

1999 Churchwide Assembly
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Reports and Records:
Assembly Minutes

August 16-22, 1999
Denver, Colorado

Published by the
Office of the Secretary
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
8765 West Higgins Road
Chicago, Ill. 60631

The Rev. Lowell G. Almen
Secretary

Copyright © 2000 Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Printed on recycled paper (10% post-consumer waste)

Contents

Introduction	5
Minutes of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly	
Plenary Session One	10
Plenary Session Two	39
Plenary Session Three	132
Plenary Session Four	156
Plenary Session Five	201
Plenary Session Six	298
Plenary Session Seven	390
Plenary Session Eight	416
Plenary Session Nine	478
Plenary Session Ten	532
Plenary Session Eleven	620
Supporting Exhibits of the Churchwide Assembly	
Exhibit A: Members of the Churchwide Assembly	
Voting Members	635
Advisory Members	647
Other Members	648
Exhibit B: Report of the Elections Committee	
First Ballot	651
Second Ballot	663
Exhibit C: Report of the Presiding Bishop	666
Exhibit D: Report of the Secretary	679
Exhibit E: Text of the “Tucson Resolution” of the Conference of Bishops	686
Exhibit F: Inter-unit Response to Synodical Memorials on the Ordination, Consecration, and Commissioning of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons	689
Exhibit G: The Study of Ministry	
Part 1:A Review of its Effects Six Years Later	706
Part 2:Ministry in Daily Life–A Call to Action	712
Exhibit H: Final Report on Ministry With and Among Persons with Disabilities	717
Exhibit I: Director for Rural Ministry and Networking	737
Exhibit J: Appeals Process	745
<i>Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (as amended)</i>	<i>749</i>
Index	983

Introduction

You have before you the historic record of the official minutes of the sixth Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The assembly was held August 16 through 22, 1999, under the theme, "Making Christ Known: Hope for a New Century." The site for the assembly was the Colorado Convention Center in Denver, Colorado.

Work of the Churchwide Assembly

The Churchwide Assembly is "...the highest legislative authority of the churchwide organization...." According to the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*, the assembly deals with matters that "...are necessary in the pursuit of the purpose and functions of this church..." (churchwide constitutional provision 12.11.).

Responsibilities of the Churchwide Assembly include: review of the work of the churchwide officers and churchwide units and action on business proposed by them through the Church Council; consideration of proposals from synodical assemblies (i.e., memorials); establishment of churchwide policy; adoption of a budget; election of officers, the Church Council, and members of churchwide unit boards and various committees; amendment of this church's constitutions and bylaws; and fulfillment of other functions necessary for this church's work (churchwide constitutional provision 12.21.).

About this Volume

This volume, *1999 Reports and Records: Assembly Minutes*, was prepared to be a complete and conveniently useable official record of the Churchwide Assembly. Therefore, reports and approved documents have been printed in the text of these minutes at the point of presentation or adoption, rather than appended elsewhere as exhibits. The content of the minutes, as a result, records the historical sequence of actions taken by the assembly.

Prior to Assembly

Various information items and proposals for action were presented to the voting members in the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*. Included in the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report* were summaries of minutes of the Church Council held during the 1997-1999 biennium, reports of churchwide units, and printed documentation from the officers.

The *1999 Pre-Assembly Report* also contained various appendices to the Report of the Secretary, including summaries of the annual parochial statistics and the names of persons added to or removed from the roster of ordained ministers and the officially recognized lay rosters of this church during the previous biennium. In this volume, *1999 Reports and Records: Assembly Minutes*, those summaries and registers have been revised, according to the latest available data reported by synods, and are reprinted as appendices to the Report of the Secretary.

For historical purposes, the financial audits for fiscal years 1997 and 1998 are appended to the Report of the Treasurer.

Action Numbers

The numbers attached to each final action of the Churchwide Assembly are preceded by the letters, “CA,” to designate that the action was taken by the Churchwide Assembly. The designation, “CA,” is followed by the year of the assembly, 1999; thus, “CA99.” Then follows the notation of the day of the assembly on which the action occurred, and the number of the action taken sequentially during the assembly. Thus, the action number, CA99.03.06, signifies that the sixth action of the assembly occurred on the third day of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

References to actions of various ELCA governing bodies also are cited by a code. For example, CC98.04.05, refers to the action taken by the Church Council (CC) at the council’s April (fourth month) meeting in 1998 (98), which represented the fifth action (05) of that governing body in the calendar year. Similarly, the designations, “EC,” and “CB,” refer respectively to the Executive Committee of the Church Council and the Conference of Bishops.

Citations of Governing Documents

Care should be taken to distinguish between action numbers and citations to the sections of the *Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*. References to this church’s governing documents are codified variously as ELCA 8.11. (a churchwide constitutional provision), ELCA 8.11.01. (a churchwide bylaw), S9.04. (*Constitution for Synods*), and C10.02. (*Model Constitution for Congregations*). A dagger (†) preceding the letter “S” or an asterisk (*) before “C” indicates that the provision is required rather than only recommended. Continuing resolutions are designated by a letter and the year in which they were adopted; thus, an ELCA churchwide continuing resolution is numbered, for example, 15.31.C95.

Reprint of Governing Documents

Various amendments to the governing documents of this church were adopted by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly. As a convenience to readers and for historical documentation, the full text of the 1999 edition of the *Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*, as amended, is printed at the end of this volume.

Words of Gratitude

Special appreciation is due those persons who recorded the proceedings of the assembly and prepared the preliminary minutes. Three teams of two persons each carried out that task: the Rev. Susan L. Gamelin (Southeastern Synod staff, Atlanta, Ga.); Ms. Ruth E. Hamilton (Office of the Secretary, Chicago, Ill.); the Rev. Richard E. Mueller (Florissant, Mo.); Ms. Carolyn Thomas (Rocky Mountain Synod staff, Denver, Colo.); the Rev. Karl J. Nelson (Sheboygan, Wis.); and the Rev. Leslie G. Svendsen (Northfield, Minn.). I am deeply grateful to each of them.

The monumental challenge of editing and preparing the minutes for publication was accomplished by Mr. Thomas J. Ehlen, Ms. Olinda D. Fink, the Rev. Randall R. Lee, and the Rev. Paul A. Schreck, members of the staff of the Office of the Secretary. To them, I declare personal gratitude for their conscientious service.

Abundant gratitude is conveyed to Ms. Mary Beth Nowak, assembly arrangements director, and all those who worked as part of the assembly operation, particularly members of the staff of the Office of the Presiding Bishop and the Office of the Secretary. Appreciation, too, is affirmed for the thorough efforts of staff members of the Department for Communication and *The Lutheran* magazine.

The Local Arrangements Committee was co-chaired by the Rev. Charles A. Berdahl, Ms. Terry L. Bowes, and the Rev. David W. Peters. Several sub-committee chairs and members working with them contributed diligently and graciously to the work of the assembly. Members of the committees are listed on page 35 of these minutes. I thank all of those who contributed conscientiously and faithfully to the work of the assembly.

Making Christ Known

Even as the themes of our previous churchwide assemblies have called this church to sing with “Many Voices, One Song,” to “See, Grow, and Serve to the Glory of God,” to be “Rooted in the Gospel for Witness and Service,” and to be “Alive in Our Heritage and Hope,” so this assembly challenged the members, congregations, synods, and churchwide ministries of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to serve with vigor and love in “Making Christ Known,” even as we by God’s grace confess anew our loving Savior as our “Hope for a New Century.”

THE REV. LOWELL G. ALMEN, *Secretary*
Festival of Pentecost
June 11, 2000

Sixth Churchwide Assembly
of the
Evangelical Lutheran Church
in America

Minutes

August 16-22, 1999
Denver, Colorado

Plenary Session One

Monday, August 16, 1999

7:30 P.M.–9:00 P.M.

Order for the Opening of an Assembly and Welcome

At 7:31 P.M. Mountain Daylight Time, the Rev. H. George Anderson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, opened the Sixth Biennial Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in Exhibit Hall A of the Colorado Convention Center in Denver, Colorado, by welcoming voting members to the last churchwide assembly of the millennium and by asking for God's guidance. The assembly began with the order for the Opening of a Churchwide Assembly, followed by the singing of "A Mighty Fortress."

Prior to the official opening of the assembly, a Service of Holy Communion was held, beginning at 4:30 P.M. Worship leaders included the following: the Rev. Karen S. Parker, presiding minister; Ms. Addie J. Butler, assisting minister; the Rev. H. George Anderson, preacher; the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, confessor; Mr. Richard L. McAuliffe, lector. Music was provided by Lutheran Music Program; handbells were directed by Ms. Barbara Brocker; Ms. Iris Castañon, soloist; Ms. Kathy Eggleston, organist; a choir was comprised of members from Rocky Mountain Synod congregations.

Report of the Credentials Committee

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, pages 5-6 (Section I, pages 9 and 30.)

The Church Council and the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, determined that 1,039 was the proper number of voting members for this assembly. This number includes an allocation of 1,035 voting members from synods, plus the four churchwide officers.

Reporting on behalf of the Credentials Committee, Secretary Almen presented the initial report, current as of 7:00 P.M. on Monday, August 16, 1999:

Voting members	990
Officers	<u>4</u>
TOTAL	994

The voting members were further identified as 593 lay members (314 females and 279 males) and 397 clergy. Based upon this report, Bishop Anderson declared a quorum to be present.

Greetings: Rocky Mountain Synod

Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Allan C. Bjornberg, bishop of the Rocky Mountain Synod, who welcomed the members of the assembly on behalf of the Rocky Mountain Synod congregations, leaders, and 800 assembly volunteers. He recounted the history of the sojourners and pilgrims who have come to the confluence of waters and cultures on this synod's territory. He then welcomed the pilgrims and sojourners who were attending the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to this confluence of baptismal waters. He described this church as long in history, deep in faith, old in witness, and young in vision.

Introduction to Electronic Voting

Bishop Anderson led the voting members through a demonstration of the electronic voting system. He announced that most votes would be taken utilizing the electronic system, although some votes would be taken using colored voting cards. He reminded the voting members that proxy voting is not permitted under the assembly's Rules of Organization and Procedure; therefore, he instructed voting members only to use the voting key pad located at their own seat.

Adoption of "Rules of Organization and Procedure"

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, pages 5-21

Bishop Anderson reviewed some of the Rules of Organization and Procedure, beginning with a general overview that highlighted the deadlines for specific procedures. Following the overview, Bishop Anderson reviewed the procedures for dealing with the full communion proposals.

Nominations

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, page 7.

Bishop Anderson identified the Nominations Desk in the Assembly Office (Convention Center Meeting Room A-214) as the place to submit floor nominations for various boards, committees, and the Church Council. He also called attention to the deadline for such nominations as 2:25 P.M. on Wednesday, August 18, 1999.

Access to Seating

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, page 13.

Bishop Anderson called attention to the fact that only those voting members and others with appropriate credentials are permitted onto the floor of the assembly.

Speeches

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, page 13.

Bishop Anderson reminded voting members that speeches are limited to three minutes making special note of a "traffic light" timer that turns amber after two minutes and red at the end of three minutes. He called attention also to another innovation: microphones labeled specifically for those speaking either in favor of or in opposition to an issue on the floor. Odd-numbered microphones are for those in favor, even numbered microphones for those opposed to the motion. Those wishing to offer an amendment or substitute motion may use any microphone. Bishop Anderson also said the deadline for adding new business to the assembly's agenda is 1:00 P.M. on Thursday, August 19, 1999. Proposals for new business are to be delivered to the secretary's deputy seated at the right-hand side of the speakers' platform.

Motions and Resolutions

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, page 14.

Substitute Motions:

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, page 14.

Bishop Anderson reviewed the procedure used to make substitute motions. This procedure was first introduced at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly. The assembly first will

work on perfecting the original motion, he said, then proceed to the substitute motion. The assembly then will vote on the substitute motion, followed by a vote on the original motion if such a vote is still required.

Amendments to the Social Statement:

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, page 14; continued on *Minutes*, pages 116, 391, 416.

Bishop Anderson reminded voting members that any amendments or substitutions to the social statement on economic life are due in writing by 8:30 A.M. on Wednesday, August 18, 1999.

Amendments to the Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America:

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, pages 15-16; continued on *Minutes*, pages 445, 459, 461, 617, 625.

Bishop Anderson announced that the deadline for notifying the Secretary of any removals to the *en bloc* motion concerning the constitution or bylaws is 8:30 A.M. on Wednesday, August 18, 1999. Any new changes to the constitution would only be received at this assembly as a first reading. Any new amendments to a bylaw or continuing resolution must be proposed in writing to the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, by 12:30 P.M. on Thursday, August 19, 1999.

2000-2001 Budget Proposal:

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, pages 16-17; continued on *Minutes*, pages 150, 546.

Bishop Anderson informed the voting members that the dead line for amendments to the 2000-2001 budget proposal is 2:00 P.M., Friday, August 20, 1999.

Memorials from Synods:

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, pages 17-18; continued on *Minutes*, pages 188, 274, 285, 492, 553.

Bishop Anderson announced that the deadline for removing a memorial from the *en bloc* resolution is 12:15 P.M., Tuesday, August 17, 1999.

Proposals for Full Communion:

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, pages 14-15; continued on *Minutes*, pages 42, 132, 157, 270, 299, 349.

Bishop Anderson reminded the voting members that a two-thirds vote is required for passage of the proposals for full communion. He noted that amendments were not in order for the proposal concerning the Moravian Church, "Following our Shepherd to Full Communion" because that document has already been approved by the Moravian Church. Amendments to "Called to Common Mission," which describes a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church, are in order since this is "A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the 'Concordat of Agreement.'" Any amendments to "Called to Common Mission" are due by 2:25 P.M. on Wednesday, August 18, 1999.

Bishop Anderson then outlined the process for consideration of the full-communion proposals, saying 90 minutes were scheduled during the plenary sessions on Tuesday to introduce each document. Hearings were scheduled on Tuesday afternoon offering further review of each proposal for full communion. Discussion as a "quasi-committee of the whole" was scheduled for Wednesday morning for "Called to Common Mission" and on Wednesday

afternoon for “Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion.” On Thursday the assembly was scheduled to vote on the Moravian proposal, followed by a vote on the Episcopal proposal. Bishop Anderson reminded the voting members that the proposed rules required votes on both proposals no later than the end of Friday’s plenary session.

At Bishop Anderson’s request, the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, moved the adoption of the Rules of Organization and Procedure.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes—985, No—13

CA99.01.01 To adopt the following Rules of Organization and Procedure (exclusive of quoted constitutional provisions, bylaws, and continuing resolutions that are already in force):

Rules of Organization and Procedure for the 1999 Churchwide Assembly

Authority of the Churchwide Assembly

The legislative function of the churchwide organization shall be fulfilled by the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 11.31.).

The Churchwide Assembly shall be the highest legislative authority of the churchwide organization and shall deal with all matters which are necessary in pursuit of the purposes and functions of this church. The powers of the Churchwide Assembly are limited only by the provisions of the Articles of Incorporation, this constitution and bylaws, and the assembly’s own resolutions (ELCA 12.11.).

Duties of the Churchwide Assembly

The Churchwide Assembly shall:

- a. Review the work of the churchwide officers, and for this purpose require and receive reports from them and act on business proposed by them.
- b. Review the work of the churchwide units, and for this purpose require and receive reports from them and act on business proposed by them.
- c. Receive and consider proposals from synod assemblies.
- d. Establish churchwide policy.
- e. Adopt a budget for the churchwide organization.
- f. Elect officers, board members, and other persons as provided in the constitution or bylaws.
- g. Establish churchwide units to carry out the functions of the churchwide organization.
- h. Have the sole authority to amend the constitution and bylaws.
- i. Fulfill other functions as required in the constitution and bylaws.
- j. Conduct such other business as necessary to further the purposes and functions of the churchwide organization (ELCA 12.21.).

Parliamentary Procedure

The Churchwide Assembly shall use parliamentary procedures in accordance with *Robert’s Rules of Order*, latest edition, unless otherwise ordered by the assembly (ELCA 12.31.09.).

(Note: the 1990 edition of *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*, is, therefore, the governing parliamentary law of this church, except as otherwise provided.)

No motion shall be out of order, because of conflict with federal, state, or local constitutions or laws.

Assembly Presiding Officer

The presiding bishop shall preside at the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 13.21.c.).

The vice president shall serve...in the event the bishop is unable to do so, as chair of the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 13.31.).

Assembly Secretary

The secretary shall be responsible for the minutes and records of the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 13.41.02.a.).

Assembly Voting Members

Each synod shall elect one voting member of the Churchwide Assembly for every 6,500 baptized members in the synod. In addition, each synod shall elect one voting member for every 50 congregations in the synod. The synod bishop, who is *ex officio* a member of the Churchwide Assembly, shall be included in the number of voting members so determined. There shall be at least two voting members from each synod. The secretary shall notify each synod of the number of assembly members it is to elect (ELCA 12.41.11.).

The officers of this church and the bishops of the synods shall serve as *ex officio* members of the Churchwide Assembly. They shall have voice and vote (ELCA 12.41.21.).

Inclusive Representation

Except as otherwise provided in this constitution and bylaws, the churchwide organization, through the Church Council, shall establish processes that will ensure that at least 60 percent of the members of its assemblies...be lay persons; that as nearly as possible, 50 percent of the lay members of these assemblies...shall be female and 50 percent shall be male, and that, where possible, the representation of ordained ministers shall be both female and male. At least 10 percent of the members of these assemblies...shall be persons of color and/or persons whose primary language is other than English (ELCA 5.01.f.).

The term, "persons of color and/or persons whose primary language is other than English," shall be understood to mean African American, Black, Arab and Middle Eastern, Asian, Hispanic, American Indian, and Alaska Native people. This definition, however, shall not be understood as limiting this church's commitment to inclusive participation in its life and work (ELCA 5.01.C96.).

Additional voting members have been allocated by the Church Council as follows:

<i>Synod</i>	<i>Additional Members</i>
Caribbean	3
<i>Stipulation:</i> All three persons must be persons of color or whose primary language is other than English (total voting members from synod would be five: three clergy, including bishop, one lay woman and one lay man)	
Alaska	2
<i>Stipulation:</i> At least one must be an Alaska Native person	
Arkansas-Oklahoma	3
<i>Stipulation:</i> At least one must be a person of color or a person whose primary language is other than English	

West Virginia-Western Maryland	3
<i>Stipulation: None</i>	
Slovak Zion	2
<i>Stipulation: None</i>	
Eastern Washington-Idaho	1
<i>Stipulation: Must be a person of color or a person whose primary language is other than English</i>	
Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana	1
<i>Stipulation: Must be a person of color or a person whose primary language is other than English</i>	
Northern Great Lakes	1
<i>Stipulation: Must be a person of color or a person whose primary language is other than English</i>	
La Crosse Area	1
<i>Stipulation: Must be a person of color or a person whose primary language is other than English</i>	
Northwestern Pennsylvania	1
<i>Stipulation: Must be a person of color or a person whose primary language is other than English</i>	
Metropolitan Washington, D.C.	1
<i>Stipulation: Must be a person of color or a person whose primary language is other than English</i>	

Assembly Properly Constituted

Each assembly...of the churchwide organization...shall be conclusively presumed to have been properly constituted, and neither the method of selection nor the composition of any such assembly...may be challenged in a court of law by any person or be used as the basis of a challenge in a court of law to the validity or effect of any action taken or authorized by any such assembly (ELCA 5.01.j).

Eligibility to Serve as Voting Member

Each voting member of the Churchwide Assembly shall be a voting member of a congregation of this church and shall cease to be a member of the assembly if no longer a voting member of a congregation of this church. The criterion for voting membership in the congregation from which the voting member is elected shall be in effect regarding minimum age for that voting member. (ELCA 12.41.13.).

Certification of Voting Members

The secretary of each synod shall submit to the secretary of this church at least nine months before each regular Churchwide Assembly a certified list of the voting members elected by the Synod Assembly (ELCA 12.41.12.).

Seating of Alternate Voting Members

If a synodical bishop certifies that one of the voting members elected from that synod is not or will not be present, the Credentials Committee shall seat an alternate as a voting member from that synod.

Advisory Members

Members of the Church Council and board chairpersons or their designees, unless elected as voting members, shall serve as advisory members of the Churchwide Assembly.

Executive directors of churchwide units, the executive for administration, and executive assistants to the presiding bishop shall serve as advisory members of the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 12.41.31.).

Advisory members shall have voice but not vote (ELCA 12.41.32.).

Other Members

Other categories of non-voting members may be established by the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 12.41.41.).

Presidents of the colleges, universities, and seminaries of this church, unless elected as voting members of the assembly, shall have voice but not vote (ELCA 12.41.A89.).

An individual whose term of office as a bishop of a synod commences within one month of the assembly, unless elected as a voting member of the assembly, shall have the privilege of seat and voice, but not vote, during the assembly.

An individual whose term of office as a bishop of a synod either commences or expires during the course of the assembly shall have the privilege of seat and voice, but not vote, during that portion of the assembly before commencement or after termination of such term.

An individual who served as a churchwide or presiding bishop in a predecessor church body or this church, unless elected as a voting member of the assembly, shall have voice but not vote.

Resource Members

Resource members shall be persons recommended by the presiding bishop of this church or by the Church Council who, because of their position or expertise, can contribute to the work of the Churchwide Assembly. Resource members shall have voice only with respect to matters within their expertise, but not vote.

Official Visitors

Official visitors shall be persons invited by the presiding bishop of this church or the Church Council to address the Churchwide Assembly. They shall not have vote.

Mandated Committees

The Churchwide Assembly shall have a Reference and Counsel Committee, a Memorials Committee, and a Nominating Committee. The description of these committees shall be in the bylaws (ELCA 12.51.).

Reference and Counsel Committee

A Reference and Counsel Committee, appointed by the Church Council, shall review all proposed changes or additions to the constitution and bylaws and other items submitted which are not germane to items contained in the stated agenda of the assembly (ELCA 12.51.10.).

Memorials Committee

A Memorials Committee, appointed by the Church Council, shall review memorials from synod assemblies and make appropriate recommendations for assembly action (ELCA 12.51.21.).

Nominating Committee

A Nominating Committee, elected by the Churchwide Assembly, shall nominate two persons for each position for which an election will be held by the Churchwide Assembly and for which a nominating procedure has not otherwise been designated in the constitution and bylaws of this church (ELCA 12.51.31.).

The Nominating Committee shall strive to ensure that at least two of the voting membership of the Church Council shall have been younger than 30 years of age at the time of their election (ELCA 19.21.A98.).

The Church Council shall place in nomination the names of two persons for each position [on the Nominating Committee] (ELCA 19.21.01.).

Nominations Desk

Nominations from the floor at the Churchwide Assembly shall be made at the Nominations Desk, which shall be maintained under the supervision of the secretary of this church (ELCA 19.61.A98.a.).

A nomination from the floor shall be made by using the form provided by the secretary of this church. Nomination forms may be obtained from the Nominations Desk at times prescribed in the assembly's Rules of Organization and Procedure. This form is also included in each voting member's registration materials (ELCA 19.61.A98.b.).

Information and additional forms may be obtained from the Nominations Desk on Monday, August 16, 1999, from Noon to 4:30 P.M. and from 6:00 P.M. to 7:30 P.M., on Tuesday, August 17, 1999, from 8:00 A.M. to 6:30 P.M., and on Wednesday, August 18, 1999, from 8:00 A.M. to 2:25 P.M.

Nominations Form

The required form to be used in making nominations from the floor shall include the nominee's name, address, phone number, gender, lay or clergy status, white or person of color or primary language other than English status, congregational membership, synodical membership, and affirmation of willingness to serve, if elected; the name, address, and synodical membership of the voting member who is making the nomination; and such other information as the secretary of this church shall require (ELCA 19.61.A98.c.).

For purposes of nomination procedures, "synodical membership" means:

- 1) In the case of a lay person, the synod that includes the congregation in which such person holds membership, and
- 2) In the case of an ordained minister, the synod on whose roster such ordained minister's name is maintained (ELCA 19.61.A98.d.).

Congregational Membership

Each nominee for an elected or appointed position in this church shall be a voting member of a congregation of this church (ELCA 19.05.).

Making Floor Nominations

Floor nominations for positions on a board of a churchwide unit require, in addition to the nominator, the written support of at least ten other voting members. Floor nominations for the Church Council, the Nominating Committee, or other churchwide committee to be elected by the Churchwide Assembly require, in addition to the nominator, the written support of at least 20 other voting members (ELCA 19.61.B98.a.).

A nomination from the floor for any position (other than bishop, vice president, and secretary) shall be made by filing the completed nomination form with the Nominations Desk at times prescribed in the assembly's Rules of Organization and Procedure (ELCA 19.61.B98.b.).

Nominations from the floor for any position (other than presiding bishop, vice president, secretary, and editor of *The Lutheran*) shall be made by filing the completed prescribed form with the Nominations Desk on Tuesday, August 17, 1999, from 8:00 A.M. to 6:30 P.M., or on Wednesday, August 18, 1999, from 8:00 A.M. to 2:25 P.M.

Nominations will be considered made in the order in which filed at the Nominations Desk (ELCA 19.61.B98.c.).

Restrictions on Floor Nominations for Boards

(cf. ELCA 19.21.02. and 19.21.04.)

Nominations from the floor for positions on the churchwide boards shall comply with criteria and restrictions established by the Nominating Committee and set forth in materials provided to each voting member of the assembly (ELCA 19.61.A98.a.).

So long as the number of incumbent members from a given synod serving on a board with terms not expiring plus the number of positions on the same board to which individuals from the same synod already have been nominated (whether by the Nominating Committee or from the floor) total less than the maximum number of two individuals from the same synod who may serve on that board, an individual from the same synod may be nominated for another position on that board, provided other criteria and restrictions are met. Individuals from the same synod may be nominated for a position on a board to which individuals from the same synod already have been nominated, provided other criteria and restrictions are met (ELCA 19.61.C98.b.).

Restrictions on Floor Nominations for Church Council

(cf. ELCA 19.21.02. and 19.02.)

Nominations from the floor for positions on the Church Council shall comply with criteria and restrictions established by the Church Council and Nominating Committee and set forth in materials provided in advance to each voting member of the assembly (ELCA 19.61.D98.a.).

So long as other criteria and restrictions are met, an individual may be nominated for a Church Council position, unless someone from the same synod is serving on the Church Council with a term not expiring this year. In addition to meeting other criteria and restrictions, individuals from one synod can be nominated only for *one* position on the Church Council (ELCA 19.61.D98.b.).

So long as the number of incumbent members from a given region serving on the Church Council with terms not expiring this year plus the number of Church Council positions to which individuals from the same region have already been nominated (whether by the Nominating Committee or from the floor) total less than the maximum number of individuals from the same region who may serve on the Church Council, an individual from the same region may be nominated for another Church Council position, provided other criteria and restrictions are met. Provided other criteria and restrictions are met, individuals may be nominated for a Church Council position for which someone from the same region already has been nominated (ELCA 19.61.D98.c.).

Restrictions on Floor Nominations for Nominating Committee

(cf. ELCA 19.21.01.)

Nominations from the floor for positions on the Nominating Committee shall comply with criteria and restrictions established by the Church Council and set forth in materials provided to each voting member of the assembly (ELCA 19.61.E98.a.).

So long as the number of incumbent members from a given region serving on the Nominating Committee with terms not expiring plus the number of Nominating Committee positions to which individuals from the same region have already been nominated (whether by the Church Council or from the floor) total less than the maximum number of three individuals from the same region who may serve on the Nominating Committee, an individual from the same region may be nominated for another Nominating Committee position, provided other criteria and restrictions are met. Provided other criteria and

restrictions are met, individuals may be nominated for a Nominating Committee position for which someone from the same region has already been nominated (ELCA 19.61.E98.b.).

Restrictions on Nominations for Officers

The presiding bishop shall be an ordained minister of this church. The presiding bishop may be male or female, as may other officers of this church (ELCA 13.21.).

The presiding bishop shall be elected by the Churchwide Assembly to a six-year term (ELCA 13.22.).

The presiding bishop shall be a full-time, salaried position (ELCA 13.22.02.).

The vice president of this church shall be a layperson (ELCA 13.31.).

The vice president shall be elected by the Churchwide Assembly to a six-year term and shall be a voting member of a congregation of this church (ELCA 13.32.).

The vice president shall serve without salary (ELCA 13.32.02.).

The secretary shall be elected by the Churchwide Assembly to a six-year term and shall be a voting member of a congregation of this church (ELCA 13.42.).

The secretary shall be a full-time, salaried position (ELCA 13.42.02.).

The secretary may be either a lay person or an ordained minister.

Other Committees

The Churchwide Assembly may authorize such other committees as it deems necessary (ELCA 12.51.).

Agenda

The presiding bishop shall provide for the preparation of the agenda for the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 13.21.c.).

The Agenda Committee shall assist the presiding bishop in the preparation of the agenda of the Churchwide Assembly.

Program and Worship

The arrangements for agenda, program, and worship shall be under the supervision of the presiding bishop (ELCA 12.31.04.).

The Program and Worship Committee shall assist the presiding bishop in the preparation for the program and worship at the Churchwide Assembly.

Physical Arrangements

Physical arrangements for churchwide assemblies shall be made by the secretary or by an assembly manager working under the secretary's supervision. Such committees as may be necessary to facilitate the planning for and operation of the assembly may be established by the secretary in consultation with the presiding bishop (ELCA 12.31.05.).

The Physical Arrangements Committee shall assist the secretary of this church in the physical arrangements for the Churchwide Assembly.

Minutes Committee

The Minutes Committee shall review minutes of the Churchwide Assembly prepared under the supervision of the secretary of this church, and periodically recommend that the assembly receive the preliminary minutes of sessions, as distributed. The presiding bishop and secretary shall have the authority to approve the minutes on behalf of the Churchwide Assembly and shall deposit in the archives of this church the protocol copy of the assembly's minutes.

Credentials Committee

The Credentials Committee shall oversee the registration of voting members and shall report periodically to the Churchwide Assembly the number of voting members registered.

Audit of Credentials Report

At the request of the chair of the Credentials Committee or of the assembly, the chair may order an audit of the report of the Credentials Committee. When so ordered, the credentials committee will provide the bishop of each synod with a list of the registered voting members from such synod. Each bishop (or other voting member duly appointed by the bishop) shall then make appropriate corrections on such list and certify the accuracy of the list with such corrections as may be indicated. Each bishop (or other voting member duly appointed by the bishop) shall promptly return the certified list to the chair of the Credentials Committee.

Election Procedures Utilizing the Common Ballot

The common ballot is used in those elections when the ecclesiastical or nominating ballot is not used (ELCA 19.61.F98.a.).

For the first common ballot, the exact number of ballot forms equal to the number of voting members from each synod will be given to the bishop of that synod. The bishop of the synod, or his or her designee, will be responsible for distributing the ballot forms to each of the voting members from the synod (ELCA 19.61.F98.b.).

Upon recommendation of the chair and with the consent of the assembly, the second common ballot may be conducted by electronic device. Unless the second common ballot is conducted by electronic device, the distribution of ballot forms for the second common ballot will be in the same manner as the first common ballot (ELCA 19.61.F98.c.).

Any discrepancy between the number of ballots given to a synodical bishop and the number of voting members (including the synod bishop) from such synod must be reported by the synodical bishop to the Elections Committee (ELCA 19.61.F98.d.).

Each ticket for which an election is held will be considered a separate ballot (ELCA 19.61.F98.e.).

A voting member may vote for only one nominee on each ticket (ELCA 19.61.F98.f.).

Failure to vote for a nominee for every ticket does not invalidate a ballot for the tickets for which a nominee is marked (ELCA 19.61.F98.g.).

Ballots must be marked in accordance with the instructions presented in plenary session (ELCA 19.61.F98.h.).

Ballot forms shall not be folded (ELCA 19.61.F98.i.).

Marked ballot forms must be deposited at the designated Ballot Stations at certain exits of the hall in which plenary sessions are held (ELCA 19.61.F98.j.).

If a ballot is damaged so that it cannot be scanned, a replacement ballot may be obtained at the Ballot Station upon surrender of the damaged ballot (ELCA 19.61.F98.k.).

Unless otherwise ordered by the assembly, polls for the first common ballot close at the time designated in the assembly's Rules of Organization and Procedure (ELCA 19.61.F98.l.).

Unless otherwise ordered by the assembly, polls for the first common ballot close at 2:00 P.M. on Friday, August 20, 1999.

On each ticket for which balloting is conducted by electronic device, the polls will remain open for a reasonable time, as determined by the chair, to permit members to record their votes (ELCA 19.61.F98.m.).

Unless the second ballot is conducted by electronic device, polls for the second common ballot close at the time designated in the assembly's Rules of Organization and Procedure or as otherwise ordered by the assembly (ELCA 19.61.F98.n.).

Unless either otherwise ordered by the assembly or the second ballot is conducted by electronic device, polls for the second common ballot close at 6:00 P.M. on Saturday, August 21, 1999.

On the second ballot, whether by ballot form or by electronic device, the first position on each ticket shall be given to the nominee who received the greatest number of votes on the first ballot. If two nominees are tied for the highest vote, the first position on the ticket shall be determined by draw (ELCA 19.61.F98.o.).

Ecclesiastical Ballot Defined

An “ecclesiastical ballot” for the election of officers (other than treasurer) of the churchwide organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is an election process:

- a. In which on the first ballot the name of any eligible individual may be submitted for nomination by a voting member of the assembly;
- b. Through which the possibility of election to office exists on any ballot by achievement of the required number of votes cast by voting members of the assembly applicable to a particular ballot;
- c. That precludes spoken floor nominations;
- d. In which the first ballot is the nominating ballot if no election occurs on the first ballot;
- e. In which the first ballot defines the total slate of nominees for possible election on a subsequent ballot, with no additional nominations;
- f. That does not preclude, after the reporting of the first ballot, the right of persons nominated to withdraw their names prior to the casting of the second ballot;
- g. In which any name appearing on the second ballot may not be subsequently withdrawn;
- h. That does not preclude an assably’s adoption of rules that permit, at a defined point in the election process and for a defined period of time, speeches to the assembly by nominees or their representatives and/or a question-and-answer forum in which the nominees or their representatives participate; and
- i. In which the number of names that appear on any ballot subsequent to the second ballot shall be determined in accordance with provisions of the governing documents (ELCA 19.61.A94.).

Election Procedures Utilizing the Ecclesiastical Ballot

For each election by ecclesiastical or nominating ballot, the exact number of appropriate ballot sets equal to the number of voting members from each synod will be given to the bishop of that synod. The bishop of the synod, or his or her designee, will be responsible for distributing the ballot sets to each of the voting members from the synod (ELCA 19.61.G98.a.).

Unless otherwise ordered by the chair, one of the numbered ballots from the appropriate ballot set is to be used on each ballot for elections determined by ecclesiastical or nominating ballot. The chair will announce the number of the ballot from the appropriate ballot set that is to be used for each ballot. Failure to use the correct numbered ballot will result in an illegal ballot (ELCA 19.61.G98.b.).

