

# The **LUTHERAN** **CLARION**



Lutheran Concerns Association  
1320 Hartford Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55116

July 2009  
Volume 1, Issue 6

## CCM Opinion Attempting to Enforce “Fan into Flame” is Meaningless

Although troubling, CCM Opinion 09-2556 responding to a series of questions concerning the propriety of resolutions adopted by a district convention is not surprising. As has been common in recent years, the questions to the CCM are vague and general – indeed so vague that in previous years the CCM may well have declined to answer the questions. But that was back when the CCM simply carried out its limited function of interpreting the Constitution, bylaws, and resolutions of the Synod. The current CCM has taken on a far broader role.

Although worded very generally, the questions are directed at a very specific situation – a resolution by the Southern Illinois District (SID) Convention deciding not to participate at this time in the *Fan into Flame* fundraising appeal that is part of the *Ablaze!* program. The Synod encouraged support of *Ablaze!* in 2007 Convention Resolution 1-01A. The questions ask whether a district may pass a resolution not to participate in a Synod initiative or action. The CCM cites various bylaws and ultimately concludes that “in circumstances where the Synod has adopted a resolution calling for action or participation ..., the agency is not at liberty to ignore that resolution.” The CCM characterizes such a resolution as “disobedience” and “null and void.” This gives President Kieschnick’s political supporters the ammunition they seek to attack the SID and any others in the Synod who have raised concerns about *Ablaze!* Considering the speed at which the CCM issued its opinion as compared to its usual schedule, one would think there was some urgency involved.

But a close reading of CCM Opinion 09-2556 shows that it is essentially meaningless, while giving the appearance of being significant. It does not apply to Resolution 1-01A (or much of anything else for that matter), and therefore cannot justifiably be used to nullify the

**“More important than the extreme liberty that the CCM takes when interpreting the Constitution and bylaws is the attitude reflected in its opinions.”**

SID resolution. Resolution 1-01A does not direct the districts or anyone else to participate in *Ablaze!* Although a bit vague, it can fairly be described as simply a resolution of encouragement. The actual wording of the resolution lumps together congregations, districts, and various other entities including the LWML (which is not even an agency of the Synod), and encourages “mission revitalization efforts.” **Nowhere does the opinion direct the districts or anyone else to participate in *Ablaze!***

More important than the extreme liberty that the CCM takes when interpreting the Constitution and bylaws is the attitude reflected in its opinions. It is an attitude that has permeated LCMS bureaucracy since Rev. Gerald Kieschnick was elected president and began making appointments. This attitude does not reflect action based upon the Word of God, a proper recognition of one’s limited responsibilities and authority under the bylaws, or what could be characterized as “service leadership.” Instead, the attitude is one of rules and regulations, power, and coercion, or what could be characterized as “power leadership.”

Even though Resolution 1-01A references congregations, the CCM Opinion fails to mention the many Constitution and bylaw provisions that describe the relationship between the Synod and congregations. Some might argue that the questions and answers in the CCM opinion do not expressly refer to congregations. But the SID resolution was adopted by delegates

.....continued.....

### In this Issue of **The Lutheran Clarion**

CCM Opinion 09-2556 & “Fan into Flame.”.....	1
LCA Annual Convention.....	2
Southeastern District Convention.....	2
The Strange Evaluation of Pastors.....	3
Want to Make a Difference in the LCMS?.....	5
Paperless District Conventions.....	6
Book Review: Understanding Intelligent Design.....	6
National Convention Nomination Form.....	7

elected by the SID congregations who were voting on what to do with the mission money given by the congregations to the SID. Trying to avoid the effect of the CCM opinion with this type of reasoning only enhances the appearance of an attitude of power leadership.

So consideration of the relationship between the congregations and Synod is important to the CCM opinion and this entire issue. Article VII of the Constitution makes clear that "the Synod is not an ecclesiastical government exercising legislative or coercive powers, and with respect to the individual congregation's right of self-government it is but an advisory body." "The Synod functions in support of its member congregations" (Bylaw 1.1.1(a)) and "on behalf of its member congregations administers those ministries that can be accomplished more effectively" (Bylaw 1.1.1.(b)). The Synod "is regarded as an extension of the congregations" (Bylaw 1.3.3.) and takes action at conventions "on behalf of and in support of the member congregations" (Bylaw 1.4.1.).

