

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



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

March 2009  
Volume 1, Issue 4

## A Temporal or Ecclesiastical Structure?

It is my contention that the structure of the church now being proposed for the LCMS is detrimental to that which we confess in the Nicene Creed about the church being “one, holy, Christian/Catholic and apostolic.” The proposed structure is harmful to the unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity of Christ’s church and it is a structure that obstructs gathering and collaborating for the purpose of witnessing to the gospel according to our church’s confession/theology.<sup>1</sup>

It appears we are seeking a temporal rather than an ecclesiastical based structure.

We are doing this in order to mimic the “Christian” world around us. This has been one of the most common concerns expressed about the crisis facing our church today, i.e. the lack of real theological leadership.

**“The structure of the church, whatever it be, should always serve the marks of the Church—the Word (Gospel) of God, Baptism and the Holy Lord’s Supper.”**

This was noted when the chairman of the Blue Ribbon Committee on Synodical Structure and Governance addressed the Saint Louis seminary. He more or less admitted that he did not approach the matter theologically. Structure doesn’t seem to be a matter for theology.

The only place in the New Testament where the word “structure” is used with any ecclesiological significance is in Eph 2:21.<sup>2</sup> If we today truly desire to restore oneness in our church, what a blessed promise Paul gives us here. He first describes the situation of those who are identified as “Gentiles in the flesh” (Eph 2:11). He reminds them that they...

<sup>12</sup> were at that time separated from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world.

Now he continues with the most beautiful and prolonged expression of the Gospel, which includes an exclusion of the Law.

<sup>13</sup> But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near in the blood of Christ. <sup>14</sup> For he is our peace, who has made us

both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility, <sup>15</sup> by **abolishing** in his flesh **the law of commandments and ordinances...**

Here we are reminded that the talk of constitutions and by-laws as well as of structures is of the Law. As such it is not the place for us Christians to begin our conversation. To speak in terms of structure is itself a “secular” exercise; in theological terms it is a matter of the Law rather than the Gospel. The church always starts its task from the Gospel, never from the Law. For the Law is the “alien” Word of God, while the Gospel is his “proper” word for us.

The promise continues:

... that he might create in himself **one new man in place of the two**, so making **peace**, <sup>16</sup> and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end. <sup>17</sup>And he came and preached peace to you **who were far off** and peace to those **who were near**; <sup>18</sup> for through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father.

Now we hear St. Paul instruct us otherwise:

<sup>19</sup> So then you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, <sup>20</sup> built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone, <sup>21</sup> in whom the whole **structure** is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; <sup>22</sup> in whom you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit.

The structure of the church, whatever it be, should always serve the marks of the Church—the Word (Gospel) of God, Baptism and the Holy Lord’s Supper. It should also be

.....continued.....

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

A Temporal or Ecclesiastical Structure?.....	1
Delegate Selection...A Simple Solution.....	2
Lessons Learned in North Dakota.....	3
Just Being Who We Are.....	4
The Secret History of the Blue Ribbon Plan.....	5
Lutheran Concerns Annual Conference 2009.....	7

served by them; we will always trust God to be there for His church though these blessed gifts.

What we have found in recent years in our church is an approach to church and ministry which is secularized, almost proudly so. And why should that have such an appeal today? Because it allows us to do our own thing rather than the example of Christ, St. Paul and Dr. C.F.W. Walther, who emphasized otherwise, that the Word of God is the only power or authority that they have.

We hear today—ever so often—that this is not our grandfather’s church. That may be correct in some respects, but there is a history to what is happening today. In fact our grandfathers also faced much the same question—about the structure of the church. Dr. Walther and Rev. Wilhelm Löhe came to disagree about precisely this matter: Dr. Walther could accept a consistorial or an episcopal constitution, or, perhaps more accurately, a presbyterial-synodical polity; he expressed this clearly in his first synodical address in 1848.<sup>3</sup>

The 19th century Lutherans were caught with the question, what is the authentic way of **organizing** the church, the way **prescribed** by Christ, the way **required** by the Bible. Our church was caught in the danger of wanting to give an answer to this question.<sup>4</sup>

In view of that, how familiar then are these words:

“What does God’s Word have to do with such seemingly mundane matters as conventions and church boards? More than one might at first think.”<sup>5</sup> “[W]hat our Synod is, how it is organized, and how it functions.”<sup>6</sup>

Furthermore, note the citation of *Missions Affirmations of 1965*;<sup>7</sup> this was one of the most controversial documents ever to appear before a convention.

