisha are addressed as “father” for this reason: they were heads of the prophetic guild (2 Kgs 2:12; 6:21; 13:14)
Dr. Andrew Steinmann is Professor of Theology and Hebrew at Concordia University, River Forest. He is the author of several books on the Old Testament and Hebrew and Aramaic grammar, including forthcoming commentaries on Daniel and Proverbs in Concordia Publishing House’s Concordia Commentary Series.
Appropriate Approaches to Planning, Preparing, and Implementing Young Children’s Dramatic Performances
by Robin Rezek

In many elementary schools and early childhood learning centers, Advent and Christmas programs involving children’s dramatic performances have become a tradition. It’s not unusual to observe 30 or more children arranged neatly by height on a make-shift stage each adorned with crooked reindeer antlers and the occasional burgundy velvet dress over one’s head. Nervous parents and relatives are poised with the latest cameras and video equipment at the ready waiting to capture the momentous event. It seems almost sacrilegious to question whether such programs are appropriate for young children. They have, after all, been occurring, probably almost simultaneously, all around the world for at least one hundred years, probably a lot longer. It’s a bold move, but someone must ask the question, “Are formal dramatic performances appropriate for young children?”

The field of early childhood education has advanced significantly during the past decades. With new information comes the responsibility to examine all of our current practices to make sure we are acting in the best interest of the children based on what we currently know about human growth and development and appropriate educational practices (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997). The amount of time taken from regular classroom routines to prepare for holiday programs requires educators to stop for a moment and question the value of these performances. Why do we want to spend so much time at one of the busiest and most stressful times of the year planning and organizing children’s programs? Whom will the program benefit? What role do the children play? Are they involved in the planning? Do they enjoy the experience; or does it cause them stress? Is participation optional or mandatory? Are the preparation activities developmentally appropriate; or are best practices ignored during the program preparation time? Do such programs provide children with a positive introduction to the creative arts; or will children only remember the nervous tummies and the requirement to stand still and cooperate for long periods of time?
These are crucial questions that must be considered. If the answers indicate that the programs are performed for the benefit of adults rather than the children, and developmentally appropriate practices are placed on hold for several weeks in order to prepare for such performances, then we need to revise our approach to planning children's programs. It's important to note that in many cases, Christmas and winter holidays are not the only time of year inappropriate dramatic programs take place. There are also fall programs, spring programs, preschool and kindergarten graduations, and children's plays and operettas. The list goes on. Conceivably, the majority of the school year could be devoted to coercing children to cooperate in order to provide adorable photo opportunities and lots of warm fuzzies for adults.

The truth is, however, that we needn't throw out the baby with the bath water and do away with children's dramatic programs entirely in order to mend our ways. Such performances, when done properly, offer a wealth of opportunity to introduce children to the creative arts in a manner that will be of benefit to all who participate: children, parents, teachers, and other trusted adults. With a little creative thinking, children's programs can evolve naturally out of the developmentally appropriate activities that are already occurring within the classroom. The performance itself can serve as the culminating event to a class project. According to Isbell and Raines (2006), most drama professionals believe that process-oriented drama activities are more beneficial for young children than are activities that focus on the end product. Therefore, it's best when dramatic programs evolve naturally as children participate in their normal classroom activities. Dramatic programs can be a celebration of learning which allow children to demonstrate their new findings through a combination of the expressive arts. Both children and adults can participate in ways that allow them to develop and share their special gifts and talents. Young children learn best through drama activities that are free from the stress and pressure associated with practice and preparation that focus on a polished end product (Brown, 1990). Those children that feel comfortable "front and center" can be given opportunities to perform; while others find ways to contribute in different capacities. For example, preparing scenery, researching historical accuracies, handing out programs and welcoming the audience are all ways a child can participate without having to perform. The focus is on learning through participation throughout the entire process, rather than on performing correctly during the actual performance (Isbell & Raines, 2006). The
opportunities are vast and exciting.

Following, is a description of the process one preschool class followed as the teachers tried to provide a less-stressful, child-centered approach to preparing the annual Christmas program. The scenario takes place in a Christian preschool with a multiage class of three, four, and five-year-olds.