Instead of recognizing the fundamental purpose of the Synod to serve the congregations, the CCM Opinion and the Kieschnick administration generally approach their tasks by exercising power, control, and coercion. CCM Opinion 09-2556 is a particularly clear example of this. Are we a Synod where congregations and districts are considered "disobedient" simply because they have concerns over an ineffective and failing mission program? Are district resolutions declared "null and void" when the district takes a thoughtful and biblical approach to missions simply because the district is not championing the synodical president's marketing approach? No wonder support among the membership for LCMS mission programs has been declining so rapidly in recent years!

The LCMS needs to return to an attitude of service toward districts and congregations. The Word of God should rule our hearts and minds when it comes to missions. Members of Synod can tell the difference between a message based on the Word of God and a message based upon consultant-developed-sound-bites and logos combined with an overdose of emotion. So long as leadership in the Synod approaches its tasks reflecting an attitude of power and control, the money of the members will continue to be redirected to where the Word of God is preached. No CCM opinion can change this. If the leadership in the Synod returns to an attitude of service based on the Word of God, the members will respond.

**Christian A. Preus**, President, LCA  
Member of the LCMS Board of Directors (1995-2007)

## Lutheran Concerns Association Holds Annual Conference

On April 21 -22, the LCA held its annual conference at the Ramada Inn – Mall of America, in Bloomington, Minnesota. Many faithful members and some non-members of the LCA made a sound investment in attending this conference with its outstanding speakers, great extended periods of discussion following the presentations, and the re-election of Mr. Christian Preus as President of the LCA along with Mr. Walter Disen as Vice President, Rev. Dr. Daniel Jastram as Secretary/Treasurer, Mr. David Hawk, Dcs. Betty Mulholland, Rev. Richard Bolland, and Rev. Thomas Queck to the Board of Directors.

Good fellowship, great speakers, and important discussions on laying plans for addressing concerns to the Synodical convention in Houston in 2010 were positive outcomes of the conference.

## Southeastern District Convention: Well Organized, But Failed to Address Important Issues

The 2009 convention of the Southeastern District (SED) of the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod was touted as a paperless convention. Each delegate received a CD containing the documents that would normally be published in a binder. Some effort was put into this packaging to present the documents in a menu driven format. Additionally, the files were posted on the district website and could be accessed by anybody wishing to view them.

I am not aware of the cost savings to the district budget, but I am sure it was significant. The production and mailing of the individual CDs must have considerably reduced the cost of disseminating this information. Many of the documents on the CD as part of a delegates "workbook" did not need to be printed in hardcopy, but was good to have at the ready and at least browsed through by each delegate to refresh their memories as to the bylaws of the SED and the procedures of a convention.

In my many years of government service, I have learned that paperless usually means that the expense of printing is passed on to the lower echelons of command. Electronic files allow for ease of storage but not for reading. So, I am sure that most

congregations printed the “workbook” themselves to allow reading and note taking and therefore absorbed the cost of printing.

About a week before the convention, after the floor committees had reviewed and revised the submitted overtures, each delegate received files of the newly formed resolutions via email. Paper copies of these resolutions were provided at the floor committee meetings and again on the floor of the convention after further revision. So, we find that paperless is not exactly paperless. This compromise to reduce expense and increase ease of use is what each of us faces in our congregations as well; to copy or not to copy?

**“...despite the smoothness of the proceedings we still remain a fractured district because of our refusal to address the contentious issues of theology in faith and practice.”**

For such a large district, I find that there are relatively few that take an active part in events leading up to the convention (for this reason it may be wise not to waste money on printed materials that won't be viewed). The floor committee meetings that hear recommendations to modify and consolidate overtures and will produce resolutions that will likely be adopted, are attended by very few. Even when there are truly contentious issues and theological points that need to be addressed, there is only a handful of interested individuals.