There is in our midst the attempt to give all the answers in advance, answers for every conceivable case. That is the Reformed way. Do it in the way of St. Paul: some will be circumcised and others not, but always evangelically. That is doing it the way of the gospel.

Are things really that different today? What then are we to do? This is basically the wrong question: it should rather be “What is our Lord doing for His church today.” He’s praying for it, of course. Oh, what a blessing that is for us all.

Rev. Dr. Ronald Feuerhahn  
Professor Emeritus, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

1 A paraphrase of Peter Galadza—See note 2.  
2 Peter Galadza, “The Structure of the Eastern Churches; Bonded with Human Blood or Baptismal Water?” *Pro Ecclesia*, 17:4 (Fall 2008), 373.  
3 C. F. W. Walther, “Synodalrede,” *Mo. Synod Proceedings*, 1848, pp.30-38 (2d Ed.), trans. Paul F. Koehnke, “Dr. Walther’s First Presidential Address,” *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, 33 (Apr 1960) 12-20, in Carl S. Meyer, ed., *Moving Frontiers*, St. Louis, M, 1964, 170-77.

4. Hermann Sasse, “Ministry and Congregation (July 1949),” in Norman E. Nagel, (We Confess Series, III, *We Confess the Church*), 76; cf. also 72.  
5. Opening sentence of *Congregation--Synod--Church: A Study Document on Basic Theological Principles Underlying LCMS Structure and Governance*, 2007, p.7  
6. Last sentence of Introduction, *ibid.*, 8.  
7. Last two lines of point 2 of *Ibid.*, *Basic Theological Principles*, p.8.. [Emphases added in all Scripture quotes.]

## Delegate Selection: An Exceptionally Simple Solution

President Kieschnick’s Blue Ribbon Task Force on Structure Report proposes some very significant changes to the selection of delegates to a synodical convention. The Task Force Report generally has not been received with much enthusiasm. The proposed changes to the delegate selection process provides a good example why. Recently the Task Force presented to the North Dakota District Convention an outline of its recommended bylaw changes. But neither the initial Report nor the District Convention outline gives a persuasive rationale for the proposed changes. They also fail to take into consideration the history of delegate selection in the LCMS and fail to recognize the controversy and division that has existed in the Synod on this issue over the past five years.

The lack of a supporting rationale can perhaps be explained by the rejection of 2004 Convention Resolution 7-08. This resolution proposed the appointment of a blue ribbon committee to study and make recommendations regarding delegate representation. While nearly every other resolution at the 2004 Convention was adopted, this resolution was defeated by more than 100 votes. The 2004 Convention made it clear that it did not even want to appoint a committee to study the issue. Nonetheless, President Kieschnick directed his Task Force on Structure to proceed with proposed changes to the bylaws.

**“The simple solution to the controversy is to delete from the bylaws the ability of the President of the Synod to make exceptions.”**

The history of delegate selection in the LCMS explains why the 2004 Convention saw no need to study this issue again. In the early 1960’s, a controversy arose in the LCMS regarding the selection of delegates. Overture 5-09 to the 1967 Convention observed “considerable confusion and dissatisfaction” regarding the election of delegates. The overture proposed changes to “remove the confusion that resulted from having electoral circuits differing from visitation circuits.” The overture also allowed for a “prescribed procedure” that would permit the President of the Synod to deal with “exceptional” cases. Based upon this overture, a resolution

.....continued.....

was adopted by the 1967 Convention that approved certain bylaw changes. The bylaws allowed "exceptions" that could be "made only by the President of the Synod." The confusion, dissatisfaction, and controversy were resolved.

For over three decades the bylaws served the Synod well. But a concern arose after the 2001 convention that developed into a very divisive controversy after the 2004 convention and again after the 2007 convention. The "exceptions" allowed by the bylaws to be granted only in "exceptional" circumstances increased by about 400% from 1998 to 2004. At the 2004 Convention President Kieschnick granted every exception requested, which resulted in 176 additional delegates comprising 14.2% of all delegates. The "exceptions" allowed in the bylaws was now being employed in a very different fashion. This caused many in the Synod great concern, with many questioning the propriety of the exceptions. This history shows that the basic framework of the delegate selection process that worked so well for over 30 years is not broken and does not need an overhaul. Instead, it needs a very simple minor tweak.