On the first two ballots for each office being selected by ecclesiastical or nominating ballot, both the first and last names of a nominee should be used. Members should endeavor to use correct spelling and should provide any additional accurate information identifying the nominee, such as title, synod, residence, etc. (ELCA 19.61.G98.c.)

On the third and subsequent ballots conducted by written ballot, only the last name of the nominee need be used, provided there is no other nominee with the same or similar name (ELCA 19.61.G98.d.).

A member may vote for only one nominee on each ballot (ELCA 19.61.G98.e.).

Ballots should not be marked prior to the time the chair advises the voting members to do so (ELCA 19.61.G98.f.).

Written ballots shall not be folded (ELCA 19.61.G98.g.).

Written ballots will be collected from the voting members in accordance with instructions from the Elections Committee or from the chair (ELCA 19.61.G98.h.).

When the results of the first ballot are presented, the chair will announce when and how persons nominated may withdraw their names prior to the casting of the second ballot (ELCA 19.61.G98.i.).

Whenever the number of names of nominees that will appear on a ballot is nine or less, on recommendation of the chair and with the consent of the assembly, voting may be by means of electronic device (ELCA 19.61.G98.j.).

When voting by electronic device, the first position on each ballot shall be given to the nominee who received the greatest number of votes on the immediately preceding ballot, with the remaining positions assigned to the other nominees in descending order of the number of votes received on the immediately preceding ballot. If two or more nominees were tied with the same vote on the immediately preceding ballot, their respective positions shall be determined by draw by the chair of the Elections Committee (ELCA 19.61.G98.k.).

On each ticket for which balloting is conducted by electronic device, the polls will remain open for a reasonable time, as determined by the chair, to permit voting members to record their votes (ELCA 19.61.G98.l.).

Voting Procedures Other Than for Elections

Proxy and absentee voting shall not be permitted at a Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 12.31.08.).

As directed by the chair, voting (other than in elections) may be by voice, by raising voting cards, by show of hands, by standing, by written ballot, or by electronic device.

Each voting member's registration packet contains three voting cards—green (yes), red (no), and white (abstain). These cards also are to be used, when requested by the chair, to obtain recognition at the microphone.

When a vote is taken by standing, those persons voting affirmative shall rise when requested by the chair, and remain standing, until counted and told to be seated by the chair. Thereafter, those voting negatively shall respond in the same manner followed by those who wish to abstain.

Each voting member's registration packet contains a ballot pad of numbered ballots. Each voting member is responsible for this pad. When directed by the chair, one of the numbered ballots from the ballot pad shall be used. The chair will announce the number of the ballot from the ballot pad that is to be used for a particular vote. Failure to use the correctly numbered ballot will result in an invalid ballot. These ballots should not be folded and will be collected at the voting member's table in accordance with instructions from the Elections Committee or from the chair.

When a division of the house is ordered, the vote shall be by electronic device, by standing vote, or by written ballot as directed by the chair. No division of the house is in order when a vote has been taken by electronic device, by standing vote, or by written ballot.

Any member who has an electronic device on which the green light does not illuminate when the chair has called for members to test their electronic devices should notify immediately the Elections Committee.

Any member who because of a physical limitation has difficulty in using the electronic device or in seeing the visual display on which voting instructions are projected should contact the Elections Committee for assistance.

Each member shall vote only by the electronic device at his or her assigned seat.

Voting by electronic device shall be in accordance with instructions from the chair or the Elections Committee.

A member's vote by electronic device can be recorded and transmitted only when the green light on the device is illuminated.

While the green light on the electronic device remains illuminated and prior to transmission of the vote, a member can change his or her vote by pressing the clear-erase key.

The member's vote by electronic device will be shown on the display panel of the device prior to the transmission of the vote. Once the vote is transmitted, it cannot be changed or corrected.

The vote by electronic device shall be recorded by entering #1 for yes, #2 for no.

On each vote by electronic device, the member must select her or his vote by entering the appropriate key number, which number will then be shown on the display panel of the device.

A member's vote by electronic device shall be recorded before the chair orders the voting closed.

Elections Committee

The Elections Committee shall oversee the conduct of elections in accordance with election procedures approved by the Churchwide Assembly.

In the election for presiding bishop, vice president, or secretary, the Elections Committee shall report the results of any balloting by announcing the number of votes received by each nominee and the names of those nominees qualified to remain on the next ballot or the name of the nominee who is elected.

The Elections Committee shall report the results of balloting in other elections by announcing the name of the person elected or by announcing the names of nominees qualified to remain on the ballot. Vote totals shall be reported to the secretary of this church and recorded in the minutes of the assembly. Based on this report, the chair shall declare elected those who received the required number of votes.

A written report showing the results of a ballot shall be distributed to the voting members concurrently with, or as soon as possible after, the announced report of the Elections Committee.

Election of Officers and Editor

Set forth hereafter are the procedures for the elections of the presiding bishop, the vice president, the secretary, and the editor of *The Lutheran*, irrespective of whether there will be an election at this assembly for any of these positions. Elections are required because of completion of the specified term for a position or when a vacancy otherwise occurs.

At the 1999 Churchwide Assembly, the only election required because of completion of term is the editor of *The Lutheran*.

Election of the Presiding Bishop

The presiding bishop shall be elected by the Churchwide Assembly by ecclesiastical ballot. Three-fourths of the votes cast shall be necessary for election on the first ballot. If no one is elected, the first ballot shall be considered the nominating ballot. Three-fourths of the votes cast on the second ballot shall be necessary for election. The third ballot shall be limited to the seven persons (plus ties) who received the greatest number of votes on the second ballot, and two-thirds of the votes cast shall be necessary for election. The fourth ballot shall be limited to the three persons (plus ties) who receive the greatest number of votes on the third ballot, and 60 percent of the votes cast shall be necessary for election. On subsequent ballots, a majority of the votes cast shall be necessary for election. These ballots shall be limited to the two persons (plus ties) who receive the greatest number of votes on the previous ballot (ELCA 19.31.01.a.).

Prior to the third ballot for presiding bishop, biographical data will be distributed for the seven persons (plus ties) who receive the greatest number of votes on the second ballot.

Prior to the third ballot for presiding bishop, the seven persons (plus ties) receiving the greatest number of votes on the second ballot will be invited to address the assembly, with each speech limited to five minutes. If any such person is not present at the assembly, the bishop of the synod of such person's roster shall, in consultation with such person, if possible, designate an alternate to speak on behalf of such person.

Prior to the fourth ballot for presiding bishop, the three persons (plus ties) receiving the greatest number of votes on the third ballot will be invited to participate in a question and answer period moderated by an individual appointed by the Executive Committee of the Church Council.

Election of the Vice President

The vice president shall be elected by the Churchwide Assembly. The election shall proceed without oral nominations. If the first ballot for vice president does not result in an election, it shall be considered a nominating ballot. On the first ballot, three-fourths of the votes cast shall be required for election. Thereafter only such votes as are cast for persons who received votes on the first or nominating ballot shall be valid. On the second ballot, three-fourths of the votes cast shall be required for election. On the third ballot, the voting shall be limited to the seven persons (plus ties) receiving the greatest number of votes on the second ballot and two-thirds of the votes cast shall be necessary for election. On the fourth ballot, voting shall be limited to the three persons (plus ties) receiving the greatest number of votes on the previous ballot and 60 percent of the votes cast shall elect. On subsequent ballots, voting shall be limited to two persons (plus ties) receiving the greatest number of votes on the previous ballot and a majority of votes cast shall elect (ELCA 19.31.01.b.).

Prior to the third ballot for vice president, biographical data will be distributed for the seven persons (plus ties) who receive the greatest number of votes on the second ballot.

Prior to the fourth ballot for vice president, the three persons (plus ties) receiving the greatest number of votes on the third ballot will be invited to address the assembly, with each speech limited to five minutes. If any such person is not available to address the assembly, the bishop of the synod of such person's congregation membership shall, in consultation with such person, if possible, designate an alternate to speak on behalf of such person.

Election of the Secretary

The secretary shall be elected by the Churchwide Assembly. The election shall proceed without oral nominations. If the first ballot for secretary does not result in an election, it shall be considered a nominating ballot. On the first ballot, three-fourths of the votes cast shall be required for election. Thereafter only such votes as are cast for persons who received votes on the first or nominating ballot shall be valid. On the second ballot, three-fourths of the votes cast shall be required for election. On the third ballot, the voting shall be limited to the seven persons (plus ties) receiving the greatest number of votes on the second ballot and two-thirds of the votes cast shall be necessary for election. On the fourth ballot, voting shall be limited to the three persons (plus ties) receiving the greatest number of votes on the previous ballot and 60 percent of the votes cast shall elect. On subsequent ballots, voting shall be limited to the two persons (plus ties) receiving the greatest number of votes on the previous ballot and a majority of the votes cast shall elect (ELCA 19.31.01.c.).

Prior to the third ballot for secretary, biographical data will be distributed for the seven persons (plus ties) who receive the greatest number of votes on the second ballot.

Prior to the fourth ballot for secretary, the three persons (plus ties) receiving the greatest number of votes on the third ballot will be invited to address the assembly, with each speech limited to five minutes. If any such person is not present at the assembly, the bishop of the synod of such person's roster of ordained ministers, or such person's congregation membership, shall, in consultation with such person, if possible, designate an alternate to speak on behalf of such person.

Majority Required for Election

Other than in elections of presiding bishop, vice president, and secretary, a majority of votes cast on the first ballot shall be necessary for election. If an election does not occur on the first ballot, the names of the two persons receiving the highest number of votes cast shall be placed on the second ballot. On the second ballot, a majority of legal votes cast shall be necessary for election (ELCA 19.11.01.b.).

On the final ballot for the election of presiding bishop, vice president, and secretary of this church, when only two names appear on the ballot, a majority of the legal votes cast shall be necessary for election (ELCA 19.11.01.e.).

Breaking Ties

On the ballot for the election of the presiding bishop, vice president, and secretary, when only two names appear, the marked ballot of the treasurer shall be held by the chair of the Elections Committee and shall be counted only where necessary to break a tie that would otherwise exist (ELCA 19.61.H98.a.).

On the first common ballot, the blank ballots of the treasurer and vice president shall be held by the chair of the Elections Committee to be presented to the treasurer for her or his vote only in those elections where a tie would otherwise exist, and to be presented to the vice president for his or her vote only in those elections to break a tie remaining after the ballot of the treasurer has been counted (ELCA 19.61.H98.b.).

On the second common ballot, the marked ballot of the treasurer shall be held by the chair of the Elections Committee and shall be counted only where necessary to break a tie that would otherwise exist (ELCA 19.61.H98.c.).

Nomination and Election of the Editor of *The Lutheran*

The advisory committee of *The Lutheran*, in consultation with the presiding bishop and the Church Council, shall nominate the editor for the church periodical (ELCA 17.21.01.).

The Churchwide Assembly shall elect the editor of the church periodical. If the first nominee nominated by the advisory committee is not elected, the advisory committee shall nominate another person. The editor shall be elected to a four-year term (ELCA 17.21.02.).

The editor of the church periodical shall be elected to a four-year term (ELCA 19.51.04.).

For the position of editor of *The Lutheran*, a majority of legal votes cast shall be necessary for election (ELCA 19.11.01.b.).

Additional Officials or Committees

Additional officials or committees (sergeants-at-arms; parliamentarians; chairs for hearings; chairs for unit lunches; tellers; pages; etc.) of the Churchwide Assembly shall be appointed by the presiding bishop.

Notice of Meeting

The secretary shall give notice of the time and place of each regular assembly by publication thereof at least 60 days in advance in this church's periodical (ELCA 12.31.02.).

Written notices shall be mailed to all voting members not more than 30 days nor less than 10 days in advance of any meeting (ELCA 12.31.02.).

Assembly Reports

At least 20 days prior to an assembly the secretary shall prepare and distribute to each congregation and to the voting members-elect a pre-assembly report (ELCA 12.31.03.).

Reports of the Presiding Bishop and Secretary of This Church

Following presentation, the presiding bishop's report and the secretary's report shall be referred to the Reference and Counsel Committee.

Status of Reports

All reports published in the *Pre-Assembly Report* shall be treated as having been received by the assembly without formal vote.

Quorum

At least one-half of the persons elected as voting members must be present at a meeting to constitute a quorum for the legal conduct of business. If such a quorum is not present, those voting members present may adjourn the meeting to another time and place, provided that only those persons eligible to vote at the original meeting may vote at the adjourned meeting (ELCA 12.31.07.).

Absence of Members

Members shall not absent themselves from any session of the assembly without valid excuse, under penalty of forfeiture of the *per diem* allowance for the day of absence and proportionate reimbursement of travel expenses.

Access to Seating

A person will be admitted to restricted seating areas only upon display of proper credentials.

Obtaining the Floor

In plenary sessions of the Churchwide Assembly, the voting members, including the *ex officio* members, always have prior right to obtain the floor. Advisory members shall be entitled to obtain the floor, if it does not prevent voting members from being heard. Resource members shall be entitled to the floor only with respect to matters within their expertise, if it does not prevent the voting members from being heard. Official visitors may address the assembly when requested to do so by the chair.

Speeches

Unless otherwise determined by a majority vote of the assembly, all speeches during discussion shall be limited to three minutes. A signal shall be given one minute before the speaker's time ends. A second signal shall be given one minute later, and the speaker shall then sit down, unless the chair proposes and receives consent that an additional minute or minutes be allowed the speaker.

Alternating Speeches

Insofar as is possible during discussion, a speaker on one side of the question shall be followed by a speaker on the other side.

To facilitate alternating speeches and when requested by the chair, assembly members awaiting recognition at the microphones shall display one of the colored (green, red, white) cards found in their registration packets. The green card is to be used to identify a member who will speak in favor of the pending matter on the floor (i.e., the question that will be voted upon, if there is no further motion of any kind). A red card is to be used to identify a member who wishes to speak against the pending matter. A white card is to be used to identify a member who wishes to offer an amendment to the pending matter, or some other motion that would be in order.

Moving the Previous Question

A member who has spoken on the pending question(s) may not move the previous question(s).

Applause

In the give-and-take of debate on issues before the Churchwide Assembly, members of the assembly and visitors shall refrain from applause.

Departing from Agenda

With the consent of the Churchwide Assembly, the chair shall have the authority to call items of business before the assembly in whatever order he or she considers most expedient for the conduct of the assembly's business.

Motions and Resolutions

Substantive motions or resolutions, or amendments to either, must be presented in writing to the secretary of this church promptly after being moved. A form is provided for this purpose. This form is included in each voting member's registration packet; other forms are available at the tables of voting members.

A resolution, which is germane to the matter before the assembly, may be offered by any voting member from the floor by going to a microphone and being recognized by the chair.

Any resolution not germane to the matter before the Churchwide Assembly or on the assembly agenda must be submitted to the secretary of this church in writing no later than 1:00 P.M., Thursday, August 19, 1999. Each resolution must be supported in writing by one other voting member. At least 24 hours must elapse before such resolution may be considered in plenary session. The secretary shall refer such resolution to the Reference and Counsel Committee, which may:

- (a) Recommend approval;
- (b) Recommend disapproval;
- (c) Recommend referral to a unit of this church; or
- (d) Recommend a substitute motion to the assembly.

Any resolution not germane to the matter before the Churchwide Assembly or on the assembly agenda that might be submitted by a voting member, because of circumstances that develop during the assembly and cannot be submitted to the secretary of this church before 1:00 P.M., Thursday, August 19, 1999, must be submitted to the secretary in writing and supported in writing by one other voting member. The secretary shall refer such resolutions to the Reference and Counsel Committee, which may:

- (a) Decline to refer the resolution to the assembly;
- (b) Recommend approval;
- (c) Recommend disapproval;
- (d) Recommend referral to a unit of this church; or
- (e) Recommend a substitute motion to the assembly.

In its recommendation, the Committee of Reference and Counsel, following consultation with the Division for Church in Society, shall inform the Churchwide Assembly when a resolution requires action on a societal issue for which this church does not have an established social policy. Should such motion or resolution be adopted by the Churchwide Assembly, the matter shall be referred to the Division for Church in Society, which shall bring to the next regular meeting of the Church Council a plan for appropriate implementation.

Substitute Motions

When a substitute motion is made, secondary amendments may be offered first to the original motion. After all secondary amendments to the original motion have been disposed of, secondary amendments to the substitute motion may be offered. When all amendments to the substitute motion have been disposed of, the vote shall be taken on whether the substitute motion is to be substituted or rejected.

With respect to any recommendation made by the Memorials Committee in a printed report distributed to the assembly members prior to, or at the first business session of the assembly, a voting member of the assembly may offer a substitute motion to the committee's recommendation only if such member, prior to 12:15 P.M. on Tuesday, August 17, 1999, has given written notice to the chair of the Memorials Committee, or other committee member designated by the chair of the Memorials Committee.

Amendments to Major Statements

Any amendment to a major statement must be submitted in writing to the secretary of this church prior to the hour and date indicated:

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
Economic Life	8:30 A.M., Wednesday morning, August 18, 1999

Voting members who submit amendments may be requested to meet with the staff of the unit that developed the statement.

If in the opinion of the chair of the assembly the amendments to a major statement are either too voluminous or too complex for the assembly to consider expeditiously, all amendments may be referred by the chair to either the Committee of Reference and Counsel or to an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the chair with the consent of the assembly for its recommendations for the consideration of the statement and the proposed amendments by the assembly.

If a voting member wishes to offer a substantive amendment that was not submitted prior to the deadline, the assembly may consider such amendment by a simple majority vote.

Vote to Adopt Social Statements

A two-thirds vote of the voting members of the Churchwide Assembly shall be required for adoption of a social statement.

Vote to Adopt Certain Recommendations from Task Force Reports

A two-thirds majority vote of the voting members of the Churchwide Assembly shall be required to adopt recommendations from a task force report that require amendment of a constitution or bylaw provision for implementation.

Voting on Ecumenical Proposals for Full Communion

This church may establish official church-to-church relationships and agreements. Establishments of such official relationships and agreements shall require a two-thirds vote of the voting members of the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 8.71.01.).

Before this assembly are the two ecumenical proposals for full communion with other churches that constitute official church-to-church relationships and agreements requiring a two-thirds vote for approval.

Voting on each of the ecumenical proposals for full communion will not take place prior to Plenary Session Six on Thursday morning, August 19, 1999, nor later than Plenary Session Eight on Friday afternoon, August 20, 1999.

The results of the vote on the first of the two ecumenical proposals for full communion to be voted upon will be announced as soon as possible after the vote has been tallied and prior to voting on the second of the two proposals. The results of the vote on the second of the two ecumenical proposals for full communion to be voted upon will be announced as soon as possible after the vote has been tallied.

No Amendments to Ecumenical Proposal for Full Communion with the Moravian Church

Since the proposal for full communion with the Moravian Church in America, "Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion," is before this Assembly pursuant to a process approved by

that church and this church, neither amendments nor substitute motions shall be in order with respect to the ecumenical proposals for full communion with the Moravian Church in America.

Amendments Permitted to Ecumenical Proposal for Full Communion with The Episcopal Church

Since the proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church, “Called to Common Mission,” is before this assembly pursuant to actions of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly, amendments and substitute motions are in order with respect to the ecumenical proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church.

Any amendment or substitute motion to the proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church must be submitted in writing to the secretary of this church prior to 2:25 P.M., on Wednesday, August 18, 1999.

Voting members who submit amendments or substitute motions may be requested to meet with the staff of the unit that developed the statement.

If in the opinion of the chair of the assembly the amendments or substitute motions to the proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church are either too voluminous or too complex for the assembly to consider expeditiously, all amendments and substitute motions may be referred by the chair to either the Committee of Reference and Counsel or to an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the chair with the consent of the assembly for its recommendations for the consideration of the statement and the proposed amendments or substitute motions by the assembly.

If a voting member wishes to offer a substantive amendment that was not submitted prior to the deadline, the assembly may consider such amendment by a simple majority vote.

Unit Lunches

Voting members, advisory members, other members, resource members, official visitors, and other categories approved by the Churchwide Assembly are assigned to unit lunches by the secretary of this church. Unit lunches are for information only and have no legislative authority.

Hearings

Certain proposals that are scheduled for assembly action or information are the subject of hearings. Voting members, advisory members, other members, resource members, official visitors, and other categories approved by the Churchwide Assembly may attend with voice. Other guests may attend only if space permits and shall have no voice. Hearings have no legislative authority.

The chair of the open hearing shall endeavor to maintain decorum and order and may call upon the assistance of sergeants-at-arms. Insofar as is possible during discussion, a speaker on one side of the question shall be followed by a speaker on the other side.

Constitutional Amendments

The constitution of this church may be amended through either of the following procedures:

- a) The Church Council may propose an amendment, with an official notice to be sent to the synods at least six months prior to the next regular meeting of the Churchwide Assembly. The adoption of such an amendment shall require a two-thirds vote of the members of the next regular meeting of the Churchwide Assembly present and voting.
- b) An amendment may be proposed by 25 or more members of the Churchwide Assembly. The proposed amendment shall be referred to the Committee of Reference and Counsel for its recommendation, following which it shall come before the assembly. Adoption of such an amendment shall require passage at two successive regular meetings of the Churchwide Assembly by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting (ELCA 22.11.).

A constitutional amendment may only be proposed by a main motion.

Bylaw Amendments

Bylaws not in conflict with this constitution may be adopted or amended at any regular meeting of the Churchwide Assembly when presented in writing by the Church Council or by at least 15 members of the assembly. An amendment proposed by members of the assembly shall immediately be submitted to the Committee of Reference and Counsel for its recommendation. In no event shall an amendment be placed before the assembly for action sooner than the day following its presentation to the assembly. A two-thirds vote of the members present and voting shall be necessary for adoption (ELCA 22.21.).

A bylaw amendment may be proposed only by a main motion.

A proposed bylaw amendment must be submitted in writing to the secretary of this church prior to 12:30 P.M. on Thursday, August 19, 1999. The secretary first shall report to the assembly any bylaw amendments so submitted and the amendments then shall be referred to the Committee of Reference and Counsel.

Continuing Resolutions

Provisions relating to the administrative functions of this church shall be set forth in the continuing resolutions. Continuing resolutions may be adopted or amended by a majority vote of the Churchwide Assembly or by a two-thirds vote of the Church Council (ELCA 22.31.).

Should the board or standing committee in question disagree with the action of the Church Council in amending a continuing resolution, it may appeal the decision to the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 15.41.04.; 16.11.41.; 16.22.17.; 17.21.21.; 17.31.06.; 17.41.08.; 17.51.04.; 17.61.07.).

A continuing resolution amendment may be proposed only by a main motion.

Amendments to *Constitution for Synods*

The *Constitution for Synods* contains mandatory provisions that incorporate and record therein provisions of the constitution and bylaws of this church. Amendments to mandatory provisions incorporating constitutional provisions of this church shall be made in the same manner as prescribed in Chapter 22 for amendments to the constitution of this church. Amendments to mandatory provisions incorporating bylaw provisions of this church and amendments to non-mandatory provisions shall be made in the same manner as prescribed in Chapter 22 for amendments to the bylaws of this church. Non-mandatory provisions shall not be inconsistent with the constitution and bylaws of this church (ELCA 10.13.).

An amendment to the *Constitution for Synods* may be proposed only by a main motion.

Amendments to *Model Constitution for Congregations*

A *Model Constitution for Congregations* shall be provided by this church. Amendments to the *Model Constitution for Congregations* shall be made in the same manner as prescribed in Chapter 22 for amendments of the bylaws of this church (ELCA 9.53.02.).

An amendment to the *Model Constitution for Congregations* may be proposed only by a main motion.

En Bloc Resolution for Constitutional Amendments

The constitutions may be amended and bylaws and continuing resolutions may be adopted or amended by *en bloc*¹ resolutions, unless a voting member objects to the inclusion of any

¹ Adoption of several motions by a single assembly resolution; sometimes known as an omnibus bill or resolution.

particular provision. The objection of a voting member shall be made in writing delivered to the secretary of this church not later than 8:30 A.M. on Wednesday, August 18, 1999. Particular provisions to which objection is so noted shall be considered separately and all other provisions not objected to will be considered as part of the *en bloc* resolution.

Budget Procedures

The presiding bishop shall provide for the preparation of the budget for the churchwide organization (ELCA 13.21.f.).

At the direction of the presiding bishop, the executive for administration shall develop the budget for the churchwide organization and report to the Church Council and the Churchwide Assembly through the Budget and Finance Committee of the Church Council with regard to the preparation of the budget (ELCA 15.11.B91.d.).

A Budget and Finance Committee shall be composed of members of the Church Council elected by the council and the treasurer of this church as an *ex officio* member with voice but not vote in the committee. This committee shall have staff services provided by the Office of the Bishop and the Office of the Treasurer (ELCA 14.41.A91.).

The Church Council, upon recommendation of the presiding bishop, shall submit budget proposals for approval by the Churchwide Assembly and authorize expenditures within the parameters of approved budgets (ELCA 14.21.04.).

The Churchwide Assembly shall adopt a budget for the churchwide organization (ELCA 12.21.e.).

Each synod shall remit to the churchwide organization a percentage of all donor unrestricted receipts contributed to it by the congregations of the synod, such percentage to be determined by the Churchwide Assembly. Individual exceptions may be made by the Church Council upon request of a synod (ELCA 10.71.).

Proposed amendments to the budget must be submitted to the secretary of this church in writing no later than 2:00 P.M. on Friday, August 20, 1999. Each amendment must be supported in writing by one other voting member. The secretary shall refer such proposed amendments to the Budget and Finance Committee. During the consideration of the budget by the assembly, the Budget and Finance Committee shall report on the implication of each proposed amendment.

Any amendment to the budget that increases a current program proposal of, or adds a current program proposal to, a churchwide unit must include a corresponding decrease in some other current program proposal of the same or another churchwide unit(s) and/or increase in revenues. Any amendment to the budget that proposes an increase in revenues shall require an affirmative vote by at least two-thirds of those present and voting.

Appropriations

When a motion calling for an appropriation comes before the Churchwide Assembly from any source other than the Church Council or a memorial from a synod, it shall be referred at once to the Committee of Reference and Counsel. The Committee of Reference and Counsel shall refer the proposed appropriation to the Budget and Finance Committee of the Church Council. The Budget and Finance Committee may consult with the churchwide unit(s) affected by the proposed appropriation. The Budget and Finance Committee may conclude that it cannot evaluate adequately the proposed appropriation prior to assembly adjournment and may request that the Church Council be designated to receive the evaluation later and to determine whether or not the proposed appropriation shall be authorized. The findings of the Budget and Finance Committee shall be forwarded to the Committee of Reference and Counsel, which shall then make its recommendation to the Churchwide Assembly. If the report of the Committee of Reference and Counsel is negative, a two-thirds vote of the voting members present and voting shall be required for adoption.

A proposed appropriation that originates with a synod through a memorial will be handled in the same way as in the preceding rule, except that reference shall be to the Memorials Committee rather than to the Committee of Reference and Counsel.

New Studies or Research Proposals

Each proposal by a voting member for a study or research project shall be made as a main motion and shall be referred to the Committee of Reference and Counsel. The Reference and Counsel Committee shall refer the proposal to the Department for Research and Evaluation. This department, in consultation with the churchwide unit to which the proposal is directed, will seek to determine the purpose, relationship to existing studies and research projects or current programs, potential value, overall costs including staff requirements, and availability of budget and staff. The Department for Research and Evaluation may conclude that it cannot evaluate adequately the proposal prior to the assembly adjournment and request that the Church Council be designated to receive the evaluation at a later time and determine whether or not the study or research project should be initiated. The findings of the Department for Research and Evaluation shall be submitted to the Reference and Counsel Committee, which may make its recommendation to the assembly. When a proposal falls within the responsibilities of another unit, that unit may submit its reactions to the proposal in a separate report. If the recommendation calls for a new appropriation, the matter also shall be referred at once to the Budget and Finance Committee for consideration and report to the Reference and Counsel Committee. If the report of the Reference and Counsel Committee is negative, a two-thirds vote of the voting members present and voting shall be required for adoption.

A proposal that originates with a synod through a memorial shall be handled the same way, except that reference shall be to the Memorials Committee, rather than to the Reference and Counsel Committee.

Relationship to Church Council

This church shall have a Church Council which shall be the board of directors of this church and shall serve as the interim legislative authority between meetings of the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 14.11.).

“Interim legislative authority” is defined to mean that between meetings of the Churchwide Assembly, the Church Council may exercise the authority of the Churchwide Assembly so long as:

- a. the actions of the Church Council do not conflict with the actions of and policies established by the Churchwide Assembly; and
- b. the Church Council is not precluded by constitutional or bylaw provisions from taking action on the matter (ELCA 14.13.).

The Church Council shall act on the policies proposed by churchwide unit boards subject to review by the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 14.21.01.).

The Church Council shall review recommendations from churchwide units for consideration by the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 14.21.03.).

The Church Council, upon recommendation of the presiding bishop, shall submit budget proposals for approval by the Churchwide Assembly and authorize expenditures within the parameters of approved budgets (ELCA 14.21.04.).

The Church Council shall arrange the process for all elections to boards of churchwide units to assure conformity with established criteria (ELCA 14.21.08.).

The Church Council shall report its actions to the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 14.21.14.).

Status of Church Council Recommendations

The recommendation of the Church Council with respect to any proposal by a churchwide unit board shall be treated as a motion before the Churchwide Assembly, unless the Church Council shall otherwise determine.

Status of Recommendations of the Memorials Committee and Reference and Counsel Committee

When either the Memorials Committee or the Reference and Counsel Committee has made a recommendation (other than merely recommending approval or rejection) concerning a memorial(s) or resolution(s) considered by the committee, such recommendation shall be the main motion before the assembly.

When either the Memorials Committee or the Reference and Counsel Committee has recommended the passage of a memorial or resolution considered by the committee, such memorial or resolution recommended for passage shall be the main motion before the assembly and the committee's recommendation shall be received as information.

When either the Memorials Committee or the Reference and Counsel Committee has recommended the rejection of a memorial or resolution considered by the committee without making any other recommendation on the same or closely related subject, such memorial or resolution recommended for rejection shall be the main motion before the assembly and the committee's recommendation shall be received as information.

***En Bloc* Resolution for Responses to Certain Memorials**

The responses to the synod memorials, as recommended by the Memorials Committee in a printed report distributed to assembly members prior to, or at, the first business session of the assembly, may be approved by *en bloc* resolutions when so proposed by the Memorials Committee.

If a voting member desires the assembly to discuss a synodical memorial or the Memorials Committee's response that is proposed for *en bloc* consideration, she or he may request that it be removed from the proposed *en bloc* resolution. The assembly then will consider and vote separately on the proposed response of the Memorials Committee. To call for such separate consideration, a voting member must submit written notification to the secretary of this church or the secretary's deputy no later than 12:15 P.M., Tuesday, August 17, 1999, on the form entitled *Notice Related to Recommendations of the Memorials Committee*. A copy of that form is included on page 3 of the Report of the Memorials Committee. Additional forms will be available from the secretary's deputy.

A voting member who desires to offer a substitute to the recommendation of the Memorials Committee also must complete the same form, *Notice Related to Recommendations of the Memorials Committee*. In addition, the text of the proposed substitute should be submitted on a *Motion Form* to the secretary or the secretary's deputy.

Consultation with at least one of the co-chairs of the Memorials Committee is required when a substitute will be moved, and is recommended when any other amendment will be proposed to the response recommended by the Memorials Committee.

Relationship to Boards of Churchwide Units

Each board shall be responsible to the Churchwide Assembly and will report to the Church Council in the interim. The policies, procedures, and programs of each board shall be reviewed by the Church Council in order to assure conformity with the governing documents of this church and with Churchwide Assembly actions (ELCA 16.11.11.; 17.41.03.; 17.51.02.; 17.61.05.; 17.61.A91.g.; 17.21.04.).

Relationship to Commissions

Action of the Churchwide Assembly is required to establish a commission or to determine that a commission's mandate has been fulfilled (ELCA 16.21.).

Relationship to Board of Pensions

The Churchwide Assembly shall:

- a. authorize the creation of the governance structure for this program;

- b. approve the documents establishing and governing the program;
- c. refer any amendments to the program initiated by the Churchwide Assembly to the Board of Pensions for recommendation before final action by the Church Council, assuring that no amendment shall abridge the rights of members with respect to their pension accumulations;
- d. direct the establishment of an appeal process within the Board of Pensions to enable participants in the plans to appeal decisions (ELCA 17.61.01.).

The Church Council shall refer, as it deems appropriate, proposed amendments [to the church pension and other benefits plans] to the Churchwide Assembly for final action (ELCA 17.61.02.d.).

[The Board of Pensions] shall manage and operate the pension and other benefits plans for this church within the design and policy adopted by the Churchwide Assembly and shall invest assets according to its best judgment (ELCA 17.61.A91.a.).

[The Board of Pensions] shall report to the Churchwide Assembly through the Church Council, with the Church Council making comments on all board actions needing approval of the Churchwide Assembly (ELCA 17.61.A91.g.).

Distribution of Materials

Materials may be distributed on the floor of the assembly only with the written consent of the secretary of this church. In cases where the secretary does not consent, appeal may be made to the Committee of Reference and Counsel, whose decision shall be final.

Assembly Costs

The churchwide organization shall be responsible for the costs of the Churchwide Assembly, including the reasonable costs for travel, housing, and board for voting and advisory members (ELCA 12.31.06.).

College Corporation Meetings

The voting members of the Churchwide Assembly also constitute the voting members of certain college corporations that hold meetings as part of the agenda of the assembly. The assembly will recess to conduct the corporation meeting(s) and reconvene at the conclusion of the corporation meeting(s), or at the beginning of the next scheduled session of the assembly. Quorum requirements for college corporation meetings are specified in the governing documents of each college. The quorum requirement for the Churchwide Assembly does not apply to college corporation meetings.

Unfinished Business

When the orders of the day are called for adjournment of the Churchwide Assembly, all remaining unfinished items of business shall be referred to the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for disposition.

Organization of the Assembly: Roll of Voting Members

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section I, pages 5, 22, and Exhibit A

The Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, on behalf of the Credentials Committee, presented a revised roll of voting members and announced that the revised roll would be included as Exhibit A in the official minutes of the assembly. Bishop Anderson, hearing no objection, accepted Secretary Almen's report.

Constitution of Assembly Committees

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section I, page 28

Bishop Anderson directed the voting members to the location in their *Pre-Assembly Report* of the proposed members of assembly committees. Hearing no objection to the constitution of the committees, he declared the committees authorized and constituted.

