Protestants divided

Lutheran factionalism

At Light Pass in South Australia’s Barossa Valley, a pair of church towers could be taken from a distance for the two spires of a cathedral (see Rechner). But they belong to two Lutheran churches, each with their own cemetery at the back, defiantly facing each other on either side of the narrow Light Pass Road. The ‘Strait Gate’ church prominently displays its name with the inscription ‘ENTER YE AT THE STRAIT GATE – MATTHEW 7:13’ as if to remind the members of the opposing synod that they will likely have trouble passing through the narrow gate of heaven, because according to the gospel of Matthew ‘strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leads to life, and few be there be that find it’.1 One of these churches is the Immanuel Lutheran church, originally built by Kavel’s people,2 the other was built by a breakaway synod led by Julius Rechner which formed in 1860.3

1 Matthew 7:14.
3 The breakaway synod dedicated its church ‘Zur Engen Pforte’ in 1861. A new Immanuel Church (which now stands) was dedicated without a church tower in 1886, and in 1887 the breakaway synod added a church tower to house a bell from the Moravian village of Kleinwelka. The Immanuel Synod added an almost identical tower in 1930. In 1960, the breakaway synod replaced its church with a modern structure but retained the bell tower. ‘Strait Gate Lutheran Church’, Organ Historical Trust of Australia.
Breakaway synods characterised German Protestantism. Martin Luther gave Germans the Bible in their own language in 1534 so that they could interpret it for themselves, and this they did. Alongside the Lutheran church emerged the reformed churches inspired by Calvin and Zwingli in Switzerland. John Calvin (Jehan Cauvin, 1509–64) is known for his insistence on predestination and Huldrych Zwingli (1484–1531) disputed Luther’s insistence on the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist at a Marburg colloquy in 1529. Exactly these issues of interpretation were to bedevil Protestantism.

In the course of Prussian nation-building under Friedrich Wilhelm III, several attempts were made between 1798 and 1840 to meld Protestants together into a ‘union church’. In Bavaria, there was relatively little resistance to the church union, but further north resisters considered themselves ‘true Lutherans’ (Alt-Lutheraner) and formed ‘free churches’ (Freikirchen) that became subject to various kinds of persecution after 1817. An 1830 decree on church rites caused particular resistance, and led to Lutheran migrations to the expanding empire of Russia and to the United States, promoted for its freedom of religion. It also led to the first organised migration of Germans to Australia in 1838 under Pastor August Kavel. Kavel had been removed from his ministry because of his opposition to the prescribed new worship order, therefore the members of the first German community in South Australia considered themselves religious refugees with a licence for stubborn dogmatism. Kavel’s people disassociated themselves from the missionaries sent from Dresden in 1838 and 1840 and rejected the second group of immigrants arriving in 1841 under Pastor G.D. Fritzsche. Their irreconcilable difference was based on Revelations 20, out of which some constructed the expectation of a thousand-year Reich, while others were suspicious of such millenarian leanings.

More Germans arrived in South Australia, as well as in Queensland and Victoria, as a result of the failed German Revolution of 1848 and the discovery of gold in Victoria, and the synodal split in South Australia was carried into the other colonies, even though these subsequent migrations were driven by economic rather than religious motives. The pastors required for these new migrant communities were supplied by the German missionary training colleges that supplied pastors to ‘heathen mission’ (here referred to as mission) and to ‘inner mission’ (here referred to as migrant communities). Some had been sent to the Australian colonies for the purpose of heathen mission but eventually became migrant
community pastors (Teichelmann, Schürmann, Meyer, Klose in South Australia, and Schmidt and Eipper in Queensland). Training colleges mushroomed in Germany with different confessional orientations within Lutheranism and also from a pre-Lutheran protestant movement, the Unity of Brethren (Unitas Fratrum or Brüderunität), colloquially called Moravians (Märenbrüder).

The German missionary training colleges

The Moravians, based at Herrnhut in Saxony on the Zinzendorf estate since 1722, became a model for Lutheran evangelism. They were a strongly pious community of dissenters whose lives were organised around devotion, arranged in choirs – men’s choir, young women’s choir, married couples’ choir, and so on. They began heathen mission in 1732 by sending out colonists to the slavery economy of the West Indies to settle as Christian communities, along the Catholic model of monastic colonisation. The Moravian mission effort was itself preceded by bible societies and by the Halle mission established by August Francke in 1705. The Halle pietist movement inspired a number of societies in Germany and Switzerland in a spirit of Counter-Enlightenment ‘Awakening’, which fostered transnational links across Europe and a strong evangelist outreach. In terms of Hegelian dialectics, the Catholic thesis, which produced the Enlightenment anti-thesis, resulted in the evangelist mission outreach as its synthesis.

William Carey, inspired by the Zinzendorf initiative, formed the Particular Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel (1792) and sent Baptist missionaries to India in 1793. Then three Protestant mission societies were formed in quick succession in the United Kingdom – the initially Calvinistic and later interdenominational London Missionary Society (LMS) in 1795 attending to China, South-East Asia and the South Seas; the Presbyterian Scottish Missionary Society in 1796; and the Anglican Church Mission Society (CMS) in 1799, whose first missionaries were German Lutherans. The influential Dr Karl Steinkopf

---

5 Early Bible societies included the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (1698), Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (1701), Deutsche Christentumsgesellschaft (1780), Religiöse Traktatgesellschaft (1799).
in London facilitated their placements. Steinkopf had been Secretary of the Deutsche Christentumsgesellschaft in Basel for five years before he was sent to London as minister for the German Lutheran Savoy Church in 1801 (during which time the French/Italian/Swiss alpine region of Savoy was occupied by French revolutionary forces). From Basel, he had connection with the Religious Tract Society (Religiöse Traktatgesellschaft [RTS], formed in London in 1799) and with the LMS. He also became a member of the CMS and helped to form the interdenominational British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) in London in 1804. As foreign secretary of the RTS and BFBS, he travelled extensively and helped to seed bible societies on the Continent. This German–English network flourished in a period of intellectual ‘Anglomania’ when the royal Hanoverian connection promoted such links.

