“Don’t know why they chose me.” This humble statement sums up exactly why the awards committee at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, has chosen CHI’s director, Mr. Lawrence (Larry) Lumpe for the Christus Vivit award. This award is conveyed upon either a layman or a church work professional whose life exemplifies “an evident and sustained devotion to the Lord and a diligent and effective use of his gifts in support of the church and its mission.”

Lumpe has always had a heart for the church and its mission. Although he did not become a full-time church worker by profession, he has dedicated the past thirty years of his life to full-time service to his Lord. After returning from serving in the army to his hometown of Lincoln, Missouri, he started his career at the local bank. He quickly rose to the top and found himself in Rolla, Missouri, as a bank president at the tender age of 28. He served as president of five banks and eventually became the assistant vice-president of Commerce Bank in Kansas City. He has served as president of the Missouri Bankers Association and on the governance committee of the American Bankers Association in Washington, D.C. In 1980 he retired from banking and put his talents to work for the Missouri District as an estate planner. He served on the board of the Lutheran Layman’s League (LLL) for sixteen years and was the executive director of the LLL for a total of nearly ten years.

From February 2010 to the present he has taken up the mantle of service again, using his time and energy as director of Concordia Historical Institute. He previously served on the Institute’s board for twelve years, four of those as its president. This is not his first time in the director’s chair; in 2001 he was appointed interim director for a year when the position was temporarily vacant.

Mr. Lumpe and his wife, Carol, are the parents of Patricia Hawkins, Cherri Waites and Loren Lumpe, and have five grandchildren.

We join Concordia Seminary in praising God for servants like Larry Lumpe who humbly and effectively serve the Lord in whatever capacity they are placed.
A Story of Missions to Native Americans: Living Among the Ojibwe at Bethany
by Rebecca Wells

A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J, K, M, N, O, P, S, T, W. These are the seventeen letters that make up the Ojibwe (also known as Chippewa) alphabet. St. Lorenz Lutheran Church in Frankenmuth, Michigan, one of the fourteen charter congregations of the Missouri Synod, began mission work among the Ojibwe two years prior to the founding of the Synod. Led by their pastor, August Craemer, this group traveled to America in 1845 with the “noble idea” that every member of the community would exemplify “the joy of living with Christ” through words and actions for the nearby Native Americans to observe. While there was some success with this method of mission work, it was limited. As the community of Frankenmuth grew, the Ojibwe people moved away. God, in his mercy, did not let this end the mission work; it continued nearby under Craemer’s assistant and successor, Edward R. Baierlein.

Born in Poland as Edward von Vilseck, Baierlein was disowned by his Roman Catholic family after converting to Lutheranism in 1841. He was forbidden to bear the family name so he changed it to Baierlein, meaning “little Bavarian.” After training at a missionary seminary in Germany, he fell ill shortly before he was to leave for India. Instead he was sent to Frankenmuth, Michigan, in 1847 to assist Craemer with the mission work among the Ojibwe. Baierlein continued Craemer’s mission work of preaching to the Ojibwe and teaching their children by using an interpreter, but he quickly realized he needed to focus on learning the Ojibwe language—a task for which he was well-suited. His language skills allowed him to learn the Ojibwe language rather easily. Baierlein eventually reached the point that he no longer used an interpreter when preaching his sermons. During his ministry in Michigan, he even developed a spelling and reading book for his students and a liturgy in the Ojibwe language.

Chief Bemassikeh speaking to his tribe

After a year a new mission opportunity arose in a neighboring location. An Ojibwe chief, Bemassikeh, lived with his tribe near the Pine River in Michigan. The chief, though not a Christian himself, asked Baierlein and his wife to come live with them. They arrived in May 1848 and Baierlein called the place Bethany—meaning “house of misery”—because of the people’s starvation due to a food shortage. Baierlein made two promises to the tribal leaders. He would show them the way to eternal life so that they might be happy after death, and he would teach their
Baierlein still had a number of obstacles to face in his ministry. One was nearby whiskey traders who frequently sold whiskey to the Native Americans, which led to drunkenness and hostility not only among the adults, but sometimes among his students as well. Another difficulty was the opposition of missionaries from other denominations. They would often cast doubt and suspicion upon Baierlein in an attempt to get the people at Bethany to convert to their religion. This contributed to Baierlein’s struggle to gain the trust of the adults, which was a necessary first step to sharing the Gospel message.