The floor committees should be commended for their conscientious and prayerful consideration of each overture. They deserve to hear from the delegates, especially the pastoral delegates, when the issues and the language can best be addressed, before being presented to the convention and the “mob” agrees to call the question so as not to delay lunch.

A third area of concern is something that I must confess, unsettled me in the weeks leading to the convention. With so many wild ideas of what prayer actually is and is not, and so many bizarre practices, I did not know what to expect when we were told that the convention would be punctuated throughout by “listening prayer.”

My only knowledge of “listening prayer” is an awareness of a book published under that title and a first-hand observation of a so-called listening prayer earlier this year. The book I haven't read, but the encounter with “listening prayer” smacked of transcendentalism through guided meditation and an enthusiastic hope of

hearing God. Blessedly, our convention possessed none of this type of “listening prayer.” Instead, we read, contemplated, and discussed God's Word, and then prayed together at our tables.

Despite the fact that we took time from the business at hand and conducted these Bible studies, we accomplished everything on the agenda, hearing every resolution and not having to cut short any speaker.

Some of the convention results include the reelection of Rev. Dr. Jon Diefenthaler as president and several other incumbents. Significant resolutions include the condemnation of human trafficking/slavery and the prayerful support of its enforced abolition, an encouragement for the BRTFSSG to withdraw recommendations of increased delegate representation for larger congregations at district conventions and retention of the present form and practice of selecting delegates to Synod Convention.

The SED staff has the thanks of our district for their ability to host such a large gathering and ensure its smooth conduct. But despite the smoothness of the proceedings we still remain a fractured district because of our refusal to address the contentious issues of theology in faith and practice. May God bless the next triennium of the SED to His glory for the sake of His Son, Jesus Christ.

**Rev. Timothy Sandeno**

Pastor, Good Shepherd Lutheran Church  
Charleston, SC

## The Strange Evaluation of Pastors

At the request of my Circuit Counselor, I filled-out my Personal Information Form or PIF. This is an important document most of which is completed by the worker and part of which is completed by the District President. It is important because any congregation wishing to consider calling a pastor will be sent the PIF in its entirety so as to sort out those who they believe would not be a good “fit” in their congregation and identify those who would “fit.”

Much of the information requested is rather predictable: education, work experience in the church and outside of the church, service rendered to congregations, districts and to the Synod and the like. There are also a lot of preferences to indicate: size of parish, size of community, type of position, (Senior Pastor, Associate, etc.). Where things get a bit strange is the method which is given to indicate one's

...continued...

“Theological Position.” Here a continuum is provided with five check boxes ranging from 1-5 indicating how “flexible” (that is liberal) a pastor is with 1 being very flexible and 5 being very inflexible.

I guess I was laboring under the misconception that our Synod only had one theological position, not five. Of course, this kind of idea that the Synod only has one theological position is probably considered inflexible to begin with, but I had no idea that we had a sort of “multiple choice” option for our theological position! My inquiring Lutheran mind asked, “What does this mean?” To make the whole matter even less clear, underneath the continuum of the five theological positions there is the word, “Evangelical.” According to the instructions which come with the form this means that the more “flexible” you are, the more “evangelical” you are. At this point my confusion turns to chaos!

I always thought that being evangelical meant that you proclaimed the Gospel. At least, that’s what the word means. The word “evangelical” comes to us straight from the Greek *euangelion* meaning “Good News.” Thus one who is evangelical is one who proclaims the Good News of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. I am assuming that every LCMS pastor is evangelical in this way. To employ such a term to a spectrum of theological positions seems completely inappropriate, inaccurate, and can only leave the congregation considering a prospective pastor puzzled if not misled.

To begin with, being “flexible” in theology is plain “non-Lutheran.” The Lutheran/Christian faith has always understood itself as the one, true faith where Christianity is unencumbered by false teaching. Our Evangelical Lutheran Church is seen as the place where the Word of God is taught in all its truth and purity and where the Sacraments are administered in accord with Christ’s institution. To be anything less than that is to become a “sect,” not the Church. However, it would seem that the Council of Presidents of the LCMS has some new ideas about what constitutes orthodoxy.