A number of missionary training institutes emerged in Germany, initially in collaboration with the British mission societies. Here we examine only those from where Lutheran missionaries were recruited to Australia – initially from Dresden/Leipzig (Saxony), Berlin (Prussia) and Basel (Switzerland), and eventually from Hermannsburg (Hanover) and Neuendettelsau (Bavaria). These training centres had different confessional orientations that manifested as tensions in the mission work. Moreover, ‘inner mission’ and ‘heathen mission’ invoked quite different demands for requisite training. The missionary training seminaries were constantly fine-tuning their curricula in an attempt to provide comprehensive alternative pathways to ordination, bridging the gap between barely adequate schooling and higher learning, and providing an affordable shortcut for pious candidates who lacked the wherewithal to attend the theological faculties.

Jänicke’s Mission Institute (1800)

The first German mission school, the Jänickesche Missionsinstitut in Berlin, emerged in 1800 in association with the LMS and dedicated to ‘heathen mission’ (Mission unter den Heiden). Its director, Johannes

---


8 The scribbled sub-headings will help the reader through the following notes on the characteristics distinguishing the mission institutions from each other.
Jänicke (1748–1827), was a religious refugee from Bohemia who had fled from Saxony to Prussia during the Counter-Reformation. He studied in Leipzig and ministered in the Bohemian Bethlehem Church in Berlin, which accommodated both old-Lutheran and Reformed Church Bohemians, so there was a tendency towards supra-confessional tolerance. Jänicke took in mostly artisans and began the four-year training program with arithmetic and writing, but also offered German, Latin and English, and a little Greek and Hebrew. He produced many notable candidates working for the LMS in China, Korea, South India and Namibia.

After Jänicke’s death, two organisations claimed to continue his work. One was the Berliner Missionsgesellschaft, formed in 1824 and aligned with the Prussian State Church. It opened its own training seminary in 1829 and was able to attract the public funding formerly allocated to Jänicke, and to continue Jänicke’s collaboration with the LMS (see below, Gossner). The other successor was Jänicke’s son-in-law J.W. Rückert, who remained doggedly ‘old Lutheran’ and was drained of funding and support. His collaboration with the LMS, which organised and funded the placements of missionaries, became beset by tensions. This competition eroded the strong reputation of the Berlin colleges.

By this time, other Lutheran seminaries had emerged. Basel partnered with the CMS and Barmen was oriented towards Dutch territories. This brotherly division of labour disintegrated as more institutions began to compete for the same funding and placements in the Protestant empires.

Basler Missionsgesellschaft

German pietists, mostly from Baden and Württemberg, formed the interdenominational Basel Mission Society (1815), which collaborated with the CMS in London to train candidates for ‘heathen mission’. The Basel training seminary opened in 1816. The Basel Mission Society was a daughter organisation of the Deutsche Christentumsgesellschaft, in which C.G. Blumhardt, the first director at Basel, had succeeded Steinkopf. The Basel Mission Society had a well-organised grassroots support network of ‘Hilfsvereine’. With these support societies and its

---

10 The Berlin Mission Society only adopted this name in 1908. It originally adopted the name of Rückert’s school, the Gesellschaft zur Beförderung der evangelischen Missionen unter den Heiden.
mission newsletter, the *Evangelischer Heidenbote* (Protestant Heathen Messenger), it conducted public awareness campaigns to solicit donations and gifts. The network extended across Switzerland and Germany as far away as Saxony, draining support from the Berlin institutions.

The Basel seminary offered a three-year course to an intake of up to 15 candidates per year, who had to be at least 20 years old. The LMS sponsored between four and nine places each year, and other places at the seminary were funded by the Hilfsvereine, so that candidates who could not afford a university education could be trained as missionaries ready for ordination. The first curriculum at Basel, occupying 36 hours per week (plus three hours of singing), offered a balance of theological studies and practical skills (each making about 40 per cent of all courses offered) with only minimal language studies (about 20 per cent of courses were devoted to English, Dutch, German grammar and philology). The candidate moved from the more practical studies in the first two semesters – arithmetic, calligraphy, orthography, rhetoric, map-making, non-European geography, bible studies and bible passages – to the more theoretical in the final semesters – homiletics and catechesis, mission history and method, logic, and history of Christianity. The two permanent teaching staff also offered courses in anatomy, botany, surgery and basic medicine, and supplementary instruction in drawing, music, singing, reading, technical work, parish record keeping and ‘interacting with Catholic missions’. It was a pragmatic education that aimed to qualify candidates for ordination in the Lutheran or Anglican Church without extending the full theological training provided by universities.

This shortcut route to ordination caused consternation among German and British theologians. Moreover, some of the staunchly Lutheran candidates (including Christopher Eipper from Basel and Teichelmann and Schürmann from Dresden) refused to swear allegiance to a bishop requisite for ordination into the Anglican Church. The British mission societies for their part also had reservations about the English-language competence of the German candidates. The mission directors of Sierra Leone (where Johann Handt was sent in 1827) decided to only accept native English speakers. For placement in India, the British required at least a grounding in the Bible languages, which were completely absent from the pragmatic Basel curriculum of the first few years. The first college director at Basel, Inspektor Blumhardt, became disillusioned with the demands made from London. He pointedly observed that the fine CMS college in London’s fashionable Islington was equipped to receive
50 students, but had only been able to recruit 12. Blumhardt felt that
the high standards set in London, which arose from the ‘high church’
ambitions driven by the Oxford movement, could be implemented
neither in London nor Basel. He began to develop mission fields for
Basel candidates independent of the British and Dutch mission societies
by sending candidates to the Caucasus, from 1827 to Liberia and from
1834 to India. After 1839, Blumhardt’s successor Hoffman yielded
to the academic pressures. He added Latin, Greek and Hebrew, as well
as English and the option of an oriental language, to an increasingly
academic curriculum, which swelled into a demanding workload over
four years of study, still starting from basic school knowledge (reading,
writing, arithmetic). The Anglo-German Protestant missionary alliance
disintegrated further.