Memorials Committee

Mr. Dale Blade
Ms. Sheila Barr
Pr. Martha W. Clementson
Pr. Gary R. Danielson
Ms. Patricia Davenport
Mr. D. Mark Klever
Mr. Christopher Mehling
Pr. Philip L. Natwick
Bp. Glenn W. Nycklemoe
Mr. Carlos Peña, *co-chair*
Ms. Beverly A. Peterson, *co-chair*
Ms. Mary Jane Schieve
Ms. Judy Wagner St. Pierre
Bp. Howard E. Wennes

Nominating Committee

Mr. Robert A. Addy
Mr. Robert L. Anderson
Pr. Kirk W. Bish, *chair*
Pr. James E. Braaten
Mr. Keith P. Brown
Pr. Thomas M. Carlson
Ms. Barbara J. Eaves

Pr. Cynthia A. Ishler
Ms. Mary R. Jones
Pr. George E. Keck
Ms. Dorothy K. Peterman
Ms. Barbara L. Price
Mr. Fred B. Renwick
Ms. Roberta C. Schott
Ms. Mary Ann Shealy
Pr. Susan E. Tjornehoj
Pr. Robert L. Vogel, *vice chair*

Committee of Reference and Counsel

Ms. Linda J. Brown, *co-chair*
Ms. Karen Dietz
Bp. Guy S. Edmiston
Pr. Franklin D. Fry, *co-chair* [Excused]
Mr. Fernando Guzman
Ms. Donna Haack
Mr. Donald G. Hayes
Mr. Mark Helmke
Bp. Mark R. Ramseth
Mr. Dale V. Sandstrom
Pr. Karen L. Soli
Pr. Walter F. Taylor Jr.
Ms. Lily R. Wu

The Rules of Organization and Procedure for the 1999 Churchwide Assembly, as adopted by this assembly [CA99.01.01], provided for additional committees, the members of which were listed on page 8 in the assembly Program booklet. Hearing no objection, Presiding Bishop Anderson declared those committees to be duly authorized and constituted.

Staff Planning Committee

Pr. Lowell G. Almen, *chair*
Bp. H. George Anderson
Ms. Kristi S. Bangert
Mr. John R. Brooks
Ms. Rhonda W. Campbell
Pr. Jeffrey E. King
Pr. Randall R. Lee
Pr. Paul R. Nelson
Ms. Mary Beth Nowak, *assembly manager*

Mr. John L. Peterson
Pr. Kurt A. Reichardt
Pr. Eric C. Shafer
Ms. Myrna J. Sheie
Mr. Scott C. Weidler

Local Arrangements Committee

Pr. Laurel Alexander, *special events co-chair*
Mr. Ray Avischious, *member at large*
Mr. Ben Bartell, *special needs co-chair*

Ms. Carolyn Bartell, *special needs co-chair*
 Pr. Charles Berdahl, *co-chair*
 Ms. Terry L. Bowes, *co-chair*
 Ms. Betty Boyd, *member at large*
 Ms. Katherine Cruson, *volunteers co-chair*
 Pr. Bill Dion, *special needs co-chair*
 Ms. Anne Dion, *special needs co-chair*
 Ms. Judy Dunlavy, *hospitality co-chair*
 Ms. Lillian Filegar, *registration co-chair*
 Pr. Jim Gearhart, *facilities co-chair*
 Pr. Beth Graham, *worship co-chair*
 Pr. Dennis Hagstrom, *worship co-chair*
 Ms. Mary Beth Nowak, *ELCA staff*
 Ms. Anna Osborn, *special events co-chair*
 Ms. Jan Perino, *volunteers co-chair*
 Pr. David W. Peters, *co-chair*
 Ms. Judy Peters, *registration co-chair*
 Ms. Harriet S. Powell, *secretary*
 Pr. Ron Rude, *worship co-chair*
 Ms. Karen Setzer, *hospitality co-chair*
 Ms. Carolyn Thomas, *synod staff*
 Mr. Wallace White, *facilities co-chair*

Worship Committee

Pr. Lowell G. Almen
 Bp. H. George Anderson
 Ms. Myrna J. Sheie
 Pr. Paul R. Nelson, *director for worship*
 Pr. Karen M. Ward
 Mr. Scott C. Weidler, *music coordinator*

Local Arrangements Committee

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, page 28.

Bishop Anderson then introduced the members of the Local Arrangements Committee: Ms. Terry L. Bowes, the Rev. Charles A. Berdahl, and the Rev. David W. Peters. On behalf of the assembly Bishop Anderson thanked the members of the Local Arrangements Committee, Bishop Allan C. Bjornberg, his staff, and the many volunteers who made the 1999 Churchwide Assembly possible. The members of the Local Arrangements Committee were listed on page 28 of Section I of the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*.

Introduction of the Parliamentarian

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, page 5.

Bishop Anderson introduced Mr. David J. Hardy of Palatine, Illinois, the first general counsel of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, recently retired, as the parliamentarian for the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

Agenda Committee

Pr. Lowell G. Almen
 Bp. H. George Anderson, *chair*
 Pr. Robert N. Bacher
 Ms. Addie J. Butler
 Pr. Michael L. Cooper-White
 Ms. Myrna J. Sheie

Credentials Committee

Pr. David L. Alderfer
 Pr. Lowell G. Almen, *ex officio chair*
 Mr. Phillip H. Harris, *vice chair*
 Ms. Emilie Scott, *registrar*
 Ms. Nancy L. Vaughn

Elections Committee

Pr. David L. Alderfer, *vice chair*
 Ms. Loraine "Lorrie" G. Bergquist, *secretary*
 Mr. Scott S. Fintzen, *chair*

Minutes Committee

Pr. Lowell G. Almen, *ex officio chair*
 Mr. Thom J. Ehlen
 Pr. Susan L. Gamelin
 Ms. Ruth E. Hamilton
 Pr. Randall R. Lee
 Pr. Richard E. Mueller
 Pr. Karl J. Nelson
 Pr. Paul A. Schreck
 Pr. Leslie G. Svendsen
 Ms. Carolyn Thomas

Adoption of the Order of Business

Reference: *Order of Business*.

Bishop Anderson directed attention to the proposed Order of Business, a lavender-colored booklet, that had been given to all voting members, saying that as chair he retained some liberty to introduce hymns, music, prayer, and other brief items into the agenda. He then called upon the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to move the adoption of the Order of Business.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes—958, No—12

CA99.01.02 To approve the Order of Business as the agenda of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in keeping with the provisions of the “Rules of Organization and Procedure” for the calling of items of business before the assembly.

Report of the Vice President and Church Council

Reference: *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VIII, pages 1-48.

Vice President Addie J. Butler expressed her gratitude for the members of the Church Council who give their time, energy, and expertise to their council responsibilities. She listed the council actions that are being transmitted to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly. These actions include the ecumenical proposals entitled “Called to Common Mission” and “Following our Shepherd to Full Communion,” the social statement on economic life entitled “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All,” the World Hunger Appeal 25th Anniversary Response, a resolution in support of the “Help the Children” churchwide initiative, the 2000-2001 budget proposal, the proposal for a social statement on health care, and amendments to this church’s governing documents.

Vice President Butler reported that members of the Church Council have pledged to offer \$25,000 in support of the World Hunger Appeal’s anniversary. Vice President Butler said that since her election in 1997 she has been invited to every region of this church. She highlighted her role in introducing the ELCA Identity Project by showing a 60-second video produced as a television advertisement to be used by congregations and synods of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. She concluded her report by assuring the assembly that the Church Council is working to “Make Christ Known—Our Hope for a New Century.”

Recess

Bishop Anderson called upon the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, for announcements. Secretary Almen, acknowledging that he

might sound like a parent, cautioned the members of the assembly about several matters: moving away from the bottom of the escalators promptly to help avoid dangerous back-ups, drinking ample amounts of water to prevent altitude sickness, and crossing streets carefully. He reminded voting members of Tuesday's deadline at 12:15 P.M. for removal of items from the *en bloc* resolution, and he noted that the use of cell phones on the assembly floor was prohibited and that pagers must be set to a "silent" mode. Secretary Almen also announced the "Run, Walk, 'n' Roll" sponsored by the Board of Pensions each morning beginning at 5:30 A.M. Finally, Secretary Almen informed the assembly members that breakfast would begin at 7:00 A.M. Tuesday in Hall B of the Convention Center.

Bishop Anderson called on the Rev. Philip L. Natwick, a member of the Church Council, to lead the assembly in prayer. Following the singing of "Sing a New Song Unto the Lord" and Pastor Natwick's prayer, Bishop Anderson announced at 8:47 P.M. that the assembly was in recess until 8:30 A.M. Tuesday morning.

Plenary Session Two

Tuesday, August 17, 1999

8:30 A.M. - 12:00 Noon

The Rev. H. George Anderson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, called Plenary Session Two to order at 8:34 A.M. Mountain Daylight Time. Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, who announced that although the fire alarm in the convention center had indicated a fire in an elevator shaft, the fire marshal had investigated the situation and had determined that the plenary session could safely begin. Bishop Anderson called upon the Rev. Kirkwood J. Havel, a member of the Church Council, to lead the assembly in morning prayer and the hymn, "In the Morning When I Rise."

Bishop Anderson thanked the ensemble from Lutheran Summer Music. He announced two business sessions scheduled for the day, with hearings to follow in the afternoon.

On a "happy note," Bishop Anderson announced that the offering for the World Hunger Appeal at the Opening Worship was \$39,539, the highest total ever. That total included \$19,000 from a special offering taken by the Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod and \$2,500 from a special congregational effort from Mount Tabor Lutheran Church, West Columbia, South Carolina. He asked voting members to use their keypads to indicate whether they had participated at 5:30 A.M. in the "Run, Walk, 'n' Roll" sponsored by the Board of Pensions. The tally showed 888 voting no and 69 yes.

Report of the Presiding Bishop

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section II, pages 1-6; Minutes, Exhibit C.

Bishop Anderson called upon Ms. Addie J. Butler, vice president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to assume the chair. Chair *pro tem* Butler called upon Bishop Anderson to present the report of the presiding bishop.

Noting that this was "the last Churchwide Assembly in the 20th century," he said this was "a good time to look back and marvel at the work" of the last century. Citing an article from *The Lutheran Almanac* of 1901, he noted how the 19th century had received the horse and bequeathed the bicycle and the motorcar; had received the quill pen and bequeathed the typewriter; and had received the beacon signal and bequeathed the telephone and wireless telegraphy. Similarly this past century can claim to have bequeathed space travel, nuclear power, and the Internet. Calling attention to several ways in which this church is using the Internet to advance its mission, he specifically noted a forthcoming new on-line magazine.

The "spiritual legacies" of the past century, he said, may not be as positive, noting that no significant progress had been made in eliminating war. And yet, among churches, significant advances have been made: "We've discovered how to come together despite differences." Among Lutherans, we have inherited ecumenical cooperation and are bequeathing full communion: "We Lutherans have been leaders."

Telling of his granddaughter's efforts to overcome her fear of swimming, he drew parallels to new ELCA ecumenical relationships, pointing out how Lutherans have moved from "testing the waters" to "taking the plunge." He described how the ELCA's relationship with the United Church of Christ, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), and the Reformed

Church in America has been “qualitatively different” from prior contacts since this church entered into full communion with them in 1997. At this assembly, he said, this church has the opportunity to “plunge into a wider sea” by entering into full communion with Moravians and Episcopalians: “What a bridge we could be.”

Full communion with The Episcopal Church will mean “doing something different” in terms of some ELCA practices, but “what a step forward into a new millennium,” he said.

Reminding the assembly of how different practices and slogans kept Lutherans and Roman Catholics apart for years, he said he was glad that this century will end with the signing of the “Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification.” Formal signing of the Declaration will take place on October 31, 1999, in Augsburg, Germany. While noting that “significant differences remain,” he added, “we enter the new millennium with hope.”

He said that this century began with an expectation that the world could be converted to the Christian faith in one generation, if enough missionaries could go out to tell the story of Jesus. Many dedicated missionaries went, and the Gospel took root, even if the world was not converted in one generation. This church continues to send out people to tell the story of Jesus, and this task has been furthered as mission support dollars have exceeded expectations.

Bishop Anderson showed a video featuring Bishop Munib Younan of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan (ELCJ), who described some of the educational and spiritual ministries of his church, as the ELCJ works to foster understanding in a multi-religious society. “The ELCA is supporting this ministry in this part of the world,” Bishop Younan said, through prayer, advocacy, and mission support.

Because many ELCA synods have companion synods in various countries, ELCA members are now learning “what we have always said, that Christ is the hope of the world,” Bishop Anderson said.

Changes in the global economic situation have been reflected in how Lutheran congregations do ministry. Lutherans began the century by helping individuals, then worked through community service agencies, and are now looking at how practices affect the global economy. Bishop Anderson said that he had studied changes in congregational budgets, and the greatest change he has seen in recent years is the amount in congregational budgets going to community agencies, such as shelters, food banks, and advocacy groups.

Turning his attention to refugee resettlement and world hunger, he said that these have been a priority for the past 25 years. Because of the involvement of churches in meeting world hunger needs, there has been a decline worldwide in the number of people who are hungry. He expressed pleasure that an additional \$500,000 has been given in the first half of 1999 for world hunger compared to the prior year. Global problems, he said, will “require more than our surplus cash.” Christians need to ask, “What does the Lord require of us?” One way this Churchwide Assembly will address that question is by considering memorials on international debt.

Now, he said, “it is time for you to pick up the conversation.” He said he would take up the task of serving as referee, having had the opportunity to express his views on several issues. “I will trust your judgment,” he said, trusting that the Holy Spirit would lead the voting members as they make their decisions.

Vice President Butler announced that under the “Rules of Organization and Procedure” the Report of the Presiding Bishop was accepted and referred to the Committee of Reference and Counsel without further action.

Report of the Credentials Committee

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section I, pages 9, 28.

Bishop Anderson called upon Secretary Almen, who, as *ex officio* chair of the Credentials Committee, provided the following report of voter registration as of 8:15 A.M., August 17, 1999.

Voting Members:

Lay Members	Female	327
	Male	<u>287</u>
TOTAL		614
Ordained Ministers	Female	105
	Male	<u>301</u>
TOTAL		406
TOTAL		1,020
ELCA Officers:		<u>4</u>
TOTAL VOTING MEMBERSHIP		1,024

Of the 1,024 registered voting members, 103 were persons of color or persons whose primary language is other than English.

Theme Focus: Signs of Hope

Bishop Anderson called upon Vice President Butler to return to the podium to offer another “Sign of Hope” in this church. She described how the presence of persons emigrating from other countries continues to enrich the Church. Using a video, she described how this church provides ministries such as English classes and health services to meet the needs of these newcomers, some of whom bring the Gospel with them, while others hear the Gospel for the first time. The video also called attention to a new ELCA Spanish-language hymnal, *Libro de Liturgia y Cántico*. Bishop Anderson and Vice President Butler then read the names of 24 voting members who immigrated to the U.S. and invited them to stand.

Report of the Nominating Committee

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section VII, pages 1-73 (Section I, pages 7-8, 28).

Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Kirk W. Bish, chair of the Nominating Committee, and asked for the report of that committee. During his report, Pastor Bish reviewed the process used by the committee, adding that the committee did its work with diligence and great care. The committee met April 23-24, 1999, to carry out its responsibility of providing two nominees for each position open for election. For the 93 positions available 550 names were submitted. Pastor Bish reminded the assembly that nominations from the floor were permitted but must be submitted on the approved form and be in accordance with the provisions printed in the “Rules of Organization and Procedure” and that floor nominations must be submitted to the nominations desk at the assembly office before 2:25 P.M. on Wednesday, August 18, 1999.

Proposal for Full Communion with The Episcopal Church

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, pages 1-10.2; Section V, pages 1-6 (Section I, pages 14-15); continued on Minutes, pages 157, 349.

BACKGROUND

Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue Prior to 1997

The following narrative describes a number of important events in the discussions that have resulted in the proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church.

a. *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue I (1969-1972)*. The Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue I began in the U.S. in 1969, prior to the International Lutheran-Anglican Dialogue. It resulted in *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue: A Progress Report*, which recommended “continuing joint theological study and conversations” and offered specific proposals for limited inter-communion and mutual ecclesial recognition.

b. *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue II (1976-1980)*. The Lutheran and Episcopal churches then authorized the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue II. This dialogue issued *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue: Reports and Recommendations* and joint statements on justification, the Gospel, eucharistic presence, the authority of Scripture, and apostolicity.

c. *Interim Eucharistic Sharing*. In 1982, The Episcopal Church, The American Lutheran Church, The Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, and the Lutheran Church in America took official action to enter into an Agreement on Interim Eucharistic Sharing. This meant among other things that the churches recognized each other as churches “in which the Gospel is preached and taught” and encouraged the development of common Christian life throughout their respective churches. The churches also called for a third series of dialogues to resolve other outstanding questions before they could enter into full communion (*communio in sacris* or pulpit and altar fellowship), which was the goal of the 1982 agreement. The topics for the third series were: the implications of the Gospel; historic episcopate; and ordering of ministry (bishops, priests, and deacons) in the total context of apostolicity. The Episcopalian participants wanted greater agreement on the ordering of the church as the community of faith.

d. *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue III (1983-1991)*. The Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue III produced two major reports.

(1) *Implications of the Gospel* (with a study guide) discusses the implications of the Gospel for the faith and life of the two churches in terms of what God has done in history. It describes how Lutherans and Episcopalians can faithfully articulate the Gospel together in contemporary society. Recommendations for action, not dependent on full communion, in the areas of worship, ecumenism, evangelism, and ethics were offered to the churches.

(2) *Toward Full Communion* and the *Concordat of Agreement* address the implications of the proposal for full communion. The preface to the Concordat defines full communion as it appeared in the international Lutheran-Episcopal Working Group in 1983. This definition is in accord with *Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America* (1991) and the *Declaration of Unity* of The Episcopal Church (1979). The preface begins as follows:

“The Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue, Series III, proposes this *Concordat of Agreement* to its sponsoring bodies for consideration and action by the General Convention of The Episcopal Church and the Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical

Lutheran Church in America in implementation of the goal mandated by the Lutheran-Episcopal Agreement of 1982. That agreement identified the goal as ‘full communion (*communio in sacris*/altar and pulpit fellowship).’”

e. *ELCA Study of the Lutheran-Episcopal Proposals: 1991-1997.* The 1991 Churchwide Assembly determined that the time line for a churchwide study process would not begin until 1993, after action by the ELCA Churchwide Assembly on the Study of Ministry. In 1993, the Church Council decided to schedule the decision on full communion with The Episcopal Church at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly, the same assembly that considered a proposal for full communion with churches of the Reformed tradition.

During this period of 1991-1997, a Lutheran-Episcopal Coordinating Committee received the mandate from their church bodies:

- (1) To assist the two churches in understanding and moving towards full communion, and in the reception of the *Concordat of Agreement* and its accompanying theological document, *Toward Full Communion*;
- (2) To continue to explore and recommend ways of implementing the 1982 Joint Agreement, including reception of *Implications of the Gospel*;
- (3) To assist in developing processes and resources for a study of the above mentioned documents;
- (4) To interpret the relationship between full communion and mission, as set forth in the above mentioned documents;
- (5) To facilitate communication among all expressions of the two churches (national, synodical, diocesan, local) regarding proposals put forth by Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue III, responses to the proposals, and implications of the proposals; and,
- (6) To interpret the proposals put forth by the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue III within the wider ecumenical context, seeking comments and response from other ecumenical partners; comments and response from inter-Anglican bodies (e.g., Anglican Consultative Council) and inter-Lutheran bodies (e.g., Lutheran World Federation); and to be sensitive to the areas of dissent and concern within our two churches (CC93.03.16).

As part of the ELCA reception process, a churchwide study was conducted throughout the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the results of which were made available in February 1996. This study and other related discussions throughout this church revealed areas of concern, including the following: interchangeability and reciprocity of ministries, the historic episcopate, and role and status of bishops. The Lutheran-Episcopal Coordinating Committee and the ELCA’s Department for Ecumenical Affairs addressed these issues through publication of resources and numerous consultations throughout this church. There also have been extensive discussions with key leadership groups within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, including the Conference of Bishops and the ELCA Church Council. Resources also were developed to provide answers to key questions about the Concordat and the ecumenical decisions before the 1997 Churchwide Assembly.

f. *Joint Meeting of the ELCA Conference of Bishops and the House of Bishops of The Episcopal Church.* In October 1996, the ELCA’s Conference of Bishops met jointly with the Episcopal House of Bishops to discuss the proposal for full communion. During the course of the in-depth discussion of both issues and opportunities related to this decision, the ELCA Conference of Bishops developed a list of issues that it requested the Lutheran-Episcopal Coordinating Committee to address at its October 31 -November 3, 1996, meeting.

The positive and extensive response of the Lutheran-Episcopal Coordinating Committee to this communication from the ELCA bishops was noted in a document presented to the council.

g. *Revised text considered.* The final text of the Concordat) which was revised by the Lutheran-Episcopal Coordinating Committee at its October 31-November 3, 1996, meeting) was presented. The coordinating committee also recommended that the following joint resolution be placed before the ELCA's 1997 Churchwide Assembly and the 1997 General Convention of The Episcopal Church. As was the case with the Reformed proposal, Church Council action to transmit this resolution to the 1997 Churchwide Assembly was recommended by Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson at the council's November 1996 meeting.

At its November 9-11, 1996, meeting, the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America took the following action:

To receive the request made by the Lutheran-Episcopal Coordinating Committee that the following common resolution on full communion be considered by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the General Convention of The Episcopal Church; and

To transmit the following resolution to the 1997 ELCA Churchwide Assembly for action:

RESOLVED, that this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America accepts, as a matter of verbal content as well as in principle, the *Concordat of Agreement*, as set forth below; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America agrees to make those legislative, constitutional, and liturgical changes necessary to implement full communion between the two churches, as envisioned in the *Concordat of Agreement*.

This motion failed at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America by six votes for lack of a two-thirds majority vote, with 684 votes cast in favor, and 351 votes cast in opposition.

What Is Full Communion?

The definition of Full Communion, as adopted by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly, is on page 14 of the policy document, *Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*

....4. **Full Communion.** At this stage the goal of the involvement of this church in the ecumenical movement is fully attained. Here the question of the shape and form of full communion needs to be addressed and answered practically in terms of what will best further the mission of the Church in individual cases, consistent with the Lutheran understanding of the basis of the unity of the Church in Article VII of the Augsburg Confession.

For the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the characteristics of full communion are theological and missiological implications of the Gospel that allow variety and flexibility. These characteristics stress that the Church act ecumenically for the sake of the world, not for itself alone. They will include at least the following, some of which exist at earlier stages:

1. A common confessing of the Christian faith;
2. A mutual recognition of Baptism and a sharing of the Lord's Supper, allowing for joint worship and an exchangeability of members;
3. A mutual recognition and availability of ordained ministers to the service of all members of churches in full communion, subject only but always to the disciplinary regulations of the other churches;
4. A common commitment to evangelism, witness, and service;
5. A means of common decision making on critical common issues of faith and life;
6. A mutual lifting of any condemnations that exist between churches.

We hold this definition and description of full communion to be consistent with Article VII of the Augsburg Confession, which says, "For the true unity of the church it is enough to agree concerning the teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments." Agreement in the Gospel can be reached and stated without adopting Lutheran confessional formulations as such. It allows for flexible, situation-oriented decisions about order and decision making structures. It does not demand organic union, though it does not rule it out. This definition is also in agreement with the understanding of unity adopted by the Seventh Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation in 1984, "The Unity We Seek" (quoted under the Lutheran World Federation section of this statement).

At the 1997 Churchwide Assembly, the voting members adopted the following actions related to relations with The Episcopal Church:

Resolution One [CA97.05.23]:

WHEREAS, while a solid majority (66.1 percent) voted for the adoption of the *Concordat of Agreement*, that was not sufficient for the required two-thirds majority, and

WHEREAS, despite the sadness among us and within the church at large, our church remains committed to the ultimate goal of full communion with The Episcopal Church and other churches, and

WHEREAS, we recognize our need as the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to understand our own doctrine, creeds, and polity and that of The Episcopal Church; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in Churchwide Assembly, hereby,

1. Request that the bishop, Church Council, Department for Ecumenical Affairs, and Conference of Bishops create opportunities for dialogue and teaching within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America concerning the possible avenues for full communion with The Episcopal Church;
2. Request that educational opportunities be created in consultation with The Episcopal Church for members of the faculties of ELCA colleges and seminaries, the Conference of Bishops, clergy, and laity designed to communicate the history, theology, and ecclesiology of both The Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, and that those materials will be made available to all ELCA congregations and rostered persons during the two-year period before the next Churchwide Assembly;
3. Call for discussion in the 1997-1999 biennium within our church of the process toward full communion and the implications of full communion with The Episcopal Church; and
4. Aspire to ratification of an agreement for full communion with The Episcopal Church at the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

Resolution Two [CA97.05.24]:

RESOLVED, that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America seek conversations with The Episcopal Church, building on the degree of consensus achieved at this assembly and addressing concerns that emerged during consideration of the *Concordat of Agreement*. The aim of these conversations is to bring to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly a revised proposal for full communion; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1982 agreement for "Interim Eucharistic Sharing" continue to guide joint ministry efforts in worship, education, and mission; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1997 Churchwide Assembly direct the bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to communicate this request to the presiding bishop of The Episcopal Church.

Following the Churchwide Assembly, Presiding Bishop Anderson prepared a set of options describing possible ways to continue the conversation on full communion with The Episcopal Church. He shared these options with the Conference of Bishops at its October 1997 meeting and the Church Council at its November 1997 meeting. Having received the advice of the Conference of Bishops, the Church Council voted in November 1997 (CC97.11.76):

To request that the Office of the Presiding Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America work with the counterpart in The Episcopal Church in developing a revised and rewritten *Concordat of Agreement*, using clear, down-to-earth language and including the rationale for its conclusions and recommendations; and

To authorize the presiding bishop, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Church Council, to appoint a small drafting team to be informed by a panel of advisors in that endeavor, with the understanding that an effort will be made in the composition of the team and panel to reflect the diversity of opinion on this matter within this church.

The presiding bishop, in accord with that resolution, appointed the following Lutheran members of the drafting team: the Rev. Martin E. Marty, chair (Chicago, Ill.); the Rev. Todd W. Nichol (St. Paul, Minn.); and Dr. Michael J. Root (Columbus, Ohio). The Episcopal Church likewise appointed three members to the drafting team.

The following persons were appointed to serve on the Lutheran advisory panel: Ms. Terry L. Bowes (Longmont, Colo.); Ms. Katharin A. Kelker (Billings, Mont.); Pr. Joan A. Mau (Washington Island, Wis.); Pr. Nelson T. Strobert (Gettysburg, Pa.); Bp. Peter Rogness (Milwaukee, Wis.); Ms. Marybeth A. Peterson (Omaha, Neb.); Pr. Thomas A. Prinz (Alexandria, Va.); Gov. Albert Quie (Minnetonka, Minn.); Dr. Nelvin Vos (Maxatawny, Pa.); and Bp. Ronald B. Warren (Atlanta, Ga.).

Prior to the Church Council's April 1998 meeting, the drafting team met on December 18-19, 1997, January 14-15, 1998, February 17-18, 1998, March 23-24, 1998, and April 6-8, 1998; the advisory panel met with the drafting team on December 18, 1997, and April 6, 1998.

In April 1998, the text of the revised document, "Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*," was provided to the Church Council as information. Essays by the drafting team also were presented as part of the Church Council's in-depth study and discussion of the proposal. The council took the following actions at its April 1998 meeting (CC98.04.27):

To express appreciation to the advisory panel and to the drafting team that prepared the document, "Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*," in response to action taken by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly and by the Church Council in November 1997;

To call on members and congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to review this proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church within the framework of the statement, "Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America," as adopted by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly;

To ask members and congregations to review this draft in light of the following questions, which were developed by the Conference of Bishops:

- (1) How will this proposal for full communion serve the mission, common witness, and service of the Church?
- (2) Does the revised proposal clearly set the ministry of bishops in the wider context of the ministry of all the baptized?
- (3) Does the revised proposal demonstrate a Lutheran understanding of the one office of the ministry of Word and Sacrament?
- (4) Does the revised proposal effectively and adequately present a Lutheran understanding of the historic episcopate for the North American context?
- (5) What other areas of concern need to be addressed?

To encourage members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to strengthen and renew efforts to listen carefully and respectfully to each other as they review this draft;

To call on members and congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to take advantage of the opportunities for dialogue and study of available resources for greater understanding of the history, theology, and ecclesiology of this church and The Episcopal Church and to deepen and intensify their conversations on full communion with our sisters and brothers in The Episcopal Church; and

To invite and encourage members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to respond to this draft, thereby participating in the ongoing development of a revised proposal for full communion, which will be available for review in November 1998, prior to consideration by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

Given the action of encouragement for members and congregations to study and respond to the draft, the council also adopted the following resolution in April 1998 (CC98.04.41):

To authorize the advisory panel to review responses to the document, "Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*," and to advise the drafting team based on that review.

Responses from synodical assemblies, seminary faculties, and numerous individuals and congregations were gathered by staff of the Department for Ecumenical Affairs and distributed to the members of the advisory panel and drafting team. The advisory panel met on October 13, 1998, with members of the drafting team, to analyze the responses and to provide advice to the drafting team. The drafting team met October 14-15, 1998, in order to prepare a second draft, with substantial revisions, of "Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*."

The Church Council, at the November 1998 meeting, adopted a resolution related to the process for transmittal and discussion of the revised document, "Called to Common Mission." The council voted (CC98.11.70):

WHEREAS, the action by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to transmit "Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*" to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America responds to the mandate of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly "to bring to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly a revised proposal for full communion" [CA97.5.24] with The Episcopal Church; and

WHEREAS, the members of the Church Council reflect a diversity of views on particulars of "Called to Common Mission," we nonetheless reaffirm our commitment to the action of the 1997 ELCA Churchwide Assembly that "our church remains committed to the ultimate goal of full communion with The Episcopal Church and other churches" [CA97.5.23]; and

WHEREAS, the text of "Called to Common Mission" transmitted to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly reflects significant changes that respond to criticisms and suggestions related to the three-fold ministry of Word and Sacrament and the concept of "bishop for life;" and

WHEREAS, changes to the constitution and bylaws of this church and to the approved Rite for the Installation of a Bishop will be provided at the time of the publication of "Called to Common Mission"; and

WHEREAS, while "Called to Common Mission" may not be a document acceptable to the entire membership of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, it nevertheless provides a basis for articulating a vision of a shared common mission with The Episcopal Church; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America offers thanks to the members of the drafting team and the members of the advisory panel, as well as to all who provided written responses with comments and suggestions, and to those who signed petitions; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Church Council seeks to promote further discussion, continued education, and prayer related to the proposal to establish full communion with The Episcopal Church; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Church Council urges that this process of discussion, continued education, and prayer leading to and following the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly be conducted with honesty, mutual respect, and pastoral care for all persons in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church.

To facilitate widespread study, discussion, and understanding among members and throughout the congregations and synods of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, including the 1999 synodical assemblies, the ELCA Church Council acted on November 15, 1998, to convey the revised proposal, "Called to Common Mission," to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly. The council voted (CC98.11.55):

To transmit the following resolution to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for action.

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE
CHURCH COUNCIL**

RESOLVED, that this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America accepts “Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*” as set forth below as the basis for a relationship of full communion to be established between The Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America requests that Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America convey this action to Presiding Bishop Frank T. Griswold of The Episcopal Church.

Proposed Text of “Called to Common Mission”

CALLED TO COMMON MISSION:

A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*

[November 1998]

Introduction

Our churches have discovered afresh our unity in the Gospel and our commitment to the mission to which God calls the church of Jesus Christ in every generation. Unity and mission are organically linked in the Body of Christ, the church. All baptized people are called to lives of faithful witness and service in the name of Jesus. Indeed, the baptized are nourished and sustained by Christ as encountered in Word and Sacrament. Our search for a fuller expression of visible unity is for the sake of living and sharing the Gospel. Unity and mission are at the heart of the church’s life, reflecting thereby an obedient response to the call of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Many years of thorough and conscientious dialogue have brought our churches to this moment. The history of how far our churches have already traveled together is significant. It guides us on a common path toward the unity for which Christ prayed.

The purpose of this *Concordat of Agreement* is to achieve full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church. Our churches have set this goal in response to our Lord’s Prayer that all may be one. Our growing unity is urgently required so that our churches will be empowered to engage more fully and more faithfully the mission of God in the world.

I ask not only on behalf of these, but also on behalf of those who will believe in me through their word, that they may all be one. As you, Father, are in me and I am in you, may they also be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me (John 17:20-21).

The Concordat is the latest stage in a long history of ecumenical dialogue between the two churches. Although the issues that gave rise to the Protestant Reformation in England and on the European continent were dissimilar in some respects, Anglicans and Lutherans

have long recognized something of themselves in each other, and our churches have never issued condemnations against one another. Liturgical and sacramental worship has always figured largely in the identity and character of each tradition. Moreover, the architects of reformation, both in England and on the continent, were concerned to uphold the catholic faith. Thus it is no surprise that official ecumenical conversations between Lutherans and Anglicans date back to the late nineteenth century.

The first official conversation in this century involving Anglicans and Lutherans in the U.S.A. took place in December 1935, between The Episcopal Church and The Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church, a church with roots in Sweden. In 1969, the first of three rounds of Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue began. Periodic reports were submitted to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and its predecessor bodies and to The Episcopal Church. Two final reports, *Implications of the Gospel* and “*Toward Full Communion*” and “*Concordat of Agreement*,” were submitted in 1988 and 1991 respectively.

Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue was coordinated through the Lutheran World Federation and the Anglican Consultative Council with the Anglican-Lutheran International Conversations, the European Regional Commission, and the other national and local dialogues. Consultations were held as well with other churches and traditions in dialogue with Lutherans and Anglicans.

In 1996, the Nordic and Baltic Lutheran and the British and Irish Anglican churches entered communion on the basis of agreement in The Porvoo Common Statement. Earlier, in 1988, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany and the Church of England agreed on steps to closer relations on the basis of The Meissen Declaration. Anglican and Lutheran churches in Canada, in Southern and Eastern Africa, and in Asia have initiated dialogue and begun to share in mission. These actions, and those that follow, help to prepare us and, indeed, other churches committed to the ecumenical movement, to move from our present separation into a relationship of full communion.

Official Text

CALLED TO COMMON MISSION:

A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*

[November 1998]

1. The Lutheran-Episcopal Agreement of 1982 identified as its goal the establishment of “full communion (*communio in sacris*/altar and pulpit fellowship)” between The Episcopal Church and the churches that united to form the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. As the meaning of full communion for purposes of this *Concordat of Agreement*, both churches endorse in principle the definitions agreed to by the (international) Anglican-Lutheran Joint Working Group at Cold Ash, Berkshire, England, in 1983, which they deem to be in full accord with their own definitions given in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America’s policy statement “Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America” (1991), and in the “Declaration on Unity” of The Episcopal Church (1979).