The simple solution to the controversy is to delete from the bylaws the ability of the President of the Synod to make exceptions. The reason for allowing exceptions back in 1967 was to accommodate those areas of the country where the geographical considerations and other related factors made complying with the numerical requirements for a circuit exceptionally challenging. The advancements in technology since 1967, and certainly the controversy and division in the Synod over the past five years justifies eliminating "exceptions" to the selection of voting delegates. Correcting this problem is easy and appropriate: delete Bylaw 3.1.2(b) and Bylaw 5.1.1(a) and (b). We do not need an overhaul of the selection process for convention delegates. A simple solution will do.

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

**Can You Help Our Synod?**

**The LCA is working hard to keep you well informed regarding matters of concern in the LCMS. Will you consider assisting us in this important task? Please consider joining the LCA and/or sending a gift in support of our efforts to keep our Synod Biblical and Confessional. Please send your tax deductible donations to:**

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

**Lessons Learned in North Dakota: Be Prepared for Your District Convention!**

The presentation of the Task Force to the North Dakota District Convention is now available on the Synod's web site, <http://www.lcms.org/pages/internal.asp?NavID=13867>

I offer this brief report, not to discuss the *content* of the presentation and its proposals, but to comment on the *format* of the presentation and subsequent discussion. It is my hope that delegates to the other thirty-four district conventions would be thoroughly prepared to receive and respond to the Task Force presentation at their own conventions.

The presentation to the North Dakota District Convention was made collaboratively by President Kieschnick, Vice-President Diekelman, and Task Force Chairman Greene. Two hours were allotted for the presentation on Tuesday afternoon, January 20.

At the beginning of the first hour, delegates were provided with a survey and invited to respond to each of the twenty points of the proposal (some of which were divided into subpoints), using a numerical ranking system: *Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Not Sure (3), Disagree (2), Strongly Disagree (1)*. No space or opportunity was provided on the survey for written comments.

During the first hour, the presentation was given as it appears on the Synod web site. The presenters primarily read verbatim from the slides, occasionally adding an explanatory comment. At the conclusion of each of the twenty points, delegates were instructed to respond on the survey to that particular point, and were given approximately 15-20 seconds to do so. Questions or comments from the floor were strongly discouraged, with the assurance that the second hour of the presentation would be available for delegate questions. With twenty points to cover in one hour, the presentation needed to proceed efficiently and without interruption. At the end of the first hour, the surveys were collected by the Task Force and the convention took a short break.

The second hour of the presentation was designed specifically for questions of clarification. Personal opinions or evaluations of the proposals were discouraged, with the explanation that that was the function of the surveys, and again, time was of the essence. The twenty points were once again addressed in order, with the three presenters answering clarifying questions to the best of their knowledge (some of the proposals were still incomplete). At the end of the hour, discussion was ended and the convention proceeded with its other business. Delegates were invited to address further questions to the presenters privately at a later time. During the second hour,

.....continued.....

there was only enough time for questions on the first seventeen points. Points 18-20 were not addressed, and no additional time was given.

A congregation of the district had submitted overtures to the convention regarding the Task Force proposals (based on the August 20, 2008 document). The floor committee declined those overtures and did not present any resolutions regarding the Task Force proposals. A motion was made (and seconded) from the floor to bring those congregational overtures to the floor as resolutions, but the motion failed.

Those are the facts. Now, a few personal comments:

The timing of the distribution and recollection of the surveys was peculiar. Delegates were asked to respond to each point immediately, after only two or three minutes of information, with only a few seconds to think, and without the benefit of any clarification. Several delegates stated during the second hour that their responses may have changed if they had been allowed to ask clarifying questions before filling out the surveys. Based on the general reaction of the convention, this procedure may change at subsequent conventions, with the surveys being collected at the end of the second hour.

The inherent insufficiency of numerical responses may make it difficult for the Task Force to receive accurate feedback. The meaning of positive responses ("agree") is clear, but there is a great deal of ambiguity with regard to negative responses ("disagree"). *Why* did the delegates disagree with one or more points? Do they prefer the current system? Is the proposal mostly good, but with one or two untenable details? Do they just not understand it? There's no way to know *why* a delegate disagreed with a proposal on the basis of a simple numerical survey.