Heterodox grassroots

Placing candidates in colonial missions without the conduit of the
British mission societies further eroded the Anglo-German Protestant
missionary alliance. A scriptural dispute with political implications no
doubt exacerbated these Anglo–German rifts. In 1824, Pope Leo XII
condemned the free circulation of bibles that included the Aprocrypha,
and the Anglican Church, with its aspirations for high church status,
distanced itself from such texts that were not authorised by the Roman
Catholic Church. In 1825, the English Bible Society severed its links with
the Continental ones, who continued to include the Apocrypha in their
translations, so the English–German network of bible societies built up to
a large degree by Steinkopf disintegrated.

The network of mission societies (Hilfsvereine), on the other hand,
blossomed in the German-speaking areas. In the 1830s, the Leipzig
Mission Society corresponded with mission societies in Bremen (formed
in 1819), Lübeck (since 1820), Hamburg (1822), Dresden, Leipzig,
Halle, Barmen, Klemzig, Tübingen, Zürich, Homburg, Weissenfels,
Lüneburg, Calw, Elberfeld, Naumburg and Rostock. Other Hilfsvereine

included Grossmunzel (1829), Hildesheim (1833), Hameln (1834), Strasbourg (1836), Hannover, Stade, Lehe, Celle, Breklum (North Fresia) and East Fresia.  

These networks had little structural hierarchy and were orientated towards international contacts, leaning on the model of the Moravians of the Brüderunität (Unitas Fratrum). Strong pressures were exerted to join the Union Church of Prussia in the 1830s, but since Germany still had no external empire, the state churches showed little interest in heathen mission. The supra-confessional aspirations of the mission networks resulted in tensions between old-Lutheran dogma and Reformed Church aspirations, so that there were frequent shifts in allegiance in this heterodox movement. For example, one of Basel’s Hilfsvereine, the Barmer Verein, conducted a preparatory school to send candidates to Basel until 1825, when it opened its own training seminary from which candidates were posted particularly in the Dutch territories of Sumatra, Borneo, Nias and the Cape Colony. In 1828, this became the Rheinische Missionsgesellschaft (Rhenish Mission Society), which eventually became the largest Lutheran mission society in the German empire (but without direct involvement in Australia and not covered here). The mission societies in Hamburg, Bremen and four other northern townships merged in 1836 into the Norddeutsche Missionsverein and included reformed and old-Lutheran members. In its attempt to enter the New Zealand mission field, it was pre-empted by British missionaries. Like all direct action grassroots movements, this mission movement driven by the personal commitment of pietist awakening and charismatic leadership was fluid and unpredictable.

**Gossner Mission (1836)**

Also in 1836, Johannes Evangelista Gossner (1773–1858) broke away from the Berlin Mission Society to form the Gossner Mission in Berlin. Gossner was a former Catholic who had recently converted to Lutheranism and had taken on Jänicke’s ministry in the Bohemian Bethlehem Church in Berlin. He had a supra-confessional orientation and little patience
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13 Volker Stolle, ‘Wozu war ein konfessionelles Hilfswerk nötig?’, *Lernprozesse für unsere Mission* Nr 74, Evangelisches Missionswerk Deutschland (n.d.).
for the doctrinal enmities that were corroding Lutheranism, particularly in Berlin where Rückert’s old-Lutheran stance emphasised confessional divisions. Gossner did not aim to provide theological training that could lead to ordination. What was required were not theologians but many practical workers – ‘Godly mechanics’ he liked to call them – and his mission newsletter was called Die Biene auf dem Missionsfelde (The bee on the mission field). The Gossner Mission was born with six young artisans who had been turned away by other missionary training institutions. Gossner recruited six more, including Wilhelm Schmidt who was already a pastor in the Bethlehem Bohemian church in Berlin, and personally instructed his first apostolic twelve in Bible readings and hymn singing. Gossner entered into correspondence with Steinkopf in London and with the CMS to arrange placements for his missionaries. Gossner’s very first cohort was recruited after less than a year of training by the Australian immigration activist John Dunmore Lang, to form a mission at Moreton Bay (see Zion Hill). Other candidates in the 20-year history of the Gossner mission were destined for the New Hebrides (1844), the Chatham Islands (1845) and north India (1845) where Gossner churches still exist. The Gossner men were practical, unorthodox and undogmatic. This did not recommend them to old-Lutheran purists who would give up their homeland for the correct liturgy.

Rückert conducted a campaign against Gossner, whom he called an unorthodox competitor, a ‘propagandist’ and a ‘Catholic’. Gossner had no institutional organisation and no staff, so that in Rückert’s opinion it was ‘envy and malice and slander’ to speak of two mission institutes in Berlin. Rückert wrote to the LMS that ‘Our pupils are instructed by six teachers in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, English, History, Logic, Mathematics, Music and the several branches of theological knowledge. They live in my own house and are provided a monthly allowance with all necessaries’. He claimed to have graduated 10 missionaries in 10 years, including Schürmann and Teichelmann. Rückert urged the LMS to support his seminary, similar to the funding provided by the CMS for places at the Basel seminary. Rückert died in 1854 and Gossner in 1858, and the Berlin Mission Society became caught up in disputes over the direction of missionary training, some arguing for more theological training and some for the pragmatic model adopted by Gossner in Berlin and

15 Rückert to LMS, 10 December 1838, Correspondence, Berliner Missionsgesellschaft, Signatur 572, Archiv der Berliner Missionsgesellschaft.
Harms in Hermannsburg (see below). In 1855, the curriculum of the Berlin Mission Society consisted of six hours of instruction per day with six theology courses (Dogma, Epistles, Catechism, Bible Studies, Libri symbolici, Church History), two German language courses (Synopsis, Grammar), three bible languages (Greek, Hebrew, Latin) as well as recitals, church service and a course in ‘South African Mission’. Unlike Rückert’s earlier school, it did not offer English, Logic and Mathematics.