**“A ‘missional’ pastor in the LCMS may be open to contemporary worship, may be more ‘flexible’ when it comes to practicing a bit ‘looser’ kind of communion...”**

To compound the “weirdness,” when a congregation requests information on a specific pastor they are sent the entire PIF for use by the calling committee. By “entire” I mean they also receive the district president’s written evaluation. Now that may not seem strange at first until you realize that the district president will not send this portion of the PIF to the pastor himself! If the pastor wants to

see the entire PIF he is told that he must make a personal appointment at the district office (no matter how far away it is), and personally travel there. He will then be given a copy of his PIF (without the district president’s evaluation), and he will be placed in a room by himself to examine this partial document. If he wants to discuss the district president’s evaluation specifically, then a face-to-face appointment must be made with the district president and he will discuss it with you.

**Stranger still is the incredible secrecy surrounding the District President’s evaluation of the pastor.** Remember the PIF is not secret to any calling congregation, but only to the pastor who has been evaluated.

One must wonder why the secrecy? As a former public school principal I routinely did teacher evaluations. I was required by law and ethics to provide a complete copy of my evaluation to every teacher I evaluated. In fact, I had to have each teacher sign a document affirming that they had received a copy of their evaluation. I also had to offer them the opportunity to write a rebuttal to the evaluation if there were information they believed was inaccurate or in error and that rebuttal had to be included in that teacher’s file along with my evaluation. We were also told in our school law classes that we may have private files but once we showed any of our private files to any other person, then that file was no longer private and had to be made available to the individual teacher concerned.

Could it be that any calling committee in the Synod can see the District President’s evaluation and have it sent to them through the mail but the pastor being evaluated cannot? Yes, that is precisely the case! This practice is obviously not for the protection of the privacy of the individual pastor. It should also be obvious that the district president’s evaluation of a pastor is also not intended to assist the pastor to improve his performance as a pastor because he’s simply not privy to the information.

**No, this procedure leads one to believe that the point of the “privacy” is to make it as difficult as possible, if not completely impossible, for a pastor to know exactly what the district president thinks of him.** With this system there is absolutely no recourse for the pastor to offer any kind of rebuttal to the evaluation given him, and so calling congregations are completely at the mercy of the information which the District President provides.

What mischief does such a system permit? Please permit a hypothetical example.

Suppose there is an LCMS pastor who believes that being faithful to the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions necessitates leading only liturgical worship, practicing closed communion, providing thorough adult and youth instruction in the Faith, avoidance of any worship setting which might be unionistic or syncretistic, and who wants to establish voluntary private confession as a normal practice in the congregation. Because this pastor holds such an old fashioned or "inflexible" Lutheran position his district president may disapprove of his conduct. He is written up by the district president as being rigid, inflexible, and on the far right (position # 5) on the "Theological Position" scale. Additionally, in his written comments this pastor is described as virtually unfit for the pastoral office or so deficient that he cannot be recommended. What call committee would give such a pastor a second look?

**What is now made possible is that the PIF can become a very effective instrument for ensuring that only those pastors who fit our Synod's current view of a so-called "missional" pastor can be placed into most parishes.** A "missional" pastor in the LCMS may be open to contemporary worship, may be more "flexible" when it comes to practicing a bit "looser" kind of closed communion, may want to adopt a governance structure within a congregation that is more business oriented, may want to lessen the amount of instruction offered to adults or even children, may want more flexibility with respect to joint worship activities with church bodies with whom the LCMS is not in pulpit and altar fellowship, and may want to use female readers of the Scriptures or to help distribute the elements during Holy Communion, or serve as Elders or congregational chairpersons or vice chairpersons. Some district presidents view such pastors as being more advantageous to producing greater numerical growth in the Church. **The PIF enables any District President who is so inclined to accomplish the keeping of old style "Confessional" Lutheran pastors from receiving calls and also enables them, over time, to fill the congregations of their respective districts with those "Missional" pastors they prefer over time.**