In addition to working with the people at Bethany, Baierlein would use Bethany as a base of operations to go out into surrounding areas to share the Gospel with other tribes. This work, unlike that of the Bethany mission, was not successful. By December 1851, Baierlein counted a total of forty-one baptized members in his congregation at Bethany, both adults and children. At this point his members were better equipped to stay true to their faith whether facing opposition from unbaptized spouses or other outside forces.

With the increasing membership and church attendance, Baierlein saw a need for a church building. Before he committed to this, however, he endeavored to convince the tribe to settle at Bethany permanently and farm the land. The nomadic life of the Ojibwe had been a major and recurring obstacle in establishing a permanent mission. Church attendance would often be low when many were away to hunt for food. Slowly but surely, Baierlein was able to change their minds on the idea of settling, especially after being asked for advice on how to improve their life of subsistence. After one widow finally built her own log cabin, others quickly followed suit. Then in 1851 a church was built alongside Baierlein’s log cabin. The mission was looking more and more like a permanent village.

Also around this time, another missionary, Ernst G. H. Miessler, was sent to aid Baierlein in his efforts, arriving at Bethany in November 1851. Although Baierlein’s original desire had been to share the Gospel in India, once at Bethany he did not plan to leave that mission work. God, however, had other plans. In 1852 Baierlein was called to India by the Leipzig Mission Society due to their shortage of men in that mission field. After five years ministering to the Ojibwe at Bethany (6 years total in Michigan), he and his family (three daughters were born to the Baierleins during their time at Bethany) left in May 1853 to continue their journey of sharing the Gospel with the unchurched. His ministry in India lasted thirty-three years until his health caused him to retire. Miessler succeeded Baierlein, taking over as the head of the Bethany mission.

The next issue of Historical Footnotes will feature the final installment of this three-part article, focusing on the mission work of Ernst Miessler and the demise of the Bethany mission.
In our previous issue we shared a sketch of the life of August Friedrich Craemer, missionary, synodical founder and seminary president, as we observe the bicentennial of his birth in 2012. That article included the story of his meeting his wife, Dorothea Benthien, a fellow-passenger on the ship that was bringing the group that would found the mission colony at Frankenmuth, Michigan, under Craemer’s pastoral leadership.

Dorothea’s assistance rendered to passengers afflicted with smallpox suggested that she would make a fitting wife for Craemer in helping to care for Native American children at the mission. After assuring him that she would indeed be willing to undertake such service, he asked her to become his wife.

But Dorothea had to reveal something to August that she feared would separate them. Dorothea was traveling to America with her brother, his wife and a five-year-old boy named Heinrich. Craemer had assumed the boy was her brother’s son, but he was actually Dorothea’s child, born out of wedlock. The news did not cause August to change his mind. He was still willing to marry her and adopt Heinrich as his own son. And so they were married the day after the ship docked in New York, and two days after that the colonists started their long trip to Michigan.

Heinrich went on to become a pastor, graduating from the seminary in Saint Louis in 1866. He served as vicar and pastor at Trinity Lutheran Church, Cleveland, Ohio, where he met and married Sophie Wyneken, the daughter of F. C. D. Wyneken, and at Trinity Lutheran Church in Zanesville, Ohio, from 1869 to 1880. In that year he resigned for health reasons and moved to California.

The first child of August and Dorothea was J. Lorenz Craemer, born at Frankenmuth on December 4, 1846. He also entered the ministry, graduating from the Saint Louis seminary in 1869. He served parishes in Charlottesville, Virginia; Waverly and Fort Dodge, Iowa; and Huntley and Decatur, Illinois.

A daughter born in 1848 died at two months of age from being smothered in her bed. She was followed by a son, Ferdinand, born in the middle of 1849. He became a teacher. In 1850 Craemer was called to head the practical seminary in Fort Wayne, where additional children—Wilhelm, Friedrich, Marie and Carl J.—were born. Friedrich also prepared for the ministry, and Marie was married to Pastor F. W. Grumm, who served at Aurelia, Iowa.

Before 1881 the Craemers had experienced only one death in the family, that of the infant who died in Frankenmuth. But in 1881, within two months, three of August’s
grown children and two grandchildren died. The first was Marie, the only daughter in the family, along with her two children. While Dorothea was still in Iowa at that sickbed, their son Friedrich returned from his vicarage sick with tuberculosis. He died on September 19, 1881. A few weeks later August was informed that Heinrich had died on October 28, 1881, in California, also of tuberculosis.

