

FORUM LETTER

Volume 43 Number 10

October 2014

Against the stream

Inside this issue:

A series of immodest proposals

Omnium gatherum

5

8



We are well aware that thereby we set our course against the stream of what is currently popular. People want to be entertained rather than instructed. They repeat Pilate's question, "What is truth?" and deride as a fool anyone who dares to assert that he had found the truth and is proclaiming it. The current taste wants nothing but "views," nothing but thoughts "without prejudice," expressed in attractive form. The man of today wants his age to be celebrated as the age of maturity and enlightenment, but past centuries to be smiled at as times of childish simplicity, darkness, and superstition. What was proclaimed as truth in a former day must now be relegated to a pigeonhole of history. . . . The spirit of the age believes that truth is the riddle of a sphinx that has not yet found an Oedipus. What truth there is on earth is parceled out, if not among the different chief religions, at least among the various parties in Christendom. All the various so-called churches are regarded as different branches of one tree, and the varieties of teaching in these churches are simply different refractions of the one sun, merely different colors of the one rainbow. They are all sisters, and only lovelessness and spiritual pride can stoke the fires of discord among them.

But however prevalent these principles have become in our day and however commonly they are expressed sometimes in veiled, sometimes in unveiled form, we cannot subscribe to them. By a divine conviction we believe that there is a truth here on earth and that this truth is contained in God's Word, that is, in the divinely inspired writings of the apostles and prophets. We also believe that these sacred writings have the purpose of imparting the light of this one complete truth to man sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death, and that therefore these writings are so clear that a human being is able to recognize and draw this one complete truth from them. —C. F. W. Walther, *Selected Writings of C.F.W. Walther: Editorials from Lehre und Wehre* (translated by Herbert J.A. Bouman; Concordia Publishing House, 1981), 11-12.

FORUM LETTER is published monthly by the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau (www.alpb.org) with LUTHERAN FORUM, a quarterly journal, in a combined subscription for \$28.45 (U.S.) a year, \$51.95 (U.S.) for two years, in the United States and Canada. Retirees and students, \$23.00 a year. Add \$8.00 per year for Canadian, \$12.00 for overseas delivery. Write to the Subscription Office for special rates for groups. Single copy, \$2.50.

Editor: Pr. Richard O. Johnson
<roj@nccn.net>

Associate Editor: Pr. Peter Speckhard
<pspeckhard@hotmail.com>

Member: Associated Church Press.

EDITORIAL OFFICE: P. O. Box 235, Grass Valley, CA 95945. <roj@nccn.net>

SUBSCRIPTION OFFICE: American Lutheran Publicity Bureau, P. O. Box 327, Delhi, NY 13753-0327 <dkralpb@aol.com> Telephone 607-746-7511. Postage paid at Delhi, NY and additional mailing offices.

POSTMASTER: Send changes of address to P. O. Box 327, Delhi, NY 13753-0327.

Copyright © 2014 by the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau.
ISSN 0046-4732

The land of the free



[Editor's note: The Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod recently sponsored an essay contest open to its church workers and seminarians on the topic of religious freedom in America, entitled "Free to Be Faithful." Associate Editor Speckhard wrote one of the winning entries, and we are happy to offer you a very slightly edited version of his essay here. The winning entries in the contest will soon be emailed to all LCMS church workers, along with an accompanying discussion guide.]

When we citizens of the United States sing our national anthem, we begin and end with a question: "O say, does that star-spangled banner yet wave

o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?" The song doesn't actually end there, but that first verse is all we ever sing, and it is fitting that something so symbolically entwined with our nation's identity should end in the form of a question. It is a question that can never be answered permanently because it is always being asked anew. Every nation is really nothing more than a tentative, provisional answer to the more lasting question of how we shall order our lives together. Empires rise and fall, systems of government work for a while and then collapse, earthly nations come and go. None, including the United States, lasts forever. But Americans always have a chance for renewal because our very patriotism questions our government.

The question in our national anthem expresses two things clearly. It shows that Americans, in principle if not always in practice, value freedom above many other good things. Freedom is more central to our nation's reason for being than other political virtues. We don't ask whether our flag still waves over the wealthy and secure, or the well-educated and peaceful, or the diverse and industrious. Those are great things for any people to be, but what matters most to Americans is whether we are still free.