Neuendettelsau Mission Society (1841)

The proliferation of Lutheran training institutes and mission societies with different aims and orientations continued. Near Basel, the St Chrischona Pilgermission (Lutheran travelling missionary society) formed in 1840, and in 1841 Wilhelm Löhe set up the Lutheran Neuendettelsauer Missionsgesellschaft near Nürnberg. This was formally called ‘Gesellschaft für innere Mission im Sinne der Lutherischen Kirche’ (Society for Inner Mission in the spirit of the Lutheran Church), flagging a focus on migrant mission and a more narrow confessional orientation than Basel, Hamburg and Berlin. Neuendettelsau accepted candidates at age 17 and preferred aspirants in their 20s who had to be ‘decidedly confessionally oriented’ (not supra-confessional). Its newsletter, Kirchliche Mitteilungen (‘Church News’), commenced in 1843. The Neuendettelsau institute started as a preparatory school to send candidates to Lutheran theological seminaries in the United States. A seminary for deaconesses opened in 1854, and the new seminary building in Neuendettelsau opened in 1867. Neuendettelsau did not send candidates into heathen mission until 1878 with a first placement to Australia (see Johann Flierl), which opened the way to missions in Papua New Guinea. The curriculum initially comprised English, Latin and Greek, with Hebrew offered as an elective, theological training, writing and oratory, and – in accordance with Luther’s emphasis on music – singing, piano and violin. Since many candidates commenced from a low standard of education (unlike at the Leipzig institute), there was much catching up to do in literacy, geography and numeracy, and the curriculum was often tailored to the requirements of the candidates. In 1878, the textbooks on ethics and dogma by German linguist Bauer had not yet been printed, so each student copied them from the handwritten manuscript. The final exams were marked by sympathetic pastors, and for languages there was no minimum threshold. Candidates who could

16 Berliner Missionsberichte, no. 11, 1858, p. 167.
not afford the 600–700 Mark annual fee were taken in on credit, and could even be supplied with clothing and books by the institute, and at graduation signed for their accumulated debt, which in Flierl’s case was 2,000 Mark. The day began at 5am and ended at 10pm with evening prayer and liturgy, so the days were already full. As the curriculum became increasingly demanding, the program grew to four years in 1892 and to six years by 1913, approximating the training received in theological faculties.

**Hermannsburg Mission Society (1849)**

Whereas the curriculum in Basel and Neuendettelsau mushroomed under the pressure to prepare candidates for ordination, a back-to-basics missionary training institution emerged in a small township about halfway between Hannover and Hamburg. The Norddeutsche Mission in Hamburg splintered off into a Reformed Church faction in Bremen, while the old-Lutheran Ludwig **Harms** set up his own training centre in 1849 at **Hermannsburg**. Like Gossner in Berlin, Harms leaned on the ‘Moravian model’ of missionising, although the Herrnhut Moravians themselves did not yet provide formal missionary training (until 1869). Both Gossner in Berlin and Harms in Hermannsburg provided minimal training in order to send pious artisans (and their wives) as colonists to support a core of one or two ordained pastors.

Harms, too, started with an apostolic twelve, mostly farm boys from the surrounding heathlands of Lüneburg. The earliest group photos show brotherly affection with linked arms and hands. In one image, the heads of candidates are superimposed over figures in dark suits and polished shoes, which these boys most likely did not own. After the first year of study, Hermannsburg was willing to support its students in the Missionshaus. Some brought substantial fortunes with them, including a whole local farm in 1854. Teachers were not paid until this policy of ‘communism’ was abolished in 1870.

The Hanoverian church authority (Konsistorium) refused to ordain the first Hermannsburg cohort because of an insurmountable ‘defectus scientiae’ in their training, which lacked the Bible languages, science and theology. The Lutheran Church refused to recognise the Hermannsburg school as a Lutheran church institution and referred to it instead as a private initiative (until 1977).

However, Pastor Harms enjoyed enormous local support in his congregation. He spoke and instructed in Platt, the local dialect, and was a highly charismatic figure dominating the Hermannsburg township. His deft storytelling sermons and lectures often invoked the devil. Contrary to the church law of 1864, he insisted that baptism must expressly include an avowal of Satan. When he took up his post as Hermannsburg parish pastor in 1849, he conducted a public ceremony in which the parishioners were asked to ‘rise up and speak after me’ a vow of personal allegiance to himself ‘never to divorce from me until God doeth us part’.

This pipe-smoking ‘man of the people’ addressed his candidates as his children. Their strictly celibate monastic life was highly regimented in daily rhythm from 6am to 10pm with 28 hours per week of instruction, and the remainder spent in physical labour, so that they would become ‘as dexterous with axe and dung fork as with book and pen’. Two young men died under the rigours of these demands in the first few years, and those who left the institute were subjected to public chastisement. In 1853, one student died, two left and at least one was expelled. In 1857, three were expelled because they demanded the right to get engaged to marry. They had all had to swear an oath of personal allegiance to Harms and were therefore opprobriated as ‘oath-breaking scoundrels’ (bundbrüchige Schurken). Another 10, who were expelled for demanding changes in the teaching style, emigrated and attached themselves to the Wisconsin Synod. Students subject to punishment had to show repentance, admit their guilt and had to thank Harms for the punishment they received. The patriarchal personal cult surrounding Ludwig Harms had something ‘dark, sharp, and ruthless’ even in the eyes of other Lutherans.

---

20 Lüdemann, Vision.
21 Lüdemann, Vision, p. 42.
22 Lüdemann, Vision, pp. 53, 41.
Harms attracted students from Scandinavia and the Baltic, but had difficulty in forging links with the Protestant mission societies overseas. After four years of training, with no placements in sight, Harms therefore commissioned his own boat, the *Candace* (after the Ethiopian Queen in Apostles 8:27) and the first cohort was sent to Ethiopia in 1853, reputedly on the strength of sailors’ reports that the Galla (Oromo) people would profit from a mission. The Sultan of Muskat (Oman) repelled the missionaries. Harms then turned towards the Zulu in South Africa. American and LMS missionaries had been active in Zulu mission since the 1830s, and they had recently been colonised by Wesleyans (1841), Lutherans from Stavenger in Norway (1845), Lutherans from Berlin (1847) and Anglicans (1850). Harms sent 40 candidates between 1856 and 1860 and called his first Zulu mission ‘Hermannsburg’. From Hermannsburg in Hanover, Harms held the micromanagement of the Zulu missions where it was a requirement that if Zulu parents left the mission, their children would still be detained. The missionaries themselves were equally subject to discipline, and observers were astounded that ‘a dozen families live in one large dwelling and eat at a common table, having all their affairs, with the concerns of the entire mission, managed by a single person’. The experiment was ‘watched with the deepest interest by Christians throughout the world’.23

Harms forged his own theology with little difference between his own opinion and God’s word, and other pastors considered his sermons divisive, polarising and factionalist.24 Harms enjoined his students not to engage in supra-confessional laxities:

> We Lutherans have the purest and most unadulterated confession. This is why I do not want you to have a confessional union with Catholics and Reformed Protestants. You are not to enter into a union with the others, but we shall remain unshakably true to our confession.25

This dogmatism of Hermannsburg candidates continued to fester in the Australian mission effort.