This uncertainty is only compounded by the various ways in which more detailed and specific responses were disallowed. There was no place on the survey for comments or rationales behind the numbers. Personal comments from the floor during the presentation were strongly discouraged. The floor committee rejected detailed, specific responses in the form of overtures because the presentation and surveys were deemed to be sufficient. Unfortunately, it was only a minority of the convention delegates that believed such thorough responses were needed.

Therefore, my advice to the delegates to the remaining thirty-four district conventions is this: Study the twenty proposals ahead of time. Have clarifying questions prepared in advance. Understand not only whether you agree or disagree with a proposal, but also *why* you agree or disagree. Avail yourselves of every possible opportunity to respond to the Task Force, not with just a number, but with a clear, detailed rationale.

Above all, let us encourage a *public* discussion of the pros and cons of the Task Force proposals, and not limit our responses to a few circled numbers on a stack of papers in an office somewhere in St. Louis.

Respectfully submitted, Rev. Scott Hojnacki  
Pastor, St. Paul's & St. Peter's Lutheran Churches  
Beach & Belfield, North Dakota  
Pastoral Delegate to NDD Convention

## Just Being Who We Are

*(The following is a copy of a letter from President, Rev. John Wille contained in his South Wisconsin District newsletter. It is reprinted in The Clarion with his permission.)*

Dear friends and members of SWD:

About a year ago on a collegial visit with the Pastoral Leadership Institute, my group was in south Los Angeles for a cross-cultural visit. On one of the legs of that visit we had a conversation with a Roman Catholic priest who was one of the assistants to the Bishop for Los Angeles. He was a middle-aged man of Hispanic descent. We met at one of the Roman Catholic centers, with a school and a beautiful old church building. It was going through a revitalization process.

As the conversation progressed, the Catholic priest said something to us that has been branded into my memory. He remarked that the Catholic Church had been struggling with its identity since the mid-1970s. They had tried many different programs, many different approaches to ministry, running from one religious fad to the next; but nothing seemed to address their real issues. They were adrift, not knowing who they were or what they were

.....continued.....

### The LCA Recommends:

Dr. Karl L. Barth, former district president and President Emeritus of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, is featured in a new DVD from JDL Video Productions. "Missouri What?" will help congregations, pastors and lay people understand the current structure of the LCMS. Also, included on the DVD is a PowerPoint presentation that coincides with the program and also a pdf file that includes the dialog from the presentation. These resources will prove to be an excellent Bible Study presentation as well as a presentation for circuit conferences and personal study.

The DVD can be ordered for only \$10.00 at [www.missouriwhat.org](http://www.missouriwhat.org) or by calling JDL Video Productions at 314-308-5203. Orders can also be mailed to JDL Video Productions, 5425 Lindenwood, St. Louis, MO 63109 with a check for \$13.04 which

to be about. Worship attendance and membership lagged.

Perhaps why that is so memorable is that shortly before that as part of our LCMS revitalization process, there was a power-point slide that showed that our LCMS has been in a membership decline since the mid-1970s. We all know how our church-body struggled in the mid-1970s with the battle for the Bible. Some of us lived through it. Many others of us have read about it in history books. The point is that until the early to mid-70s our LCMS growth was on the upswing. Then, something happened...and we have been in decline ever since.

We have been in decline even though we have talked and taught evangelism and more evangelism. We have gone from the "Evangelism Explosion" and Church Growth to Dialog Evangelism and to Ablaze! Yet nothing has seemed to work. Oh, there are areas where we are growing; but many of our congregations struggle with lagging attendance and offerings. The decline continues. The question is, Why?

It would be easy to blame the "battle for the Bible" for that slide; but that's 35 years ago. It would have been easy to say that the German immigration is a thing of the past. But I don't remember that many German immigrants coming to America in the 1960's. The "battle for the Bible" did impact our church-body. It was a struggle for the heart and soul of our Synod.

**"But who are we really? What sets us apart from the non-denoms, from the Baptists, from the Evangelical Free churches, or for that matter even from the Catholic Church?"**

Perhaps that struggle was and is symptomatic of a much deeper struggle; not about the Word of God but about who we are. We have been trying this or that. We have gone to Promise Keepers' and Willow Creek. We have read *A Purpose Driven Life*, and Max Lucado. Our worship style ranges from contemporary to blended to traditional, and even highly liturgical.

But who are we really? What sets us apart from the non-denoms, from the Baptists, from the Evangelical Free churches, or for that matter even from the Catholic Church?