It is most certainly time for a bit of "sunshine" in the LCMS with respect to PIF's! The so-called "Sunshine Laws" effective in virtually every public governance sector of this country would absolutely forbid the LCMS practices respecting the withholding of personal evaluations from those being evaluated. While it may be technically legal for the District Presidents to issue such evaluations and to keep them from those pastors who are being evaluated, it most certainly is not ethical! The Council of Presidents needs to change their policies regarding the evaluations of pastors and they need to change them now!

### **Want to Make a Difference in the LCMS?**

Wouldn't it be great if there were an organization made up of LCMS members who funded and worked toward addressing the rank and file of the LCMS throughout the Synod by providing a well-written, well-documented publication which assisted the people of our Synod in becoming aware of important issues within the Synod which the Synod itself doesn't address in its official publications? They would work to provide a clear picture of critical proposals being made in our Synod which would (if adopted) radically change both the nature and character of The LCMS. That would be a good thing, right?

Wouldn't it be wonderful if this same organization also organized annual conferences in support of sound, biblical, truly Lutheran presentations on how to best understand and impact our own Synod for the sake of the Gospel of Jesus Christ? **Obviously, such an organization does exist. It is the Lutheran Concerns Association!** Right now this long-standing voice of Confessional Lutheranism represents a membership committed to returning the LCMS to its rightful place as the leading orthodox, Confessional, Biblical, and Lutheran church body in the United States of America.

This organization stands for electing solid Lutheran leadership for our Synod. It stands for those who promote real Lutheran liturgical worship. It stands for retaining our distinctively Lutheran heritage, doctrine, and practice. It does not want to "blend in" with generic Protestantism but to stand out in our clear Lutheranism! The men and women in the LCA have banded together to do corporately what we cannot achieve individually. We want to change the Synod back into the Lutheran body it once was!

**Will you join us?** Will you consider being part of the solution to our Synod's problems? Will you help us keep the Synod of our grandfathers and our Reformation fathers? **Then please consider joining the Lutheran Concerns Association!** Send your \$35.00 enrollment check to:

Lutheran Concerns Association  
1320 Hartford Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55116

### **The Lutheran Clarion Needs Your Help!**

As the clear and leading voice of unofficial publications within The Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod, we are able to reach a growing list of those in our Synod who want to help our Church body change its current direction. Right now that circulation is nearing 4,000 addresses. Since we do not tie membership in the LCA or charge for a subscription to The Lutheran Clarion, and since we send *The Clarion* out to anyone who wants to receive it, we need your help to keep the rank and file of our Synod informed. Kindly send your contributions in support of The Lutheran Clarion to the address above.

## Paperless District Conventions On-ly Transfer Costs & Diminish Clarity

Under the guise of reducing costs many districts (and perhaps the Synod), are holding so-called paperless conventions. Delegates are being sent copies of their convention workbooks on Compact Disks (CD's), instead of printed booklets. Often numbering well over 100 pages, the convention workbooks are the primary way for delegates to prepare for their duties as delegates to the convention.

Whether or not this actually saves money is an open question. In the Missouri District there was the cost of producing the CD, the cost of the fancy printed folder that the CD came in, the cost of mailing the CD's, and there is still the cost of running off the paper copies that help the delegates make notes and properly prepare for their delegate duties! **What has happened is that the districts which are holding paperless conventions have simply transferred the cost of duplication to the individual delegates or their congregations.** If one begins to actually compute the real costs of printing out over 100 pages of materials on photocopy machines, the cost of the materials is undoubtedly much larger than it would have been had the district printed out their workbooks to begin with.

But there's more. Not only are the workbooks now more expensive, for those delegates who don't have the capability to print out such a large volume of materials, in some district conventions the delegates can't even bring their laptop computers to the convention floor if they want to read the workbook from the CD!