**Three Weeks before the Program**

During the Thanksgiving break, some of the class parents built a stable in the classroom dramatic play area. They provided costumes for Mary, Joseph, the shepherds, and the angels. There was a manger with pretend hay and several farm animal puppets, especially sheep. When the children arrived at school, they were allowed to experiment and play in the center without prompting from adults. The teachers listened and observed while the children's play developed. Some children had definite ideas about how their play episodes should unfold. Others used the materials in new and unexpected ways.

During whole group discussions the children wanted to talk about the proper way to use the stable and costumes. The children who knew the Christmas story were seeking support from the teachers. They wanted to use the center to tell the Christmas story “the real way” not the “made-up way.” The teachers didn’t tell the children how the story really went. Rather, they asked them where the real story could be found. Several children knew to look in the Bible. The children asked to hear the Christmas story as it is told in the Bible. The teachers complied, stopping to answer questions and provide explanations as necessary. In the days that followed, the children began acting out the Christmas story as told in the Bible. Sometimes, one child would serve as narrator pretending to read the story from the Bible while other costumed children acted out the story. This kind of self-directed practice was a daily part of the children’s free choice time. The children negotiated character roles changing parts frequently. Eventually, most participants settled into a favorite role.

**Two Weeks before the Program**

During learning center time, materials were provided for the children to make gifts for family and friends. A conversation developed as one child asked the others why we make gifts at Christmas. One teacher listened and took notes. Later at whole group time, she brought up the discussion and asked the children if they knew why we make and give gifts at Christmas. An interesting discussion followed, but no one really knew
for sure. The class discussed ways they could find out the reason for gift giving. The children were asked to work with their parents to see if they could find out why gifts are shared at Christmas. A note was prepared for parents in order to help them understand this assignment.

The next day, the children came in with all sorts of information to share at group time. Some children told the part of the story about the wise men. That hadn’t been discussed previously. Other children said gifts were shared because it’s Jesus’ birthday. That was also a new way to describe Christmas. Some children felt it was unfair that people get the gifts on Jesus’ birthday. Jesus should get the gifts. Conversation developed around ways the children could give Jesus gifts on His birthday. With a little guidance from the teachers, it was decided that the children could use the gifts Jesus had given to them to make gifts to give back to Him. “We can use our voices to sing Him a song. We can use our bodies to do a dance. We can paint pictures for Him. Hey, our Christmas play can be a present for Jesus…”

The children’s contributions went on.

During the next week, the teachers adapted the classroom learning centers to support the children’s ideas. Some children painted scenery for the Christmas play while they worked in the art center. Others composed songs for Jesus in the music center. One group choreographed a dance for Jesus. Others who had special gifts that couldn’t easily be displayed during the program were videotaped while performing activities such as shooting baskets in the gym; making a birthday cake for Jesus; and working cooperatively with a friend.

**One Week before the Program**

The teachers helped the children organize all of their gifts for Jesus into a special Christmas program. The class decided to invite their parents and friends. Invitations were prepared and sent home. The excitement grew as the children prepared for their program. It was their celebration of Jesus’ birthday, done in their own way using their own creative gifts to give gifts back to Jesus.

**The Night of the Program**

The program was presented in a relaxed manner. Some children performed; others helped behind the scenes or enjoyed watching their contribution shared on the videotape. Jesus’ birthday cake was served fol-

...this time the children also beamed, because the program was theirs, a birthday present to Jesus...
owing the program while everyone enjoyed meaningful conversation in
a relaxed, child-friendly atmosphere. Parents beamed with pride as they
have for generations, but this time the children also beamed, because the
program was theirs, a birthday present to Jesus and an opportunity to
discover and develop their own special creative talents in a way that was
meaningful to them. LEJ
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From the Little Red Schoolhouse to the World: Teaching, Learning, and Safety on the Internet

by Scott Schuth

Teachers and parents alike are struggling to find ways of keeping children safe when on the Internet. Part of that struggle involves balancing safety with allowing children to do what they do best, explore. The goal of this article is to assist teachers, administrators, parents, and the community-at-large in making decisions that help keep that balance in children’s learning experiences. At best, this discussion only touches the surface of what it means to keep children safe while online. It serves as a starting point toward understanding what the dangers are and the support mechanisms that are available. The key is for educators to continue a dialog within and outside of the school’s four walls.