From my perspective we are Lutheran Christians. We are Lutheran Christians with a unique set of beliefs. We are Lutheran Christians with a unique set of confessions. We cling to *sola scriptura, sola gratia, sola fide*. We are the priesthood of believers.

One of our unique characteristics that sets us apart was impressed upon me by Rev. E.J. Otto, who served as SWD Mission Executive back in the early 1990's. When

we started the church in Tomah (WI), there were so many large churches. His comment was that we have and proclaim the Gospel like no other church on the face of the earth. We proclaim sin and grace, Law and Gospel. We have Word and Sacraments. We offer free forgiveness because of the blood of Christ on the cross. The list could go on.

The bottom line is: perhaps it is time that we just be who we are, who God has made us. That's the conclusion which the Catholic priest came to. He told us that he was convinced that they needed to be who they were; Roman Catholic Christians. ***We are Lutheran Christians. We are people of grace and people of forgiveness. We are people who care about our vocation as the people of God. We are the people of God in this place and this time, by God's own design, for God's own purpose. We are "a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people belonging to God, that you may declare the praises of him who called you out of darkness into his wonderful light."***  
***1 Peter 2:9***

It is time for us to be "bold witnesses" of the truth which we believe. Time for us to be *passionate believers...changing life with our Lord Jesus and for our Lord Jesus; passionate believers engaging our neighbors; passionate believers pointing people to our Savior, His love and forgiveness; passionate believers living out our faith.*

## The Secret History of the Blue Ribbon Plan

The LCMS President's "Blue Ribbon Task Force on Synod Structure and Governance" issued a report in August 2008 entitled "Walking Together - The LCMS Future: Proposals and Possibilities for Consideration and Discussion" (available at synod's web-site: [www.lcms.org](http://www.lcms.org)). These proposals are to be considered by the synod at its convention in 2010 in order to change its structure and governing powers. I have called these proposals the "Blue Ribbon Plan" and written specific critiques elsewhere (see [www.steadfastlutherans.org](http://www.steadfastlutherans.org) under "Blue Ribbon Plan").

Recently while organizing some of my files, I came across a copy of a document from six years ago that proposed some of the same ideas found in the "Blue Ribbon Plan." The document was sent by the Coordinator of the Jesus First organization to his associates on January 30, 2003, in the form of sample overtures to the 2003 LCMS district conventions. The overture title was "To Provide more equitable and Representation and Voting Privileges

.....continued.....

at Conventions and Study Other Organizational Matters.” The single “Resolved” in the overture stated:

RESOLVED that the Commission on Structure of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod study the voting and organizational structure of our Synod and bring recommendations for solving the following matters and other issues related to these structures to the entire Synod no later than ten months prior to the 2004 Synodical Convention:

- \* Granting commissioned ministers fair representation, perhaps on a circuit basis, to district and national conventions;
- \* Providing a more equitable representation based on size and number of congregations, circuits, and districts;
- \* Reducing the size and number of Synodical boards and commissions, wherever possible, and determine the best method for selecting members;
- \* Asking the Council of Presidents to participate more directly in the nomination and appointment of Board and Commission members;
- \* Considering ways by which two or more districts may share the services of individual staff members;
- \* Exploring options for choosing Synodical vice-presidents two through five on a regional basis.

The LCMS Commission on Structure responded to this request in a timely manner (see the *2004 LCMS Convention Workbook*, pages 264-265). After weighing numerous factors with regard to delegate selection, the Commission on Structure concluded that all congregations should elect two delegates each to district and synod conventions. The two delegates would be one rostered minister (clergy or commissioned) and one layman. Although this would mean larger synod conventions, the Commission reasoned that the National Youth Gathering has in recent years registered over twice the number of synodical congregations with no great logistical problems. The Commission reasoned that if congregations can afford to send their youth on a “fun and fellowship trip,” they can certainly afford to send their delegates to do the work of the church.

The response to the Commission on Structure can be found in overtures 7-02 and 7-03, in the *2004 LCMS Convention Proceedings*. These overtures, sent by members of the “Jesus First” organization, clearly indicate that “Jesus First” disagrees with the LC-MS Commission on Structure. In order to bypass the Commission, overtures 7-02 and 7-03 urged the appointment of a separate Task Force for the project. A whole series of overtures were also submitted asking for “delegate representation based on congregational size” (overtures 7-42, 7-43, 7-44, 7-45, 7-46, 7-47, 7-48, 7-50, 7-53, and 7-54 in *2004 LCMS Convention Proceedings*).