Not a given

Secondly, by asking the question in our anthem we acknowledge that it is indeed a question, not a given. The flag can stop waving over the free and the brave, either because we have been conquered by a foreign power (which hardly seems likely to us today, but was the clear and present danger when the anthem was written) or because we over whom the flag waves have traded our freedom for something we have decided we value more, in which case we ourselves become the conquerors rather than the inheritors of the free nation Francis Scott Key wrote about. The threat that we will fail our own test is always a clear and present danger because we're always tempted to trade away freedom for something else — national security, economic equality or social progress.

So every time we sing the anthem we put the current state of our nation on trial again. Though we've never lived up to our values perfectly, we constantly question ourselves, judge ourselves; we've even gone to war with ourselves to ensure

that freedom for everyone remains our nation's chief promise and constant goal. The little word "yet" in the question implies the need for vigilance. Does the banner "yet" wave over the free and the brave?

When we implicitly answer in the affirmative, then we acknowledge, to paraphrase Aragorn from *Lord of the Rings*, that there may come a day when the American flag does not wave over a free people, but it is not yet, not this day. Not only do we remain unconquered by a foreign power, but we still seek freedom first (though not exclusively) in ordering our lives together.

The heart of our freedom

At the heart of the freedom upon which our nation was founded is religious freedom. Long before the Statue of Liberty beckoned the immigrant waves of tired and poor with the promise of political freedom and the economic opportunities that come with being free, the shores of America offered refuge to those seeking freedom to worship without fear. This prior promise might be summarized: "Give us your heretics, your nonconformists, your Old Believers. Give us your schismatics, your zealots, your visionary prophets on fire with their grand and quirky visions. In freedom let them build a vast Babylon of little New Jerusalems." Puritans and Quakers, Unitarians and Anabaptists, impassioned preachers of fire and brimstone — all could come to these shores and breathe free, free especially from secular interference.

The resulting array of religions and religious practices in our culture still dominates the American landscape. There is a reason the Puritans set sail instead of staying home, and that reason was the request that they leave. There is a reason portions of the Midwest are covered with Amish farms; the Amish were not welcome in Europe. Freedom of religion even produced a home-grown taste for home-grown new religions, causing Mormonism, Christian Science, and Jehovah's Witnesses to flourish here.

A beacon for Lutherans

This freedom was also the beacon to those who founded the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod. The Saxons did not come here because they were tired and poor. They came here to find a government that would protect their freedom to live their

Christian vision, which was increasingly running afoul of the law in the various German kingdoms. Some of those who would later found the LCMS described the “cause, purpose and goal” of their emigration from Saxony as follows:

*After the calmest and most mature reflection, [the Saxon emigrants] find themselves confronted with the impossibility, humanly speaking, of retaining this faith pure and unadulterated in their present homeland, of confessing it, and of transmitting it to their descendants. They are, therefore, constrained by their conscience to emigrate and to seek a land where this faith is not endangered and where they consequently can serve God undisturbed. . . . A land such as they seek is the United States of North America, where complete religious and civil liberty prevails and energetic and effective protection is given against foreign countries as nowhere else in the world. These States they therefore have chosen as the goal, and, indeed, the only goal, of their emigration, and consequently their new home. [Quoted in Walter O. Forster, *Zion on the Mississippi* (Concordia Publishing House, 1953), 567]*

Is it still the land they sought?

So for us in the LCMS today the question becomes whether or not our country remains the land those immigrants sought, and what would we do about it if we determined it was not? Migrate somewhere else? Where? The world has run out of West. We don't have the same options that those Saxon Lutherans had. But even if we did, we can probably rule out the possibility of simply relocating, partly because there is no more promising place to go and partly because we've grown soft having lived so long in comfortable freedom. Most of us simply are not up for the prospect of uprooting our lives to live as strangers in a strange land someplace else. But despite our softness, or perhaps because of it, our own land may very well change around us, rendering us strangers here whether we like it or not. Thus staying here responsibly means standing up for religious freedom.

In working to safeguard religious freedom, we must not let our nation become our idol. The political task is important but never the primary Christian vocation. If our flag stopped waving, if the United States were invaded and conquered tomorrow, our Christian mission would remain entirely intact. If we could not worship and live in freedom and safety, then we would have to worship and live

in danger. So? Of all the Americans who have worshiped their various gods in freedom and safety over the years, we who do so week after week in the presence of the martyrs should know that freedom and safety are indeed great blessings but hardly essential for a life of following Christ. We give God thanks for the blessing of freedom and we work to preserve it and pass it on, but we dare not become addicted to it lest we citizens of an eternal kingdom tether ourselves too tightly to an earthly realm and our faithfulness wane with it.