---

Herrnhut Mission College (1869)

Following the example of other mission societies (who themselves emulated the Moravian model), the German Moravian Brethren also opened a missionary training college at Niesky near Herrnhut in 1869 to prepare candidates for ordination. It only accepted members of the Moravian community who were already well educated, mostly at the Moravian Kleinwelka school where Latin, Greek, Hebrew, German, French and English was taught to boys and girls.

The mission training curriculum was much less demanding than at other colleges, with instruction in the mornings and on two afternoons, and a strong emphasis on English as the only foreign language. In 1889, only four new candidates entered, bringing the cohort to 15, and the following year eight candidates were sent into mission and two new students accepted, so the college cohort was very small. But considering the small pool from which the students were drawn, the uptake was enormous.

The Moravian community was much less grounded in Germanness than the Lutherans and had strong sister communities in Ireland and England. This facilitated their entry into the emerging colony of Victoria through the conduit of Charles La Trobe, the superintendent of the Port Phillip district since 1839 and first lieutenant-governor of Victoria in 1851. The Moravians also forged a solid working relationship with Scottish Presbyterians in Australia. One of their prominent missionaries, Friedrich Hagenauer, became Protector of Aborigines in Victoria, and advised the Queensland Government on mission policy in the 1880s, where Nicolas Hey became missionary at Mapoon in 1891.

Factionalism in mission

The confessional differences in the training background of migrant pastors and missionaries rippled through the Lutheran communities in Australia and prevented them from forming a united Lutheran church in Australia until 1966. Their mission efforts, too, were divided by confessional disputes instead of galvanised by a common purpose.

Neither were Lutherans in Australia able to forge a working relationship with the Moravians. A Moravian congregation led by Daniel Schondorf established itself at Bethel in 1854, close to the first Lutheran communities in the Barossa Valley. They invited the nearby Lutheran congregations
for their annual mission festivals, but without response. One of the lay members of the Immanuel Synod once asked for clarification whether it was actually ‘forbidden to attend the mission festival in Bethel’. It was not exactly forbidden, just not encouraged, in the interest of ecclesiastic conscience, to fraternise with people who had a different point of view. The Immanuel Synod minuted:

> We have received an invitation from Pastor Buck of the Moravian Brethren to be present next Sunday at a Mission Festival in Bethel. Since the point of view of our Church separates us from the Moravian Brethren, the Pastors on the c’ttee were inclined not to accept this invitation, whereas the lay brethren spoke in favour, not, indeed, of the chairman’s taking part, but that one of our missionaries should go. Although in the course of the discussion the point of view gradually gained the upper hand, that it could not be wrong to meet the Moravian Brethren halfway in this sphere of common activity, especially since they invited us because of this common interest, yet the voice of the ecclesiastic conscience gained the upper hand, and the invitation was declined.

Actually, the South Australian Lutherans had already formed their own mission society (Hilfsverein) in 1853 to raise money for missionary training and heathen mission and initially directed the funds raised from their mission festivals to Leipzig (presumably because the first four South Australian missionaries came from the Dresden Mission Society, which had been shifted to Leipzig). From 1861, the South Australians began to divide their donations between Leipzig and Hermannsburg. This was just when Hermannsburg was gaining a reputation for its Zulu mission, and its mission festivals were attended by between 10,000 and 20,000 people from all over Europe. Also in that year, John King was rescued at Cooper’s Creek in Central Australia and the idea of an Australian inland mission quickly gained currency. Gippsland in Victoria, too, was simultaneously colonised in 1862 by the Anglican Church with a mission at Lake Tyers and the Moravian effort in the same year to commence a mission at Mafra (which later took root at Ramahyuck).
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26 Immanuel Synod, Mission Committee Meetings: Kaibels’ notes, 1901–14, 25 September 1902, Lutheran Archives Australia (LAA).
27 Immanuel Synod, Mission Committee Minutes, 1895–1901 (translated), 24 October 1900, LAA.
28 Der Lutherische Kirchenbote, 2 February 1905, Biographical Collection, Schoknecht Rev. CHM, LAA.
The rush to the interior (Kopperamanna and Killalpaninna, 1866)

The Australian interior was becoming the subject of speculative interest as the new colonies of South Australia and Victoria vied with each other for the untapped potential of the north and offered cash prizes for inland exploration. After the failure of the Burke and Wills expedition to the Gulf of Carpentaria sponsored by the Victorian Government in 1860, the South Australian Government sponsored another attempt in 1862. As a result of Stuart’s successful overland exploration from Adelaide, the Northern Territory was given over to South Australia in 1863. Thomas Elder established Beltana station in 1862 and imported camels and Afghan camel drivers as a supply line for this newly tapped interior. A truly grandiose idea was to install the world’s latest telecommunication technology right across the continent. Melbourne and Adelaide were already connected to each other by telegraph, but a link to Europe was a daring leap ahead. Massive public works along the south/north axis led to the discovery of gold, so the township of Darwin was officially proclaimed in 1870, and its first Chinese coolies were imported in 1875. The 3,200 km telegraph line, connected to an undersea cable to Java, was completed in 1872, and in 1878 construction began on a north–south railway line (which reached Alice Springs in 1929 and Darwin in 2003). Alfred Howitt had found the only surviving member of Burke and Wills party, John King, sustained by Dieri people at Cooper’s Creek in September 1861, which gave rise to the idea that this must be a fertile soil for mission.