These too were sent mostly from “Jesus First.” The corresponding Resolution brought from the Floor Committee to the 2004 convention (Res. 7-08) was soundly declined by the convention. Subsequently, in March 2005, the synodical president appointed a “Blue Ribbon Task Force on Synodical Structure and Governance.” This task force has brought back the same concept of “delegate representation based on congregational size” which the 2004 convention soundly declined.

**“If...delegate representation based on congregation size would be adopted, then...a principle of elitism, or aristocracy, would become the fundamental principle of synod.”**

This is a “secret history,” because synodical commissions and task forces usually preface their work with a brief history of when and how the synod considered its proposals. Why did the proponents of the “Blue Ribbon Plan” not do this? Probably because they don’t want people to know that the same ideas were soundly defeated at the 2004 convention. Since it is unlikely that the same delegates will be present at the 2010 convention, they will most likely be ignorant of the “secret history” of the “delegate representation based on congregational size” proposal. For this reason, the present essay will be useful for delegates to the 2010 convention.

Why are the members of the “Jesus First” organization so persistent in their demands for the “delegate representation based on congregational size” principle? Perhaps most of them are simply ignorant that the Missouri Synod is constituted as a membership organization, whose members are individual congregations. Each of these members has equal rights, as is the case in most membership organizations. This is the fundamental principle of the synod’s structure and governance. If the principle of “delegate representation based on congregational size” would be adopted, then the members of the synod would be unequal and a principle of elitism, or aristocracy, would become the fundamental principle of synod. Perhaps members of the “Jesus First” organization believe that bigger congregations are greater, or more important, than smaller ones. Do they not understand Jesus’ words “The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them . . . but it shall NOT be so among you! Whoever is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he who governs as he who serves” (Luke 22:24-26).

The synod’s traditional pattern of delegate selection is not perfect, but it has worked for over 150 years. Although other proposals from the “Blue Ribbon Task Force on Synodical Structure and Governance” may be beneficial, the proposal on “delegate representation based on congregational size” needs to be defeated—again!

Rev. Dr. Martin R. Noland

## Lutheran Concerns Annual Conference 2009

The Lutheran Concerns Association Extends a cordial invitation to all Confessional Lutherans to attend our annual conference. We look forward to meeting you and working together to make the LCMS a faithful, strong voice for Evangelical Lutherans.



### REGISTRATION FORM

Lutheran Concerns Association  
Annual Meeting - April 21-22, 2009  
RAMADA INN--MALL OF AMERICA  
BLOOMINGTON, MN

**REGISTRATION FEE: Paid Member of LCA: \$25.00      Non-Members: \$35.00**

I will attend the meeting: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name  
\_\_\_\_\_ Address

My check is enclosed \_\_\_\_\_.      I will pay at the door \_\_\_\_\_.

The Ramada Inn Mall of America is located at 2300 East American Blvd., Bloomington, MN. Telephone: 952-854-3411 or 1-800-272-6232 The special rate of \$89.00 plus taxes will apply **provided** you mention at the time of the reservation that you are attending the meeting of the **Association of Confessional Lutherans** which meets following the LCA meeting. A free shuttle service from the airport is offered by Ramada-Mall of America. As many as four people can stay in a room at the noted rate. You must make your own reservation. **Make check payable to:** Lutheran Concerns Association.

Kindly detach this reservation form and return it to:  
Lutheran Concerns Association  
1320 Hartford Avenue  
Saint Paul, MN 55116



### LCA CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

“Your Father’s Church”

#### TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 2009

6:30 PM – 8:30 PM      **Rev. Joseph Fisher**, “How A Confessional Congregation Works With A District and Neighboring Congregations With a Different Agenda”

#### WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 2009

8:00 AM – 8:30 AM      LCA Business Meeting  
8:30 AM – 9:15 AM      **Rev. Timothy Rossow**, “Specific Ministry Pastors”  
9:15 AM – 10:00 AM      **Rev. Thomas Queck & Mr. Walter Dissen**, “Funding the Mission: As Seen By a Parish Pastor & Layman”  
10:00 AM – 10:15 AM      Break  
10:15 AM – 11:45 AM      **Mr. Christian Preus**, “The Blue Ribbon Task Force on Structure and Governance”

***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

Lutheran Concerns Association