This heavy load deeply affected Dorothea, and her health steadily declined over the next three years. August found her dead beside her bed on November 11, 1884. In the following years, three of August’s grandchildren died within a period of fourteen days.

In February 1888 his son Ferdinand died in Saint Louis after a long illness, and on June 15, 1890, Lorenz died. Lorenz’s first wife had died at Fort Dodge, Iowa, leaving him with six children. He had two more children after he remarried, leaving August with eight grandchildren.

Through all of these sorrows Craemer continued to serve the seminary, which had moved to Springfield, Illinois, in 1875. Between 1888 and 1890 two typhoid epidemics broke out at the seminary, forcing the closure of the school in April 1888. Several students died at the institution and others who had left and gone home also died. Final exams were finally held on July 30. An epidemic in 1889 was somewhat milder.

Craemer’s own health finally broke down in April 1891 at the installation of Reinhold Pieper as a member of the seminary faculty in the newly completed Aula building for which Craemer had worked so hard. His two surviving sons, Wilhelm and Carl, were summoned to his bedside. He died peacefully on the morning of May 3 and was buried in the Oak Ridge Cemetery on May 7. It was said that his funeral was the largest ever held in Springfield, except for that of Abraham Lincoln.
any of you may remember the television show To Tell the Truth. In the show, a panel of celebrities attempted to determine which of three contestants was telling the truth. The show ended with the famous statement, “Will the real [John Q. Guest] please stand up.” Some feel that this statement would aptly apply to Martin Scharlemann.

As we have seen in the previous four articles, Scharlemann was a man of dedication and skill, but it is his connection to the controversy surrounding Concordia Seminary where questions begin to arise. For some Scharlemann is a paradox. On the one hand he was seen as a progressive theologian, advocating a modern approach to biblical interpretation. And on the other hand he was seen as allying with the conservative right to bring down not only John Tietjen’s presidency at Concordia Seminary but also all of the professors who supported Tietjen. As recently as 2007, Ed Schroeder, a professor at Concordia in the early 1970s and Scharlemann’s brother-in-law, remarked in his Thursday Theology (#483 September 13, 2007) online newsletter that Martin Scharlemann was a mystery to be unraveled.

Mary Todd in a section on woman’s suffrage from the book Authority Vested describes it this way: “The formerly moderate Scharlemann had reversed his former position by the end of the decade and now represented the conservatives who once attacked him for his writings on biblical interpretation.” (193) While Todd is speaking specifically about suffrage here, she echoes the observation that a broader shift was discernible in Scharlemann.

James Burkee in his recent book Power, Politics, and the Missouri Synod dramatizes the change still further where he identifies Scharlemann as a “former liberal icon turned neoconservative.” (photo caption)

It was a collection of essays or articles which Scharlemann wrote in the late 1950’s which established the perception that he was a moderate theologian, pressing the Missouri Synod to move away from its conservative roots. One of these was entitled “The Inerrancy of Scripture.” This essay was intended for use among the Concordia faculty to engender private discussion and reflection. While writing this essay was not something that Scharlemann “relished,” he believed “that this kind of undertaking is part of our task—possibly even part of our cross—as persons belonging to the faculty of this Seminary.”

Scharlemann was also aware that this subject could lead to division and discord among the people of God. The discussion on the nature of the Word of God had led to what he termed a “deep crisis in all of Christianity.” Considering these factors alone, it is perhaps unfortunate that he chose to begin the essay with the provocative statement, “In this paper I propose to defend the paradox that the Book of God’s truth contains errors.” For many, neither subtlety of language nor nuance of argument could rescue the paper from this beginning.

Scharlemann’s standing was further aggravated by two additional papers. In April 1959, Scharlemann read the paper “The Bible as Record, Witness, and Medium” to the pastors of the Northern Illinois District, and in October he read the paper “Revelation and Inspiration” at the Western District pastoral conference. These papers were strongly critiqued and a large groundswell of opposition developed. By the 1962 convention in Cleveland moves were made to remove Dr. Scharlemann from the faculty of Concordia Seminary. In response, Scharlemann agreed to officially withdraw his essays and apologized to the Synod in convention for the controversy and discord he had caused. The delegates responded by overwhelmingly passing a resolution accepting his apology and assuring him of forgiveness.

Over the next few years concerns about the teaching at Concordia Seminary continued to be voiced from various corners of the Synod. Periodicals such as Christian News and The Confessional Lutheran actively challenged the growing use of certain theological methods at Concordia Seminary. As the decade of the 60s was drawing to a close two major events would set the stage for the following years’ dramatic events. In 1969 J. A. O. Preus was elected president of the Synod and John Tietjen was called as president of Concordia Seminary.