The Language of Children Online

Each generation forms its own identity in many ways. One such way is through developing a language that is relevant to them. The Internet has provided a new venue for children to make use of their language. It is true some of this language is used to “confuse the enemy (parents, guardians, and teachers)” but it is more the result of a sub-culture, that is, an online community. This language also serves to reduce the number of keystrokes necessary to communicate online.

For instance, who would’ve known that there are now 3 (or more) ways of indicating our intention to make eye contact with someone in a future place and time? CUL, CUL8r, and CUL8er are all ways of abbreviating the phrase “See you later.” It flies in the face of teachers’ efforts because spelling and grammar are all but forgotten. It shows, however, an ability to adapt to new technologies by using phonetics to shorten the number of keystrokes necessary to communicate online.

This sub-language isn’t, in itself, an attempt to “confuse the enemy.” It is nothing more than what some call “Techno-type.” The danger of this is when teachers and parents are unaware of this use of acronyms and phonetic shortcuts to communicate online and on-phone. In fact, it’s the child predator who wants to keep their online conversations...
“their little secret.” They are the ones who truly see parents and teachers as the “enemy.” Quite possibly the most dangerous use of this is “W2M F2F?” Translation: Want to meet face-to-face?

Fortunately, for every Internet danger, there is an online resource to help prevent them. The most popular website to help make sense of this alphabet soup is NetLingo.com – “Dictionary of Internet Terms: Online Definitions & Text Messaging.”

On its home page is a library of invaluable resources. In fact, particular attention should be given to the hyperlink, Top 20 Acronyms Every Parent Should Know.

**Focusing Children’s Time on “The Net”**

While the Internet poses many dangers to children, it is equally true that parents and teachers can turn Internet usage into a learning experience. Despite all the bad press the Internet has received, it is a rich resource for children as well as adults. The key is to channel their energies toward sites that encourage them to learn and to have fun. Below are some ideas and websites to “kick-start” that channeling. They are presented in no particular order; they can be applicable to a range of ages, gender, individual or group settings, etc.

**Libraries**

Getting students excited about library resources is a great way of not only keeping them safe while online, it helps them learn to be resourceful in their daily lives. But it takes more than just telling them to visit a library website. Creating bookmarks to the children’s section of the website is important, along with showing them how to make use of those bookmarks. For example, one library’s homepage is [http://www.ahmlinfo/](http://www.ahmlinfo/). To be sure, there is a link on that page to what they call “Kids’ World.” But sending students to the homepage will intimidate, if not bore, them. Whereas bookmarking [http://ahmlinfo/kids_world/default.asp](http://ahmlinfo/kids_world/default.asp) on your school computers takes them to an entirely different look and feel that increases the chance that they will explore the website. Public libraries make excellent use of their financial resources, both in their buildings and on websites. There are features such as access to homework assistance websites that might ordinarily be too costly for schools or families to purchase.

**Entertainment Sites**

Commercial entertainment sites, while not always the best resource for learning, are becoming increasingly a safe place for children to
explore. The Nickelodeon* website, http://www.nick.com/, has a wide variety of links to games, podcasts, and blogs, all with the ability to have these experiences customized with their preferences if they register. The registration screen asks only for a “Nick” name, a password, their birth date, and gender. The key is that the child cannot be identified by the data provided in the registration. Therefore, it is important to make sure students know to create login names that do not identify themselves. For the teenager, Nickelodeon offers a more relevant site as an extension to their cable station “The N” at http://www.the-n.com/.

**News Sites**

Teachers and parents may expect news websites from newspaper and television companies to be a rich resource of information for children. And while that is true, the websites are not designed for children to make effective use of them to retrieve that information. Teachers can take this as an opportunity to help students make use of news sites by directly pointing them to specific places on the website. Another potential risk with news sites is that they often request identifying information from users if they want to make use of “members only” content.