2. We therefore understand full communion to be a relation between distinct churches in which each recognizes the other as a catholic and apostolic church holding the essentials

of the Christian faith. Within this new relation, churches become interdependent while remaining autonomous. Full communion includes the establishment locally and nationally of recognized organs of regular consultation and communication, including episcopal collegiality, to express and strengthen the fellowship and enable common witness, life, and service. Diversity is preserved, but this diversity is not static. Neither church seeks to remake the other in its own image, but each is open to the gifts of the other as it seeks to be faithful to Christ and his mission. They are together committed to a visible unity in the church's mission to proclaim the Word and administer the Sacraments.

3. The Episcopal Church agrees that in its General Convention, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America agrees that in its Churchwide Assembly, there shall be one vote to accept or reject, as a matter of verbal content as well as in principle, the full set of agreements to follow. If they are adopted by both churches, each church agrees to make those legislative, canonical, constitutional, and liturgical changes that are needed and appropriate for the full communion between the churches.

A. Agreements

Agreement in the Doctrine of the Faith

4. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church recognize in each other the essentials of the one catholic and apostolic faith as it is witnessed in the unaltered *Augsburg Confession*, the *Small Catechism*, and *The Book of Common Prayer of 1979* (including "Ordination Rites" and "An Outline of the Faith"), and also as it is summarized in part in *Implications of the Gospel* and "*Toward Full Communion*" and "*Concordat of Agreement*," (containing the reports of Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue III), the papers and official conversations of Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue III, and the statements formulated by Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogues I and II. Each church also promises to encourage its people to study each other's basic documents.

5. We endorse the international Anglican-Lutheran doctrinal consensus which was summarized in *The Niagara Report* (1989) as follows:

"We accept the authority of the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. We read the Scriptures liturgically in the course of the church's year.

"We accept the Niceno-Constantinopolitan and Apostles' Creeds and confess the basic Trinitarian and Christological Dogmas to which these creeds testify. That is, we believe that Jesus of Nazareth is true God and true Man, and that God is authentically identified as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

"Anglicans and Lutherans use very similar orders of service for the Eucharist, for the Prayer Offices, for the administration of Baptism, for the rites of Marriage, Burial, and Confession and Absolution. We acknowledge in the liturgy both a celebration of salvation through Christ and a significant factor in forming the *consensus fidelium* [the consensus of the faithful]. We have many hymns, canticles, and collects in common.

"We believe that baptism with water in the name of the Triune God unites the one baptized with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, initiates into the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church, and confers the gracious gift of new life.

"We believe that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received under the forms of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. We also believe that the grace of divine forgiveness offered in the sacrament is received with the thankful offering of ourselves for God's service.

“We believe and proclaim the Gospel, that in Jesus Christ God loves and redeems the world. We share a common understanding of God’s justifying grace, i.e. that we are accounted righteous and are made righteous before God only by grace through faith because of the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not on account of our works or merit. Both our traditions affirm that justification leads and must lead to ‘good works’; authentic faith issues in love.

“Anglicans and Lutherans believe that the church is not the creation of individual believers, but that it is constituted and sustained by the Triune God through God’s saving action in Word and Sacraments. We believe that the church is sent into the world as sign, instrument, and foretaste of the kingdom of God. But we also recognize that the church stands in constant need of reform and renewal.

“We believe that all members of the church are called to participate in its apostolic mission. They are therefore given various ministries by the Holy Spirit. Within the community of the church the ordained ministry exists to serve the ministry of the whole people of God. We hold the ordained ministry of Word and Sacrament to be a gift of God to his church and therefore an office of divine institution.

“We believe that a ministry of pastoral oversight (*episkope*), exercised in personal, collegial, and communal ways, is necessary to witness to and safeguard the unity and apostolicity of the church.

“We share a common hope in the final consummation of the kingdom of God and believe that we are compelled to work for the establishment of justice and peace. The obligations of the kingdom are to govern our life in the church and our concern for the world. The Christian faith is that God has made peace through Jesus ‘by the blood of his cross’ (Colossians 1:20) so establishing the one valid center for the unity of the whole human family.”

Agreement in Ministry

6. The ministry of the whole people of God forms the context for what is said here about all forms of ministry. We together affirm that all members of Christ’s church are commissioned for ministry through baptism. All are called to represent Christ and his church; to bear witness to him wherever they may be; to carry on Christ’s work of reconciliation in the world; and to participate in the life, worship, and governance of the church. We give thanks for a renewed discovery of the centrality of the ministry of all the baptized in both our churches. Our witness to the Gospel and pursuit of peace, justice, and reconciliation in the world have been immeasurably strengthened. Because both our churches affirm this ministry which has already been treated in our previous dialogues, it is not here extensively addressed. Both churches need more adequately to realize the ministry of the baptized through discernment of gifts, education, equipping the saints for ministry, and seeking and serving Christ in all persons.

7. We acknowledge that one another’s ordained ministries are and have been given by God to be instruments of God’s grace in the service of God’s people, and possess not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also Christ’s commission through his body, the church. We acknowledge that personal, collegial, and communal oversight is embodied and exercised in both our churches in a diversity of forms, in fidelity to the teaching and mission of the apostles. We agree that ordained ministers are called and set apart for the one ministry of

Word and Sacrament, and that they do not cease thereby to share in the priesthood of all believers. They fulfill their particular ministries within the community of the faithful and not apart from it. The concept of the priesthood of all believers affirms the need for ordained ministry, while at the same time setting ministry in proper relationship to the laity. The Anglican tradition uses the terms “presbyter” and “priest” and the Lutheran tradition in America characteristically uses the term “pastor” for the same ordained ministry.

8. In order to give witness to the faith we share (see paragraphs 4 and 5 above), we agree that the one ordained ministry will be shared between the two churches in a common pattern for the sake of common mission. In the past, each church has sought and found ways to exercise the ordained ministry in faithfulness to the apostolic message and mission. Each has developed structures of oversight that serve the continuity of this ministry under God’s Word. Within the future common pattern, the ministry of pastors/priests will be shared from the outset (see paragraph 16 below). Some functions of ordained deacons in The Episcopal Church and consecrated diaconal ministers and deaconesses in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America can be shared insofar as they are called to be agents of the church in meeting needs, hopes, and concerns within church and society. The churches will over time come to share in the ministry of bishops in an evangelical, historic succession (see paragraph 19 below). This succession also is manifest in the churches’ use of the apostolic scriptures, the confession of the ancient creeds, and the celebration of the sacraments instituted by our Lord. As our churches live in full communion, our ordained ministries will still be regulated by the constitutional framework of each church.

9. Important expectations of each church for a shared ordained ministry will be realized at the beginning of our new relation: an immediate recognition by The Episcopal Church of presently existing ordained ministers within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and a commitment by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to receive and adapt an episcopate that will be shared. Both churches acknowledge that the diaconate, including its place within the threefold ministerial office and its relationship with all other ministries, is in need of continuing exploration, renewal, and reform, which they pledge themselves to undertake in consultation with one another. The ordination of deacons, deaconesses, or diaconal ministers by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is not required by this Concordat.

10. The New Testament describes a laying-on-of-hands to set persons apart for a variety of ministries. In the history of the church, many and various terms have been used to describe the rite by which a person becomes a bishop. In the English language these terms include: confecting, consecrating, constituting, installing, making, ordaining, ordering. Both our traditions have used the term “consecration of bishops” for this same rite at some times. Today the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America uses the term “installation” while The Episcopal Church uses the word “ordination” for the rite by which a person becomes a bishop. What is involved in each case is the setting apart within the one ministry of Word and Sacrament of a person elected and called for the exercise of oversight (*episkope*) wider than the local congregation in the service of the Gospel.

11. “Historic succession” refers to a tradition which goes back to the ancient church, in which bishops already in the succession install newly elected bishops with prayer and the laying-on-of-hands. At present The Episcopal Church has bishops in this historic succession, as do all the churches of the Anglican Communion, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at present does not, although some member churches of the Lutheran

World Federation do. The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1886/1888, the ecumenical policy of The Episcopal Church, refers to this tradition as “the historic episcopate.” In the Lutheran Confessions, Article 14 of the *Apology* refers to this episcopal pattern by the phrase, “the ecclesiastical and canonical polity” which it is “our deep desire to maintain.”

12. **Commitment and Definition.** As a result of their agreement in faith and in testimony of their full communion with one another, both churches now make the following commitment to share an episcopal succession that is both evangelical and historic. They promise to include regularly one or more bishops of the other church to participate in the laying-on-of-hands at the ordinations/installations of their own bishops as a sign, though not a guarantee, of the unity and apostolic continuity of the whole church. With the laying-on-of-hands by other bishops, such ordinations/installations will involve prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit. Both churches value and maintain a ministry of *episkope* as one of the ways in which the apostolic succession of the church is visibly expressed and personally symbolized in fidelity to the Gospel through the ages. By such a liturgical statement the churches recognize that the bishop serves the diocese or synod through ties of collegiality and consultation that strengthen its links with the universal church. It is also a liturgical expression of the full communion initiated by this Concordat, calling for mutual planning and common mission in each place. We agree that when persons duly called and elected are ordained/installed in this way, they are understood to join bishops already in this succession and thus to enter the historic episcopate.

13. While our two churches will come to share in the historic institution of the episcopate in the church (as defined in paragraph 12 above), each remains free to explore its particular interpretations of the ministry of bishops in evangelical and historic succession. Whenever possible, this should be done in consultation with one another. The Episcopal Church is free to maintain that sharing in the historic catholic episcopate, while not necessary for salvation or for recognition of another church as a church, is nonetheless necessary when Anglicans enter the relationship of full communion in order to link the local churches for mutual responsibility in the communion of the larger church. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is free to maintain that this same episcopate, although pastorally desirable when exercised in personal, collegial, and communal ways, is nonetheless not necessary for the relationship of full communion. Such freedom is evidenced by its communion with such non-episcopal churches as the Reformed churches of *A Formula of Agreement* and most churches within the Lutheran World Federation.

14. The two churches will acknowledge immediately the full authenticity of each other’s ordained ministries (bishops, priests, and deacons in The Episcopal Church and pastors in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America). The creation of a common and fully interchangeable ministry of bishops in full communion will occur with the incorporation of all active bishops in the historic episcopal succession and the continuing process of collegial consultation in matters of Christian faith and life. For both churches, the relationship of full communion begins when both churches adopt this Concordat. For the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the characteristics of the goal of full communion—defined in its 1991 policy statement, “Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America”—will be realized at this time. For The Episcopal Church, full communion, although begun at the same time, will not be fully realized until both churches determine that in the context of a common life and mission there is a shared ministry of bishops in the historic episcopate. For both churches, life in full communion entails more than legislative decisions and shared ministries. The people of both churches have to receive and share this relationship as they grow together in full communion.

B. Actions of The Episcopal Church

15. The Episcopal Church by this Concordat recognizes the ministers ordained in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America or its predecessor bodies as fully authentic. The Episcopal Church acknowledges that the pastors and bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America minister as pastors/priests within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and that the bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America are pastors/priests exercising a ministry of oversight (*episkope*) within its synods. Further, The Episcopal Church agrees that all bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America who are chosen after both churches pass this Concordat and installed within the ministry of the historic episcopate will be understood by The Episcopal Church as having been ordained into this ministry (see paragraph 18 below).

16. To enable the full communion that is coming into being by means of this Concordat, The Episcopal Church pledges to continue the process for enacting a temporary suspension, in this case only, of the seventeenth-century restriction that “no persons are allowed to exercise the offices of bishop, priest, or deacon in this Church unless they are so ordained, or have already received such ordination with the laying-on-of-hands by bishops who are themselves duly qualified to confer Holy Orders” (“Preface to the Ordination Rites,” *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 510). The purpose of this action, to declare this restriction inapplicable to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, will be to permit the full interchangeability and reciprocity of all its pastors as priests or presbyters within The Episcopal Church, without any further ordination or re-ordination or supplemental ordination whatsoever, subject always to canonically or constitutionally approved invitation. The purpose of temporarily suspending this restriction, which has been a constant requirement in Anglican polity since the Ordinal of 1662, is precisely in order to secure the future implementation of the ordinals’ same principle in the sharing of ordained ministries. It is for this reason that The Episcopal Church can feel confident in taking this unprecedented step with regard to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

17. The Episcopal Church acknowledges and seeks to receive the gifts of the Lutheran tradition which has consistently emphasized the primacy of the Word. The Episcopal Church therefore endorses the Lutheran affirmation that the historic catholic episcopate under the Word of God must always serve the Gospel, and that the ultimate authority under which bishops preach and teach is the Gospel itself (see *Augsburg Confession* 28. 21-23). In testimony and implementation thereof, The Episcopal Church agrees to establish and welcome, either by itself or jointly with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, structures for collegial and periodic review of the ministry exercised by bishops with a view to evaluation, adaptation, improvement, and continual reform in the service of the Gospel.

C. Actions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

18. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America agrees that all its bishops chosen after both churches pass this Concordat will be installed for pastoral service of the Gospel with this church’s intention to enter the ministry of the historic episcopate. They will be understood by The Episcopal Church as having been ordained into this ministry, even though tenure in office of the Presiding Bishop and synodical bishops may be terminated by retirement, resignation, disciplinary action, or conclusion of term. Any subsequent installation of a bishop so installed should not repeat the prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit and the laying-on-of-hands. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America further agrees to

revise its rite for the “Installation of a Bishop” to reflect this understanding. A distinction between episcopal and pastoral ministries within the one office of Word and Sacrament is neither commanded nor forbidden by divine law (see *Apology of the Augsburg Confession* 14.1 and the *Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope* 63). By thus freely accepting the historic episcopate, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America does not thereby affirm that it is necessary for the unity of the church (*Augsburg Confession* 7.3).

19. In order to receive the historic episcopate, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America pledges that, following the adoption of this Concordat and in keeping with the collegiality and continuity of ordained ministry attested as early as Canon 4 of the First Ecumenical Council (Nicaea I, A.D. 325), at least three bishops already sharing in the sign of the episcopal succession will be invited to participate in the installation of its next Presiding Bishop through prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit and with the laying-on-of-hands. These participating bishops will be invited from churches of the Lutheran communion which share in the historic episcopate. In addition, a bishop or bishops will be invited from The Episcopal Church to participate in the same way as a symbol of the full communion now shared. Synodical bishops elected and awaiting installation may be similarly installed at the same service, if they wish. Further, all other installations of bishops in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will be through prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit and with the laying-on-of-hands by other bishops, at least three of whom are to be in the historic succession (see paragraph 12 above). Its liturgical rites will reflect these provisions.

20. In accord with the historic practice whereby the bishop is representative of the wider church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America agrees to make constitutional and liturgical provision that bishops shall preside and participate in the laying-on-of-hands at the ordination of all clergy. Pastors shall continue to participate with the bishop in the laying-on-of-hands at all ordinations of pastors. Such offices are to be exercised as servant ministry, and not for domination or arbitrary control. All the people of God have a true equality, dignity, and authority for building up the body of Christ.

21. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America by this Concordat recognizes the bishops, priests, and deacons ordained in The Episcopal Church as fully authentic ministers in their respective orders within The Episcopal Church and the bishops of The Episcopal Church as chief pastors in the historic succession exercising a ministry of oversight (*episkope*) within its dioceses.

D. Actions of Both Churches

Interchangeability of Clergy: Occasional Ministry, Extended Service, Transfer

22. In this Concordat, the two churches declare that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith, although this does not require from either church acceptance of all doctrinal formulations of the other. Ordained ministers serving occasionally or for an extended period in the ministry of the other church will be expected to undergo the appropriate acceptance procedures of that church respecting always the internal discipline of each church. For the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, such ministers will be expected to preach, teach, and administer the sacraments in a manner that is consistent with its “Confession of Faith” as written in chapter two of the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*. For The Episcopal Church, such ministers will be expected to teach and act in a manner that is consistent with the doctrine, discipline, and worship of The Episcopal Church. Ordained

ministers from either church seeking long-term ministry with primary responsibility in the other will be expected to apply for clergy transfer and to agree to the installation vow or declaration of conformity in the church to which she or he is applying to minister permanently.

Joint Commission

23. To assist in joint planning for mission, both churches authorize the establishment of a joint commission, fully accountable to the decision-making bodies of the two churches. Its purpose will be consultative, to facilitate mutual support and advice as well as common decision making through appropriate channels in fundamental matters that the churches may face together in the future. The joint commission will work with the appropriate boards, committees, commissions, and staff of the two churches concerning such ecumenical, doctrinal, pastoral, and liturgical matters as may arise, always subject to approval by the appropriate decision-making bodies of the two churches.

Wider Context

24. In thus moving to establish, in geographically overlapping episcopates in collegial consultation, one ordained ministry open to women as well as to men, to married persons as well as to single persons, both churches agree that the historic catholic episcopate can be locally adapted and reformed in the service of the Gospel. In this spirit they offer this Concordat and growth toward full communion for serious consideration among the churches of the Reformation as well as among the Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches. They pledge widespread consultation during the process at all stages. Each church promises to issue no official commentary on this text that has not been accepted by the joint commission as a legitimate interpretation thereof.

Existing Relationships

25. Each church agrees that the other church will continue to live in communion with all the churches with whom the latter is now in communion. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America continues to be in full communion (pulpit and altar fellowship) with all member churches of the Lutheran World Federation and with three of the Reformed family of churches (Presbyterian Church [U.S.A.], Reformed Church in America, and United Church of Christ). This Concordat does not imply or inaugurate any automatic communion between The Episcopal Church and those churches with whom the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is in full communion. The Episcopal Church continues to be in full communion with all the Provinces of the Anglican Communion, with the Old Catholic Churches of Europe, with the united churches of the Indian subcontinent, with the Mar Thoma Church, and with the Philippine Independent Church. This Concordat does not imply or inaugurate any automatic communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and those churches with whom The Episcopal Church is in full communion.

Other Dialogues

26. Both churches agree that each will continue to engage in dialogue with other churches and traditions. Both churches agree to take each other and this Concordat into

account at every stage in their dialogues with other churches and traditions. Where appropriate, both churches will seek to engage in joint dialogues. On the basis of this Concordat, both churches pledge that they will not enter into formal agreements with other churches and traditions without prior consultation with each other. At the same time both churches pledge that they will not impede the development of relationships and agreements with other churches and traditions with whom they have been in dialogue.

E. Conclusion

27. Recognizing each other as churches in which the Gospel is truly preached and the holy sacraments duly administered, we receive with thanksgiving the gift of unity which is already given in Christ.

He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in him all things in heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or powers—all things have been created through him and for him. He himself is before all things, and in him all things hold together. He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, so that he might come to have first place in everything. For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him God was pleased to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, by making peace through the blood of his cross (Colossians 1:15-20).

28. Repeatedly Christians have echoed the scriptural confession that the unity of the church is both Christ's own work and his call to us. It is therefore our task as well as his gift. We must "make every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Ephesians 4:3). We pray that we may rely upon, and willingly receive from one another, the gifts Christ gives through his Spirit "for building up the body of Christ" in love (Ephesians 4:16).

29. We do not know to what new, recovered, or continuing tasks of mission this Concordat will lead our churches, but we give thanks to God for leading us to this point. We entrust ourselves to that leading in the future, confident that our full communion will be a witness to the gift and goal already present in Christ, "so that God may be all in all" (1 Corinthians 15:28). Entering full communion and thus removing limitations through mutual recognition of faith, sacraments, and ministries will bring new opportunities and levels of shared evangelism, witness, and service. It is the gift of Christ that we are sent as he has been sent (John 17:17-26), that our unity will be received and perceived as we participate together in the mission of the Son in obedience to the Father through the power and presence of the Holy Spirit.

Now to him who by the power at work within us is able to accomplish abundantly far more than all we can ask or imagine, to him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus to all generations, forever and ever. Amen (Ephesians 3:20-21).

Completed by the Drafting Team
October 15, 1998
The Lutheran Center
Chicago, Illinois

Presentation of “Called to Common Mission”

Bishop Anderson directed the attention of the assembly to the introduction of “Called to Common Mission,” the revised proposal for full communion that was called for by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly. “The main reference for you in your binder will be Section IV of the material beginning on page one. Pages one through three contain a brief history of the process to this point. The resolution that we are going to be voting on is on page three of Section IV, and then that is followed by the full text of ‘Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*.’ There is additional material elsewhere in your book, but this is the main body to deal with. The other material can be found in Section V, pages three through six—there is background material there—and then synod memorials relating to ‘Called to Common Mission’ are printed in Section VI, starting on page nine.

“Now coming to the podium are a number of resource people who will assist us in this conversation. I invite them up; I think we have enough chairs there. I am going to ask them just to stand as I read their names so you can see them and recognize them as we move through the process.

“We had a drafting team consisting of ELCA members and Episcopal members.

“The ELCA members were the Rev. Martin E. Marty, co-chair of the drafting team, the Rev. Todd Nicol, professor at Luther Seminary—he is apparently not yet here—Dr. Michael Root, professor at Trinity Seminary in Columbus.

“The Episcopal members of the drafting team: Bishop Christopher Epting, co-chair of the drafting team, the Rev. David W. Perry, ecumenical staff, Ms. Midge Roof, ecumenical staff.

“Other members of the team who are here, but not on the platform: the Rev. William Norgren and the Rev. Robert Wright of The Episcopal Church.

“And then, two speakers: Pastor Nancy Curtis and Pastor Norman Wahl. And our ecumenical staff person, the Rev. Daniel F. Martensen, director of the ELCA Department for Ecumenical Affairs.

“Now I want to acknowledge the co-chairs of the drafting team and ask each of them to say some words to us about the process. Dr. Martin Marty you know very well. He is an ELCA pastor, professor emeritus from the University of Chicago Divinity School. He will be followed by Bishop Christopher Epting, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Iowa. So I now invite Dr. Marty to move us into this discussion.”

Address by the Rev. Martin E. Marty

Dr. Martin Marty thanked Bishop Anderson, greeted the assembly, then began his address by quoting from 1 Corinthians 10:16-17, “The cup of blessing that we bless, is it not a sharing in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a sharing in the body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body for we all partake of that one bread.” Dr. Marty then said:

“To help realize our oneness in the body of Christ, this church, when very young in 1991, committed itself to move toward full communion with others. With such communion, we said the goal of the involvement of this church in the ecumenical movement will have been fully attained. Full communion, this church added, requires a mutual recognition and

availability of ordained ministers. Having in 1997 come to full communion, including exchange of ministers, with the United Church of Christ, the Reformed Church in America, and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the Churchwide Assembly this week has the enviable opportunity to approve full communion with both the Moravian Church and The Episcopal Church. Such approval will enable us to show forth more Christian unity at the same time as we demonstrate more Christian diversity. This unity will be evident in our further uninhibited celebration of the one body of Christ around the one cup and the one bread. This diversity will be manifest as we come to enjoy a variety of ways unmatched in Christendom to arrange and order our own ministry. All the churches I just mentioned confess themselves as faithful to the apostolic message, and thus they are all in the apostolic succession with the apostles of Jesus Christ. But they govern themselves in different ways.

“In voting for these actions, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America would be distinctive, as Bishop Anderson just reminded us—there was a little bit of ‘we’re number one’ clue there—as a bridge because we would celebrate full communion with churches whose diverse polities are described as congregational, synodical, presbyterian, conferencial—I learned that word last night from the Moravians—and episcopal, while we Lutherans would retain our full autonomy and freedom in Christ. What better demonstration could there be that the liberating Gospel of Jesus Christ is this church’s consistent concern? Meanwhile, the ways of governing and ordering the Church will remain matters of indifference—called *adiaphora*, which means they can be adapted to the ages. It is now my task and delight to present ‘Called to Common Mission,’ one of your two full communion proposals. Through your vote, you can make history by helping this church accept greater blessings and larger measures of God’s gift. These will come with full communion with two other churches with whom we’ve long known kinship, but from whom we remain as of this day separated.

“As you recall, an earlier version of this instrument, in respect to The Episcopal Church, failed by six votes to carry a two-thirds majority in the Churchwide Assembly in 1997. That assembly, by a near unanimous vote, then asked the leadership of this church to return this year with a revision of that proposal for final action and forwarding to The Episcopal Church. Our drafting committee thus received its authority from that assembly vote, its authorization by action of this church’s elected representatives—the Church Council—and its assignment from Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson on November 24, 1997. The appointment convoked a small drafting team to be informed by a panel of advisors. The three of us were to work with the appointees of The Episcopal Church to do this revising. This we have done. ‘Called to Common Mission’ comes with thanks:

- “1. to the 1997 Churchwide Assembly for voting that there be this revised proposal for full communion for this year, enabling us to bring to a conclusion, depending on what you are measuring, 20 and even 30 years of intense Lutheran-Episcopal efforts precisely toward this end;
- “2. to the Church Council for their recommendation and request to our committee to prepare this revision and for monitoring us along the way;
- “3. to Presiding Bishop Anderson for our chartering letter;
- “4. to the representative panel of advisors from this church with whom we twice met;
- “5. to sundry members of the ELCA for their criticisms and suggestions;
- “6. to the Conference of Bishops for their appropriate April 1999 Resolution of Understanding and Expectation concerning ‘Called to Common Mission’;

- “7. to the Department for Ecumenical Affairs for untiring responses to our committee’s research requests;
- “8. to the committee to create Lutheran-Episcopal educational opportunities to help educate our church members during the seasons of deliberations;
- “9. to the ELCA synods, which have studied these issues for years, and for a final time, have revisited them this spring;
- “10. to the Episcopal team members, now friends, the committee headed by Bishop C. Christopher Epting, from whom we will soon hear. With his colleagues, they will represent here the Episcopal understandings of this issue. They were informed and consecrated partners, always sensitive to ELCA concerns. They consistently kept in mind the simple goal of full communion, with exchangeability of ministers, and finally,
- “11. to the participants in Lutheran-Episcopal dialogues, who for almost 30 years have worked to bring us to this week, this moment.

“Our drafting committee responded carefully to the 1997 Churchwide Assembly’s call for revision of the proposal so narrowly defeated that year. The revisers were instructed to address concerns that emerged during consideration of the *Concordat of Agreement*, and we have done so. In the course of our prolonged work, we also chose to experiment beyond this mandate. The Episcopal and Lutheran re-drafters alike explored alternatives which reached us from some ELCA members. It was very clear that whether or not some might have some appeal among some Lutherans, none of these could ever become acceptable to The Episcopal Church. They, therefore, would be futile instruments for churches on the way to full communion with exchange of ministry. In effect, we found that support for them would mean voting down any exchange of ministers with a sister church and full communion with it. We also saw no prospects in following the urging of some ELCA members who counseled that this church should pursue new interim Eucharist agreements that would succeed those with which we have experimented since 1982. All alternatives would leave us short of full communion and would not mean recognizing the interchangeability from both sides of ordained ministers. We were particularly asked by the Church Council to accent the priesthood of all believers—a Lutheran expression. This was no problem at all. The Episcopalians have consistently stressed, and increasingly stress, the ministry of all the baptized—their preferred term. They display this expansive ministry freely in their church life; we say ‘look at the record.’ Third, we were asked that the revised proposal demonstrate a Lutheran understanding of the one office of the ministry of Word and Sacrament. ‘Called to Common Mission’ spells out this one office

“Our committee made eight changes and elaborated on them in the document you have before you. These dealt with all the contested issues of 1997, and with them we kept in mind the bottom line: the recommendation of assembly action that our presiding bishop would convey our action to the presiding bishop of The Episcopal Church, the church that would take up these issues again in 2000.

“We revisers would like to have spoken in more detail about that mission to which ‘Called to Common Mission’ calls us. But do remember, please, dear friends, the basic: that the first mission of the Church of Jesus Christ is to realize and display and act in all its mission upon the reality of the Church, which is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. The Church falters in this part of the mission whenever Christians fail to grasp new opportunities given them for full communion. The steps you voting members will take this week will help

this Church become evermore aware of our bond with Christians of times past through 20 centuries. We can henceforth also be more imaginatively and more faithfully connected with Christians of today in places everywhere toward the furtherance of the Gospel mission in Africa, Asia, Latin America, among people of many races and classes and ages and more, in the Anglican community and through the Lutheran World Federation. If passage of 'Called to Common Mission' may for the time being be unappealing to some among us, there are reasons to be confident that generations to follow will not only experience healing, but be grateful to the Churchwide Assembly of 1999 for this vote that can help us so enlarge our vision and mission. As chair of the draft revision committee, I have learned and I have been changed by our arduous, but enjoyable, task. I hope that any of you who still waver in support will also be open to change along the way.

"For half a century as a Church historian, I have been privileged to tell the story of a divided Christian Church that is at the same time now growing both more united and exemplifying ever more diversity. Think of the part the ELCA, with its treasure of the Gospel of forgiveness, can play in the unity part of this story as we further diversify. Writing Church history and taking part in revising this document can sometimes look like little more than work of the head, but as we set about our task prayerfully, we have relished the reality that it also involves the Christian heart, so let me close by speaking from such a hungry heart.

"In a warring world—Serbia, Northern Ireland, where Christians participate in armed conflict, and all over the world—Christian bodies are divided from each other and within and among each other. We baptized Christians, through acts like this, could provide a fresh and startling sign to place over against the forces of conflict, and for communion. Through it, we can have a greater potential for a livelier response on the part of our two suffering and frail, but beautiful, churches, to the Gospel of Christ, if we now overcome any remaining hesitations. You voting members, and through you, this church, can undertake a lively adventure for the sake of that Gospel and for the mission of the Church of Jesus Christ. Our timing is superb. These actions come at this concluding hour of this century which has seen so many Christian moves and of a millennium that has seen so many diverse Christian mission endeavors. This moment is rich in promise. Your action can inspire a joy that can come with full communion and exchange of ministers with two more bodies. I hope, therefore, that 'Called to Common Mission' will also speak to the heads and hearts of all of you so that this assembly will make two decisive moves to advance hope for a new century, and then, through full communion, also new ways of making Christ known. Thank you for the privilege."

Bishop Anderson thanked Pastor Marty for his comments, then invited Bishop Christopher Epting, of The Episcopal Church, to bring an Episcopalian point of view on 'Called to Common Mission.'

Address by the Bishop C. Christopher Epting

Bishop C. Christopher Epting said, "Let me say what a privilege and joy it is to be able to stand before you today, the same privilege and joy that I have experienced over the past months and years while I served as a member of The Episcopal Church's writing team, as we worked with our Lutheran colleagues in their attempt to re-draft the *Concordat of Agreement* between our two churches in such a way that it could be accepted by both of us and lead to the full communion we both so clearly desire. You need to know, as Marty hinted at, that those sessions were carried out with unflinching good will and mutual respect as we worked

through some of the tough issues and some of the subtle nuances dealt with in the document before you, and which is now entitled 'Called to Common Mission.'

"Let me say that we know many of you approve of this document and believe it is a perfectly adequate way forward to full communion between us. We also know that there are still some among you with serious doubt that this is the way forward, and others among you who may yet have some reservations, but would still like to proceed. We are also aware that some of the issues our dialogues have raised for you are long-standing issues within Lutheranism and particularly within this relatively new merger—the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. I have been told on more than one occasion by your theologians and pastors, both lay and clergy, that in some sense, this debate has very little to do with The Episcopal Church, but is a debate among Lutherans into which we have been invited to participate because of our deepening relationship. That may be overstating the case, but I think we can all see the truth of it. I would simply plead with you in all of this to try and keep the broader view ever before you—the kind of thing Marty referenced.

"I believe, too, that we are confronted with an historic opportunity in these days. For two Christian communions, one of which has preserved apostolic succession and apostolic faith without the sign of the historic episcopate, and one which has done it, at least in part, because of that sign, to be able fully to reconcile ministers and ministries without unchurching one or the other in the process is no small accomplishment. For you to have entered into full communion with the Protestant churches of the Reformed tradition in 1997, clearly demonstrating your freedom in the Gospel to take that step, and now in that same freedom, to embrace in an evangelical way the catholic sign of the historic succession, in many ways would confirm you in that pivotal role as a bridge church. Worldwide, the Anglican communion, of which The Episcopal Church is a part, still occupies some of that place as bridge church, given our close relationships with the Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches on the one hand, and with many Protestant churches on the other.

"I know this is a lot to ask of those of you who still have reservations, especially when emotions and passionate commitments can run so high among you. But I encourage you to reflect at least as much on these words from 'Called to Common Mission' as you do on some of the others. It comes from paragraphs 24 and 29. 'In thus moving to establish in geographically overlapping episcopates in collegial consultation, one ordained ministry open to women as well as to men, to married persons as well as to single persons, both churches agree that the historic catholic episcopate can be locally adapted and reformed in the service of the Gospel. In this spirit they offer this Concordat and growth toward full communion for serious consideration among the churches of the Reformation, as well as among Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches' (paragraph 24). 'Entering full communion and thus removing limitations through mutual recognition of faith, sacraments and ministries will bring new opportunities and levels of shared evangelism service and witness. It is the gift of Christ that we are sent as He has been sent, that our unity will be received and perceived as we participate together in the mission of the Son in obedience to the Father through the power and presence of the Holy Spirit' (paragraph 29).

"In closing, let me just add one personal note. In my role as chair of The Episcopal Church's delegation to the drafting team, I want to say how much I have come to appreciate and in many ways, for the first time, the Lutheran confessional heritage and its witness to the Gospel. And I guess what I want to say is that I think, and have every expectation that many others would have that same experience, were we to enter into full communion together and begin to grow in mission, including educational mission, and shared ministry together, dear

friends, we may not have just this opportunity again. I pray that we will not miss it. God bless you in your deliberations.”

Bishop Anderson thanked Bishop Epting for his comments, then continued by introducing two ELCA pastors, the Rev. Norman W. Wahl and the Rev. Nancy M. Curtis, who were to bring the perspective of the parish pastor to both sides of this discussion. “Pastor Wahl, who will speak first, is the pastor of Bethel Lutheran Church in Rochester, Minnesota. He is a participant in the Ecumenical Lutheranism conversations [on LutherLink], and also attended the conferences in Mahtomedi, Minnesota, that produced the Mahtomedi resolution. Pastor Curtis is the pastor of St. James Lutheran Church in New Haven, Indiana. She is the convener of the Ecumenical Lutheranism meeting on LutherLink, and we look forward to hearing the perspectives of two respected parish pastors who share both a strong commitment to our church and to the whole Church of Jesus Christ. I want to thank both of you for agreeing to share with the assembly your reflections on ‘Called to Common Mission.’ Each of you will have 15 minutes for your presentation, and I would ask that we hold applause until after both speakers have made their presentations. Pastor Wahl, would you begin?”

Address by the Rev. Norman W. Wahl

Pastor Norman W. Wahl said, “It is both a privilege and a responsibility to stand at this microphone this morning, and I thank Bishop Anderson for the opportunity to speak to this assembly about ‘Called to Common Mission’ [CCM]. Bishop Anderson and I had a conference last May, spent an hour personally exploring each other’s positions on CCM. And while we disagree about the best avenue for our church to take, we remain committed to the ministry of Jesus Christ in and through the ELCA.