The calling of Tietjen to the seminary is particularly pertinent to the story of Scharlemann. Correspond-
ence from Scharlemann’s collection at CHI indicates that Scharlemann was interested in serving as the seminary president and that he actively worked to have his name entered into the nomination process. The fact that he was not called to the presidency has led some to conclude that Scharlemann responded by setting out on a course challenging Tietjen. To be sure, Scharlemann did voice opposition to Tietjen’s leadership and direction for the seminary from the outset. Scharlemann, however, would argue that he had begun to have concerns about the direction of the seminary prior to the selection of Tietjen. What is certain is that on April 9, 1970, Scharlemann wrote a letter to President Preus suggesting “that a competent committee of inquiry be created to look into the matters that threaten to deface the Lutheran character of the life and instruction going on at Concordia Seminary.”

Tensions would remain high at Concordia Seminary for the next four years. President Preus appointed a fact-finding committee to look into the issues raised by Scharlemann and others. It is difficult to briefly and accurately characterize all the events which occurred during these years. In very broad terms the controversy pitted the faculty of Concordia Seminary (except the “Minority Five”) against President Preus and the fact-finding committee.

The political machinery slowly moved forward and with several pivotal resolutions passed at the synodical convention in 1973, the newly elected Board of Control for the seminary began to take their final definitive steps. In January 1974 the board suspended President Tietjen and named Dr. Scharlemann to the post for the interim. For some this was the final straw. Many of the letters sent to Scharlemann in his role as acting president are filled with vitriol and criticism. Some of these letter-writers believed that it had been Scharlemann’s goal all along to attain the presidency and this was the final proof. As for the “Faculty Majority,” they protested the suspension of Tietjen and refused to accept Scharlemann as president. Many of the students also voted to protest. They called for a moratorium on classes until Tietjen was reinstated or until the charges against him were proven. The professors were ordered to return to their classrooms and resume their teaching responsibilities by February 19. If they failed to return, they would be considered in breach of contract and they would be fired. The faculty acted on their consciences and resisted. What followed was perhaps the most enduring image of the entire controversy. James Burkee provides an apt summary.

That morning [February 19th], most of the students and faculty of Concordia Seminary gathered in the campus quadrangle. Surrounded by Tudor Gothic buildings and onlooking reporters and photographers, students planted white wooden crosses in the cold ground for each faculty and staff member, and one each for themselves. Leaving the quadrangle, they boarded up the entrance to the seminary with two large frames marked “EXILED” and began a staged march out of the campus that would soon lead to formal separation from the LCMS. (148-149)

For Scharlemann, his tenure as acting president would be brief. The pressure, stress and demands quickly took their toll and he was forced to resign and take a leave of absence on account of nervous exhaustion. He would return to the faculty in the fall of 1974 serving in various capacities as the seminary, now headed by Ralph Bohlmann, worked to rebuild its faculty and its student body.

In the final decade of Scharlemann’s life, he was recognized and praised by various groups. He was honored as one of the Minority Five who had resisted the prevailing mood that was moving Concordia Seminary and the Missouri Synod away from its historic foundations. But questions remain. How does one make sense of Scharlemann’s apparent move from moderate progressive theologian to conservative defender? It seems safe to say that Scharlemann himself would resist this characterization. What was Scharlemann driving at when he stated in his letter to Preus that the “Lutheran character of life and instruction going on at the Seminary” was in danger of being defaced? Was he concerned more with the sociopolitical activities occurring on the campus or was he primarily concerned with theological doctrine and method? Perhaps some of these questions can be answered by a thorough study of his personal papers. Perhaps a researcher will be able to speak with some clarity and insight when the statement is made, “Will the real Martin Scharlemann please stand up.”
To Our Friends of History:

Memorials
Rev. Harry H. Behning by Gertrude Behning
Lillian Wohlrabe by Dr. John C. Wohlrabe, Jr.
Arlowene Wohlrabe by Dr. John C. Wohlrabe, Jr.
Dr. & Mrs. Elmer G. Graul by Richard Grahl
Fran Mildebrath by Eric Mildebrath
Mark Staudte by Mrs. Natalie Wehrman

Honors
Thanks to son, Tom Hirsch, by Mrs. Joyce M. Wolf
Commemorating Dr. John C. Wohlrabe, Jr., by William Kramer
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