Case in point – The English District Convention. A district letter dated May 15, 2009, states: "It is the responsibility of each delegate to review and print the workbook. Copies of the workbook will NOT be available at the convention and, due to standing rules, use of electronic devices and laptop computers will not be permitted in the sanctuary."

Who makes the "standing rules," and why can't the standing rules be changed? At least in the Missouri District laptop use will be permitted, but using cell phones, e-mail, or messaging will not. In Missouri, they had the good sense to change the standing rules.

What is accomplished by all this? First, there is no actual monetary savings because the costs are actually greater including the costs of delegates or congregations to duplicate their own workbooks. Second, it would seem that it will be less likely that delegates will have the full information that they need in order to carry out their obligations. Third, such measures may well result in voting confusion caused by the inability of

some to even have a copy of what is being voted on since they will not have the workbook available to them in the delegate hall!

It would seem clear to any casual observer that the implementation of so-called paperless conventions will not be paperless, will not be less expensive, and will promote less informed delegations. Paperless conventions are just a very bad idea!

### Many Thanks to BALANCE-CONCORD!

The Lutheran Concerns Association wishes to express its sincere and heartfelt thanks to Balance-Concord for its continuing financial support for **The Lutheran Clarion!** Such assistance from other brothers and sisters of our Synod is most needed and welcome. Other Confessional organizations within the LCMS are urged and encouraged to follow the example of Balance-Concord and assist us to bring the light of truth regarding the issues of our Synod into full view.

### Book Review: Understanding Intelligent Design: Everything You Need to Know in Plain Language

Understanding Intelligent Design: Everything You Need to Know in Plain Language. William A. Dembski and Sean McDowell, Harvest House Publishers, Eugene, Oregon 97402. 2008. 233 pages. Paperback. \$15.00.

The year 2009 marks the 200<sup>th</sup> birthday of Charles Darwin. The anniversary has given rise to a great celebration by evolutionists. Darwinism is being proclaimed a scientific fact as well established as the law of gravity. It is also said to be the basic principle that guides all modern research in biology. As a matter of fact, however, both claims are ungrounded in fact.

Dembski and McDowell are two leaders in the Intelligent Design movement which in recent years has challenged Darwinism. Research in biochemistry and microbiology has demonstrated the even the simplest cell is exceedingly complex, needing several hundred genes in just the right combination to function properly. The problem for evolutionary theory is that natural selection, the basis of their theory, can only select systems with an existing function. It cannot account for how such a complex system first achieved its function. As Michael Behe, one of the leaders in the Intelligent design movement writes, "Let me be clear. I am not saying the origin of life was simply an

extremely improbable accident. I am saying the origin of life was deliberately, purposely arranged." ("The Edge of Evolution," P.216 ) It was designed by a designer!

Theologians often accept evolutionary theory because they think it is scientifically proven. They then subscribe to theistic evolution with disastrous results. Dembski and McDowell ask, " If undirected material causes are so effective in designing the world, why invoke God at all?" P.44

Understanding Intelligent Design does a masterful job in demonstrating the many problems that evolutionary theory faces and the strong case for Intelligent Design which clearly points to a Creator.

The authors present compelling evidence that demonstrates the weaknesses of evolutionary theory. For example they point out the limits of mutations. They state "There are no known cases where such mutations have produced large-scale changes that benefit an organism, let alone the development of new species." P.60.

They also point out that the fossil record does not supply the many transitional forms expected for the development of new phyla. They write, " At the beginning of the Cambrian period, roughly 530 million years ago by conventional dating, the majority of phyla appeared in a geological blink of an eye and without any trace of a prior evolutionary history." P.71

The book in plain language then points out that the hundreds of thousands of bits of information found in the DNA of the simplest organism could not have arisen by chance. They say, " How could nature, without intelligent guidance, take the massive informational jumps needed for life to originate?" P.131. Think then of how the higher organisms, including man, point to an intelligent design, not chance evolution. There is hard evidence of intelligent Design and a Designer!