“I find myself in a difficult position here this morning, even as you might find yourselves in difficult positions, having read and heard much pro and con material on ‘Called to Common Mission.’ And so I thank you for listening this morning, even to a lone dissenting voice. Six days ago, I sat with ten other people around a coffee table, enjoying an afternoon together. A wonderful woman began to update us on the coming travels of her brother Herb. Herb would be taking a trip, including a few days at the ELCA assembly. A Southern Baptist among us, with a quick wit, said, ‘I hope that you Lutherans don’t do something silly like us Southern Baptists and boycott Disney or something.’ We all chuckled, my dad laughed, and then he said, ‘But, seriously, one of the major proposals to come before the assembly in Denver will be the Episcopalian proposal,’ as he called it, and then ever the proud father, he said, ‘And my son Norman here will be speaking to the assembly on the issue.’ By the way, I should tell you Herb’s last name—it is Chilstrom, as in Bishop Herbert Chilstrom. I was sitting with the former bishop’s sister, Southern Baptists, and other Lutherans talking about ‘Called to Common Mission.’

“Now I don’t know where you are in terms of the CCM. Some of us have come here with firm stances. Others are pulled in both directions. Others yet may have no idea how they will vote. There has been no shortage of materials for you to read or opinions for you to hear. As I have studied this issue carefully over the past years and months, I have found good and faithful people on both sides of the issue. The Lutheran Confessions and Scripture can be appealed to persuasively on both sides.

“And so I have come here to denigrate no position or no person, I have come here to speak to you from the heart as a parish pastor, and my heart is troubled. Heated and intense

debate have led to an increasing divide within the Church. How ironic it is that a proposal intending to lead to greater Christian unity has led to even greater divisiveness within our own church. When it became apparent that we would not be able to muster the wide churchwide support so that this proposal could be successfully implemented across the church, despite the great efforts that have been made to promote the Concordat and now CCM, I had hoped that we might be able to have the wisdom to say, 'We just misjudged, and we were not able to move with clarity at this point.' But we are here and a vote is imminent. This vote will not be about ecumenical relations with our Episcopalian brothers and sisters, it will be a vote about the historic episcopate. This vote is not about ministry or mission, but it is about interchangeable bishops and interchangeable pastors.

"Generally speaking, those churches which hold to some sort of historic episcopate, including Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Episcopalians, generally believe that to carry the full expression of legitimacy, unity, and faithfulness to Christ's teachings, they must be governed by bishops, ordained a certain way into the historic episcopate. Episcopal means 'of the bishop,' so for The Episcopal Church, the office of bishop is an incremental mark of the Church. Lutherans have never taught that the historic episcopate is necessary for the unity of the Church. It is foreign to us. We've never thought that bishops are necessary for our unity or continuity. Instead, the real genius of Lutheranism is the priesthood of all believers. We have agreed for centuries about that amazing discovery during the time of the Reformation, grounded in Scripture, uncovered by Luther, that the priesthood belongs to all of God's baptized; not some believers, but all believers; not those with collars or titles, but to young and old, rich and poor, to pastors and to people. We have never believed that ministry flows out of an office or out of certain hands, but we believe it flows out of Word and Sacrament.

"One of the certain changes to be brought about by the approval of CCM is the restricting of ordaining to the office of bishop. Currently, bishops frequently ordain pastors, but they are also authorized, they also can authorize other clergy to ordain pastors even as others ordained in Luther's day. I have preached at a number of ordinations and have participated in many others. Allow me to tell you about two of those most recent. In one, a middle-age man faced almost insurmountable odds to become a pastor in the church. I sat with him, with his brother, and with other family members in the aftermath of their father's suicide. I visited him frequently in the hospital, due to a lifelong debilitating illness. It was a day of celebration when his seminary professor brother laid hands on his head, praying for the Holy Spirit. That seminary professor brother that day represented both the wider Church and the intimacy of the Spirit far better than any bishop could have for that brother. More recently, I witnessed the love of a father ordaining his son named Timothy—reminiscent of Paul's Letters to Timothy in the Bible, the advice of the experienced to the novice.

"Do we want to restrict the privilege of ordaining to a few? Do we want to restrict it to an office, or do we want to continue to open it up for the ministry to flow from Word and Sacrament, which truly has united us as Lutherans and Christians? The Anglican episcopacy may have been effective for The Episcopal Church, even as the pope is effective for the Roman Catholic Church. But in my study, I have found scant evidence that adopting the historic episcopate will greatly broaden our mission opportunities, particularly when that is taking a new step of mandating a structure. Our experience of Lutheranism in America has been widely varied, and to this point, we have kept the tent wide enough that we are able to embrace all the strands that have been our foundation as the ELCA. The document that we have before us is sufficiently unclear that the bishops of our church have added their

commentary to the written text. That commentary is fine. It deals with CCM, but it obviously cannot and will not deal with actions or assemblies of the future.

“I believe it is naïve if we believe that we will not be spending untold sums of money in the future fleshing out this agreement—studies on the historic or apostolic episcopate, on the threefold order of ministry, studies on the powers of bishops, funding the Joint Commission. CCM is not trying to fool us. It is what it is. But it cannot avoid traps of the future. One of the traps of the present is making a requirement the historic episcopate for our church. It is presented in the form of a gift, but the plain fact remains that it is a requirement for full communion with The Episcopal Church. There have been impassioned pleas to approve CCM for the sake of unity itself; in fact, it has been attempted to place the burden of a divided Church on those who have opposed CCM as a flawed document. The real problem is that currently Episcopalian polity disallows Lutheran pastors from presiding at Episcopalian altars. We have long been welcome, as Episcopalians and Lutherans, to dine at each other’s tables. We have always been able to do social ministries together. One would be hard pressed to find even one CCM opponent who does not earnestly desire greater mission and ministry with Episcopalians and others. This is simply the wrong way to do the right thing.

“Recently I sat down with a neighboring Episcopalian priest explicitly to discuss the Concordat and CCM. We had an interesting time talking about episcopacy, congregationalism, ministry, but our conversation soon veered to the real mission in Rochester, Minnesota—how we could better serve those people who live in or come to Rochester, how we could better support local food shelves or somehow minister to the people who come to the Mayo Clinic for hospitalization. Those are the ministries that fuel our passion.

“The May 1999 issue of *The Lutheran* had some interesting articles about ministries that we already accomplish together as two churches. Since 1982, there has been a blended congregation in Williams, Arizona. Since 1997, an Episcopalian priest has served Trinity Lutheran Church in Stockholm, Maine. At Massachusetts Institute of Technology, there has been a combined campus ministry for 25 years, far pre-dating any agreement between our two churches. That is the ministry we should be talking about and expending our dollars upon. That is the ministry that we have been able to do to this point and if we have now, we can find ways to do them in the future without jeopardizing the unity of our own church.

“This is not the only ecumenical discussion that has been stalled even in the past year over the issue of the historic episcopate. In January, the Consultation on Church Unity (COCU) decided not to attempt any more to bridge the gap of the historic episcopate. This is a wide-ranging group of Protestant churches, including the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, the International Council of Community Churches, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the United Church of Christ, the United Methodist Church, and The Episcopal Church. In the end, the first eight churches could not accede to the demand of the historic episcopate by The Episcopal Church, and at this point, they have simply agreed to disagree about that issue and to claim what unity they have in Jesus Christ.

“I pray the same for the ELCA and this assembly. We do not need to adopt the polity or positions of other churches in order to be one in Christ. The CCM document talks about bishops being ‘a sign, though not a guarantee, of the unity and apostolic continuity of the whole Church.’ My own bishop, Glenn Nycklemoe, is a faithful, pastoral, and Spirit-filled

leader of the Church. The bishops of our church have served with honor and distinction. But they are not the sign of our unity and our continuity in the Church. We need to continue to hold high Word and Sacrament—that which has guaranteed the unity of the Church for time immemorial as we understand the Church.

“All of us know a variety of Christians—from quiet Lutherans to door-knocking Lutherans—well, maybe not as many of those. We know personally spiritual Moravians to devout Roman Catholics to socially conscious Methodists, and many more. We don’t need to be each other in order to be one, for we are branches growing out of that one vine that we call Jesus Christ. I pray we celebrate that oneness in this assembly and in our church. The true miracle of the Church is that 2,000 years after the birth of Christ and his death on a dusty hill outside of Jerusalem that millions of people like you and me still gather every week to hear the word and to taste the Sacrament. I pray we do not go down the road of CCM. I believe it is a diversion of our mission and ministry, but whatever path God leads us upon, may we walk there together in love and in peace. God bless us all.”

Bishop Anderson thanked Pastor Wahl, and asked the assembly to please hold its applause until both speakers could be acknowledged at the same time. He then asked Pastor Nancy Curtis to come to the podium for her presentation.

Address by the Rev. Nancy M. Curtis

Pastor Nancy M. Curtis said, “As a parish pastor, it is a great honor for me to be able to recommend to this assembly the document clarifying and expanding the proposal for a concordat, or agreement, between Lutherans and Episcopalians in this country, entitled ‘Called to Common Mission.’ I’m delighted with the prospects we have before us as two churches in full communion when we affirm that oneness in Christ at this assembly, which we can do. The prayer of Jesus for us in John 17, ‘that they may be one,’ has guided this church far before the inception of the ELCA. It shows us not just our past, but our present possibilities and the possibilities for the future.

“From my little congregation, much smaller than Norm’s, in a factory town of northeast Indiana, bordering the cornfields and the soybeans on one side, and the factories where the people work on the other, I bring you reflections on this agreement both from people of our congregations and others in the area, for congregations are the heart of where mission begins.

“What we are to do here is to aid congregations by opening doors, increasing possibilities to reach those who have not yet heard the Word of Christ. Agreements such as we can enter into here this week with the Episcopal brothers and sisters do affect us in northeast Indiana because we are connected with a larger world. In a way, both Norm and I are here with you because of the Internet, and my people are on the Internet, too. I got ICQd last night a couple of times. And we all have relatives in places where there are Episcopalians, and we might move somewhere like that someday. And looking at what full communion with The Episcopal Church might mean began in our congregation because of the lack of Episcopalians around with some shoulder-shrugging. In fact, in our town we have in 13 churches no congregations with which we are in full communion. All of those are next door in Fort Wayne.

“So the first question, after I brought to the congregation that there was going to be the possibility of this agreement, was perhaps the first one asked in yours. ‘If a church says it believes in Jesus Christ, why not just accept them? Then tell them so. What is all the fuss about? But, you see, our congregation also lies in a place where large and growing churches

of non-denominational bent and Assemblies of God and Baptists are [located] and they do not recognize our Baptism. Those in our community who do recognize our baptisms and whose sacraments sometimes we can recognize completely, and sometimes we believe may be valid, do not receive us at the Table. So, our folks know only too well what it is like to live without visible unity. We live in a very small town of 9,000 where there are four Lutheran churches, three of whom do not welcome us at the Table of the Lord, and will not join with us in any endeavor outside AAL meetings and broader-based community activities. We do not, as a result, even have a local ecumenical ministerium with the congregations in this town, let alone pastoral exchange. We cannot get to the point where we can even pray together, let alone celebrate the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. We might even wish for a few Episcopalians to move in upon occasion. So, we looked together in our congregation at what Episcopalians believe. Is our baptism valid to them? What do they believe? And we read this proposal over. We listened to what they had to say about themselves, not what others thought they believed. We work hard in our congregation, as do you in yours, to listen to others who speak for church bodies as to what they believe, and we go with what they say, rather than what we believe they ought to say. To doubt someone's word about who they are is considered highly insulting in our community.

"We found that Episcopalians believe in the centrality of the Word alone, spoken in liturgy and read in scripture, and preached and enacted in the two sacraments, just as we do. We found that The Episcopal Church agrees on the Gospel which we love and pass on to our little children. 'Yes,' said the sheet metal worker once when we discussed this, 'we should be able to commune together in our churches.' When we looked at the Episcopal liturgy, we noted that Lutherans are more loudly in bondage to sin than the Episcopalians, perhaps, because we add that sentence. But what is used in their liturgy is more familiar to us than that used in the local United Church of Christ and Presbyterian churches in Fort Wayne, with whom we are also in full communion. It would be easier to ask the assistant rector of the Fort Wayne Episcopal Church to serve as supply on a Communion Sunday for us than the equally distant UCC pastor who is totally unfamiliar with our liturgy.

"So, the next question was, 'Will anything change in our liturgy, in our church, with this agreement?' And we read the document, and we found our liturgy remains what it is until either the pastor or the worship and music committee get energetic again. And will we still have Bishop Stuck, who is our synod's bishop, or do we somehow have to obey Episcopal bishops? Some of them we're not so sure of, but we know Bishop Stuck. He came after Easter to be with us. We looked at the document, it is sure and certain. Agreeing to have full communion with The Episcopal Church still means we are stuck with Stuck, and that after his six-year term, he will still have to stand for election, no matter what.

"What about synod assemblies? Will they be longer because of this agreement? That was an actual question! Or will our worship be changed in any way? And we looked carefully at the document recommended so highly to you today, and discovered that unless someone among us would attend the installation of a bishop, everything would be just as we would decide to have it. The actual change in the installation of one of our bishops would be like the Seckler pickle factory in the cornfields outside Fort Wayne, Indiana—if you blink, you miss it.

"So then we looked at ordinations. Our congregation has a longing—a great longing—to send one of our young people into the public ministry of this church. Now, in our synod no one can remember a bishop not ordaining, but we discovered through our study that being ordained in a Lutheran church actually takes place in different ways. A son or daughter of

our congregation can now still choose a beloved pastor to lay hands in the ordination rite on their head in a nurturing place, such as in the local congregation. Our people liked that idea, even though it is not the custom in our synod. But we also discovered something about the history of ordination. We found that no pastor alone such as I could just decide to go out and ordain someone.

“We heard worry that if a bishop were to ordain, that it would mean that bishop would have an increase in his or her power. Now, our folks do worry about what people in positions of leadership can or cannot do, and they worry about me a lot. They work on lines in factories, you see, where they are very dependent for their work environment on the power of their foremen and of the department managers at the grocery stores where they work. This concerned them. We found that if we agree to full communion, the power of Lutheran bishops would be decreased by the addition of the historic episcopate—a way of visibly showing faithfulness to the Word alone. How could that be? Remember that pastors do not have the power to ordain on their own. That power is only given to them and delegated by bishops at this time, and always has more power when one can delegate one’s own authority to someone else. This would now be restricted.

“The one visible change, in a few cases, in this country will be the addition of the hands of a bishop in all ordinations. Our people felt that unless someone was really worried about heavy-handed bishops, that the problem was not one to worry about; that it would be a wonderful sign of the presence of the people of God being there, even if it did show that the bishop had less power to delegate the authority of his or her office. So we can say ‘yes’ to the addition, not the removal, of the presence of another pastor of the church who happens to be responsible for the office for six years.

“For Episcopal people, the historic episcopate is a sign of the unity of the Church under the specific Word of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as it has been handed down to us, and no other word—no other Gospel is very important. Our folks were worried about this and they were a bit puzzled. What did it mean? So they went to the document again. And they found it to be a terribly important sign to a group of Christians with whom we share the centrality of the Word, and that Episcopalians, from the important people in the mission field, those in the pews, all the way down to bishops, are in service to the Word alone, and we can say ‘yes’ to that.

“And then, what about this agreement being American, my folks asked. Many in our congregation have served in the Armed Forces in our country, not just by being drafted. When we started three years ago to move from monthly Communion to weekly observance, which will be accomplished this Advent, there was another question about whether that was American too, since no Lutherans in our area within memory had ever done that. Is it Lutheran if it isn’t American? And do our customs, even small ones, even *adiaphora*, such as procedures in liturgy, need to remain the same for us to be true American Lutherans? We looked at that, and found that so long as we are careful to realize what is necessary for ‘Church,’ which is the Word alone set forth in the spoken and sacramentally enacted Word of God, we are free as few others to adopt practices which are signs of the presence of that Word in our midst.

“We also, as a small congregation, feel for other small congregations. One such is in Wamego, Kansas, where the Lutheran campus pastor, indirectly responsible for my being here, attends retired. In the same building as their little Lutheran congregation worships, also a small Episcopal congregation. They occasionally have a priest come from Topeka. The Lutheran congregation has recently been able to call a pastor. Each congregation wishes to

maintain its own identity. By being able to call a priest or a pastor who could lead both worship services, each congregation could be served within its own tradition. They need not merge or die, but here is a perfect example of mission which will be furthered by our saying 'yes' in this church to this document.

"Full communion, when we say 'yes' to the proposal before us, will be a result of years of ecumenical dialogue. Such dialogue is a two-way street. The Episcopal Church has changed much to enable full communion with us. They recognize our clergy as valid now—right now—and what is before us is to be a chance for a bridge between those churches without bishops with whom we are in full communion and those with whom we are. We get to do and be Church in a way no other community can be—in full communion with different kinds of polity. And thus we are called, you and I, out of ourselves in this assembly. We are called to be aware of being members of a body of Christ far larger than our own, to whom we are responsible—the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church—not just our congregations or the ELCA or even American Christianity.

"And thus it is that there are not at all two sides to the document before you, nor are Norman Wahl and I, who have gotten to know one another at a ball field, on opposite sides, nor are our congregations. There is but one side, and that is that we do desire visible unity with our brothers and sisters in The Episcopal Church. We have listened to them, we have worked with them, we have respected them, we have communed with them during this process. We are to the point where the final step in full communion, the exchange of clergy is sought. To do this, we will adopt a sign which is thoroughly Lutheran, by our heritage long before the Reformation, by our Confessions, and by the practice of Lutheran brothers and sisters in the world. 'Yes' is the answer to calls to step out in faith. 'Yes' is the answer to the disciple who asks to be brought into fellowship with those with whom they might not otherwise ever walk. 'Yes' is the ratification of our openness in Christ and our faithfulness to the Word alone of Jesus Christ and to no other. Yes! And Amen."

Discussion with the Drafting Team

Bishop Anderson invited the assembly to offer its thanks for the presentations of both speakers by its applause. He announced that Todd Nichol had arrived, and invited Dr. Nichol to stand so that he might be recognized by the assembly. He then opened the floor for questions by saying, "Well, I was very impressed with our speakers, and now we have time for you to raise some questions. Some of you may wonder how The Episcopal Church interprets provisions of this proposal. Later we will be in conversation with ourselves. This is an opportunity to hear from the partners in the discussion, so please feel free to move to microphones if you have questions about this proposal that you would like Bishop Epting or other representatives of The Episcopal Church to address. I would also say that this afternoon in the hearings the folks you see here will be in various hearings, and so you will have additional opportunities to ask questions at that time if you wish. I recognize Microphone 11."

Mr. Richard Peterson [Minneapolis Area Synod] asked, "What the consequences would be, in the opinion of the drafters and The Episcopal Church, of a second rejection of full communion by the ELCA."

Ms. Midge Roof responded, saying "I think it is always dangerous to speculate and play 'what if' games, and I do not really like to do that, but I would like to take on this question. The Episcopal Church, I think, would suffer a greater diminution of enthusiasm for full

communion with the ELCA. I am sorry to report that, but I think it is a natural emotion. Emotions ran so high going into Philadelphia for all of us. I think it would be hard to generate that kind of enthusiasm once again in the face of a second rejection. One of the things that I think hurt Episcopalians so badly after your rejection of full communion in Philadelphia was we thought we were working on a relationship, and it felt as though the Lutherans were just perfecting a document.”

Mr. Richard Nehring [Rocky Mountain Synod] said, “This is actually a neutral question—not a comment in opposition—but this is addressed to Bishop Epting. In paragraph 14 of CCM, it says, ‘For the Episcopal Church, full communion, though begun at the same time, will not be fully realized until both churches determine that in the context of a common life and mission there is a shared ministry of bishops in the historic episcopate.’ I have two questions: One, just what specifically is expected of the ELCA to achieve that shared ministry? And about how long in terms of amount of years do you expect the process to take?”

Bishop Epting responded, saying “Thank you. There has been some concern about this sort of two-step process, which we really do not believe is the case, that we recognize that immediately upon implementation by both communions of this proposal, that Lutheran pastors and Episcopal priests will be mutually interchangeable. As we begin joint and mutual ordinations together, then we continue that process of full communion coming to its completion. I do not know that it is possible to set a time table for that. It is not going to be something that is going to happen at some moment and did not happen in another. As Bill Norgren pointed out, it is not a two-step process. In some ways, this whole process is a 7.5 million member process as our two churches come closer and closer together, as this is a process of reception which takes place over time. So it begins in full communion declared instantaneously as this proposal is passed by both our communions, and then as we live into the joint ordinations together, that process will at some point be at completion. I do not believe there is a magic moment in which it will happen at one point and not at another.”

Mr. Nehring continued, “Does this imply that once all—say, for example—do all bishops of the ELCA have to be installed into the historic episcopate before this occurs?”

Bishop Epting stated, “Before the process of full communion has occurred, that would be the case.”

Mr. Nehring then asked, “Okay. And what about ordination of pastors? Do they all have to be ordained by bishops in the historic episcopate?”

Bishop Epting replied, “No. Pastors are immediately interchangeable.”

The Rev. Thomas A. Prinz [Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod] said, “A comment and then a question. The comment is simply ‘thanks to the Episcopal representatives for being present with us now late in this conversation for full communion. And then a question: ‘As this conversation has rolled across the ELCA, there have been characterizations made of The Episcopal Church and of the episcopacy in particular. To describe Episcopal bishops as hierarchical, monarchical, medieval, European, patriarchal—and you need to know that these are not compliments among Lutherans—do you identify with any of these descriptions?’”

Father David Perry responded, saying, “I have been a baptized member of The Episcopal Church for 58 years, and though in a private conversation I said to Dan Martensen, perhaps unwisely, that I knew some bishops who were ‘turkeys’—I have done it publicly again—I think my experience and for most people in The Episcopal Church, our experience has been—I will speak now as a clergy person, one primarily as a pastoral relationship with my bishop—an

enabling relationship for the people of God that I served in a local congregation. The bishop's ministrations, support, and encouragement have always been important in that relationship, not only in terms of sacramental acts that the bishop shared in our communities, but also the connection of our bishop in terms of the wider family of the Church. So perhaps there are from time to time in our community bishops who act as though they were infallible, may have expressed in some ways hierarchy, some are concerned about the miters that some of our bishops wear—not all of our bishops wear. You may have seen recently in the press at the Lambeth Conference, a number of our bishops threw their miters into the Thames at the Lambeth Conference meeting. The bottom line for me is we all probably have people who evidence leadership styles that are not helpful. My experience in The Episcopal Church with the majority of our bishops is that they are neither hierarchical nor monarchical, but, in fact, in my experience, are people of servant leadership.”

The Rev. Wallace S. Kemp [Florida-Bahamas Synod] said, “‘Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion’ with the Moravians does not require us to accept the historic episcopacy. Full communion with The Episcopal Church does require us absolutely to accept the historic episcopacy. The use of the word ‘full’ as an adjective for communion seems to me to mean two different things in these two agreements. Might I also add that...” Bishop Anderson interrupted to ask, “Do you have a question? This is a period for questions.” Pastor Kemp replied, “Can we distinguish between those words ‘full’ in those two different documents? Is there a distinction?” Bishop Anderson asked the assembly to please try to focus its questions for the Episcopalian resource persons, explaining, “We will have another opportunity for us to share our own opinions on these matters.”

Dr. Michael Root responded to the question, “In the ecumenical policy statement of the ELCA, full communion involves interchangeability of ministries. Now in both proposals, they are equally ‘full,’ they involve full interchangeability of ministries, although the way in which one gets to that point is different in the two texts. So as I understand the ecumenism policy of this church, both are full communion statements in the same sense.”

The Rev. Diane E. Wheatley [Upstate New York Synod] said, “At our synod assembly, new information rose to my attention that there are three Episcopalian bishops who at this time do not and will not ordain women. And when I asked questions at the assembly, I was unable to get an answer as to what is being done in the dialogue about that within The Episcopal Church. And when we—if we adopt this proposal, when our women in those areas come up for ordination, or should we elect a woman as bishop in those areas, what happens then if the bishops refuse to participate?”

Bishop Epting responded, “That is an excellent question. And we do yet have three remaining dioceses after 20 years and more that have not yet moved to ordain women. At our last general convention in Philadelphia—you know, our conventions seem to meet in the same cities at the same time; we were in Philadelphia the last time, and will be here a year from now in this very hall—at our last general convention, we placed canonical procedures in place which will require all dioceses to make ordination of women possible, and we are in the process this triennium of that being played out. Of course, you recognize that it is not only the bishop that has this decision; in these three dioceses, the bishop has to have the cooperation of his standing committee and commission on ministry and the various polities that we have. During this triennium, those dioceses are making the decisions and putting the processes into place so that women can indeed access the ordination process. My belief is at this point—and I cannot be absolutely held to this—but all but one of these dioceses currently has processes in place by which women can go to seminary, and women could be

called as rectors or pastors of congregations. I believe this is finally, after a long time, an issue that will soon be behind us in The Episcopal Church. It has certainly been a painful one, but my belief is that we are moving in that direction. Perhaps our shared understanding of ministry of both women and men in ordained ministry together would even be a more powerful witness to that effect. We are getting there.”

The Rev. John H. P. Reumann [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod] said, “A question that could be asked from either microphone, which for the clarity of the assembly in the next few days might be helpful. ‘What is there that divides us, and how is it coming together on what may be the basic issue, the historic episcopate?’ Anglican understanding suggests that there is something that bishops, not just any bishop, but those in a valid historic episcopate, convey at ordination that makes ministries valid. On the Lutheran side, the counterpart is not simply the priesthood of all believers and the Spirit acting wherever the Spirit will, but that pastors, confessionally subscribing, provide a sign of the unity of the Church, and something is provided by pastors ordaining other pastors. In the proposal before us, if this is not an inaccurate description of our several views, where is it that Lutherans would now be making a change, an adaptation or an enrichment of their confessional stance? How, in other words, do several members of the committee see themselves to have solved this key problem?”

Bishop Epting stated, “I wonder if I might ask Professor Wright to join us for this discussion at the microphone down there, on Lutheran confessional identity and Episcopal succession. I think that is a matter that he speaks to uniquely.”

Canon Robert Wright responded, “I think the essential difference in the two was stated well by the theologian Wolfhart Pannenberg when he raised the question himself as to whether there is in Lutheranism a reason for having a ministry of oversight beyond that of the local pastor. And he said in his view, there most certainly is, and that is the place of the bishop—to exercise a ministry of *episkope*—or oversight—beyond that of the local pastor. I think the way he put it was that all local pastors exercise a ministry of oversight within their own congregations, but there is a reason for having a ministry beyond that, and that he saw that as the reason for the kind of ministry that is proposed in the CCM document.”

The Rev. Michael D. Wilker [Sierra Pacific Synod] asked, “Why do you want to have Lutheran pastors preaching and teaching and presiding at the sacraments in Episcopal congregations? Why are you so eager to have me and others be in your churches?”

Bishop Epting replied, “I think part of the—we have to remember that this is the fruit of and, hopefully, the last stage in the 30 years of ecumenical dialogue between our two communions in which we have discovered the commonality of the faith that we share. The CCM document lists a rather large block of theological material with which we have convergence. As we move toward unity, it seemed to be a natural thing that our pastors and priests would be able to move back and forth, serving one another’s congregations. I could give you a practical example. In my case, I happen to serve as bishop of a rural upper Midwestern diocese, the diocese of Iowa, where The Episcopal Church is, as we say, pretty thin on the ground. Where we are numerous, we are more numerous on both coasts than in the Sunbelt, and not so much in the Midwest. I have tiny congregations that would relish and welcome Lutheran pastors to serve in those contexts. I believe there are places in the country where perhaps the Episcopal strength could serve in that same way tiny Lutheran congregations. I simply believe this is a kind of missionary strategy, and the fact that we have come to common faith agreement in these ecumenical dialogues means that in many ways, the person in the pew would not recognize the difference in preaching from a Lutheran pastor or Episcopal priest because the Gospel we proclaim is the same.”

Ms. Cynthia A. Jurisson [Metropolitan Chicago Synod] said, “I am a professor at the Lutheran seminary in Chicago. The question I want to ask is a simple one. I suspect it is a question that is on the minds of many people here. I know it has been asked before, but I have not heard an answer yet that I feel is convincing or adequately answers the question. The question is simply this: ‘According to the ELCA constitution, we say about ourselves as Lutherans, ‘The members of this church shall be the baptized members of its congregations’ and this church ‘acknowledges itself to be in the historic continuity of the community of saints.’ We have all talked about how much we can work together, we proclaim Jesus Christ as our Lord and Savior, we agree on Word and Sacrament. The question is, ‘Why, then, cannot The Episcopal Church recognize immediately and unqualifiedly our clergy and our bishops as fully valid?’ The answer I have heard is usually that this would be very difficult for Anglicans or for Episcopalians to do because they would be breaking communion with worldwide Anglicanism. But it appears that American Episcopalians have been willing to do that already on a number of controversial issues, including the ordination of women and the ordination of women as bishops. So I think the question really still needs to be answered, ‘What is it about us and our bishops and our ministry that you cannot quite fully recognize here and now?’”

Bishop Epting responded, “We really do not in our ecumenical dialogues today use the term ‘validity’ anymore. It was a common term used in days gone by. We recognize fully the bishops in the Lutheran church as fully bishops, and pastors in their synods in which they function, and pastors in their congregations. Now this is the opportunity for us to make one step forward in this full communion proposal. We do indeed have ecumenical–full communion relationships, obviously—with our sister and brother Anglicans around the world. We have full communion proposals with other congregations and communions which share in the historic episcopate, and we need, obviously, to keep that in mind in our ecumenical proposals. We have indeed from time to time, if you will, ‘pushed the envelope’ on such matters as the ordination of women and the consecration of the first women bishops in the Anglican communion. We did that in full consultation with our Anglican partners around the world and others, and continue that process. We moved quicker than some, and we continue that process around the world with a somewhat uneven gait, but we are moving in that direction fully. The ecumenical policies of that worldwide Anglican ecumenism include the historic episcopate as the fourth leg in what we call the Chicago–Lambeth Quadrilateral, and, therefore, that is the issue that we have to work with in order to remain in communion with our own 75-million-member communion.”

The Rev. John K. Stendahl [New England Synod] said, “Chris Epting already answered a question in regard to full communion in paragraph 14, but I think there is still some uncertainty about this and, therefore, this may be directed more to David Perry, and I am inviting him to take a run at it. The proposed implementation of the document would establish full communion and mutual recognition of ministries. For Lutherans, what we mean by full communion will then be fully realized. But as the document notes, for Episcopalians, who have traditionally held that the way in which the Church is knit together in this garment, as it were, in this fabric of hand-woven connection in this episcopate, the fullness of full communion would be something that would come when both ministries have been more fully woven together. And some of us see that as an interesting semantic point, but others among us seem to see it as an inequality or an implicit insult or denigration of our ministries, so I am wondering if you might say something helpful in clarifying on paragraph 14.”

Father Perry responded, “If I could ask Dr. William Norgren to speak to that, and after he speaks, I will make a comment. Bill was a consultant on the drafting team, and I would like Bill to speak to that, if he would. Dr. Norgren.”

Bishop Anderson added, “While he is coming to the microphone—we are running out of time on this phase, so I am going to suggest we take two more [questions], and then you will have to decide whether you want to extend the time. There will be opportunities both in the hearings for further conversation with the Episcopal representatives, so this is not your last chance, but we do want to get some of the other items before us this morning.”

Father Norgren responded to the question, saying, “As early as 1920, the Lambeth Conference of Bishops acknowledged the spiritual reality of the ministries of those communions which do not possess the [historic] episcopate, and that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. We believe that actions to bring our ministries into full communion must include unambiguous acknowledgment of the reality of God’s gift of ministry in their separation, and also that the sign of continuity of succession in ordinations with the ancient Church is, insofar as lies in our power, visibly expressed. Now I think that both of our churches acknowledge that all ordained ministries, the ordained ministries of all churches, including The Episcopal Church and the ELCA, are impoverished to the extent that our churches and ministries have been separated. Put another way, the mutual interdependence of the churches in the Church, as God wills it to be, is necessary. We draw that from Scripture quite obviously, and that the mutual recognition of ministries which is contained within CCM has to involve the interaction and integration of ministries for purposes of common mission.”

The Rev. John M. Weber [Southeastern Synod] said, “I have a question for Bishop Epting, please. I wish there was a microphone in the middle, neither opposed or in favor. I have a question. The question is centering around the issue of the word ‘process’—moving into the ‘process’ of full communion. It is my understanding that in The Episcopal Church there are three levels of relationship. One is as we are right now—communion and pulpit fellowship. The other is a special category for the Roman Catholic Church, who are not in total full communion. Full communion, if I understand, is the acceptance of the ordinals; those churches that accept the ordinals are in full communion with The Episcopal Church. My understanding of this document for us is, if we accept this, our understanding of full communion. Is it in The Episcopal Church the same understanding or is it, with your acceptance, moving into the ‘process’ of full communion?”

Bishop Epting responded, “First of all, let me say that there really are not sort of three steps. We have no special relationship with the Roman Catholic Church; we are not in communion with the Roman church, nor they with us. We have historical connections as you do, obviously, as all churches do prior to the Reformation. In the great split between east and west before that, we had one great Church out of which we all came. So there is not that separate category. We have a full communion status which we share with a number of churches around the world. We have interim Eucharistic agreements, as we have with you up to this point, where we can stand together at the table, but so far, cannot stand interchangeably. And this proposal would move us toward that. I do not think there is any distinction in our understanding of full communion. I think full communion is mutual recognition of ministries and sacraments and full interchangeability of ministry. I do not think there is any difference between us in what full communion means.”

Bishop Anderson said, “Microphone 9. And with your consent, we need to close this discussion at that point. So at Microphone 9, this will be the last speaker.”

Ms. Mary-Margaret Ruth [Lower Susquehanna Synod] asked, “What does the role of bishop mean in the life of The Episcopal Church; specifically, how do the Episcopalian parishioners view the role of their bishops?”

Ms. Roof replied, "I was privileged to speak to this point in Philadelphia and I am happy to address this once again. As a lay person sitting in the pews, when our bishop comes to visit our congregation once a year, once every two years, depending on the size of your diocese, it is the strongest icon and image of connectedness with the Church throughout history all the way back to Jesus and his disciples. And the miters that some of our bishops wear, that have given rise to so much hilarity, remind us of the visitation of the tongues of flame at Pentecost on the heads of those apostles. So our bishops are a sign of connectedness through time, but also through space, across national boundaries. Our bishops remind us that we are connected with the entire Anglican communion around the world. I remember when I was growing up there was a very strong feeling—and I am sure as Lutherans, you feel it, too; you meet someplace along the line a Lutheran from Tanzania or the Caribbean, and you have common cause—so our bishops are the sign that kind of pulls all this together for those of us in The Episcopal Church."