The Victorian Moravians lodged an application for a mission site with the Victorian Government, but this was declined in 1863, presumably because South Australia had just been granted the administration of the northern territory.29 Regardless, four Moravian missionaries (Kramer, Meissel, Kühn and Walder) arrived from Herrnhut in Germany in November 1864 with the brief to set up an inland mission at Cooper’s Creek as an extension of the promising Moravian mission effort already underway in Victoria. Prolonged drought prevented their inland expedition, so they

---

attached themselves to various Moravian missions in Victoria until mid-1866, when the call for action came from Melbourne to gather them at Bethel in the Barossa Valley and commence their mission enterprise.\textsuperscript{30}

The Moravians already had good credentials with Australian mission, but at the same time South Australian Lutherans also put together a missionary expedition for Cooper’s Creek to found the ‘first mission in the interior’, a much publicised joint initiative of the two Lutheran synods at Light Pass: the South Australian Synod (ELSA)\textsuperscript{31} and the Immanuel Synod. They approached Ludwig Harms at the Hermannsburger Missionsgesellschaft (HMG) in early 1863 (the year when the Moravians also lodged their application). Harms agreed to support the venture on the condition that he would have full control. Any surplus funds raised by the mission committee were to be channelled to the HMG to support the training of further missionaries, since a heathen mission was not to accumulate capital. A new mission house had just been completed at Hermannsburg (HMG) and Harms now expected to be able to send out 24 missionaries every second year, so that new mission fields were welcome, and the India mission commenced in 1864. In August 1866, four HMG pastors arrived in South Australia, two destined for the German communities and two for the new mission, Johann Friedrich Goessling and Ernst Homann,\textsuperscript{32} accompanied by lay helper Hermann Heinrich Vogelsang, also from the HMG. None of the South Australian mission committee members had ever been in the area near Cooper’s Creek. To provide local knowledge, a South Australian lay helper, Ernst Jakob, joined the three newcomers and their triumphal procession left Tanunda on 9 October 1866 and progressed at pilgrim speed, covering 20 km per day.

The two competing mission groups arrived at Cooper’s Creek within days of each other, and with the help of the local police constable selected sites within 16 km of each other. They were both unwelcome and had to flee several times from threats of an attack by the Dieri people.


\textsuperscript{31} This was the synod that grew out of the second group of German arrivals in South Australia centred on Pastor Fritzche at Lobethal near Adelaide and Pastor Meyer at Bethanien in the Barossa Valley. This synod first called itself the Bethanien-Lobethal Synodalverband, then the South Australian Synod, later the Evangelical-Lutheran Synod of Australia (ELSA), which became the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia (UELCA, 1921–66) or VELKA (Vereinigte Evangelische Luthersche Kirche in Australien). It joined the Lutheran Church of Australia at its formation in 1966.

The Moravians (Kramer, Walder and Meissel) gave up their Kopperamanna station after two years of fear and uncertainty, but the Lutherans regrouped and managed to form a longstanding mission among the Dieri at Cooper’s Creek (which until 1875 they also called Hermannsburg but is part of the history of Killalpaninna). They also took on the Kopperamanna station left by the Moravians. Homann remained until 1872, and another HMG Pastor, Carl Schoknecht, stayed until 1873.

The cooperation between the two South Australian synods supporting the venture collapsed when the Immanuel Synod sought unification with a Victorian Lutheran synod, which led to a great deal of rankling. The candidates sent from the HMG had all joined the ELSA since the Immanuel Synod was accused of tending towards chiliasm, which was anathema to the HMG dogma. Over the heads of the mission committee, the HMG director Theodor Harms recalled the only remaining ordained missionary from Cooper’s Creek. Mission superintendent G.A. Heidenreich of Tanunda (also a HMG graduate) wrote to Schoknecht at Cooper’s Creek:

Hold out until the mission festival, then we will see who has the say. Don’t go before that or they [Immanuel Synod] will have won the game, as they want to grab all the mission property for themselves … I have also sent a copy of the circular to W. Harms and given him the necessary details, but mainly that we can no longer have fellowship with Rechner [president of Immanuel Synod] … Today I am with Oster [president of ELSA] and we are agreed that this mission [Cooper’s Creek] should cease, even if W. Harms [HMG] should intervene, for now we are acting from conviction.33

After Schoknecht’s departure the Cooper’s Creek mission was without an ordained missionary, and the government demanded that a qualified teacher must be stationed at the mission. In 1874, the two synods agreed to divide up the mission property between themselves. At Easter 1875, the General Conference of the Immanuel Synod minuted:

33 Heidenreich to Carl Schoknecht, 13 August 1873, Biographical Collection, Schoknecht Rev CHM, LAA.
Pastor Rechner informed the gathering that at last a definite decision had been reached concerning both synods with reference to the mission, namely that the two synods go their own separate ways. He added that this separation had not been brought about by us.34

The Immanuel Synod obtained help from the Neuendettelsau Mission Society to continue the Cooper’s Creek mission at Lake Killalpaninna (which they called Bethesda mission).

The ELSA received the larger part of the Cooper’s Creek mission property, including the livestock, and commenced the Hermannsburg mission among the Aranda in 1875, again under HMG direction, with HMG staff and with Heidenreich as mission superintendent. The mission property was to be held in common between the ELSA and the HMG, but in case the mission had to be abandoned, all property would fall to the HMG. This agreement was to lead to immense tensions when the ELSA withdrew from the venture in 1894 over a rift developing with the HMG.

In an effort to gain English-speaking missionaries, the ELSA had begun to collaborate with the American Missouri Synod in 1879 and to send its Australian candidates there for training (until the Concordia College opened in Adelaide in 1890). Missouri provided candidates for the Australian missions without claiming ultimate control over them, unlike the HMG. However, the Missouri Synod took the position on predestination that some men were destined by God to be saved and others to be damned; in 1881, Theodor Harms publicly attacked this position as too close to the Reformed state church from which he had separated.35 This drew the ELSA into a division over allegiance to either the HMG or Missouri.