**Teachers as Leaders**

Teaching is challenging enough without the dangers of the Internet. To be sure, parents are a part of the prevention equation and they should be encouraged to be involved in understanding risk-preventive measures. Educators have a clear opportunity to lead the way to that understanding with minimal effort. Success in this area requires that teachers not ignore the dangers, rather be mindful of them and turn them into learning opportunities. One strategy is to take one hour per week (Four 15-minute periods will work just as well) to explore and investigate websites. It is just as important to find good websites as well as those that may have risks associated with them. The focus should be placed on finding sites that are safe and appeal to children, tweens, and teens. In the fight against sexual predators, this means finding more than educational websites. It also means finding entertainment websites that have opportunities for learning. Imagine the looks on students’ faces when they are assigned a website review of their favorite website. With the right rubrics, they not only understand how to critically evaluate websites themselves, they are also providing “intelligence information” to the teachers and possibly their parents.

**Reflection**

Keeping children safe is no easy task. The Internet has added yet
another layer of complexity to that task. The media has made us aware of the more common dangers of children on the Internet. And, for that, they should be commended. Like this article, the media has only begun to scratch the surface of knowledge regarding this topic. It is through awareness of risk factors, such as the online language, and through channeling the curiosity that children have, we are armed with tools and techniques to fend off and prevent the tragedies to which we have become an audience.
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A brief list of recommended websites
www.lsportal.net: A growing "members only" portal to resources for the Lutheran teacher.
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Everyone loves a good story. And all of us have plenty of stories to tell. We teaching ministers are presented with many opportunities to tell our stories to parents, colleagues, and students. But what makes a good story?

Let’s begin our definition of a good story by stating what it isn’t. Generally speaking, there are four fleshly ways to tell about our day, week, month, year, and life.

First, there is tragedy. Our life is hard, but we will make it. We want others to support us and help make our lives easier. We present noble perseverance and rugged determination to do whatever it takes. We come off as victims, as courageous survivors of our tragedy.

Second, there is romance. Life is adventurous and we will seize the day. We want others to applaud us and admire us for our heroic achievements. We present ourselves as the hero, a unique star.

Third, there is irony. This story angle sees life as pointless. We want others to join us in judging others and life with cynicism. We don’t want others to bother us. We have an air of superior indifference about us as we stay removed as a disillusioned drop-out.

Lastly, there is comedy. Life is a party and we want to play, play, play. We want others to laugh and smile with us and keep things pleasant. We will gladly talk about the weather, sports, and share jokes, but we will not venture much deeper.

I suspect at this point recent conversations with friends and family might be coming to mind. It is probably easier to identify the approach others use than our own vantage point when we tell our stories. Ask those closest to you how you present yourself to them. A dear close brother or sister will speak the truth in love.

So what is a good way to tell a story? Exodus 18:7-12 gives us an example:

So Moses went out to meet his father-in-law and bowed down and kissed him. They greeted each other and then went into the tent. Moses told his
father-in-law about everything the Lord had done to Pharaoh and
the Egyptians for Israel's sake and about all the hardships they had
met along the way and how the Lord had saved them. Jethro was
delighted to hear about all the good things the Lord had done for
Israel in rescuing them from the hand of the Egyptians and of
Pharaoh, and who rescued the people from the hand of the
Egyptians. Now I know that the Lord is greater than all other
gods, for he did this to those who had treated Israel arrogantly.
Then Jethro brought a burnt offering and other sacrifices to God,
and Aaron came with all the elders of Israel to eat bread with
Moses' father-in-law in the presence of God.

Note how Moses didn't tell his story. From the text, we do not get a
sense of “Woe is me for these ungrateful, complaining Israelites.” (vic-
tim) Nor do we hear, “You should have seen me with my arms up in the
air during the battle with the Amalekites.” (hero) We do not see that
Jethro does most of the talking and Moses simply shakes his head.
(cynic) Nor do we see superficial discussion about the weather, country-
side, or even how Moses’ boys are doing. (clown)

On the contrary, Moses tells his story as a transcendent drama. God
is the center of everything. Moses invites his father-in-law to see God at
work. And this way of telling stories—rather than leading hearers to
exhaustion and eventual boredom as the four fleshly ways do—leads
both speaker and hearer to praise and worship God.