Bishop Anderson continued, "Thank you. I see a white card. Is this a procedural question Microphone 4?"

The Rev. Paul K. Erbes [Rocky Mountain Synod] moved to have copies of the ELCA document on ecumenism distributed to the assembly.

Moved;

Seconded: To have copies of "Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America" (1991) distributed to voting members of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

Pastor Erbes spoke to his motion, saying, "Reverend Chair, I ask that the chair distribute the 1991 ecumenical vision statement since it is so foundational to all that we are doing here, and really set the vision for what the ministry of the church is doing. Could you, further, report to us what the vote was at that time in 1991 and give some information on that?"

Bishop Anderson answered, "In 1991? I think we could. I would like the assembly's permission—this is really a request to distribute material. If you are in favor of the distribution of the 1991 statement on ecumenism for the information of the assembly, please say 'aye.' Opposed 'no.' It is carried and it will be distributed."

Moved;

Seconded;

Carried: To have copies of "Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America" (1991) distributed to voting members of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

Bishop Anderson continued, "In regard to the vote [to adopt this document by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly], we will have to look in the Archives, and we can announce that later. Microphone 3, are you still wishing to ask a question, or is this a procedural question?" The speaker indicated a desire to ask a question. Bishop Anderson said, "I am afraid our time is out on this. I appreciate your waiting, but there will be time in the hearings. So I want to thank the panel for coming up, and you will have more work to do this afternoon at the hearings, but you are obviously very popular."

Report of the Treasurer

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section II, pages 25-49.

Bishop Anderson introduced Mr. Richard L. McAuliffe, treasurer of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, who brought the report of the Office of the Treasurer. Mr. McAuliffe used a visual presentation to illustrate the financial status of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America. He noted that this church completed fiscal years 1997 and 1998 with an excess of revenue over expenses in current budgeted operations. He called special attention to a surplus approximating \$4 million in both years. Refinancing of the Lutheran Center in Chicago, made possible by the surplus, he said, made possible an annualized saving of \$700,000 to be used for new mission opportunities. He also called attention to increased income from synods and expressed thanks for growth in stewardship.

Not part of current operating revenues and expenses are gifts to the ELCA World Hunger Appeal, which totaled \$12.6 million in 1998, an increase of \$759,000 over 1997. Another \$5.4 million was received in 1998 for ELCA Disaster Response, much of it in response to Hurricane Mitch.

Another image revealed how the Church Council, at its April 1999 meeting, authorized an additional \$12 million in expenditures over the next three to five years to support ministry needs requiring special attention but that were not fully funded in the past. Of these funds \$3 million will go to projects with the poor, \$4 million for ministry support (including support for the Special Needs Retirement Fund, urban ministries, and the ELCA Identity Project) and \$5 million to reduce the Lutheran Center mortgage further.

Mr. McAuliffe added that for 1999 this church also is doing well financially with mission support for the first five months \$1 million ahead of the same period in 1998. Also increased are ELCA World Hunger and Disaster Response income.

[Audit reports follow.]

Report of the Mission Investment Fund

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section II, pages 50-64.

Mr. McAuliffe introduced the Rev. Arnold O. Pierson, vice president for marketing of the Mission Investment Fund, who presented a video highlighting two fund investors, Ada and Albert Stasny, of Waller, Texas, and the impact of the fund on their congregation, St. John's Lutheran Church. Pastor Pierson said that stewardship is not simply a matter of where we direct gifts but also a function of how we invest resources. Noting that investments have tripled since 1989, he said, "Our past has been richly blessed; our future holds great possibilities."

[Audit reports follow.]

First Presentation: Social Statement on Economic Life Proposed Text of “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All”

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 45-54; continued on *Minutes*, pages 391, 416.

BACKGROUND

“Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All” was the title for the proposed social statement on economic life. It represents the seventh social statement of Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

The development and adoption of social statements by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is guided by “Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns” which was adopted by the 1997 ELCA Churchwide Assembly. These policies and procedures give responsibility to the board of the Division for Church in Society to: name an appropriate group to study the topic; encourage broad participation by congregations and members of this church; and provide for a study document or preliminary draft, designed for study and response, which will be available at least 18 months prior to consideration by a churchwide assembly. In addition, synods receive copies of documents for review and counsel. The Conference of Bishops serves as one forum for deliberation on preliminary documents.

Work on this social statement began in 1994 with appointment by the board of the Division for Church in Society of a task force to oversee development of study materials, a first draft, and a final draft on the topic of economic life. Members of task force included: Pr. Janet M. Corpus, Fairfield, Calif. (co-chair); Mr. David Krueger, Berea, Ohio (co-chair); Mr. Timothy Calvin, Melbourne, Fla.; Mr. F. Paul Carlson, Tacoma, Wash.; Ms. Annette Citzler, Seguin, Texas; Bp. Juan Cobrda, Niles, Ill.; Ms. Sandra G. Gustavson, Doraville, Ga.; Pr. Donald M. Hallberg, Des Plaines, Ill.; Mr. Gregory Krohn, Lewisburg, Pa.; Pr. Robert J. Marshall, Chicago, Ill. (1994-1996); Ms. Mary Nelson, Chicago, Ill.; Pr. Winston D. Persaud, Dubuque, Iowa; Pr. Harvey S. Peters, Madison, Wis. (1994-1995); Mr. Kenneth Root, Eau Galle, Wis.; Ms. Teri Vautrin, Gate City, Va.; Ms. Helen Waller, Circle, Mont. (1994-1996); Pr. A. David Anglada, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Mr. Jon Evert, Moorhead, Minn.; Ms. Rebecca Judge, Middlebury, Vt.; and Pr. Gladys G. Moore, Jersey City, N.J. Staff members included Pr. Karen L. Bloomquist, Ms. Kay A. Bengston, Ms. Michelle Parson, Pr. John R. Stumme, Pr. Ronald W. Duty, and Mr. David A. Scott.

In 1994, the task force scheduled listening posts in 20 locations and prepared a synopsis called “Speaking of Economic Life.” A study document, “Give Us This Day our Daily Bread: Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All,” was published in 1996. This document was the basis for the study, discussion, and responses that helped to shape development of the first draft of the social statement.

The first draft was widely distributed in the spring of 1998. Five hundred written responses to the first draft were received by December 1, 1998. In addition, 20 hearings on the draft were held in various locations across this church.

The final draft of the social statement, “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All,” was reviewed by the board of the Division for Church in Society in March 1999. The board voted to recommend, through the ELCA Church Council, that the social statement be adopted by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

In accordance with these policies and procedures, the ELCA Church Council received “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All” at its April 1999 meeting and voted to transmit the document for consideration by the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly:

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE
CHURCH COUNCIL**

1. To adopt “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All” as a social statement of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in accordance with “Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns” (1997);
2. To call upon members of this church to pray, work, and advocate that all might have a sufficient, sustainable livelihood, and to draw upon this statement in forming their own judgments and actions in their ministries in daily life;
3. To call upon our bishops, pastors, and other rostered leaders to give renewed attention to how Scripture, liturgy, preaching, hymnody, and prayers may express God’s will for economic life and empower a faith active for justice, and to provide leadership in seeking economic justice in their communities;
4. To challenge all congregations, synods, and churchwide units to carry out the substance and spirit of this statement and intensify their work with various ecumenical, interfaith, and secular groups in pursuit of its commitments;
5. To encourage the education, service, and outreach ministries of this church in their work for economic justice;
6. To urge churchwide units and affiliated organizations (social ministry organizations, schools, colleges and universities, and seminaries) to review and adjust their programs and practices in light of this social statement;
7. To direct the Division for Church in Society, in cooperation with other churchwide units, to provide leadership, consultation, and educational and worship resources on the basis of this statement, particularly through the development of resources that interpret this statement and develop its implications for different arenas of responsibility;
8. To direct the Division for Church in Society to expand its work in advocating for corporate social responsibility, in assisting with community economic development, and in public policy advocacy that furthers the various commitments made in this statement;
9. To call upon the members of this church to give generously to the World Hunger Appeal of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, so that the Lutheran World Federation, Lutheran World Relief, domestic hunger grants, and our partner ecumenical agencies might do more in helping to alleviate the causes and consequences of hunger, poverty, and injustice; and to call upon the members of this church to participate actively in supporting these and similar ministries; and
10. To call upon the educational institutions of this church—schools, colleges and universities, seminaries, continuing education centers, camps, and retreat centers—to develop programs and educational resources in light of this statement so people can be better prepared to respond to the challenges of economic life.

¹ **“Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All”**

² **A Social Statement on Economic Life**

³ Economic life pervades our lives—the work we do, the
⁴ income we receive, how much we consume and save, what
⁵ we value, and how we view one another. An economy
⁶ (*oikonomia* or “management of the household”) is meant to
⁷ meet people’s material needs. The current market-based
⁸ economy does that to an amazing degree; many are

⁹ prospering as never before. At the same time, others
¹⁰ continue to lack what they need for basic subsistence. Out
¹¹ of deep concern for those affected adversely, we of the
¹² Evangelical Lutheran Church in America here assess
¹³ economic life today in light of the moral imperative to seek
¹⁴ **sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all.**

¹⁵ To an unprecedented degree, today’s market economy
¹⁶ has become global in scope, intensity, and impact. Common
¹⁷ brand names appear throughout the world. Many

18 companies based in the United States generate most of their
19 revenues and profits abroad. Daily foreign exchange trading
20 has increased a hundredfold over the past quarter century.
21 Billions of dollars of capital can flow out of one country and
22 into another with a few computer keystrokes. This economic
23 globalization has brought new kinds of businesses,
24 opportunities, and a better life for many. It also has resulted
25 in increasing misery for others. Intensive global competition
26 can force a company to relocate if it is to survive—generating
27 jobs elsewhere, while leaving behind many workers who
28 lose their jobs. Sudden shifts in globalized capital and
29 financial markets can dramatically affect the economic well-
30 being of millions of people, for good or for ill.

31 Human beings are responsible and accountable for
32 economic life, but people often feel powerless in the face of
33 what occurs. Market-based thought and practices dominate
34 our world today in ways that seem to eclipse other
35 economic, social, political, and religious perspectives. To
36 many people, the global market economy feels like a
37 free-running system that is reordering the world with few
38 external checks or little accountability to values other than
39 profit. Economic mandates often demand sacrifices from
40 those least able to afford them. When any economic system
41 and its effects are accepted without question—when it
42 becomes a “god-like” power reigning over people,
43 communities, and creation—then we face a central issue of
44 faith.

45 **The Church confesses**

46 If the economic arena becomes a reigning power for us,
47 the question arises: in what or whom shall we place our trust
48 and hope? The First Commandment is clear: “You shall
49 have no other gods before me” (Exodus 20:3). Or as Jesus
50 said, “You cannot serve God and wealth” (Matthew 6:24c;
51 Luke 16:13). To place our trust in something other than
52 God is the essence of sin. It disrupts our relationships with
53 God, one another, and the rest of creation, resulting in
54 injustices and exploitation: “For from the least to the
55 greatest of them, everyone is greedy for unjust gain”
56 (Jeremiah 6:13).

57 As a church we confess that we are in bondage to sin
58 and submit too readily to the idols and injustices of
59 economic life. We often rely on wealth and material goods
60 more than God and close ourselves off from the needs of
61 others. Too uncritically we accept assumptions, policies,
62 and practices that do not serve the good of all.

63 Our primary and lasting identity, trust, and hope are
64 rooted in the God we know in Jesus Christ. Baptized into
65 Christ’s life, death, and resurrection, we receive a new
66 identity and freedom, rather than being defined and held
67 captive by economic success or failure. In the gathered
68 community of Christ’s Body, the Church, we hear the Word
69 and partake of the Supper, a foretaste of the fullness of life
70 promised by Jesus, “the bread of life” (John 6:35). Through
71 the cross of Christ, God forgives our sin and frees us from
72 bondage to false gods. Faith in Christ fulfills the First
73 Commandment. We are called to love the neighbor and be
74 stewards in economic life, which, distorted by sin, is still
75 God’s good creation.

76 God who “executes justice for the oppressed, who gives
77 food to the hungry” (Psalm 146:7) is revealed in Jesus,
78 whose mission was “to bring good news to the poor . . .

79 release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to
80 let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s
81 favor” (Luke 4: 18-19). The kingdom of God he proclaimed
82 became real through concrete acts of justice: feeding people,
83 freeing them from various forms of bondage, embracing
84 those excluded by the systems of his day, and calling his
85 followers to a life of faithfulness to God.

86 God’s reign is not a new system, a set of prescriptive
87 laws, or a plan of action that depends on what we do. Nor
88 is it a spiritual realm removed from this world. In Jesus
89 Christ, God’s reign intersects earthly life, transforming us
90 and how we view the systems of this world. Our faith in
91 God provides a vantage point for critiquing any and every
92 system of this world, all of which fall short of what God
93 intends. Human impoverishment, excessive accumulation
94 and consumerism driven by greed, gross economic
95 disparities, and the degradation of nature are incompatible
96 with this reign of God.

97 Through human decisions and actions, God is at work
98 in economic life. Economic life is intended to be a means
99 through which God’s purposes for humankind and creation
100 are to be served. When this does not occur, as a church we
101 cannot remain silent because of who and whose we are.

102 **Our obligation and ongoing tensions**

103 Based on this vantage point of faith, “*sufficient,*
104 *sustainable livelihood for all*” is a benchmark for affirming,
105 opposing, and seeking changes in economic life. Because of
106 sin we fall short of these obligations in this world, but we
107 live in light of God’s promised future that ultimately there
108 will be no hunger and injustice. This promise makes us
109 restless with less than what God intends for the world. In
110 economic matters, this draws attention to:

- 111 ◆ the scope of God’s concern—“**for all,**”
- 112 ◆ the means by which life is sustained—“**livelihood,**”
- 113 ◆ what is needed—“**sufficiency,**” and
- 114 ◆ a long-term perspective—“**sustainability.**”

115 These criteria often are in tension with one another.
116 What benefits people in one area, sector, or country may
117 harm those elsewhere. What is sufficient in one context is
118 not in another. What is economically sufficient is not
119 necessarily sustainable. There are difficult and complex
120 trade-offs and ambiguities in the dynamic processes of
121 economic life. As believers, we are both impelled by God’s
122 promises and confronted with the practical realities of
123 economic life. We often must choose among competing
124 claims, conscious of our incomplete knowledge, of the sin
125 that clouds all human judgments and actions, *and* of the
126 grace and forgiveness given by Christ.

127 Economic assumptions can conflict with what we as a
128 church confess. Who we are in Christ places us in tension
129 with priorities given to money, consumption, competition,
130 and profit in our economic system.

131 ◆ While autonomy and self-sufficiency are highly valued
132 in our society, as people of faith we confess that we depend
133 on God and are interdependent with one another. Through
134 these relationships we are nurtured, sustained, and held
135 accountable.

136 ◆ While succeeding or making something of themselves
137 is what matters to many in economic life, we confess that in

138 Christ we are freely justified by grace through faith rather
139 than by what we do.

140 ◆ While a market economy emphasizes what individuals
141 want and are willing and able to buy, as people of faith we
142 realize that what human beings want is not necessarily what
143 they need for the sake of life.

144 ◆ While a market economy assumes people will act to
145 maximize their own interests, we acknowledge that what is
146 in our interest must be placed in the context of what is good
147 for the neighbor.

148 ◆ While competitiveness is key to economic success, we
149 recognize that intense competitiveness can destroy
150 relationships and work against the reconciliation and
151 cooperation God desires among people.

152 ◆ While economic reasoning assumes that resources are
153 scarce relative to people's wants, we affirm that God
154 promises a world where there is enough for everyone, if
155 only we would learn how to use and share what God has
156 given for the sake of all.

157 ◆ While economic growth often is considered an
158 unconditional good, we insist that such growth must be
159 evaluated by its direct, indirect, short-term, and long-term
160 effects on the well-being of all creation and people,
161 especially those who are poor.

162 When we pray in the Lord's Prayer, "*Give us this day our*
163 *daily bread.*" we place ourselves in tension with economic
164 assumptions of our society. Rather than being self-sufficient,
165 we need and depend on what God gives or provides through
166 people, practices, and systems. "*Daily bread*" is not earned by
167 efforts of individuals alone, but is made possible through a
168 variety of relationships and institutions.¹ God gives in ways
169 that expand our notions of who "us" includes, from people
170 close at hand to those around the globe. In stark contrast to
171 those who seek unchecked accumulation and profit, our
172 attention is drawn to those who are desperate for what will
173 sustain their lives for just *this day*.

174 **For all: especially those living in poverty**

175 "For all" refers to the whole household of God—all people
176 and creation throughout the world. We should assess
177 economic activities in terms of how they affect "all,"
178 especially people living in poverty.

179 We tend to view economic life by how it affects us
180 personally. The cross of Christ challenges Christians to view
181 this arena through the experience of those of us who are
182 impoverished, suffering, broken, betrayed, left out, without
183 hope. Through those who are "despised" and "held of no
184 account" (Isaiah 53:3) we see the crucified Christ (Matthew
185 25:31-46), through whom God's righteousness and justice
186 are revealed. The power of God's suffering, self-giving love
187 transforms and challenges the Church to stand with all who
188 are overlooked for the sake of economic progress or greed.
189 Confession of faith ought to flow into acts of justice for the
190 sake of the most vulnerable.

191 Outrage over the plight of people living in poverty is a
192 theme throughout the Bible. The poor are those who live
193 precariously between subsistence and utter deprivation. It is
194 not poor people themselves who are the problem, but their
195 lack of access to the basic necessities of life. Without such,
196 they cannot maintain their human dignity. Strong themes in
197 Scripture indicate that people are poor because of

198 circumstances that have afflicted them (such as "aliens,
199 orphans, widows"), or because of the greed and unjust
200 practices of those who "trample on the poor" (Amos 5:11).
201 The basic contrast is between the weak and the greedy. The
202 psalmist decries that "the wicked draw the sword and bend
203 their bows to bring down the poor and needy" (Psalm
204 37:14). The prophet rails against those "who write
205 oppressive statutes to turn aside the needy from justice"
206 (Isaiah 10:1-2). Their moral problem is that they have
207 followed greed rather than God. As a result, the poor lose
208 their basic productive resource (their land), and fall into
209 cycles of indebtedness. Poverty is a problem of the whole
210 human community, not only of those who are poor or
211 vulnerable.

212 In relation to those who are poor, Martin Luther's
213 insights into the meaning of the commandments against
214 killing, stealing, and coveting are sobering. We violate "you
215 shall not kill" when we do not help and support others to
216 meet their basic needs. As Luther explained, "If you see
217 anyone suffer hunger and do not feed [them], you have let
218 [them] starve."² "To steal" can include "taking advantage of
219 our neighbor in any sort of dealing that results in loss to him
220 [or her] . . . wherever business is transacted and money is
221 exchanged for goods or labor."³ "You shall not covet"
222 means "God does not wish you to deprive your neighbor of
223 anything that is [theirs], letting [them] suffer loss while you
224 gratify your greed."⁴ Related Hebraic laws called for leaving
225 produce in the fields for the poor (Deuteronomy 24:21), a
226 periodic cancellation of debts (Deuteronomy 15:1), and a
227 jubilee year in which property was to be redistributed or
228 restored to those who had lost it, so that they might again
229 have a means of livelihood (Leviticus 25).

230 Today, well over a billion people in the world are
231 deprived of what they need to meet their basic needs. Far
232 more lack clean water, adequate sanitation, housing, or
233 health services. They use whatever limited options are
234 available to them in their daily struggle to survive.
235 Thousands die daily. Millions pursue economic activities
236 that are part of the underground or informal economy, and
237 are not counted in economic statistics. Children often have
238 no option but to labor under unjust conditions to provide
239 for themselves and their families. Political struggles,
240 militarism, and warfare add to this travesty, displacing
241 masses of people from their homes.⁵ In many of the poorest
242 countries, incomes continue to decline, and people subsist
243 on less and less. Although most of the impoverished live in
244 developing countries, where their numbers continue to grow
245 at alarming rates, many millions are in the industrialized
246 countries. Millions of poor people live in communities in
247 the United States and the Caribbean where the Evangelical
248 Lutheran Church in America is present.

249 Developing countries that have opened their economies
250 to global markets have generally reduced poverty over time
251 more than those that have not, but the terms of trade often
252 work to the disadvantage of developing countries. Seeking
253 more just exchanges "for all" through investment and trade
254 is a significant challenge. The danger is that less developed
255 parts of the world, or less powerful groups within a country,
256 will be exploited or excluded from participation in global
257 markets.

258 When a developing country becomes heavily indebted, the
259 poorest are usually the most adversely affected. A huge share of
260 a country's income must be used to pay off debt, which may

261 have been incurred unjustly or under corrupt rulers. Structural
262 adjustment programs to pay off debt typically divert funds from
263 much needed educational, health, and environmental efforts, and
264 from infrastructures for economic development.

265 God stands in judgment of those in authority who fall
266 short of their responsibility, and is moved with compassion
267 to deliver the impoverished from all that oppresses them:
268 “Give justice to the weak and the orphan; maintain the right
269 of the lowly and the destitute” (Psalm 82:3). The rich are
270 expected to use wealth to benefit their neighbors who live
271 in poverty here and throughout the world.

272 In light of these realities, *we commit ourselves* as a
273 church⁶ and urge members to:

274 ◆ address creatively and courageously the complex
275 causes of poverty;

276 ◆ provide opportunities for dialogue, learning, and
277 strategizing among people of different economic situations
278 and from different regions who are harmed by global
279 economic changes;

280 ◆ give more to relieve conditions of poverty, and invest
281 more in initiatives to reduce poverty.

282 *We call for:*

283 ◆ scrutiny of how specific policies and practices affect
284 people and nations that are the poorest, and changes to
285 make policies of economic growth, trade, and investment
286 more beneficial to those who are poor;

287 ◆ efforts to increase the participation of low-income
288 people in political and civic life, and citizen vigilance and
289 action that challenges governments and other sectors when
290 they become captive to narrow economic interests that do
291 not represent the good of all;

292 ◆ shifts throughout the world from military expenditures
293 to purposes that serve the needs of low-income people;

294 ◆ support for family planning and enhanced opportunities
295 for women so that population pressures might be eased;⁷

296 ◆ reduction of overwhelming international debt burdens
297 in ways that do not impose further deprivations on the poor,
298 and cancellation of some or all debt where severe
299 indebtedness immobilizes a country’s economy;

300 ◆ investments, loan funds, hiring practices, skill training,
301 and funding of micro-enterprises and other community
302 development projects that can empower low-income people
303 economically.

304 *Livelihood: vocation, work, and human dignity*

305 *Vocation:* Our calling from God begins in the waters of
306 Baptism and is lived out in a wide array of settings and
307 relationships. Freed through the Gospel, we are to serve
308 others through arenas of responsibility such as family, work,
309 and community life. Although we continue to be ensnared
310 in the ambiguities and sin of this world, our vocation is to
311 seek what is good for people and the rest of creation in ways
312 that glorify God and anticipate God’s promised future.

313 “Livelihood” designates our means of subsistence or
314 how we are supported economically. This occurs through
315 paid jobs, self-employment, business ownership, and
316 accumulated wealth, as well as through support of family,
317 community networks, and government assistance.

318 Strong families, neighborhoods, and schools should
319 support and help prepare persons for livelihood. Churches,
320 businesses, financial institutions, government, and civil
321 society also play key roles. Through these relationships
322 people can be enabled and obligated to pursue their
323 livelihoods as they are able. When these infrastructures for
324 livelihood are absent, weak, or threatened (as they are for
325 many today), people are more likely to be impoverished
326 materially, emotionally, or spiritually.

327 Through these relationships and structures, individuals
328 can learn important virtues, such as:

329 ◆ trust, accountability, and fidelity in relationships;

330 ◆ discipline, honesty, diligence, and responsibility in
331 work;

332 ◆ frugality, prudence, and temperance in the use of
333 resources;

334 ◆ compassion and justice toward other people and the
335 rest of creation.

336 These virtues, along with perspectives and skills
337 acquired through education and training, make it more
338 likely that individuals will be able to flourish in their
339 livelihood.

340 *We commit ourselves* as a church and urge members to:

341 ◆ develop God-given capacities and provide stable,
342 holistic, loving development of children and youth through
343 families, neighborhoods, congregations, and other
344 institutions;

345 ◆ support and encourage one another as we live out our
346 vocation in ways that serve the neighbor and contribute to
347 family and community vitality;

348 ◆ pray and act to provide livelihood for ourselves and
349 others through the institutions of our day, trusting in God’s
350 providential care for all.

351 *We call for:*

352 ◆ policies that promote stable families, strong schools,
353 and safe neighborhoods;

354 ◆ addressing the barriers individuals face in preparing
355 for and sustaining a livelihood (such as lack of education,
356 transportation, child care, and health care).

357 *Work:* In Genesis, work is to be a means through which
358 basic needs might be met, as human beings “till and keep”
359 the garden in which God has placed them (Genesis 2:15).
360 Work is seen not as an end in itself, but as a means for
361 sustaining humans and the rest of creation. Due to sin, the
362 work God gives to humans also becomes toil and anguish
363 (Genesis 3:17,19). Injustice often deprives people of the
364 fruits of their work (Proverbs 13:23), which benefits others
365 instead.

366 God calls people to use their freedom and responsibility,
367 their capacities and know-how to participate productively in
368 God’s world. As stewards of what God has entrusted to us, we
369 should use available resources to generate jobs for the livelihood
370 of more people, as well as to create capital for the growth needed
371 to meet basic needs. Wealth should serve or benefit others so that
372 they also might live productively.

373 What matters in many jobs today, rather than a sense of
374 vocation, is the satisfaction of wants or desires that the pay
375 from work makes possible. Work becomes a means toward
376 increased consumerism. Many also feel a constant sense of
377 being judged, having to measure up according to an
378 unrelenting bottom line of productivity or profit. We are
379 freed from such economic captivity by the forgiveness, new
380 life, and dignity that is ours in Christ.

381 Competitive economic forces, as well as changing
382 technologies and consumer demands, significantly affect the
383 kinds of jobs available and the nature of work. Increased
384 productivity and technological innovation continue to make
385 some jobs obsolete, while creating others. A growing
386 proportion of jobs are part-time, temporary, or contractual,
387 without the longevity and security assumed in the past.
388 Workers in the United States increasingly produce services
389 rather than tangible goods. Many people choose to be
390 self-employed. A large number lose their jobs when
391 companies merge, downsize, or move to areas with lower
392 labor costs.

393 Job transitions can be enriching, but also painful.
394 Feeling invested in one's job as a calling or being able to
395 count on a future livelihood can be difficult when work is
396 continually in flux. Many workers feel treated as if they are
397 dispensable. Amid these changes, our faith reminds us that
398 our security and livelihood rest ultimately on God. Our
399 hope is grounded in God's promise—that people "shall long
400 enjoy the work of their hands" (Isaiah 65:21). This gives us
401 courage to ask why changes are occurring, to challenge
402 forces of greed and injustice when they deny some people
403 what they need to live, and, when necessary, to seek new
404 possibilities for livelihood.

405 Therefore, *we commit ourselves* as a church and urge
406 members to:

- 407 ◆ deliberate together about the challenges people face in
408 their work;
- 409 ◆ counsel and support those who are unemployed,
410 underemployed, and undergoing job transitions;
- 411 ◆ provide skill and language enhancement training that
412 will enable the most vulnerable (including new immigrants)
413 to become better prepared for jobs.

414 *We call for:*

- 415 ◆ public and private sector partnerships to create jobs
416 and job retention programs;
- 417 ◆ national economic policies that support and advance
418 the goal of low unemployment.

419 **Human dignity:** Human beings are created "in God's image"
420 (Genesis 1:27) as social beings whose dignity, worth, and
421 value are conferred by God. Although our identity does not
422 depend on what we do, through our work we should be able
423 to express this God-given dignity as persons of integrity,
424 worth, and meaning. Yet work does not constitute the whole
425 of our life. When we are viewed and treated only as
426 workers, we tend to be exploited.

427 Employers have a responsibility to treat employees with
428 dignity and respect. This should be reflected in employees'
429 remuneration, benefits, work conditions, job security, and
430 ongoing job training. Employees have a responsibility to

431 work to the best of their potential in a reliable and
432 responsible manner. This includes work habits, attitudes
433 toward employers and co-workers, and a willingness to
434 adapt and prepare for new work situations. No one should
435 be coerced to work under conditions that violate their
436 dignity or freedom, jeopardize their health or safety, result
437 in neglect of their family's well-being, or provide unjust
438 compensation for their labor.

439 Our God-given dignity in community means that we are
440 to participate actively in decisions that impact our lives,
441 rather than only passively accept decisions others make for
442 us. People should be involved in decision making that
443 directly affects their work. They should also be free to
444 determine their lives independent of particular jobs. Public
445 policy can provide economic and other conditions that
446 protect human freedom and dignity in relation to work.

447 Power disparities and competing interests are present in
448 most employment situations. Employers need competent,
449 committed workers, but this does not necessarily presume
450 respect for the personal lives and needs of individual
451 workers. Individual workers depend on the organization for
452 employment as their means of livelihood, but this does not
453 necessarily presume respect for the organization's interest
454 and goals. Management and employees move toward justice
455 as they seek cooperative ways of negotiating these interests
456 when they conflict. Because employees often are vulnerable
457 and lack power in such negotiations, they may need to
458 organize in their quest for human dignity and justice. When
459 this occurs, accurate information and fair tactics are
460 expected of all parties involved.

461 *We commit ourselves* as a church to:

- 462 ◆ hire without discriminating on the basis of race,
463 ethnicity, gender, age, disabilities, sexual orientation, or
464 genetic factors;
- 465 ◆ compensate all people we call or employ at an amount
466 sufficient for them to live in dignity;
- 467 ◆ provide adequate pension and health benefits, safe and
468 healthy work conditions, sufficient periods of rest, vacation,
469 and sabbatical, and family-friendly work schedules;
- 470 ◆ cultivate participatory workplaces, support the right of
471 employees to organize for the sake of better working
472 conditions and to engage in collective bargaining, and refrain
473 from intentionally undercutting union organizing activities, or
474 from permanently replacing striking workers.

475 *We call for:*

- 476 ◆ other employers to engage in similar practices;
- 477 ◆ government enforcement of regulations against
478 discrimination, exploitative work conditions and labor
479 practices (including child labor), and for the right of workers
480 to organize and bargain collectively;
- 481 ◆ public policies that ensure adequate social security,
482 unemployment insurance, and health care coverage;
- 483 ◆ a minimum wage level that balances employees' need
484 for sufficient income with what would be significant negative
485 effects on overall employment;
- 486 ◆ tax credits and other means of supplementing the
487 insufficient income of low-paid workers in order to move
488 them out of poverty.

489 **Sufficiency: enough, but not too much**

490 “Sufficiency” means adequate access to income and
491 other resources that enable people to meet their basic needs,
492 including nutrition, clothing, housing, health care, personal
493 development, and participation in community with dignity.
494 God has created a world of sufficiency for all, providing us
495 daily and abundantly with all the necessities of life.⁸ In
496 many countries, the problem is not the lack of resources, but
497 how they are shared, distributed, and made accessible
498 within society. Justice seeks fairness in how goods, services,
499 income, and wealth are allocated among people so that they
500 can acquire what they need to live.

501 Human need and the right to ownership often are in
502 tension with each other. The biblical understanding of
503 stewardship is that what we have does not ultimately belong
504 to us. We are called to be stewards of what God has given
505 for the sake of all. This stewardship includes holding
506 economic, political, and social processes and institutions
507 responsible for producing and distributing what is needed
508 for sufficiency for all. Private property is affirmed insofar as
509 it serves as a useful, yet imperfect means to meet the basic
510 needs of individuals, households, and communities.

511 Government is intended to serve God’s purposes by
512 limiting or countering narrow economic interests and
513 promoting the common good. Paying taxes to enable
514 government to carry out these and other purposes is an
515 appropriate expression of our stewardship in society, rather
516 than something to be avoided. Government often falls short
517 of these responsibilities. Its policies can harm the common
518 good and especially the most vulnerable in society.
519 Governing leaders are to be held accountable to God’s
520 purposes: “May [they] judge your people with
521 righteousness, and your poor with justice. . . . May [they]
522 defend the cause of the poor of the people” (Psalm 72:2).

523 The lack of material sufficiency for some within the
524 human community is itself a spiritual problem. “How does
525 God’s love abide in anyone who has the world’s goods and
526 sees a brother or sister in need and yet refuses to help?”
527 (1 John 3:17). Sin disrupts our bonds with and our sense of
528 responsibility for one another. We live separated from
529 others on the basis of income and wealth, and resent what
530 others have. Huge disparities in income and wealth, such as
531 those we face in this country, threaten the integrity of the
532 human community.

533 Those who are rich and those who are poor are called
534 into relationships of generosity from which each can benefit.
535 Within the Church, those in need and those with abundance
536 are brought together in Christ. On this basis and in the face
537 of disparities in the church of his day, Paul calls for “a fair
538 balance between your present abundance and their need, so
539 that their abundance may be for your need.” In so doing,
540 “the one who had much did not have too much, and the one
541 who had little did not have too little.” (2 Corinthians 8:9,
542 13-15).

543 God’s mandate is clear. “Is not this the fast that I
544 choose: to loose the bonds of injustice . . . and to break
545 every yoke? Is it not to share your bread with the hungry,
546 and bring the homeless poor into your house; when you see
547 the naked to cover them, and not to hide yourself from your
548 own kin?” (Isaiah 58:6-7). God’s lavish, justifying grace frees
549 us from self-serving preoccupations and calls us to a life of
550 mutual generosity as we relate to all who are our neighbors.

551 Faith becomes active through personal relationships, direct
552 assistance, and wider policy changes in society.

553 **Not enough:** In the United States, tens of millions of people
554 live in poverty, although many refuse to think of themselves
555 as “poor.” Some make daily choices as to which necessities
556 they will have to live without. Many work part- or full-time,
557 but on that basis, are still unable to lift their families out of
558 poverty. Others are physically or mentally unable to work.
559 Many lack the family, educational, and community support
560 important for making good choices in their lives. Although
561 those living in poverty are particularly visible in cities, their
562 more hidden reality in suburban, small town, and rural
563 areas can be just as painful. A greater proportion of people
564 of color live in conditions of poverty. The poor are
565 disproportionately women with their children.⁹ Systemic
566 racism and sexism continue to be evident in the incidence
567 of poverty.

568 In light of these realities, **we commit ourselves** as a
569 church and urge members to:

- 570 ◆ provide counsel, food, clothing, shelter, and money for
571 people in need, in ways that respect their dignity;
- 572 ◆ develop mutual, face-to-face, empowering relationships
573 between people who have enough and people living in
574 poverty, especially through congregational and synodical
575 partnerships;
- 576 ◆ advocate for public and private policies that effectively
577 address the causes of poverty;
- 578 ◆ generously support organizations and community-based
579 efforts that enable low-income people to obtain more
580 sufficient, sustainable livelihoods;
- 581 ◆ continue working to eradicate racism and sexism.