The final blow came when in 1890 the HMG, now directed by Egmont Harms and Georg Haccius, made a controversial rapprochement with the state church to facilitate collaboration on overseas missions by agreeing to mutually admit their members to the Lord’s Supper. By now
over 20 – that is, a quarter of all the Lutheran pastors in Australia – had come from the HMG and the narrow dogmatism of the early HMG had been imported into the Australian Lutheran community. In 1892, most of the ELSA pastors who had come from the HMG favoured severing the ELSA’s relationship with the HMG and by 1895 only four ELSA pastors defended the HMG, two of whom were immediately excluded from the ELSA. In effect, the disputes that had arisen from German nation-building had now lost their salience in Germany, but were maintained in the colonies, since they had always been packaged as confessional rather than political issues.

Severing links with the HMG meant that the ELSA withdrew from the Hermannsburg mission in central Australia, which was offered for sale to the Immanuel Synod. In the sales negotiations, the ELSA wanted to claim half of the assets, while the HMG wanted to claim two-thirds. Mission superintendent Heidenreich remained so committed to the HMG that he was also excluded from the ELSA in 1902 along with his son who had just graduated from the HMG. These two then formed a splinter synod called ELSA aaG, meaning ‘Evangelisch-Lutherische Synode von Australien auf alter Grundlage’ (‘along original lines’).36

The Immanuel Synod acquired Hermannsburg mission and its remaining HMG staff were replaced by the Neuendettelsau graduate Carl Strehlow. Carl Strehlow was succeeded in 1922 by another HMG alumni, Friedrich Wilhelm Albrecht, who stayed for 35 years, but this time the HMG made no claims on directing the mission.

This rush to the interior was not the only embarrassing competition between German Protestant missions glossed over in their histories. Much the same rifts as occurred in South Australia were repeated in Queensland, and there, too, they led to a splintering of the mission effort.

36 This became the Australian district of the Ohio Synod in 1910, which grew to six parishes with seven pastors, including three from the HMG (Heidenreich Jr, Ph. Scherer and W. Roehrs coming via Ohio). In 1926, the ELSA aaG splinter synod finally joined the Lutheran Church of Australia formed in 1921. Weiss index, LAA.
The conquest of north Queensland (Cape Bedford, Mari Yamba, Bloomfield, 1885–87)

Even before Queensland became an independent colony in 1859, by 1855 more than a quarter of the new arrivals in Moreton Bay were Germans. During the 1860s, as migration to the new colony buoyed with the help of paid migration agents, Germans migrants flooded into the Moreton Bay region and its hinterland, and the demand for Lutheran pastors could not be met from Germany. The pioneers of the disbanded Zion Hill mission were becoming pioneers of free settlement, and five of them achieved ordination as Lutheran, Presbyterian, Baptist or Methodist pastors after attending J.D. Lang’s Australian college established in 1850.

One of the five, Gottfried Hausmann (later Godfrey Haussmann), proved to be a true Gossner disciple who attended the interdenominational prayer meetings of Wesleyans, Free Methodists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians. This supra-confessional orientation clashed with the Lutheran confessionalism of many German migrants. Hausmann was ordained in the Presbyterian Church in 1853 and began to instruct and ordain at least five other candidates between 1866 and 1875. This caused a furore among Australian Lutherans, so that one of the pastors ordained by Hausmann was struck off the roll of Lutheran ministers. He then registered as the only minister of the ‘Congregational Lutheran Church’, the only one of its kind, probably in the world. Hausmann spent a period as migrant pastor in Germantown in Victoria, but was rejected by the congregation because of his ‘unorthodox’ and ‘unconfessional’ teachings. Back in Queensland during the 1860s, while its frontier war was in full force, Haussmann tried to uphold the idea of Aboriginal mission, and made two attempts at Beenleigh (Bethesda) and Nerang with the idea to train

38 Wagner, Niqué, Haussmann, Gerler and Gericke achieved ordination.
40 ‘The LAA’s Weiss index of Lutheran pastors in Australia records for Christian Berndt: ‘As a result of controversy with Pastor Haussmann his name was struck off the roll of Lutheran ministers. He was then registered as a “Congregational Lutheran” minister in Queensland and served the only “Congregational Lutheran Church” in Australia (and most likely the world) at Hillside (Hatton Vale). He was married, but no details are available’. Haussman ordained the Gossner-trained candidates F. Copas (1865), F.W. Burghardt (1866), C. Gaustadt (1869), A.D. Hartwig (1875) and C. Berndt (1876). Weiss index, LAA.
41 Weiss index, LAA.
Aboriginal workers for the plantation-style agriculture that was emerging in Queensland. Hausmann was unable to galvanise the support of his fellow Germans, led by several HMG pastors who distrusted Hausmann’s supra-confessional orientation. Hausmann's Bethesda plantation mission ended in 1881. A similar plantation initiative in Mackay undertaken by George Bridgman was also failing. At the instigation of the HMG alumni Gottfried Hellmuth at Beenleigh and Georg Heuer in Mackay, four new HMG candidates arrived in Queensland in 1883 with a view to setting up a Lutheran mission, perhaps at Mackay or Beenleigh, both centres of plantation farming (perhaps to pick up from the abandoned efforts of Hausmann or Bridgman). But nothing eventuated until both the Victorian Moravians and the South Australian Immanuel Synod were expressing an interest in a north Queensland mission.

In Victoria, the stations at **Ebenezer** (since 1858) and **Ramahyuck** (since 1863) were gaining the Moravians a reputation for success with Aboriginal mission. Their mission president in Australia, Friedrich August Hagenauer, formally a member of the Presbyterian Church, visited Queensland in 1885, where South Sea Islanders were getting imported in the ‘black-birding’ trade that stained Queensland’s international reputation. Hagenauer entered into negotiations with the Queensland Government and convinced it of the likely success of Aboriginal missions that could train Aboriginal labour to replace the imported workforce.

Hagenauer did not find the support offered by the Queensland Government sufficient to risk a mission effort so far north and withdrew from the idea. But the Queensland Government had already progressed the idea of a mission in north Queensland’s Daintree rainforest to prevent the unsupervised mixing of Aboriginal people with Chinese and Malay tin miners and plantation workers. A secular ‘mission’ at **Bloomfield** opened in early 1886 with a government subsidy of £300. The Queensland Government now found itself saddled with an expensive mission that it had to fund itself.