Telling our stories with God as the main character requires humility
and seeing our life from God's perspective. This is something that, by
the power and grace of God, we slowly do more and more as our sanc-
tified life continues. It is aided by meditating on God's Word as it pene-
trates our thoughts and intentions of our heart. It is aided by loving
believers who tell good stories and make us aware of bad ones. And it is
aided by repenting of the four self-centered, God-ignoring ways our
flesh often tells stories.

Our story is really God's story. He is always up to something, even
and perhaps most especially in our worst circumstances. As Paul told the
Romans in chapter one, verses 11-12, let's be eager to see each other,
swap stories, and mutually encourage one another in the faith. With God
as the main character rather than ourselves, the story will be good.
Communicating with words is such a necessary and basic part of sharing our faith stories that it is essential that we hone in on how best to write effectively in order to tell these anecdotes and experiences. Therefore, here is a list of guidelines to assist in your writing of school newsletters, parents’ notes, church bulletins, e-mails to colleagues, and other vehicles to “communicate good:”

1. Each pronoun should agree with their antecedent.
2. Just between you and I, case is important.
3. Verbs has to agree with their subjects.
4. Don’t use no double negatives. Not never.
5. Don’t write a run-on sentence you have got to punctuate it.
6. About sentence fragments.
7. In articles and stuff like that we use commas to keep things apart without which we would have without doubt confusion.
8. But, don’t use commas, which are not necessary.
9. Its important to use your apostrophe’s correctly.
10. Don’t abbreviate unless nec.
11. Check carefully to if you any words out.
12. In my opinion, I think that an author when he is writing something should not get accustomed to the habit of making use of too many redundant unnecessary words that he does not actually really need in order to put his message across to the reader of the article.
13. About repetition, the repetition of a word is not effective repetition.
15. Last but not least, knock off the clichés!

Okay, so perhaps most of the items listed above will not improve your writing skills, but they do give us reason to laugh at ourselves and point us to the fact that we
live in the forgiveness of Christ who continues to communicate His love for us, in spite of our miscommunications with each other. Each error we make in our writing and speaking is just another sign that we humans are always in need of forgiveness...and that forgiveness only comes through Christ’s life, suffering, death, and Resurrection.

A priest and a pastor were trying to be helpful one day. They stood by the side of a road with a sign that said, “The End is Near! Turn Yourself Around Now, Before It’s Too Late!” As a car speeds past them, the driver yells, “Leave us alone, you religious nuts!” From the curve up ahead they hear screeching tires and a big splash. The pastor turns to the priest and asks, “Do you think the sign should just say, ‘Bridge Out?’”

Even our best intention of communicating the truth is often foiled by how we say something and by what we write. Can you identify some recent examples in your own ministry life that attests to this? I sure can. (Perhaps some of you might even refer to this article and wonder, “What is he talking about?”)

One would think that with all of the communication technology available to us that there would be little chance of being misunderstood in our writing and speaking. But not so. I am reminded of a Nebraska pastor who told the story of his traveling on Interstate 80, going from Omaha to Lincoln. He decided to stop at a rest area. The first stall was occupied, so he went into the second one. He was no sooner seated than he heard a voice from the next stall, saying “Hi, How are you?” Well, he was not the type to chat with strangers at rest areas and he really didn’t know what possessed him, but he answered, a little embarrassed, “Not bad.” And the stranger said, “And, what are you up to?” Talk about dumb questions. He was really beginning to think that this was too weird. So he said, “Well, I’m driving west just like you.” Then, he heard the stranger, all upset, say, “Look, I’ll call you back, there’s some idiot in the next stall answering all the questions I’m asking you.”

Even in the midst of our failures to communicate, we do know in faith that the Lord is working in and through us. Now that’s really good news. We continue to share written and spoken words in order to proclaim with joy and celebration the Word, Jesus Christ Himself. He is with us, in our failures and in our successes, and His love flows from us to those He has put into our lives. This Good News in Christ is just TOO GOOD not to share, even through our wrong punctuations and sentence structures.
Even when we do not communicate well or do not listen well, there still is Hope...in Christ Jesus. Hope is knowing that even when there is no hope...there is Hope...in Christ. And that message can come through even when our verbs do not agree with their subjects and our participles dangle.