582 **We call for:**

- 583 ◆ government to provide adequate income assistance and
584 related services for citizens, documented immigrants, and
585 refugees who are unable to provide for their livelihood
586 through employment;
- 587 ◆ adequate, consistent public funding for the various
588 low-income services non-profit organizations provide for the
589 common good of all;
- 590 ◆ scrutiny to ensure that new ways of providing
591 low-income people with assistance and services (such as
592 through the private sector) do not sacrifice the most
593 vulnerable for the sake of economic efficiency and profit;
- 594 ◆ correction of regressive tax systems, so that people are
595 taxed progressively in relation to their ability to pay;
- 596 ◆ opposition to lotteries and other state-sponsored
597 gambling because of how these regressive means of raising
598 state revenues adversely affect those who are poor.¹⁰

599 **Too much:** Because most of us in the United States have far
600 more than we need, we can easily fall into bondage to what
601 we have. We then become like the young man Jesus
602 encountered, whose bondage to his possessions kept him
603 from following Jesus (Matthew 19:16-22; Mark 10:17-22;
604 Luke 18:18-25).

605 We consume goods and use services to meet our needs.
606 To increase consumption and expand sales, businesses

667 stimulate ever new *wants*. Rather than human *need* shaping
668 consumption, advertising and media promotion both shape
669 and expand *wants*. Our very being becomes expressed
670 through what we have or desire to possess. When
671 consuming to meet basic needs turns into consumerism as
672 an end in itself, we face a serious crisis of faith.

673 Endless accumulation of possessions and pursuit of
674 wealth can become our god as we yearn for a life without
675 limits. “Ah, you who join house to house, who add field to
676 field, until there is room for no one but you” (Isaiah 5:8).
677 Many look to material possessions and money as the means
678 for participating in the “fullness of life,” and thus become ever
679 more dependent on economic transactions. But Jesus asks,
680 “What does it profit them if they gain the whole world, but
681 lose or forfeit themselves?” (Luke 9:25).

682 In the United States, people’s worth and value tend to
683 be measured by the size of their income and wealth. If
684 judged by their multimillion dollar compensations, top
685 corporate officers and sports superstars would seem to be
686 the most highly valued in our society. Enormous disparities
687 between their compensations and the average wages of
688 workers are scandalous.

689 The economic power of large transnational corporations
690 continues to grow, making some of them larger than many
691 national economies. Along with this financial strength
692 comes an inordinate potential to influence political
693 decisions, local and regional economies, and democratic
694 processes in society. The power they wield, enhanced
695 through mergers and buyouts, can have positive effects, but
696 it can also hold others captive to transnational corporate
697 interests. The global community must continue to seek
698 effective ways to hold these and other powerful economic
699 actors more accountable for the sake of sufficient,
700 sustainable livelihood for all.

701 In light of these realities, *we commit ourselves* as a
702 church and urge members to:

703 ◆ examine how we are in bondage to our possessions
704 and can be freed to be faithful stewards of them;

705 ◆ serious and ongoing consideration in our families and
706 congregations of how to resist the allure of consumerism
707 and live lives less oriented toward the accumulation of
708 goods and financial assets;

709 ◆ educate one another, beginning with the young, on how
710 to deal responsibly with money, credit, and spending within
711 one’s means;

712 ◆ give generously of our wealth (for example, through
713 tithing and planned giving), especially for purposes that
714 serve the needs of others.

715 *We call for:*

716 ◆ corporate policies that lessen the disparities between
717 compensations of top corporate executives and that of the
718 workers throughout an organization;

719 ◆ corporate governance that is accountable for the effects
720 of a company’s practices on workers, communities, and the
721 environment here and throughout the world;

722 ◆ scrutiny of the tax breaks, subsidies, and incentives
723 many companies receive, to assure that they serve the
724 common good;

725 ◆ enforcement of laws to prevent the exercise of
726 inordinate market power by large corporations;

727 ◆ appropriate government regulatory reform so that
728 governments can monitor private sector practices more
729 effectively and efficiently in an ever-changing global
730 economy.

731 ***Sustainability: of the environment, agriculture, and*** 732 ***low-income communities***

733 “Sustainability” is the capacity of natural and social systems
734 to survive and thrive together over the long term. What is
735 sufficient in providing for people’s wants often is in tension
736 with what can be sustained over time. Sustainability has
737 implications for how we evaluate economic activity in terms
738 of its ongoing effects on the well-being of both nature and
739 human communities. Economic life should help sustain
740 humans and the rest of creation—now and in the future.

741 Efforts to provide a sufficient livelihood must be
742 sustainable economically. Individuals and families should
743 not borrow more than they are able to pay back and still
744 meet their future needs. Governments should not finance
745 their spending by excessive borrowing or money creation
746 that reduces national income and production, and threatens
747 the livelihood of future generations. Tax rates and
748 government regulations must not be so burdensome as to
749 stifle the production of the very goods and services people
750 need to live.

751 “The earth is the Lord’s and all that is in it, the world,
752 and those who live in it” (Psalm 24:1). As God created, so
753 God also sustains: “When you send forth your spirit . . . you
754 renew the face of the ground” (Psalm 104:30). God makes
755 a covenant with Noah, his descendants, and every living
756 creature that they will not be destroyed (Genesis 9:8-17). In
757 God’s promise of “new heavens and a new earth . . . they
758 shall build houses and inhabit them; they shall plant
759 vineyards and eat their fruit” (Isaiah 65:17, 21). The vantage
760 point of the kingdom of God motivates us to focus on more
761 than short-term gains. Humans, called to be stewards of
762 God’s creation, are to respect the integrity and limits of the
763 earth and its resources.

764 ***Sustaining the environment:*** The growth of economic
765 activity during the twentieth century, and the
766 industrialization and consumerism that fueled it, radically
767 changed the relationship between humans and the earth.
768 Too often the earth has been treated as a waste receptacle
769 and a limitless storehouse of raw materials to be used up for
770 the sake of economic growth, rather than as a finite, fragile
771 ecological system upon which human and all other life
772 depends.

773 Instead of being stewards who care for the long-term
774 well-being of creation, we confess that we have depleted
775 non-renewable resources, eroded topsoil, and polluted the
776 air, ground, and water. Without appropriate environmental
777 care, economic growth cannot be sustained. Caring for
778 creation means that economic processes should respect
779 environmental limits. “When we act interdependently and
780 in solidarity with creation, we *do* justice. We serve and keep
781 the earth, trusting its bounty can be sufficient for all, and
782 sustainable.”¹¹

723 **We commit ourselves** as a church and urge members to:
724 ◆ use less, re-use, recycle, and restore natural resources;
725 ◆ plan for careful land use of church property, and receive
726 and manage gifts of land and real estate in sustainable ways.

727 **We call for:**

- 728 ◆ appropriate policies and regulations that help reverse
729 environmental destruction;
- 730 ◆ planning that accounts for the impact of regional growth
731 on communities and ecosystems;
- 732 ◆ ending subsidies for economic activities that use up
733 non-renewable natural resources;
- 734 ◆ companies to pay more fully for the wider social and
735 environmental costs of what they produce;
- 736 ◆ the development and use of more energy-efficient
737 technologies.

738 **Sustaining agriculture:** Agriculture is basic to the survival
739 and security of people throughout the world. Through the
740 calling of agriculture, farmers produce the grain for our
741 daily bread and the rest of our food supply. Without a
742 bountiful and low-cost food supply, most Americans would
743 not enjoy the livelihood they do. Farmers face the challenge
744 of producing this food in ways that contribute to the
745 regeneration of the land and the vitality of rural
746 communities. At the same time, society as a whole must
747 address the high levels of risk farmers face and the low
748 prices they often receive. Changing agricultural policies and
749 the growing power of large agribusiness corporations make
750 this even more challenging.

751 **We commit ourselves** as a church and urge members to:

- 752 ◆ pray for and support those who farm the land;
- 753 ◆ pursue new ways for consumers to partner with small
754 farmers in sharing the risks and yields of farming.

755 **We call for:**

- 756 ◆ changes to assure that farmers will receive a greater
757 proportion of the retail food dollar;
- 758 ◆ adequate prices for agricultural products so that
759 farmers can be compensated fairly for their labor and
760 production costs;
- 761 ◆ sustainable agricultural practices that protect and restore
762 the regenerative capacities of the land, rather than practices
763 that deplete the land (for example, by measuring
764 productivity only by short-term agricultural yields);
- 765 ◆ more just work conditions for farm workers, especially
766 immigrants, and opportunities for them to acquire their own
767 land.

768 **Sustainable development of low-income communities:**

769 In many low-income communities, disinvestment and
770 neglect have taken their toll. In contrast to this are examples
771 of sustainable community economic development that take
772 into account the overall health and welfare of people, the
773 environment, and the local economy. Such an approach

774 creates jobs, prepares people for work, generates income
775 that is re-circulated several times in the community, and
776 sustains and renews environmental resources, all for the
777 sake of a community's long-term viability.

778 Instead of a top-down approach focused on a
779 community's deprivation and its lack of economic growth,
780 effective community development draws upon its assets and
781 emphasizes quality and diverse production. Effective
782 policies build and enhance a community's social
783 relationships, values, and institutions, which together can
784 further economic development. Local residents determine
785 the future of their community by initiating, supporting, and
786 sustaining new projects. Their capacities, skills, and assets
787 help shape the vision and plan for the community.

788 Through broad-based community organizing people
789 can be mobilized to address economic and other issues that
790 directly impact them. Government and the private sector
791 also must invest in health, education, and infrastructures
792 necessary for sustainable development. When people and
793 resources are connected in ways that multiply their power
794 and effectiveness, this will help bring about productive
795 results and meaningful participation in community and
796 economic life.

797 Therefore, **we commit ourselves** as a church and urge
798 members to:

- 799 ◆ learn about, participate in, and provide financial
800 support for community economic development and
801 organizing strategies that enhance the current and future
802 well-being of communities and the environment;
- 803 ◆ support community development corporations and
804 locally-owned or producer-owned cooperatives;
- 805 ◆ integrate social values into our investment decisions,
806 and invest more in socially responsible companies and
807 funds that sustain businesses as well as workers, consumers,
808 the environment, and low-income communities.

809 **We call for:**

- 810 ◆ support of the above strategies by governments,
811 financial institutions, and the wider society;
- 812 ◆ alternatives to gambling as a means of community
813 economic development;
- 814 ◆ grants and low-interest loans that enable small
815 companies and farms to get started, develop, and expand in
816 order to provide livelihood for more people in low-income
817 communities.

818 **In conclusion, a vision renewed**

819 Pursuing policies and practices that will lead to
820 "sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all" is such a
821 formidable challenge that to many it seems unrealistic or not
822 worth the effort. The Church as an employer, property
823 owner, consumer, investor, and community of believers can
824 be as caught up in the reigning economic assumptions as the
825 rest of society. But despite the Church's failings, through the
826 Word and the sacraments, we are forgiven, renewed, and
827 nourished. At the Table, we together receive the same bread
828 and drink of the same cup. What we receive *is* sufficient; it
829 *does* sustain us. We are strengthened to persist in the struggle
830 for justice as we look forward to the coming of God's
831 kingdom in all its fullness.

832 We are sent forth *into the world* to bear witness to God’s
 833 promised reign. The world is the whole household of God
 834 that economic life is intended to serve. The Spirit of God
 835 expands our vision and transforms our priorities. We realize
 836 that we do not eat alone; everyone needs to eat. The
 837 multitudes present around God’s global table become our
 838 neighbors rather than competitors or strangers. Empowered
 839 by God, we continue to act, pray, and hope that through
 840 economic life there truly will be *sufficient, sustainable*
 841 *livelihood for all*.

842 **End Notes:**

843 All Scriptural references are from the *New Revised*
 844 *Standard Version Bible*, Division of Christian Education of
 845 the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United
 846 States of America (1989).

- 847 1. See Martin Luther’s discussion of this in “The Large
 848 Catechism,” *The Book of Concord*, Theodore G.
 849 Tappert, transl. and ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press,
 850 1959), 430-431.
- 851 2. The Fifth Commandment as discussed in “The Large
 852 Catechism,” *BC*, 391.
- 853 3. The Seventh Commandment as discussed in “The
 854 Large Catechism,” *BC*, 395.
- 855 4. The Ninth and Tenth commandments, “The Large
 856 Catechism,” *BC*, 406.

857 5. See the ELCA Message, “Immigration” (1998) and the
 858 ELCA Social Statement, “For Peace in God’s World”
 859 (1995), available from the Division for Church in
 860 Society (Call 800-NET-ELCA, extension 2712, for this
 861 and other ELCA statements and studies).

862 6. In this and subsequent “we commit” sections, “church”
 863 includes congregations, synods, the churchwide
 864 organization, and where relevant, this calls upon
 865 affiliated organizations such as seminaries, schools,
 866 colleges and universities, and social ministry
 867 organizations to adjust their policies and practices
 868 accordingly.

869 7. “Global population growth, for example, relates to the
 870 lack of access by women to family planning and health
 871 care, quality education, fulfilling employment, and
 872 equal rights.” ELCA Social Statement, “Caring for
 873 Creation: Vision, Hope, and Justice” (1993), 3-4.

874 8. See how Luther explains the First Article of the Creed
 875 in the Small Catechism.

876 9. See the Women and Children Living in Poverty
 877 Strategy of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in
 878 America (800-NET-ELCA extension 2863).

879 10. See “Gambling: A Study for Congregations” (Division
 880 for Church in Society, 1998), 20-22.

11. “Caring for Creation . . .” (1993).

Presentation of “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All”

Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Charles S. Miller, executive director of the Division for Church in Society (DCS), the Rev. Karen L. Bloomquist, the director for studies in the Division for Church in Society, Ms. Annette Citzler, chair of the task force preparing the social statement, and the Rev. Winston D. Persaud, and the Rev. Gladys G. Moore, members of the task force. He indicated that the social statement on economic life, “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All,” would be formally presented at this time, and discussion was scheduled for later plenary sessions.

Pastor Miller explained that the development of a social statement requires several processes to unfold simultaneously. “There is, first, the work of the task force, about which you will hear much more later in our presentation. Second, there is the work of staff, who accompany the task force in their journey; in this case, years of listening, studying, and writing on the topic. And then there is the work of the division’s board. The board is the hub around which the staff and task force’s work unfolds. It is the board that monitors the ongoing work. It reviews and, when appropriate, approves the documents produced by the task force. In the end, the board’s work is essential to the integrity and quality of the final statement.

“In that context, it is my privilege to introduce the chair of the board of the Division for Church and Society. Ingrid Christiansen has served as the chair of the division board since 1992. Her tenure ends with this assembly. But during her tenure, she has overseen the board’s work on four social statements—the social statement ‘Caring for Creation’; the social statement ‘Race, Ethnicity, and Culture’; the social statement on peace—all adopted by previous assemblies; and now, the proposed social statement on economic life. With my personal deep thanks to Ingrid for her service to this church, I invite her to introduce our task

force and staff speakers.

Ms. Christiansen said, “Our four speakers, who will introduce the social statement on economic life, are people who, like the other task force and staff members in this journey, have poured their very hearts and minds into discerning the connections between our faith and the complex world of economic life. I am proud to be associated with them in presenting this statement, which is the fruits of their labors.

“I will introduce them in the order in which they will speak. Our first speaker will be the Rev. Winston D. Persaud, task force member and professor of systematic theology at Wartburg Theological Seminary. The second will be the Rev. Karen L. Bloomquist, director for studies in the Division for Church in Society, and the lead staff on this statement. Following Pastor Bloomquist will be Ms. Annette Citzler, chair of the task force and professor of economics at Texas Lutheran University. And concluding our presentation will be the Rev. Gladys G. Moore, task force and board member, and assistant to the bishop in the New Jersey Synod.”

Address by the Rev. Winston D. Persaud

Pastor Winston D. Persaud asserted, “We live in a world of rich and poor, of haves and have nots. It is God’s intention that the goods of the world be used to provide the wherewithal for all to live with dignity and that the well-being of all be promoted. We are to order and structure our lives so that God’s intention be realized in as fundamental a way as possible. In confessing that God is good, and that as Christians, we are called to be stewards of God’s goodness and God’s goods, we are pointing to the unavoidable responsibility—indeed vocation—which God has placed upon us to pursue the spiritual and material well-being of all.

“Of course, we cannot, as the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, take care of everyone’s needs, but we are to join with others in pursuing and promoting the well-being of all. No societal structure is so sacrosanct that it cannot be brought into question when the common good is not being promoted, but hindered. At the same time, as Christians we recognize that we act irresponsibly when we uncritically dismiss structures which conduce to the good of many. In the provisional world of economic realities, we do not come as if we have a blueprint for the realization of God’s reign on earth. Rather, we come to the task of economic deliberation and action, convinced that what we do is provisional, and that within that provisionality, we are to act that God’s justice be concrete and real in the lives of so many that live without the basics for survival and livelihood.

“I remember very vividly when, in the fall of 1981, the government of Guyana banned importation of wheat and flour. My wife, who was born and raised in the United States, said at a dinner table, ‘All my life I have prayed in the Lord’s Prayer, “Give us this day our daily bread,” and never once did I wonder whether there would be, literally, bread on the table. Now I do.’ Those of us, and, I suspect, all of us here, who daily or regularly pray the Lord’s Prayer, know that we are asking God for all that is necessary for our well-being, spiritual and material.

“We are united with many who do not have sufficient, sustainable livelihood. We engage the difficult and elusive question of sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all, recognizing that it is God’s commitment to the world which we seek to promote and implement. For Jesus’ sake, God has declared us just. We know that pursuing the common

good is not a matter of creating our worth before God. That is an impossibility. What is possible is the pursuit of sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all, however provisionally we do so. That is what God's stewards are called to do: celebrate and delight in the incredible gift of impossible grace in Jesus Christ, and relentlessly promote and pursue the common good. This is what the document before you offers."

Address by the Rev. Karen L. Bloomquist

Pastor Karen L. Bloomquist explained, "This social statement has been in the process of development for a longer time period of time than any other. When the ELCA came into being, many theologians and other church leaders indicated that economic matters should be among the first this church would formally address. But due to other pressing agendas, the process of developing this statement did not actually begin until 1994.

"At that time, the board of the Division for Church in Society appointed a task force who, at their first meeting, decided to spend the fall of 1994 going out to over 75 listening posts in about 20 areas of this country, hearing from about 500 members of this church what you were experiencing in economic life, and how God, and thus, the church, are involved. What we heard, saw, and felt deeply through those experiences with people in rural, small town, suburban, and urban settings decisively affect what the task force felt called to address, and how, over the past five years. Excerpts from these listening posts were published in a booklet speaking of economic life. After that, when the task force gathered, we would recall for one another what we had heard amid the tears of those farmers in the church basement in South Dakota, or how candidly international business and finance leaders in New Jersey expressed their sense of captivity to the global economy, or the visible struggle of impoverished immigrants near the Mexican border, or despairing workers who found themselves downsized out of their livelihood. And those people, and many, many others we had interacted with, were very present as we worked together on the study booklet, 'Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread: Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All.' This was sent to all congregations near the end of 1996, and this study, available here at Augsburg Fortress, continues to serve as helpful background to much of what is stated in far briefer fashion in the actual statement.

"You sent us your responses to the study, based on what you had discussed in your congregations. And in early 1998, the first draft of the statement was drafted and sent out to all congregations. At that point, it was called, 'Towards Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All.' Hundreds attended over 20 hearings and sent us responses to the draft. A few felt the church had no business speaking on economic matters because of how supremely economic assumptions reign. But far more wanted a new draft that, on the basis of the faith we share, would speak to and counter the power and influence of economic thinking and actions today. You told us, 'Do not provide highly specific prescriptions, but give us general principles growing out of our faith so that using our heads, we can apply them to particular questions and situations we face over time.' You also said that we, as a church, individually and corporately, must make serious commitments ourselves before we speak to the wider society. In these and other ways, the statement you have before you responds to what you, members of this church, communicated to us.

"Some might feel that such general principles are too bland and not provocative or prophetic enough. They do not narrowly prescribe policies or solutions, but they point to—they raise up—important values and norms that we share in common with much of the

church ecumenical. And that must be taken into consideration as decisions are made regarding economic life. It is not the words on paper, but the specific actions and follow-through on these principles that will make a difference for the sake of sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all.”

Address by Ms. Annette Citzler

Ms. Annette Citzler said, “I am grateful for this opportunity to share with you a little about the economic life task force and its work. It has been a challenging and quite gratifying experience for me to serve on the task force since its inception in 1994, and to have chaired it since 1997. I would like to call your attention to one additional member of our task force, whose name was inadvertently omitted from your list on page 45 of Section IV. She is Sandra G. Gustavson, a Church Council member, from Doraville, Georgia, who has served on our task force since 1997.

“Let me tell you a little bit about our task force membership overall. We have come from quite diverse life experiences—clergy and lay people, men and women, both younger and older people, from all over the country: Washington state to New Jersey and Wisconsin to Texas. A number of us have lived and studied or worked in international settings. Our membership includes people of color and has included people of disadvantaged economic circumstances. In career backgrounds, our membership has included congregational pastors, theologians, economists, social activists, a business ethicist and business professor, a financier and international business consultant, a social ministry executive, bishop, farmer, retired business owner, sociologist, county commissioner, and someone who has been a recipient of government support through the welfare system. Some have worked in low income jobs or in low income communities. We are a mixture of people who are single and married, parents and grandparents, or without children of our own, of urban, suburban, and rural backgrounds. We vary in philosophy from those who are free market supporters to those who are strongly critical of markets and favor more government in our economy than we have at present in the United States. The one thing we have in common is a solid faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and a belief that the Holy Spirit could bring us together to discuss economic issues from the perspective of our faith—and that is exactly what we did.

“It was not easy. And there were serious disagreements along the way. Not all of our task force members, in the end, could add their names to this document, two having dissented, one on either side of the philosophical spectrum. I regret that, but I believe we have brought to you a document that is faithful to what we believe, that calls upon all of us to think carefully about the economic decisions we make and that fulfills our mandate as a task force. While originally there were some expectations about the statement that could not be met—for example, that it be focused mainly on agriculture and the land, or that it be a primer on how capitalism works, or that it be a detailed treatise on the causes and remedies for poverty—we ultimately settled on an organization and themes for the statement that are indicated in the next slide you will see.

“First, we recognized the pervasiveness of economic realities in our lives. We seem always to be preoccupied by money, by our work, by buying things to satisfy our wants or needs. Economic life can easily become our god. Rather than condemning it outright, however, we recognized that the economic system is a means by which God’s intent for God’s people and the whole creation can be fulfilled. Since it is a means to God’s ends, however, that means is subject to all the sinfulness that it is possible for humans to devise.

And, thus, it is imperative for us to consider the economic outcomes of this system in light of our faith. What is God's will for us and for the creation? In order to realize this evaluative Christ-consideration—that is, is it faithful to God's will—there must be evaluative criteria: sufficiency, sustainability, and with livelihood for all. These criteria seemed to us as a task force to be both consistent with our faith and a prophetic challenge to our economic reality. 'Sufficiency' implies that all should have enough. 'Sustainability' implies that we should be future oriented on behalf of the creation for the sake of posterity and not just ourselves. 'Livelihood' means that there be means to contribute to the economy and thereby gain what is needed for life. 'For all' means that all people and all creation are involved here, not just Americans and not only the rich or middle class people.

"The statement is organized into six sections. What we believe comes first. Then there follows a section pointing out the tensions between what we believe about the economy and what our faith calls us to. Finally, there are four sections that deal with each of the evaluative criteria: 'For all' is concerned with those living in poverty—people for whom the economic system often fails to meet needs. The 'livelihood' section deals with people and their work. The 'sufficiency' section sets out the criteria that all should have enough, but that none should have too much. And, finally, the 'sustainability' section addresses agricultural and environmental concerns, as well as the vitality of our communities.

"Based on input we received in response to the first draft, the task force determined that we would conclude each of the above sections with two types of statements: what we as a church commit ourselves to, and then, what we call for in the wider society.

"As examples of what we commit ourselves to, here are five: investing more in initiatives to reduce poverty, living out our vocations in ways to serve the neighbor and strengthen our families and our communities, counseling and supporting the unemployed, hiring without discriminating, compensating at a sufficient wage so that workers can live in dignity.

"As examples of what we call for: reduction and cancellation of international debt for the poorest nations of the world, for farmers to receive a greater share of the retail food dollar, a minimum wage that assures sufficient income without significantly raising levels of unemployment, adequate government assistance when people are unable to provide for their livelihood through jobs, correction of regressive tax systems, and lessening compensation disparities between the highest and lowest salaries of corporate officers and line workers.

"These are only a sample of the commitments and calls for action in the document, and I urge you, if you've not already done so, to review all of these again as you prepare for the assembly's consideration of this document."

Address by the Rev. Gladys G. Moore

Pastor Gladys G. Moore continued, "In the 31st chapter of Jeremiah, we read these words, which are traditionally heard on Reformation Sunday: 'But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them and I will write it on their hearts....' What a powerful notion that God's Law is written on our hearts. That Law, which is indeed Gospel, not only for us but for the world, moves us ever deeper into being the people that God would have us be, and living as God would have us live.

"Far from being God's Law, however, we of the Division for Church in Society know that our church's social statements attempt to serve as guides—guides for our hearts, minds,

and actions, as we try to live faithfully in God's world. But as with any statement, law, or proclamation, it is only as good as the people who try to live it out. Many of the members of our congregations have probably never even heard of our church's social statements. That certainly does not invalidate their content. Instead, it challenges us who are aware of them to do a better job of advertising them, reading them, discussing them, and putting them to use in our daily lives.

"Last summer I spent six weeks in Mexico studying Spanish so that I might better relate to the increasingly Spanish-speaking world in which I live and serve. Not a day went by when I was in Chiapas that I did not think of the words, 'sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all.' In part, this was because at the time I was still serving on the task force which was charged with developing this social statement, but the greater reason for reflecting on the phrase 'sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all' was the fact that I was daily faced with such overwhelming poverty, as is often seen in too many parts of the two-thirds world and even in our own country. For the entire time that I was there, the same question would ring over and over again in my mind: So what? So what if we have a social statement which encourages us to do what that old bumper sticker says, 'Live simply so that others may simply live?' So what if we have a social statement that says we must care about the increasing gap between the rich and the poor, because too many of God's children are falling through that gap? So what if we encourage our people to be better advocates for the poor and those who are oppressed in their communities and their congregations?

"What will any of this matter at all if no one reads this particular social statement and no one uses it to encourage thoughtful discussion and faithful action? Then we will have spent nearly five years doing what some people think we Lutherans love to do—namely, what Martin Luther King Jr. called the 'paralysis of analysis.' Some people think that we Lutherans love to study and write, debate, and rewrite words, while people are literally starving and thirsting for the Word. Jesus, the living Word, not only preached, taught, and healed. In many of the lessons that we have heard during these past weeks, Jesus fed and cared for the multitudes because his compassion moved him to do so. 'You give them something to eat,' Jesus said to his disciples in our Gospel lesson a few weeks ago. He was undoubtedly challenging his disciples to care for the physical and bodily needs of the household of God, for all of God's children with whom they happened to come into contact. In other words, Jesus was talking about economics and about how to live faithfully within God's household, given the resources we have, so that all might live the abundant life that Christ Jesus came to offer. Perhaps Jesus is saying the same thing to us today. And what better way of trying to discern what our Lord is saying about things economic than to risk sitting down with other brothers and sisters, and wrestling with issues of sufficiency and sustainability for all of God's children.

"We hope and pray that you will not only vote on this social statement while here, but more so, that you will use this social statement in your congregations, communities, social ministry committees, adult forums, Sunday schools, and in the privacy of your own homes as you are struggling with what to do with the commercialism of Christmas this year. The place in which you use the social statement matters much less than that you use it. So when you vote, do not do so as much with your ballots as with your hearts. Then it won't matter whether the particulars of this social statement are written on your hearts or not, for you can always call the Division for Church and Society in Chicago and get another copy. Thank you for your presence here at this assembly and for your ongoing partnership in the Gospel."

Bishop Anderson thanked those on the platform for an excellent report, and for their

detailed and careful work. He then repeated, “We will have a chance to discuss it in detail later in the assembly.”

Recess

Noting the time, Bishop Anderson said that the Report of the Memorials Committee would be postponed until Plenary Session Four.

Bishop Anderson announced that the vote on the 1991 statement on ecumenism, “Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,” had been 919 in favor and 67 opposed with 4 abstentions.

Ms. Susan A. Stewart [Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod] requested that copies of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral from the *Book of Common Prayer*, the Episcopal statement of ecumenical understandings, be distributed to the voting members. Bishop Anderson said that the issue would be raised with Secretary Almen, who has responsibility for providing documents.

Bishop Anderson called upon Secretary Almen, who made several announcements, including instructions regarding Wednesday’s luncheons for review of churchwide units. He called attention to the deadline at 12:15 P.M. today for requests for separate consideration for memorials now designated for *en bloc* consideration.

Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Karen S. Parker [Pacifica Synod] to lead the closing worship. At 12:01 P.M., following devotions, Bishop Anderson stated that the assembly was in recess until 1:30 P.M. Mountain Daylight Time.

Plenary Session Three

Tuesday, August 17, 1999

1:30 P.M. – 3:00 P.M.

The Rev. H. George Anderson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, called Plenary Session Three to order at 1:33 P.M. Mountain Daylight Time on Tuesday, August 17, 1999.

Report of the Credentials Committee

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section I, Pages 9, 28.

Bishop Anderson called upon the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to provide the report of the Credentials Committee. Secretary Almen reported that the number of voting members registered as of 1:15 P.M. on Tuesday, August 17, 1999, was:

Voting Members:

Lay Members	Female	331
	Male	<u>288</u>
TOTAL		619
Ordained Ministers	Female	105
	Male	<u>304</u>
TOTAL		409
TOTAL		1,028
ELCA Officers:		<u>4</u>
TOTAL VOTING MEMBERSHIP		1,032

Of the 1,032 registered voting members, 105 were persons of color or persons whose primary language is other than English.

Proposal on Full Communion with the Moravian Church

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, pages 11-43 (Section I, pages 14-15); continued on Minutes, pages 270, 299.

BACKGROUND

Reception of the dialogue report, "Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion," was facilitated by the Lutheran-Moravian Coordinating Committee. The Lutheran members of the committee were appointed by the Church Council in April 1997.

The members of the Lutheran-Moravian Coordinating Committee were:

! *For the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America:*

The Rev. Walter Wagner, *co-chair*

The Rev. Ronald Rinn
The Rev. Martha Sheaffer
The Rev. Darlis J. Swan, *staff*

! *For the Moravian Church in America:*

The Rev. Otto Dreydoppel Jr., *co-chair*
The Rev. C. Daniel Crews
The Rev. Gary L. Harke, *staff*

The mandate of the Lutheran-Moravian Coordinating Committee was to:

- prepare the churches to vote on the proposal at the Moravian Synods of 1998 and the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly;
- encourage and enable local dialogue and experimentation, which would experientially prepare church representatives to vote on the proposal; and
- see to the printing, distribution, and study of “Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion.”

The Lutheran Reformed-Moravian Coordinating Committee completed work on the text of the “implementing resolution” that was considered and approved at the 1998 Moravian Synods and that is being submitted to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

In the study edition of “Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion” that was distributed throughout the churches in 1997-1998, the Lutheran-Moravian Coordinating Committee acknowledged that the report would be unfamiliar in some ways.

First, the dialogue papers were not published and distributed to clergy and others prior to [the issuance of the report], with the exception of a number of Moravian and ELCA congregations which used them in a guided study process. The key reason for that procedure is the severe limits based on funding the dialogue; neither church could afford the expenses involved in editing, printing, and distributing the materials. A grant from the Elfrid L. and Marie F. Hine Fund of Augsburg Lutheran Church, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, made the first four meetings possible. We acknowledge with gratitude the generosity of the congregation in making the funds available.

Second, our respective church leaders and the [participants in the dialogue] felt that the salient positions which emerged could be covered appropriately in the body of the report....

Third, the report contains more explanatory and background material than others because American Moravians and Lutherans know less about each other than we know about other Christian bodies. Relative size and geographical distribution in the United States account for some of our mutual non-communication. Other contributing factors are denominational agendas, theological styles, and inertia. The report, therefore, also serves to introduce Moravians to Lutherans and Lutherans to Moravians.

In the study edition, the recommendations were included following the Preface. This was done, according to the Lutheran-Moravian Coordinating Committee, to “alert readers to areas, issues, and implications for the future of Moravian-Lutheran relations, to highlight matters which will be presented for decisions at our respective assemblies, and to prompt readers to consider the opportunities for ecumenical developments offered by this dialogue as they join us in attempting to follow our Shepherd.”

Geographical and fiscal factors influenced the location meetings and the membership of the dialogue. Given the size and concentration of the Moravian Church in North America and relevant historical as well as institutional resources of both churches, sessions were held in the Allentown-Bethlehem, Pa., area.¹ Facilities of the Moravian Theological Seminary (Bethlehem), Muhlenberg College, and Christ Evangelical Lutheran Church (both in Allentown) were used for the meetings. The Moravian dialogue participants were drawn from the Bethlehem, Pa., and North Carolina areas. The Lutheran members included two from Bethlehem-Allentown, Pa., and others from beyond that area.

Record of Dialogue Process

The participants in the Lutheran-Moravian Dialogue were:

! *For the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America:*

The Rev. Walter H. Wagner, Ph.D., *co-chair*
Allentown, Pennsylvania
The Rev. Thelma Megill Cobbler, Ph.D.
Columbus, Ohio
The Rev. Sarah Henrich, Ph.D.
Saint Paul, Minnesota
David Yeago, Ph.D.
Columbia, South Carolina
The Rev. Samuel Zeiser, S.T.M.
Johnsonville, Pennsylvania
The Rev. Daniel Martensen, Ph.D., *staff*
Chicago, Illinois

! *For the Moravian Church in America*

The Rev. Arthur Freeman, Ph.D., *co-chair*
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
The Rev. Otto Dreydoppel Jr.
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
The Rev. D. Wayne Burkette, Ph.D.*
Winston-Salem, North Carolina
The Rev. C. Daniel Crews, Ph.D.
Winston-Salem, North Carolina
Robert Helm, Ph.D.**
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

* member for the first three sessions

** member for the final two sessions

¹ The Moravian Church in North America is concentrated in Northeastern Pennsylvania and North Carolina. Clusters of congregations are also in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and on the West Coast. The Unity's only seminary and one of its four-year colleges are located in Bethlehem, a city which was settled by Moravians in 1741. The Northern Province's offices and the Moravian Archives are located on the Bethlehem campus. The Winston-Salem, N.C., area also is a historical Moravian center and the site of its Salem College. The Southern Province's headquarters and Archives also are in Winston-Salem. Lutheran and Moravian pastors and congregants have long been associated with each other in these areas and cooperated in local discussions and study groups, using materials derived from the dialogue's papers. The library resources of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia were readily available and utilized in research.