Freedom to be faithful

Faithfulness is a spiritual quality. Therefore, this simple fact cannot be stated strongly enough: a worldly government lacks not only the authority but the power to take away anyone's freedom to be faithful. It is impossible. A government can only help determine just how uncomfortable being faithful will make us. A government can change the face of Christian faithfulness from that of normal upstanding citizen to stranger in a strange land, from insider to outcast, or from lawmaker to prisoner, but it can't force anyone to be unfaithful. St. Paul could faithfully invoke the privilege of his Roman citizenship to appeal to Caesar, and he could also faithfully languish in Caesar's dungeon. His freedom to be faithful was untouched either way. Joseph in Egypt, Daniel in Babylon, same story, along with countless others. We, too, can live faithfully, whether freely in a country steeped in the Judeo-Christian tradition or without religious freedom amid post-Christian decadence and tyranny. Our freedom to be faithful is not at issue in a political debate and never can be, because it is a freedom and vocation given us in baptism.

Beware the martyr complex

So what shall we do if for any reason we find ourselves less politically free to act on our faith without government interference? In a political sense we must consider intolerable even the smallest injustice or infringement on freedom of religion. That is a duty to our neighbor and to posterity. We dare not sit idly by while some law erects even minor or token barriers against anyone's freedom of religion. We should use the gift of citizenship in such a way that American Muslims, Jews, Hindus and others know they can count on the people of the

LCMS to stand up for the religious freedom of all Americans of all religions. As voting citizens, we are each a tiny fraction of Caesar and accountable to God for how we use that measure of power. But there are no guarantees of success. Beyond fulfilling our duty and privilege of voting, there is very little else we can do about some of the threats to religious liberty we might face in the future.

As we fight against every infringement on freedom of religion, we should be wary of developing a martyr complex and comparing our plight here to the plight of God's people in many other times and places who worshiped in genuine fear for their lives. Having never faced any genuine persecution, we can be easily tempted to think of facing minor annoyances as being persecuted. But if we found ourselves talking face to face with people who have fled their homes, whose families have been butchered for being Christians, would we really bring up the fact that our government tried to take away the clergy housing allowance tax deduction or forced us to change the structure of our health insurance plans? If we did, I picture the genuine Christians martyrs saying, "Yeah, that's rough," and looking away in embarrassment for us.

Faithful in small things

Another thing we must do if we want anyone to take us seriously when we argue for religious freedom is show why it is important to us. At the very least we should be active in our own churches, and our churches should be active in the world through us. If we can't be bothered to attend church when there is absolutely nothing standing in the way of our doing so, can we credibly complain if it becomes slightly more difficult to attend the church we weren't attending anyway? It will only sound like so much whining and political posturing in the ears of those we're arguing against. If we don't worship in freedom, how are we threatened by the prospect of worshiping in fear? If we don't live faithfully when the wood of religious freedom is green, what will we do when it is dry?

As Christians we have to be faithful in the small things first. If we refuse to come to church unless the music is to our taste, unless the pastor does much more than just proclaim the boring old Word of God; if we explain away low attendance when the weather is too hot, too cold, too rainy, or too nice to

be inside on a weekend; if we think it is a legitimate concern that 8:00 is too early and 10:45 is too late, then we aren't to be taken seriously anyway. Frankly, it is tough to worry about whether such people lose religious freedom when it would devastate them far more to lose their regular brunch table.

In defending religious freedom in the political sphere we must also prepare for the inevitable accusation that all we really care about is preserving a position of privilege for ourselves. This accusation is simply the default argument for people who can't conceive of any conflict except in socio-economic terms of class and power and see everything through that interpretive lens. The gist of the argument against us will take the form of, "There go those largely white, middle class Protestants worrying that they won't occupy the head of the table in American culture anymore." This misguided accusation is predictable but hard to answer because it really serves as an unarguable assumption the critic takes into the discussion rather than as a conclusion. That means we who are constantly subjected to such criticism must go out of our way to demonstrate with our actions that such criticism is unfair, which we can only do by living our faith publicly while zealously defending the freedom of other religious groups to do likewise.

The spiritual danger

But enough of such practical concerns. The primary danger is and always has been spiritual. Will we be goaded into hating those who oppose us? That is the ever-present test for Christians. Jesus prayed for those who were crucifying Him. Stephen begged God to pardon those who stoned him. But despite their example, we remain in danger of growing to hate the people and institutions that stand opposed to us. When that happens we lose the battle in a completely different way than the one that concerned us — not to some bogus law against faithfulness but to a simple temptation toward unfaithfulness. Facing genuine persecution from a genuinely anti-Christian government in the Soviet gulags, the Soviet writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn recognized that the real danger is not in the loss of freedom but in the temptation to draw the line between good and evil between ourselves and our enemies rather than through every human heart.