A closing story, to hopefully communicate this message of hope and forgiveness in Christ: A DCE was leading a Children's Message during Advent. He asked the little kids, “Now who can complete this Scripture verse: The Word became...” But no one responded. And so he asked again, and again, and again. He was just about to answer it himself when a little blonde cutie said boldly, “The Word became...FRESH...and dwelt among us.”

And she was right. The Word became FLESH in Christ, and now the Word, Christ Jesus, becomes FRESH in our lives and dwells among us as well. Watch for this freshes in our speaking and in our writing, as we continue to tell the story of Jesus and His love.

Now that’s what I call COMMUNICATION. 

---

Dr. Richard Biller, now retired from his position as Executive Director of Wheat Ridge Ministries can be reached at rich@wheatridge.org.
There's a story told by Pepper Rodgers, the former football coach at UCLA. His team was in the middle of a terrible season, and it was upsetting his home life. He later recalled, "My dog was my only friend. I told my wife that a man needs at least two friends. So, she bought me another dog."

Facing the objections and obstinacy of the public is difficult for any principal. Narrow-minded board members, an irate school parent, an uncooperative teacher—all have a way of taking the joy out of the profession. It can be a lonely feeling. However, there are ways for principals to deal with objections so that solutions can be reached.

When someone voices an objection to what you've done or plan to do, respond professionally. Listen intently to the objection being raised. Show empathy. Avoid the temptation to interrupt. Don't become defensive. Simply ask questions before providing a response. Doing so lowers the emotional level of the discussion and increases the chances that the other side will be more attentive to your point of view.

The ability to calmly listen to objections without allowing them to be taken personally or allowing oneself to react emotionally is an art. It can diffuse many potential shouting matches. It's been said that a person can gain more friends with his ears than with his mouth.

When an objection is raised, don't dismiss it or downplay it. Take both the objection and the objector seriously. Ask the person to further expand upon what he's said. This allows him to know you care, and it allows him a chance to more closely scrutinize his own thoughts. It's possible that in doing so, he'll see the weaknesses of his own ideas.

Make sure he's given the chance to express everything that's on his mind relative to the issue. This precludes him from bringing up other related issues at a later time. It also builds the confidence he has in you, as well as his willingness to listen to you.
It's possible that the objection being raised or the obstinacy being displayed has its source in an unrelated issue. Something that occurred long ago could be the cause. Ask the kinds of questions that get to the source of the disagreement.

When he's done, rephrase his objections. Try to summarize them concisely, and allow him to amend your summary.

Whether the disagreement involves one other person or a group of people, getting to the heart of a matter takes time. It may require another meeting time that affords the opportunity for discussion without the limitations imposed by the school schedule.

When the time finally arrives for the principal to air his side of the story, it's important that he does so as objectively, precisely, and low-key as possible.

Don't allow your pride to taint the discussion. Swallow your pride — it contains no calories.

Resist the temptation to quote other people who agree with your side of the argument unless you are sure it's okay with them.

Whether the venue is a public meeting or a one-on-one conversation, the principal has to avoid the temptation to make hurtful or personal remarks, no matter what the other side opts to say. Use diplomacy. Robert Frost once said that a diplomat is a man who always remembers a woman's birthday but never remembers her age. Speaking and acting respectfully also deprives the opposing side of ammunition for further conflict.

If it becomes clear to both sides that the objection was not valid, care should be taken by the principal to make sure the objector doesn't feel foolish. He should be thanked for his expression of care.

It's also possible that after hearing the reasoning behind the objections, you'll agree that you were wrong. There's nothing wrong with that. Take steps to implement necessary changes as a result.

While it's good to come to an agreement on an issue as soon as possible, it may at times be advantageous for a principal to not respond to the objection with words of approval or disapproval. Asking for the time to consult with others allows the principal to gain insight and time. But this can never be an excuse to not act upon an objection. The objector needs to be assured that the principal will get back within a specified time frame.
A disagreement doesn’t have to end with one side being declared the winner and the other the loser. Compromise can be helpful to both sides.

There are some issues that simply aren’t worth the hassle. It’s common knowledge that principals need to pick their battles wisely. A battle over the ethics of something within the school may well be worth fighting. A battle over the color of the new window shades in the office is not.