At the same time as Hagenauer publicised the interest of the Moravian church in a north Queensland mission, the Queensland Lutherans attempted to form a local synod, with the result that they formally split

---

42 The only other attempt in Queensland during the 1860s was at Somerset (1867–68). Edward Fuller began itinerant missions at Fraser Island and elsewhere in 1871.
along much the same lines as the South Australian ones. One of the synods formed in 1885 was the Evangelical-Lutheran Synod of Queensland (ELSQ), the other was the United German and Scandinavian Lutheran Synod of Queensland (UGLSSQ), an HMG-leaning synod led by Gottfried Hellmuth, one of the pastors sent from the HMG for German migrants in 1866, and including several Scandinavian pastors who were also HMG trained.

Soon afterwards, in November 1885, the Neuendettelsau graduate Johann Flierl arrived from Cooper’s Creek in north Queensland (see Chapter 3) and asked the Lutheran synods to support a north Queensland mission. Since Flierl already had the support of the Immanuel Synod, which was suspected of chiliasm, the UGSLSQ quickly decided to form its own mission instead, at Mari Yamba near Proserpine. They gained the use of a reserve on the Andromache River and a government subsidy of £120 per annum, and the mission commenced in 1887. By 1888, the chair of the mission committee, HMG alumni J.F. Gössling, one of the pioneers of the Cooper’s Creek mission, announced that he was unable to work with pastor Martin Doblies from Breklum who had now joined the Mari Yamba mission. The UGSLSQ disintegrated in 1889 under tensions between the German and Danish members, the latter feeling under-represented in its governance. This meant the failure of Mari Yamba.

However, the Immanuel Synod, at the instigation of Flierl, launched into a mission near Cooktown, at Cape Bedford (Hopevale) to which we will return in Chapter 3. In 1887, they also reluctantly took on Bloomfield mission (splitting responsibility for the two mission stations between the Immanuel Synod for Bloomfield and Neuendettelsau for Cape Bedford), and in 1902 the remaining residents of Mari Yamba were relocated to Cape Bedford mission, though many escaped the removal.

When the Moravians began to form mission stations on the west side of Cape York Peninsula beginning with Mapoon in 1891 and Weipa in 1898, Johann Flierl suspected that the Moravians, acting in unison with the Presbyterian Church, were getting a better deal from the government and gingerly asked Hagenauer for ‘advice’ in 1898. Hagenauer assured Flierl that ‘the English committees were by no means better treated’

---

44 Evangelische Lutherische Synode Queenslands (Evangelical-Lutheran Synod of Queensland) was formed in 1885 and later became part of VELKA and in 1921 part of UELCA, and in 1966 part of the Lutheran Church of Australia. Weiss index, LAA.
45 United German and Scandinavian Lutheran Synod of Queensland, 1885–1921.
than those that might be regarded as foreigners. He explained that the Constitution Acts made no provision for landownership with secure title except through purchase, which was much too expensive for mission societies, so there was no way around the uncertainties of investing in buildings and improvements on insecure land.46

Precisely this issue emerged at this time in Western Australia. The Trappists were removing themselves from Beagle Bay and its surrounding mission camps, and sought to recoup their investments from the Pallottines who were taking over the Kimberley missions, while the authorities of church and state argued that the property was held in trust for Aboriginal people and did not belong to the Trappists (see Chapter 3).

Conclusion

Political turmoil and poverty in the German states propelled waves of migration, fuelled by the available shipping routes and the active recruitment of German migrants by paid migration agents of the various Australian colonies. After the first community of religious refugees arrived in 1838 under Pastor Kavel, the German ranks in the Australian colonies were quickly swelled with draft-resisters, political refugees, 49ers from America and economic migrants. As Philip Holzknecht observes, their pastors reproduced the diversity in Germany of old-Lutheran, reformed Lutheran, pietist, confessionalist and supra-confessional orientations and formed ‘a gaggle of synods’ often in close competition and proximity to each other. They disagreed on interpretations of the Augsburg Confession, on the role of lay preachers, on millenarianism, on relations with the Prussian State Church and on transubstantiation, but mostly they had personal clashes cloaked as doctrinal disputes.47

46 Letter from Hagenauer, Board for Protection of Aborigines, Melbourne, to Flierl, 24 November 1898, filed in Reuther, Georg, 1861–1912, Persönliche Korrespondenz, Vorl. Nr. 4.93/5, 1.6. 35, Archiv de Neuendettelsauer. Hagenauer refers to the Acts establishing the Australian colonies such as the Victoria Constitution Act 1855 (UK), South Australia Act 1834 (UK), and the Constitution Act 1867 (Qld) preparing for the establishment of Queensland.
47 Holzknecht, ‘A priesthood of priests’.
Differences emerged immediately among the South Australian Lutherans and between them and the missionaries trained in Dresden, as Christine Lockwood explains.  But the HMG features centrally in the rifts that emerged among Australian Lutherans. Its first pastors arrived in 1866, and two of these, Georg Adam Heidenreich in South Australia and Carl Gottfried Hellmuth in Queensland, each formed splinter synods. HMG pastors became involved in the Cooper’s Creek mission (1866–74), at Hermannsburg mission (1875–94) and at Mari Yamba (from 1887–93), and all three missions were troubled by confessional splintering that arose from the different confessional training of the pastors.

The profusion of Lutheran mission societies, which led to a range of Lutheran training seminaries, was of course accompanied by the growth of mission societies of other denominations, so the whole picture is even more complex and more dynamic than represented here. This chapter only examined those training seminaries that were not Anglophone and that became active in Australia. Andrew May adds that in Britain the Baptist Bristol Academy has operated since about 1795, the Gosport Missionary seminary of the LMS since 1800, the CMS college at Islington since 1825, and the Welsh Bala College since 1837. The Catholic Church responded with apostolic societies dedicated to mission work, as described in Chapter 1. The picture is also complicated by the rush to the north of white settlement in Australia, which led to interest in the north of Western Australia and north Queensland, the competition between emerging independent colonies prior to Federation in 1901, which led to the inland missions, and emerging colonial ambitions of Germany, to which we turn in Chapter 3.