So even as we thank God for the blessing

that the United States has always been to the Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod, and even as we hope and pray and work to see that the star-spangled banner yet waves o’er the land of the free and the home of the brave, we must pray all the more fervently that God grant us the faithfulness to love our enemies and to pray for them. We will never bless those who persecute us if we can’t even bless them when they irritate us. The earliest Christians rejoiced when they were counted worthy of suffering for the faith. Inheriting the promise of the

martyrs’ faith matters more than inheriting the promised freedoms of America. As citizens and as a fraction of Caesar we work to secure religious freedom for everyone, but whether or not our nation remains a blessing to us and a beacon of religious freedom to the world (and it won’t forever), we citizens of an eternal kingdom have nothing to lose and nothing to fear as we witness to Christ in whatever context we find ourselves. We are always free to be faithful.

--by Peter Speckhard, associate editor

A series of immodest proposals (with apologies to Jonathan Swift)

by Karl Johnsen



We live in historic times. After multiple legislative mulligans, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada have both managed to wrangle enough votes at their respective conventions to sanction the blessing of same-sex marriages. Like many other Lutherans, I was bewildered and dismayed by this decision. But after giving the matter greater thought, I think I have come to understand this new thrust in their ministry. But I must ask the obvious question: Why stop there? This is but the first station along the track. The Love Train must go on! There are fertile fields, ripe for the ploughing. And none is more fertile than the sanctioning of polygamous marriages.

Even now the laws prohibiting polygamous marriage are being challenged in the Canadian courts. The proponents of such marriages rightly point out that the same logic used to justify homosexual unions is every bit as applicable in the case of polygamous unions. Advocates of multiple partner marriage are among us, and are becoming more vocal all the time, as a quick Google search for “Canadian Polyamory Advocacy Association” will demonstrate. The ELCA and ELCIC have gained a reputation in recent years for boldly grappling with the slippery issue of sex, and could be friends with benefits to offer those in our society who are already working toward the next logical step in sexual justice. It would seem strange if those churches who have previously championed the cause of gay marriage failed to hook up with them.

Sexual fatigue

I can certainly understand the fatigue of the champions of sexual liberation in the ELCIC and ELCA. After their recent strenuous efforts there must be a great temptation to roll over and drift off to sleep. But one would hope that they would not be satisfied with meeting only the most immediate needs. Many of their members remain in bondage, and are yearning for release. Having brought the same-sex marriage debate to a successful climax, it would seem reasonable that (after a short break) they should redouble their exertions, and press on until *everyone* is satisfied.

Liberated from the archaic requirement that marriage may only be a sexual relationship between one MAN and one WOMAN, it would seem illogical to insist that a marriage must be only between ONE man and ONE woman. After all, it is apparent to anyone who looks at it that the norm is for people to have more than one sexual partner in their lifetime. It must be acknowledged that, in terms of sexual partners, most people desire multiples.

Just the other day an acquaintance told me about a deal she worked out with her husband. She proposed that each of them agree ahead of time that if the other had opportunity for sexual congress with their dream partner, that it would be allowed. But there could be no declaration of who that dream partner would be after the fact. The person had to be chosen and declared ahead of time. Her husband agreed to those terms and asked who would be her dream partner. She replied “Johnny Depp.” He said “Okay.” Then she asked him who his dream partner

would be, and he replied “That redhead who works at Costco.” Apparently negotiations are ongoing . . .

Mainstream polygamy

But I digress. My point here is that if the ELCA and ELCIC can remove the prohibition against same-sex marriage, why restrict polygamy? It has been around forever, as indeed it is today, except without the benefit of vows. In a sense it is “in the closet,” taking the form of extramarital sexual dalliances. People have to keep these desires secret because the church tells them that acting upon these desires is sinful, and asks them to resist them. And then, to add insult to injury, when they do act upon them, they are actually encouraged to confess these acts as sins, and to submit to the indignity of absolution. What a terrible burden to put upon people who are only acting according to their nature! But if God made people this way, who are we to object?

In any case, polygamy is rapidly becoming mainstream, as TV shows like *Sister Wives* and *Big Love* clearly show. The ELCA and ELCIC had better be prepared to make their move, lest they once again be seen to be behind the times. They run the risk of congregations and budgets shrinking as the multitudes who have flocked to their churches since they sanctioned same-sex marriage begin to become disillusioned due to the churches’ failure to stay on the ever advancing cutting edge.