At some point it may become increasingly evident that the two sides aren’t going to come to accord. It may be best for the two sides to simply agree to disagree.

Principals need to resign themselves to the fact that they can’t please everyone. Issues will inevitably arise in which no matter what a principal does, someone will disagree. As any sports official knows, there are times in a game when no matter what call is made, one team will object. All the official can do is make the judgments as accurately as humanly possible.

Obviously, keeping one’s ear to the ground and proactively seeking the opinions of the various publics can avoid many problems. Understanding the feelings of board members, staff, and school parents allows a principal to reach consensus and make well-informed decisions. When asked the secret for being so successful as the long-time president of the University of Michigan, Dr. James Angell responded, “Grow antennae, not horns.”

LEJ
Think of all the Lutheran educators you have wanted to be. Was it your own teacher whose loving words made such a difference during your impressionable young years? How about the coach who made sure you had court time even though the score suggested that first stringers should be out there? Perhaps your youth director was available at a particular time of distress when comfort and God’s Word were most meaningful.

The impact of Lutheran educators on the lives of children, youth and adults take many shapes and forms. Some serve in schools, others in congregations, a growing number in international settings, and many in non-Lutheran establishments. We are trained at a variety of educational institutions, grow up in dissimilar households, live in diverse communities, and approach our callings with a wide assortment of attitudes, skills and motivations. Yet, the effects that Lutheran educators have on those whom they serve seem to possess some common threads. We are different, yet similar…and closely related.

Consider the ministries of the following ten Lutheran educators. Their locations include Arizona, Minnesota, Indiana, Louisiana, Arizona, Florida, Michigan and Indonesia. The education of these individuals at the undergraduate level includes programs in teacher education, accounting, social work, early childhood education, and human development. Degrees were granted by two of the Concordia universities and three public universities in Kansas, Maryland, and Colorado. All have received, or are in the process of pursuing, an advanced degree.

These ten Lutheran educators serve in the capacities of elementary teacher, secondary teacher, district leader, teacher trainer, early childhood administrator, and parish outreach director. Many past experiences include leadership at the national level, service in the Peace Corps, professional writing and speaking, Sunday school teaching, and service on various boards and committees.

What these ten educators have in common is exem-
plified by the words of those whom they serve: shining example of servant ministry; spiritual witness; effective communicator; role model for students; excellent listener; strong commitment to Lutheran education; leadership is Christ-like and glorifying; servant of God; ability to develop vision; inspired many to use God-given gifts; model of influence as Lutheran educator in the public sphere. Do any of these fit Lutheran educators you know or those who have made a difference in your life? Are these characteristics some which you believe need to be part of every Lutheran educator?

Ten Lutheran educators – different and similar – are models for each of us. God has chosen them to serve in unique and challenging ways very close to home and half way around the world. All have the common thread of answering God’s call to teach the simple love of Jesus and apply it to the lives of countless children, youth and adults entrusted to their care.

CONGRATULATIONS, recipients of this year’s Lutheran Education Association awards. Thank you for modeling for all of us the Christ-like characteristics of a servant-leader. May He continue to bless you, and all Lutheran educators, with continued strength and conviction in our ministry together.

David Ebeling: Christus Magister, Fort Wayne, Indiana
David Weidner: Master DCE, Orlando, Florida
Jim Halsted: Master DCO, Green Valley, Arizona
Cathie Niemeyer, and Liz Schultz: Distinguished Lutheran Early Childhood Administrator, Lincoln, Nebraska
Spencer Peregoy: Distinguished Lutheran Elementary Administrator, Ellisville, Missouri
Corey Nelson: Distinguished Lutheran Early Childhood Teacher, Rochester, Minnesota
Henry Wischmeier: Distinguished Lutheran Elementary Teacher, Columbus, Indiana
Kayla Luchmann: Outstanding New Lutheran Elementary Teacher, Rochester, Michigan
Mitzi Loughmiller: Outstanding New Lutheran Secondary Educator, New Orleans, Louisiana
Sue Van Luchene: Distinguished Lutheran International Teacher, Lippo Karawaci, Tangerang, Indonesia
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