Finally, however, the Christian must ever remember Hebrews 13:3 that tells us, "By faith we understand that the universe was formed at God's command, so that what is seen was not formed out of what was visible." But Romans 1:20 also says, "For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—His eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood by what has been made, so that men are without excuse."

**Rev. Dr. Paul A. Zimmerman**  
Traverse City, MI.

**Recommendation for Nomination  
for LCMS Convention 2010**  
*(please type or print)*

<b>Nominee</b>	I recommend the following person: Name: _____ Street: _____ City, State, Zip: _____ Phone Number: _____
<b>Position</b>	for the following office, board, or commission: (PLEASE FILL OUT SEPARATE FORMS IF NOMINATING FOR MORE THAN ONE POSITION) <input type="checkbox"/> Secretary <input type="checkbox"/> LCMS Board of Directors <input type="checkbox"/> Board for District and Congregational Services <input type="checkbox"/> Board for Mission Services <input type="checkbox"/> Board for Pastoral Education <input type="checkbox"/> Board for University Education <input type="checkbox"/> Commission on Theology & Church Relations <input type="checkbox"/> Concordia Publishing House Board of Directors <input type="checkbox"/> Lutheran Church Extension Fund Board of Directors  <b>Board of Regents</b> — <input type="checkbox"/> Ann Arbor <input type="checkbox"/> Austin <input type="checkbox"/> Bronxville <input type="checkbox"/> Fort Wayne <input type="checkbox"/> Irvine <input type="checkbox"/> Mequon <input type="checkbox"/> Portland <input type="checkbox"/> River Forest <input type="checkbox"/> St. Louis <input type="checkbox"/> St. Paul <input type="checkbox"/> Selma <input type="checkbox"/> Seward
<b>Information about nominee</b>	He/She is <input type="checkbox"/> an ordained minister <input type="checkbox"/> a commissioned minister <input type="checkbox"/> a layperson His/Her home congregation is: _____ His/Her pastor is: _____ Street: _____ City, State, Zip: _____ Synod District: _____ Circuit Counselor: _____ Address: _____
<b>References</b>	Other references for evaluation and sources of information, including mailing addresses: Name: _____ Street: _____ City, State, Zip: _____ Name: _____ Street: _____ City, State, Zip: _____
<b>About myself</b>	I am <input type="checkbox"/> an ordained minister <input type="checkbox"/> a commissioned minister <input type="checkbox"/> a layperson Name: _____ Street: _____ City, State, Zip: _____ Phone Number: _____
<b>Mail to</b>	Return as soon as possible to: Committee for Convention Nominations The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod 1333 South Kirkwood Road St. Louis, MO 63122-7295

Please feel free to reproduce this form.

**Call for 2010 Convention Nominations**

The deadline is **October 10, 2009**, for submitting nominations for vacancies on Synod boards, the Commission on Theology & Church Relations and Boards of Regents at the Concordia Universities.

Please use the above form and/or see <http://www.lcms.org/pages/internal.asp?NavID=13531> for more copies of the nomination form and a complete list of vacancies.

**The Lutheran Clarion**

(The official publication of the Lutheran Concerns Association. A non-profit 501c3 organization.)



Published regularly to support issues and causes within the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod which build faithfulness to true Confessional Lutheranism and to be a clear voice of Christian concern against actions and causes which mitigate against faithfulness to the One True Faith.

The principal place of business for all matters pertaining to the LCA is:

1320 Hartford Avenue  
St. Paul, MN 55116

Other faithful Lutheran individuals who are members of LCMS congregations are invited to submit articles of approximately 500 words for consideration to:

Rev. Richard A. Bolland, 1608 NW 78th St.  
Kansas City, MO 64418 (816-519-3780)

Articles should be approximately 500 words in length. Inquiries are welcome. Manuscripts will be edited.

The Board of Directors for the LCA:

Mr. Christian Preus (President)  
Rev. Richard Bolland      Mr. Walter Dissen  
Mr. David Hawk              Rev. Thomas J. Queck  
Rev. Daniel Jastram        Dcs. Betty Mulholland

<http://www.lutheranclarion.org>

Lutheran Concerns Association