Biblical basis

There will of course be some hypocrites in their midst who, having supported same-sex marriage, will now attempt to say that just because something is accepted in culture, it does not mean that they must accept it in their churches. But these dissenters will be easily dealt with by pointing out that *unlike* the case of same-sex marriage, one may in fact make a Biblical case for polygamy. Remember Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar? Jacob, Leah, and Rachel? I suppose someone will protest that in these cases what we have is a clear example of patriarchy – the exploitation of women who would not otherwise have agreed to such an arrangement. But let us not forget that Hagar was Sarah’s idea, and Rachel and Leah each gave Jacob one of their handmaids (Bilhah and Zilpah) to be wives number three and four. And it did not stop with the patriarchs either. David and Solomon each had enough wives to

populate a small town.

If we look to the scriptures we can even find evidence that God was okay with polygamy. For example, Deuteronomy 21:15-17 states “If a man has two wives, the one loved and the other unloved, and both the loved and the unloved have borne him children, and if the firstborn son belongs to the unloved, then on the day when he assigns his possessions as an inheritance to his sons, he may not treat the son of the loved as the firstborn in preference to the son of the unloved, who is the firstborn, but he shall acknowledge the firstborn, the son of the unloved, by giving him a double portion of all that he has, for he is the firstfruits of his strength. The right of the firstborn is his.”

While it is obvious that the main point of this law has to do with inheritance rights, the point cannot be overlooked that in this passage polygamy is assumed to be present in society, and it is in no way condemned.

And the theologians

Such theological luminaries as Thomas Aquinas, Augustine, and even Martin Luther all at one time or another in their careers have said that polygamy could be allowed. St. Augustine wrote: “Again, Jacob the son of Isaac is charged with having committed a great crime because he had four wives. But here there is no ground for a criminal accusation: for a plurality of wives was no crime when it was the custom; and it is a crime now, because it is no longer the custom. . . . This was the common practice at that time in those countries. . . . [and] no prohibition existed. The only reason of its being a crime now to do this, is because custom and the laws forbid it.” (*Against Faustus*, Book XXII, Chapter 47)

Similarly, Thomas Aquinas in his *Sentences* states that under certain circumstances polygamy is reasonable, and not inconsistent with the main purpose of marriage. And if that is not enough, consider this quote by Dr. Martin Luther: “I confess that I cannot forbid a person to marry several wives, for it does not contradict the Scripture. If a man wishes to marry more than one wife he should be asked whether he is satisfied in his conscience that he may do so in accordance with the word of God. In such a case the civil authority has nothing to do in the matter.” (*De Wette* II, 459, pp. 329-330.) Then there was that awkward pastoral advice to Philip of Hesse.

Applying this to our time

So there you have it. Augustine, Aquinas, Luther and the Bible all have allowed for polygamy. And in fact, according to the scriptures, in certain circumstances it is even seen as desirable. In the time of the patriarchs the circumstance at play was the need to produce lots of babies. This is not so much a concern today, but this does not mean that we should neglect to consider the applicable circumstances of *our* time. For instance, a number of years ago a woman I know spoke approvingly of polygamy on the grounds that her husband was, shall we say, "more energetic" than she was. She contended that having a sister wife with whom to share certain "chores" could work out quite nicely for all involved. And there would also be someone else to do the laundry. Everyone wins!

Everybody wins

But of course we must remember to approach the authors of the Bible and the theologians of past times with a critical eye. After all, we live in a more enlightened age. They were all men of their times, and as a consequence their views on polygamy are egregiously sexist. Because of their patriarchal blinders, they can only seem to envision a polygamous scenario which involves one man being married to several women. Certainly we would want to rectify this in our day and age. Clearly there are many circumstances in which one woman with several men would be an eminently sensible arrangement.

Here in Alberta, for instance, many men who work in the oil and gas industry go up into the wilderness to live in a camp for three weeks, and then get to go home for one. Just do the math. Four men married to one woman would work out quite admirably. *She* would always have one husband or another kicking around, and *they* would always have a wife waiting at home. Similarly, long haul truckers could make good use of such an arrangement. After all, trucks are expensive. And if the wheels aren't rolling, the truck isn't making money. But two men with one truck could work out a "one week on and one week off" arrangement. The truck would roll seven days a week, to the financial betterment of all involved. One wife, one truck, and two men to split the driving and servicing.

Of course it would take a special kind of

woman to thrive in such a situation. But I am told that they exist.

A solution to divorce

Sanctioning polygamy would also help us through the sticky issue of divorce and remarriage. We know that sometimes things just do not work out. Perhaps one partner or the other falls in love with someone else. What is one to do in such a scenario? Love trumps all, doesn't it? Currently the only option open to people faced with this forbidden love is the ending of one marriage before another can begin. The honest and heartfelt desire of many in this situation is to avoid ending their marriage, and to keep their family together. But within the current monogamist and polyphobic society, people who are by nature drawn to multiple sexual loves have little choice but to sneak around committing adultery, or to divorce.

But what if we did not need to end one marriage before beginning another? St. Paul clearly teaches that sexual intercourse in some sense effects a *de facto* marriage (1 Corinthians 6:16). So why not sanctify what already *is* in fact a marriage, *ex opere operato*? Of course Paul then goes on in that same chapter to condemn such acts as fornication. But as in the case of Augustine, Aquinas, and Luther, we must remember that Paul was a man of his times. He did not have our sophisticated understanding of sex. And (as we have been repeatedly told) he was a hard-bitten anti-sex misogynist anyway. So we may feel free to take from Paul what works for us today, and consign the rest to the dustbin of history.

Let's be inclusive

Finally, and perhaps most compellingly, the ELCA and ELCIC should consider sanctioning polygamy because it is the inclusive thing to do. In every congregation there are people who are hurting, having been consigned to the fringes of their communities. Call them what you will – wallflowers, bachelors, spinsters, or singles. It is not their fault; there just aren't enough potential partners to go around. For years we have heard the proponents of same-sex marriage in the ELCA and the ELCIC tell us that to ask someone to maintain chastity rather than violate Scriptural norms of sexuality is to deny them something basic to being human. Performing polygamous marriages would allow the church to open its

arms and welcome the unloved. Everyone could have a chance at happiness.

What, after all, are we afraid of? Like the miracle of the feeding of the multitudes, if we but share what we have, there will be plenty to go round so that everyone can be satisfied. And if God so wills it, there may even be baskets that are full enough to share with those outside the walls of the church. The world is filled with people who have an empty space inside them that yearns to be filled. Society is teeming with uninitiated members, waiting to be enveloped in love.

An end to all proposals

In sanctioning same-sex marriage, the ELCA and ELCIC have only begun to blaze a new trail. I realize that there will be those voices trying to throw cold water on the proposal to sanctify polygamous

unions. But let there be no shrinkage from the task at hand! They have only made it to first base. But with fearless audacity they could try for second, round third, and finally slide into home! God is always doing a new thing after all.

No doubt some will complain that these proposals will finally put an end to all proposals. That is, they would put an end to marriage itself. They will argue that if we open marriage up to anyone on any terms, we will only succeed in making marriage ultimately meaningless, and that people will then behave without restraint. To such naysayers I can only answer with this: "So . . . NOW it's the slippery slope, is it?"

Pr. Karl Johnsen serves Calvary Evangelical Lutheran Church (NALC) in Edmonton, AB. This is his first (and quite likely his final) contribution to Forum Letter.

Omnium gatherum



An invitation • If you are an ELCA pastor, you probably received the invitation from Presiding Bishop Elizabeth Eaton:

"I'm writing about an important conversation that I need your help to facilitate across our church. The question we have been invited to consider is: Who is welcome and invited to receive Holy Communion in ELCA congregations?" This is a conversation foisted on us by the 2013 Churchwide Assembly. I love the way it's phrased, since it implicitly "invites" us to consider just who *isn't* welcome and invited to the Eucharist. Nonetheless, we should take the good bishop seriously. True to our title of "forum," I in-

vite our readers to write a brief—750 words or less—reflection on this current conversation. Send them to me at roj@nccn.net, and we'll facilitate ourselves a conversation. We welcome and invite non-ELCA readers to participate, since this is an issue that concerns the whole Christian church on earth.

Another invitation • If you're reading this in the pdf version, you still have time to reserve your place at the ALPB Centennial Banquet in Bronxville, NY, October 12. Contact Donna Roche at 607-746-7511 by October 1. If you're reading the print edition, you missed your chance. —roj

Address Service Requested

DELHI, NY 13753-0327
POST OFFICE BOX 327

LUTHERAN FORUM / FORUM LETTER
AMERICAN LUTHERAN PUBLICITY BUREAU

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
MASON CITY, IA 50401
PERMIT #429