Participants in the dialogue realized from the outset that the two churches had much in common, yet were not identical. Through the dialogue, the churches were invited to listen to the Savior's call and to follow him in seeking to become more faithfully and fully one flock.

The following summary of the dialogue process was presented in the study edition of "Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion":

The Lutheran-Moravian Dialogue developed its agenda and character in light of the theological, historical, and sociological realities of the two churches. While we have been close to each other geographically, ethnically, and theologically, our churches in North America proceeded on separate denominational tracks. Our European origins indicate that we have been and still are in mutually enriching relationships. Jan Hus and the Bohemian Brethren who organized themselves as the *Unitas Fratrum* prepared the ground for the German Reformation led by Martin Luther. The latter and his colleagues encouraged and recognized the Brethren as partners in the renewal of the Gospel. Persecuted and driven from their Bohemian and Moravian homelands in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, some of the *Unitas Fratrum* were given refuge at Herrnhut, the estate of the Lutheran pietist noble, Nicholas Ludwig, Count von Zinzendorf. While at Herrnhut and ministered to by local Lutheran pastors as well as encouraged by Zinzendorf, the Unity was renewed and re-invigorated. Zinzendorf's theological credentials were recognized on several occasions by Lutheran officials, and he was ordained to the ministry of Word and Sacrament.

Our two churches developed separate ecclesial organizations and identities in North America. The chief reasons for that separate development had much to do with the patterns of immigration from Germany and the religious pluralism which came to characterize English-speaking North America. Although Moravians were indefatigable missionaries to Native Americans in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, they did not attempt, on a consistent basis, to establish Moravian churches on the frontier. The Unity resisted the denominational ecclesial pattern and organizational identity which emerged in the United States. Instead, they often chose to labor cooperatively with Lutheran, Reformed, and Episcopal clergy and laity to advance the mission of the whole Church. The *Unitas Fratrum*, then and now, may provide a valuable precedent for ecumenical experience and attitude. In Asia, Africa, and Europe, Moravians and Lutherans have long enjoyed what is now termed "full communion," including eucharistic hospitality and the full interchangeability of members and clergy.

Our churches have never issued mutual or unilateral condemnations one of the other. As will be shown in the Report, we both use the Scriptures as the source of our faith and life, confess the historic creeds and consider the *Unaltered Augsburg Confession* and *Small Catechism* to be true expressions of the Christian faith. Justification by faith through grace holds the same vital place among Lutherans and Moravians, and we acknowledge the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The differences between us have more to do with how we manifest religious devotion (piety), engage in theological reflection, and express ourselves organizationally. These are not unsubstantial differences, but they are well within the circle of full communion. One substantive incident, remembered chiefly by Lutherans, has given Moravian-Lutheran relationships in the United States a negative cast: the 1742 meeting and argument in Philadelphia between Henry Melchior Muhlenberg and Nicholas von Zinzendorf. That encounter and a few subsequent quarrels among our pastors reflect tensions within Lutheran pietism and parish rivalries rather than critical doctrinal or confessional

differences which are church-dividing. Indeed, neither the Ancient nor the Renewed Moravian Church experienced anything like the controversies which engaged Lutherans in the latter half of the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries. In place of a formal emphasis on dogma, Moravians focus on the priority of personal commitment to Jesus as Savior and the relationships among members of the community of believers. Throughout the Dialogue, the participants learned to listen to each other, recognizing that our theological methods have been shaped by our historical experiences. That listening and recognizing shaped the subjects with which we dealt and the ways in which we carried on our discussions.

The Lutheran participants were led to examine their pietist traditions, the influences of their immigrant heritages on their current outlooks, and their need to articulate more clearly their understandings of personal faith, the roles of the Holy Spirit, and the unity of the Church. Moravians, likewise, were moved to express themselves with greater clarity on doctrinal concerns, biblical hermeneutics, their own historical traditions, and church order. Together we searched for the meanings and purposes of ecumenicity, “full communion,” and following our Shepherd into God’s future.

The Lutheran-Moravian Dialogue began with conversations led by the Rev. Arthur Freeman and the Rev. Daniel Martensen. Dr. Freeman is a bishop of the Moravian Church and was professor of New Testament and Christian Spirituality at the Moravian Theological Seminary. Dr. Martensen was then the associate director of the Department for Ecumenical Affairs of the ELCA. The formulation of a preliminary set of goals, subsequently endorsed by the respective church bodies and the dialoguers, resulted from the initial conversations. The goals were:

1. to be responsible to the ecumenical vision in harmony with the Bible and the historical Moravian and Lutheran positions on ecumenicity, and to affirm the unity of the Church which already exists in Christ;
2. to explore further the historical and international connections of the Lutheran and Moravian churches;
3. to explore moving towards full communion with the Lutheran Church, including common recognition of each other’s Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry;
4. to test and articulate Moravian and Lutheran theology and theological methodologies; and
5. to share with our churches at all levels the ongoing results of the Dialogue and to solicit reactions and counsel. This would also involve the sharing of information on other bilateral dialogues in which we were engaged.

The term “full communion” has a technical meaning in the ecumenical discussions in which the ELCA engages with other churches.² The characteristics denoted in that term are:

1. a common confessing of the Christian faith;
2. a mutual recognition of Baptism and a sharing of the Lord’s Supper, allowing for the exchangeability of members;
3. mutual recognition and availability of ordained ministers to the service of all members of churches in full communion, subject only but always to the disciplinary regulations of the other churches;

² *Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 1991.*

4. a common commitment to evangelism, witness, and service;
5. a means of common decision making on critical common issues of faith and life; and
6. a mutual lifting of any condemnations that exist between the churches.

Movement toward full communion, therefore, is broad in scope, penetrating in depth, and far-reaching in its implications. It can involve a gradual process with interim stages of engagement, especially if the churches are significantly different from each other in polity and practice, and if the churches' pasts have been marked by misunderstanding and hostility.³

The first formal meeting of the [Lutheran-Moravian] Dialogue was held at Muhlenberg College in Allentown, Pa., from December 11-13, 1992. Severe storms prevented Drs. Martensen, Wayne Burkette and C. Daniel Crews from attending personally. The latter two participated through multi-party telephone conversations. Dr. Walter Wagner presented a paper titled "Factors Which Have Shaped Lutheran Theologies and Views of the Christian Life." Dr. Crews responded to the paper. The cognate paper, "What Has Shaped Moravian Theology and the Moravian View of the Christian Life?" was jointly authored by Drs. Crews and Freeman, and Professor Otto Dreydoppel Jr. Dr. Thelma Megill-Cobbler responded from the Lutheran side. Pastor Samuel Zeiser's paper, "A History of Lutheran-Moravian Interaction In America: A Lutheran Perspective," elicited responses from Dr. Freeman.

The second meeting, June 13-15, 1993, took place at the Moravian Theological Seminary in Bethlehem, Pa. Dr. Wagner presented and Dr. Freeman responded to a paper, "How Our History Has Shaped Our Concept of Our Ministry: A Lutheran Perspective." Dr. Crews presented and Dr. Megill-Cobbler responded to "How Our History Has Influenced Our Ministry: A Moravian Account." Pr. Zeiser continued the American historical account with "The Henry Melchior Muhlenberg Who Met Count Nicholas Ludwig Von Zinzendorf in 1742." Prof. Dreydoppel contributed "The Incident at Philadelphia: A Moravian Perspective On The Muhlenberg-Zinzendorf Encounter."

The third meeting, December 3-4, 1993, was held at Christ Evangelical Lutheran Church, Allentown, Pa. The general topic continued the subject of ministry with a focus on church order. Dr. Freeman shared his paper, "The Moravian Church: Its Faith and Order," and Dr. Megill-Cobbler presented "Recent Readings of the Lutheran Confessions and the Doctrine of Ministry."

The fourth meeting returned to the Moravian Theological Seminary, June 24-25, 1994. Dr. David Yeago joined the [Lutheran-Moravian] Dialogue at the fourth meeting

³ According to *Ecumenism) the Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*, the suggested stages toward full communion in circumstances which indicate that a gradual process is appropriate are:

1. ecumenical cooperation. Here the ELCA enters into ecumenical relations based on the *evangelical* and *representative principles*;
2. bilateral and multilateral dialogues. Here the ELCA enters into dialogues with varying mandates, with those who agree with the evangelical and representative principles, confess the Triune God, and share a commitment to "ecumenical conversion." This conversion or repentance includes openness to new possibilities under the guidance of God's Spirit.
3. preliminary recognition. Here the ELCA can be involved on a church-to-church basis in eucharistic sharing and cooperation, without exchangeability of ministers.
 - a. one stage requires 1 and 2 above, plus partial, mutual recognition of church and sacraments with partial agreement in doctrine; and
 - b. a second stage requires 1, 2, and 3a, partial and mutual recognition of ordained ministers and of churches, fuller agreement in doctrine, commitments to work for full communion, and preliminary agreement on lifting any mutual condemnations; and
4. full communion. At this stage the goal of the ELCA's involvement in the ecumenical movement has been fully attained. Here the question of the shape and form of full communion needs to be addressed and answered in terms of what will best further the mission of the Church in individual cases.

and Dr. Robert Helm replaced Dr. Wayne Burkette. Dr. Yeago offered a paper titled "The Holy Spirit, Grace, and Growth in Lutheran Theology," Dr. Freeman contributed "The Nature of the Spirit as the On-Going Grace of God" and Dr. Crews presented "Moravian Views of the Holy Spirit." Prof. Dreydoppel and Dr. Wagner put forward a preliminary outline for the Report [to the churches] and were instructed to prepare a more detailed draft for consideration.

The dialoguers were active between the fourth and fifth meetings. Dr. Yeago prepared a paper on the sacraments which he shared with Dr. Crews for response. The paper ("The Sacraments in Lutheran Doctrine: Theses, Documentation, and Notes") and Dr. Crews' response were then circulated to the other members for consideration.

The fifth meeting, which had originally been scheduled for June 1995, was moved to March 22-23, 1996. The Rev. Sarah Henrich from Luther Seminary [St. Paul, Minn.] joined the [Lutheran-Moravian] Dialogue at this meeting. The meeting began with a discussion of Yeago's paper and Crews' response. Most of the meeting time was then given to review of the Consensus statement that had been prepared by Walter Wagner, Arthur Freeman, and Otto Dreydoppel. Substantive and stylistic revisions were largely completed on March 23, 1996. The few items requiring clarification and editing, the dialoguers agreed, were to be handled through correspondence prior to the circulation of proposed final draft texts to the members. The vote to accept the revised Consensus was unanimous and without reservation. A further vote recommended to our respective bodies that Drs. Freeman and Wagner be considered for inclusion on any subsequent Coordinating Committee. The items designated for clarification, editorial and related matters, and some ancillary historical information were included in the draft texts circulated to the dialoguers during May-July 1996. The members concurred, explicitly and implicitly, with the final text. The recommendations and the report were then forwarded to our churches.

After the meeting the Consensus paper, as revised, was circulated to the members of the bilateral teams and others. The suggestions received were then included in the editing and it was returned to the members for their final approval. Final approval of the document was attained on August 8, 1996, the date designated to receive final changes.

Transmission by the Church Council

To encourage discussion throughout the two churches on both the dialogue report and the specific implementing resolution, the Church Council took action in November 1997. The council voted (CC97.11.84):

To receive the request made by the Lutheran-Moravian Coordinating Committee that the following resolution on full communion be considered in this form by the 1998 Synods of the Moravian Church and by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and

To transmit the following resolution to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly for action.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE CHURCH COUNCIL

The Northern and Southern Provinces of the Moravian Church in America, hereinafter termed the Moravian Church in America, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby agree that in their respective assemblies there shall be one vote to accept or reject,

without separate amendment, the resolutions which follow. If adopted by both churches, each church agrees to take these measures to establish full communion:

WHEREAS, Jesus our Shepherd calls us to unity so that the world may believe; and

WHEREAS, Moravians and Lutherans share common theological traditions and commitments to mission; and

WHEREAS, in North America Lutherans and Moravians have developed distinct church bodies while cooperating in serving our Lord; and

WHEREAS, "Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion," the report of the Lutheran-Moravian dialogue, affirmed that there are no "church-dividing differences" precluding full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America; therefore be it

RESOLVED that

1. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby recognize in one another the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic faith as it is expressed in the Scriptures, confessed in the Church's historic creeds, attested to in the *Unaltered Augsburg Confession* and *Small Catechism*, and the *Ground of the Unity* of the *Unitas Fratrum*;
2. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby
 - recognize the authenticity of each other's Baptisms and Eucharists, and
 - extend sacramental hospitality to one another's members;
3. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby
 - recognize each other's ordinations of persons to the Ministry of Word and Sacrament; and
 - recognize each other's polity and ministries of oversight (including the interpretation of church doctrines, discipline of members, authorization of persons for ordained and lay ministries, and provision for administrative functions);
4. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby recognize the full interchangeability and reciprocity of all ordained ministers of Word and Sacrament, subject to the constitutionally approved invitation for ministry in each other's churches;
5. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby authorize the establishment of a joint commission by June 2000
 - to coordinate the implementation of these resolutions,
 - to assist joint planning for mission,
 - to facilitate consultation and common decision-making through appropriate channels in fundamental matters that the churches may face together in the future, and
 - to report regularly and appropriately to each church;
6. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America through the aforementioned joint commission shall

- encourage the development of worship materials to celebrate the churches' full communion,
 - encourage on-going theological discussion,
 - encourage joint formulation of educational materials, and
 - encourage continuing education for church professionals regarding the churches' full communion;
7. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby affirm that neither will issue an official commentary on the text of these resolutions that has not been approved by the joint commission as a legitimate interpretation thereof;
 8. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby agree that each will continue to be in communion with all the churches with which each is in communion presently;
 9. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby
 - pledge to take each other and these agreements into account at every stage of their dialogues and agreements with other churches and faith traditions,
 - pledge to seek to engage in joint dialogue when appropriate, and pledge not to enter into formal agreements with other churches and faith traditions without prior consultation with the other.

Presentation of “Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”

Bishop Anderson welcomed to the platform the Rev. Robert E. Sawyer, president of the Southern Province of the Moravian Church; the Rev. R. Burke Johnson, president of the Northern Province of the Moravian Church; the Rev. Martha B. Sheaffer, ELCA pastor from Lititz, Pennsylvania; the Rev. Walter H. Wagner, ELCA pastor from Allentown, Pennsylvania; the Rev. Ronald A. Rinn, ELCA pastor from Winston-Salem, North Carolina; the Rev. Otto Dreydoppel Jr., Moravian ecumenical officer; the Rev. Daniel F. Martensen, director of the Department for Ecumenical Affairs; and the Rev. Darlis J. Swan, associate director of the ELCA Department for Ecumenical Affairs.

Bishop Anderson then invited Pastor Rinn, a member of the Lutheran-Moravian Coordinating Committee, to begin the discussion.

Address by the Rev. Ronald A. Rinn

Pastor Ronald A. Rinn said, “Bishop Anderson, Dr. Butler, members of the Church Council, voting members, representatives of churchwide divisions and units, distinguished visitors and friends. It is a joy and personal pleasure to join you this afternoon and introduce the proposal, ‘Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion.’ As Dr. Anderson has pointed out, the document and historical background is found in Section IV, beginning on page 11.

“These materials recount the dialogue process between Lutherans and Moravians, begun on the front doorsteps of my parish, Augsburg Lutheran in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. It was there that the Rev. D. Wayne Burkette, campus pastor for Salem Academy, said: ‘You know, we really ought to do something together.’ That brief remark was followed by a

conversation I had with Dan Martensen at the 1991 Churchwide Assembly, Orlando, Florida, where it was indicated that the ELCA indeed would like to do something together with the Moravians if we only had the financial resources to start the conversation. The Hine Fund of Augsburg Lutheran Church provided seed money to begin the process, and has continued to assist financially to move the dialogue forward. In 1997, the Church Council appointed a coordinating committee and mandated, among other things, ‘...to encourage and enable local dialogue and experimentation which would experientially prepare church representatives to vote on the proposal.’

“The coordinating committee identified and prepared 60 cooperative congregations and consulting congregations to conduct a six-week study of the agreement. This was accomplished in the fall of 1998. In these gatherings, we discovered much of mutual complement, particularly concerning our individual denominational history. Like Luther, Count Nicholas von Zinzendorf was a moving force in religious life in Germany and beyond. He befriended Brethren refugees from Bohemia and Moravia after many left their homelands due to religious persecution by the secular authorities and the Roman Catholic Church. Some of these refugees established a community on Zinzendorf’s estate, calling it Herrnhut. It was here that Zinzendorf began his association with the Brethren and although he had been ordained a Lutheran pastor in 1734, he was also consecrated a bishop for the Brethren in 1737.

“In this country, we can point to a meeting in Philadelphia in December 1742, which was a critical turning point in our life together. German-speaking congregations around Philadelphia were attracting Lutheran, Reformed, and Mennonite Christians, who sometimes cooperated with one another, and on other occasions, went their separate directions. For the Lutherans, there was a controversy in Germany which affected the immigrants. The strained relationship between the pietists centered in Halle and the Orthodox centered in Wittenberg, now spilled over into a suspiciousness toward the Moravian brethren in Herrnhut and Zinzendorf himself.

“When the Lutherans in Pennsylvania asked for a certified pastor, the authorities in Halle demurred until it was known that Zinzendorf was coming for a visit to Pennsylvania. It was then that Henry Melchior Muhlenberg was ordained and sent to Pennsylvania as the pastor for those congregations. There followed an unpleasant meeting in Philadelphia in 1742 between Muhlenberg and Zinzendorf, according to Muhlenberg’s written account.

“When one views the more recent history of the Lutherans and Moravians in this country and in Europe, as well as our working together in Africa and the Caribbean, it is like looking at a friend’s family photo album and seeing your second cousins in some of the pictures. We have much in common, as you have read in the materials. I quote from the report: ‘...but the journey with the Savior did not end in 1742. Chronologically long overdue, yet in a *kairotic* time, Lutherans and Moravians are able to see that we have come far together internationally. We are now ready to recognize that the Savior is calling his Moravian and Lutheran flocks to full communion and mission in the twenty-first century.’ To that end, I present for your consideration and vote the proposal: ‘Following our Shepherd to Full Communion,’ as printed in your agenda.

Bishop Anderson said, “We will now hear remarks from the Rev. Robert Sawyer, president of the Southern Province of the Moravian Church.”

Address by the Rev. Robert E. Sawyer

Pastor Robert E. Sawyer said, “Thank you, Ron. To my brothers and sisters of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, I extend greetings in the name of Jesus Christ, our

Lord. Both personally and on behalf of brother Burke Johnson, president of the Moravian Church-Northern Province, I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity of being with you, and especially to Bishop Anderson for the privilege that we have this week.

“I am sure that many of you know very little about the Moravians, so let me start on a pretty fundamental level. As Ron has told you, he and I both live in Winston-Salem. The Moravians founded our town, and we have a wonderful restoration of the eighteenth century Moravian village there. Tourists come from all over the world and as they follow costumed guides through museum buildings, they have been known to ask, ‘Are there any Moravians still living?’ I am here, among other things, to assure you that there are Moravians very much alive today—actually, nearly 800,000 of us, the large majority of those being in the Caribbean regions and in Africa.

“By most standards, we are and always have been a small church since our founding in 1457. Yes, that 1457, 60 years before the Lutheran Reformation began. Your church and ours were in touch with each other in those early years, and as our report points out, clearly the contacts between the Moravians and the Lutherans during Luther’s lifetime were mutually helpful. Between 1732 and 1742, a little village of 250 Moravians in Germany showed that their size in no way limited their vision. In that ten-year period, that village sent out missionaries to Greenland, to the Caribbean Islands, to Surinam, to South Africa, to East Africa, to Algeria, to Arctic Russia, and to what is now Sri Lanka. They came to this continent as well, and their missionary visionary explains why the Moravian Church in America today is so small. Their purpose here, as most places they went, was to witness among native or indigenous people, not to start churches among European settlers. In 1849, there were only 23 Moravian churches in the United States and Canada, but the Moravian Church was launching another new mission effort to Nicaragua. Today, there are about 180 Moravian churches in the United States and Canada.

“We have always believed in the importance of ties to other churches. The founders of our church were uncomfortable in simply announcing that ‘we are a church.’ And they turned to a Waldensian bishop to ordain our first ministers. Our ministers are still ordained by bishops. Administrative oversight, however, is by executive boards or conferences, to which Burke and I have been elected as presidents for four-year terms. The office of bishop in our church is a lifetime office, and bishops serve primarily as pastors to the pastors. The board that Burke and I chair commissioned bishops to do ordinations. We consult with them and we seek their advice in matters of doctrine and practice, and, of course, Moravian bishops have an important ministry of intercession for our church and for the whole church. We treasure a rich musical heritage, including publication of the first Protestant hymnal in 1501 in Bohemia. We have many much-loved traditions, including the Love Feast, a current-day practice of the New Testament agape meal. We sometimes struggle to make sure our many traditions are means and foundations for ministry, and not just inwardly focuses nostalgia moments; maybe one or two of your congregations share that struggle with us. Other elements of our heritage can equip us well to serve the Lord as the millennium turns.

“We are a relational church. The relationship with Christ Jesus as Lord and Savior is absolutely central, but our relationships with each other are very important as well. The eighteenth century Moravian communities in Europe and in America were highly organized for the common good and the mission of the Church. In this country, after a while, we found a real tension between that lifestyle and the American persona that emerged as highly individualistic. We are a relational church—Moravians can talk to each other, even in deep disagreement. We have a tradition that promotes communication and I believe that is an

important tradition to give to a world where genuine dialogue is all too rare. Our congregations are connected in a common statement of faith and life, and in many shared ministries, but we are not a church with a strong hierarchical structure. Our decision making is normally by consensus. I admit, however, that for our synods it is still Robert's Rules and majority vote. The motto that we have come to feature prominently during this century sums up much of our identity and our life together since our very earliest days in Bohemia: 'In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, and in all things, love.' Our challenge, your challenge, and our challenge together is to live up to the very best of heritages in a world permeated with uncertainties, but permeated also with the hope of a Shepherd who has led us this far and will not abandon us ever. We have a common Shepherd, and we look forward to serving him with you."

Discussion with the Drafting Team

Bishop Anderson said, "Thank you both. Now this is our opportunity to find out more about the Moravian Church, so please feel free to move to the microphones with any questions that you would have either about the church or about this proposal. I am sure that President Sawyer, and the other representatives of the Moravian Church would be happy to address them. Microphone 12."

The Rev. Ronald E. Brooker [Central/Southern Illinois Synod] asked, "Will the last speaker please identify the significance of the candle on the lectern?"

Pastor Sawyer responded, "I was hoping you would ask, and that you could see it was not a plant. The symbol is a much-loved and very common—if not universal—symbol in Moravian churches on Christmas Eve. It is a beeswax candle trimmed with a red trimming. It was originally an object lesson by one of our bishops to children in the 1740s. The lighted candle is to symbolize Jesus as the Light of the world, and the red trim around it is a reminder of the blood that Christ shed on the cross for the forgiveness of sins. We hold it up at the end of every Christmas Eve service to affirm that Jesus is the light of our world and of the [whole] world."

Mr. R. Guy Erwin [New England Synod] said, "I teach church history and Lutheran studies at the Yale Divinity School. I have just started writing a book on Count Zinzendorf, and I wonder if either Brother Sawyer or Brother Johnson would say something more to us about how they feel the retention of the historic episcopacy in the unity of brethren has served as a sign of the unity of the Church in Christ, and how we can learn, as Lutherans, from the Moravian example."

Pastor Dreydoppel responded, "I am neither Brother Sawyer nor Brother Johnson, but I am prepared to address the question.

"Let me say that Moravians regard the historic episcopate as a gift from the ancient church which we cherish, but for us, it is not the primary symbol of apostolicity and continuity in ministry. For us, as for you, the Gospel, Word and Sacrament, teaching, and the ministry of faithful pastors and laity, subject to the discipline of the whole Church, is our symbol of apostolicity and continuity. Within that understanding, we treasure the office of bishop as one who symbolizes the unity of Moravians and of Christians worldwide. Moravian bishops are elected by individual provinces, but in the episcopal office, they serve as bishops of the whole unity worldwide, not restricted to a particular geographic area. In our understanding, bishops are ordaining officers, are pastors to pastors and to the whole Church, are custodians of doctrine and wise persons to be consulted on significant matters

in the life of the Church, and are people with a special ministry for intercession for the whole church of Christ worldwide.”

Mr. Richard L Bauer [Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod] asked, “Would we, as the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, have to change anything, adopt anything, subtract anything, or do anything different than we are doing now to enter into common fellowship with you? Or is this truly the right time and the right place to do the right thing?”

Pastor Wagner responded, “I am not a Moravian. I am a Lutheran. Simple answer—two answers. To the first question: ‘No, there will not have to be any change in anything that Lutherans have that we already have, regardless of whatever, what other ecumenical agreements are made.’ Simple answer to first part: ‘No.’ The answer to the second part: ‘Yes, definitely. This is the right time and the right place.’”

The Rev. Steven C. Berntsen [Eastern North Dakota Synod] said, “I did my internship in Nazareth, Pennsylvania, one of the communities settled by the Moravians, and had the privilege of playing in a brass group on Easter morning, walking around town from three in the morning until six in the morning, when we met at the Moravian cemetery for their sunrise service. Just a neat tradition there. And I want to thank the committee who did the study and wrote the proposal for this agreement. I thought it was so encouraging and so uplifting to read that history, and I heartily endorse it, and..but my question. One thing that I wanted to learn more about—as I read that study, what is the—tell me a little bit more about what happened at the Moravian ‘Pentecost’ at Count Zinzendorf’s place.”

Pastor Dreydoppel responded, “I was introduced as the ecumenical officer of the Moravian Church. That is true, insofar as we are a small denomination with no formal ecumenical officer. My real job is to teach church history at Moravian Theological Seminary, and so I treasure the historical questions.

“The Moravian ‘Pentecost,’ August 13th, 1727, was a moment of renewal in our communal life. When word got out that Lutheran nobleman Count Zinzendorf was offering religious refuge on his estate in Berthelsdorf, Germany, the community accumulated a number from a wide variety of confessional traditions. As is not unusual in these circumstances, diversity tended toward disunity, and in 1727, after five years of communal life, the Moravians at Herrnhut were on the verge of breaking up their experiment in communal fellowship. However, they gathered for Eucharist in the Lutheran parish church at Berthelsdorf on a Wednesday morning, August 13th, 1727, and in that moment, felt a sense of re-unity in the Holy Spirit—the outpouring of the Holy Spirit to bring them together in Christian fellowship once again. This Pentecostal experience did not solve all of their problems, but it did give them grace and strength to continue in addressing them, and in addressing mission in the world. The immediate result of the Moravian ‘Pentecost’ experience of August 13 was the birth of a new worship tradition—the love feast—hearkening back to the agape meals of the early church in which the people gathered there at Berthelsdorf shared a meal in Christian fellowship in the context of their worship. The longer-term effect was the Moravian mission movement, which took them from Lutheran Saxony out into the Caribbean Islands and into the larger world to carry the word of Christ.”

Ms. Stephanie A. Olson [East-Central Synod of Wisconsin] said, “Just two questions I have. One, could you describe what the ‘Love Feast’ is? And secondly, could you define the term *Unitas Fratrum*? I do not know what that means, and I was curious.”

Pastor Dreydoppel responded, “To answer your second question first: *Unitas Fratrum*—Unity of the Brethren—which was the original name of the church in Germany prior

to the popular name when they settled in Moravia. ‘Of Moravians’—*Unitas Fratrum*: Unity of the Brethren.

“Now, going back to the first question: The ‘Love Feast’ consists of basically a bun that is served with—in most congregations within the United States—a sweetened coffee that is served in a mug by servers in a worship service, and all partake together. It has nothing to do with the Sacraments, but is a fellowship meal to share in a joyous occasion among the congregations. There are lots of variations of that, but I will not go into that.”

The Rev. James H. Hanson [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod] said, “I would like to ask someone to share with the assembly the importance of a personal, spiritual trip that is guided by their Daily Texts. I have been one who has used those [texts] for a number of years and found them to be very helpful. I am curious to know if they are practiced as often as some of the rest of us have been led to believe, and if indeed this has nourished their strong dependency on our Lord Jesus Christ and the written Word.”

Pastor Dreydoppel replied, “It has indeed strengthened our fellowship with each other and with our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Since 1728 Moravians have been guided in their daily devotional discipline by a series of texts that we share with each other worldwide in the Moravian Unity and with ecumenical friends worldwide.

“The first text, chosen by random, by lot, is from the Hebrew Scriptures, and is called the ‘watchword’ or the ‘password’ of the Moravian Church, and then, the church leaders in Herrnhut, after having drawn the text for each day, choose a text from the New Testament to expand the meaning, and this is called the ‘teaching text’ or the ‘doctrinal text.’ When read with the heart of faith, Moravians are often struck by the aptness for us as individuals or as a community of faith in using these texts. I had in my hand the Daily Texts book and neglected to bring it up to the podium. The text for today is one that points us toward glorifying God in all that we do or say.

“Let me be more specific with a personal example. The Moravian Daily Text for the day on which I received my Letter of Call and authorization for ordination was Isaiah 6:8: ‘Whom shall we send and who will go for us? And I said, ‘Here I am, Lord; send me!’ Moravians treasure these texts as a gift to the ecumenical church. Almost every evangelical church pastor in Europe uses the ‘Losungen’—the daily devotions of the Moravian Church. These were especially significant in the life of faith of Dietrich Bonhöffer, who, in his letters and papers, writes about how the guidance of the texts provoked him at particular points in the German church struggle.”

Bishop Guy S. Edmiston [Lower Susquehanna Synod] said, “I was deeply impressed, gentlemen, with your commitment to mission, in the earliest days of the Moravian Church, and I am assuming that commitment continues into the life of your church today. I am wondering how that commitment to mission is lived out in your present church body. How do you structure your mission opportunities? Do you have anything comparable to the ELCA’s Division for Outreach? I am just interested in how you do mission, and how that commitment is fulfilled today.”

Pastor Sawyer responded, “In terms of world mission, there is a Board of World Mission, which is a board representing both the Northern and Southern Provinces. There also is a separate province in Alaska that is part of that board, as well as a related, very small denomination, in Texas. The Board of World Mission functions on behalf of all of us in our worldwide outreach movement.

“One of the most difficult struggles we have is dealing with the issue of partnerships. There are 19 provinces of the Moravian Church worldwide. Three of those are affiliated

provinces, the other 16 are all on equal standing in the worldwide Unity, and so all have equal representation and equal voice in the Unity. However, the economic resources among the provinces vary dramatically, as you can well understand. And so we struggle. We struggle with how to develop—how to meaningfully call as partners with such a disparity of economic resources, even though spiritual vitality is probably greater in some of the more economically poor provinces.

“Another level is outreach into new mission fields in a more or less organized way. Most of that is taking place in Africa, including adventure into Malawi and the Republic of Congo, and some other areas. In my own feeling, one of the most exciting things that is happening in the Moravian Church right now is our Asian ministry, in which Moravians are spending time in Asia getting acquainted with the culture, meeting people. This has been going on for a number of years now, but at this point, we cannot report any converts. This is very much in the Moravian tradition—a ministry of presence in which we do not yet know where the Lord is taking us.”

Ms. Myrna Anderson [Northern Illinois Synod] asked, “I wonder if you could tell a little about the role of women in ministry in your church.”

Pastor Burke Johnson responded, “The role of women in ministry has taken place since the first ordination—I am going from memory—I believe in 1976 in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. About 60 percent of the students in our seminary today are female. We elected the first female bishop of the Unity last August in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, in the Northern Province. So, women have a major role in our polity, and the chair of our single seminary Board of Trustees, at this time, is a female.”

Bishop George P. Mocko [Delaware-Maryland Synod] said, “When I traveled in Estonia, I attended a Bible study and hymn sing dinner, led by laity, in a rural area where the pastor had been removed by the Russians and the church had been persecuted. On one wall there was a picture of Zinzendorf, and in the corner one of those 12-pointed stars. Clearly, the [Moravian] influence was there. Are there any formal congregations throughout this area or Germany still remaining?”

Pastor Dreydoppel explained, “The existence of the Moravian Church in Estonia is a witness to the power of the Gospel and the endurance of the Gospel in the face of persecution. The Moravian presence in Estonia goes back to one of Count Zinzendorf’s unique ideas in the eighteenth century—that of the diaspora movement. Zinzendorf was not seeking to erect an ecclesiastical body, but rather to find people who would be revivers of spiritual life and the religion of the heart in a variety of places in the state churches of Europe. And this took particular root in Estonia. For 150 years, the Moravian diaspora societies supported mission and were Bible study and prayer groups in Estonia, closely related to the Lutheran church bodies. During the Nazi period and under the time of communist domination, the Moravians in Estonia were totally cut off from any contact with Herrnhut, with the mother church. When the Wall fell in 1989, a number of Estonian Moravians who had kept the faith during this time were able to re-establish communications with Herrnhut and with other Moravians worldwide, and to begin to reestablish their communities of faith in coordination with the Lutheran church in Estonia. This is perhaps a foretaste of the feast to come, should full communion be realized, and that is that in Estonia, Moravians and Lutherans are cooperating in common mission in difficult circumstances. So could it be here also!”

The Rev. Leonard R. Klein [Lower Susquehanna Synod] asked, “Could we have a description of Moravian Communion practices?”

Pastor Johnson responded, “Practices vary somewhat from one congregation to another. The most typical Moravian practice is in conjunction with a service of liturgy and Word, and, of course, the elements are consecrated by an ordained pastor. Most typically, the elements are distributed—first the bread and then later the cup—to the members in the congregation. They stand to receive the elements from the pastor. When all have been served—the members of the congregation partake of the bread first, and then later the cup. During most of the Communion service, including the serving of the elements, hymns are being sung. If you want to know Moravian theology, become familiar with Moravian hymnody, and that is very evident in our Communion service. The right hand of fellowship, or passing of the peace, is done twice during that service, again to indicate our common need of the Savior and our unity in Christ. There are congregations where Moravians come forward to receive Communion. Sometimes Communion is done by intinction, but the most typical practice is as I have described it.”

The Rev. Robert V. Moberg [South-Central Synod of Wisconsin] said, “You mentioned some cooperative work with Estonia Lutherans. Can you tell us about other formal ecumenical relationships between Moravians and other Christian groups?”

Pastor Dreydoppel replied, “First of all, the Moravian cooperation worldwide. In the continental province—the European continental province of the Moravian Church—the Moravian Church works closely in theological education and in mission outreach with the Evangelical Church in Germany. And so, Moravians and Lutherans on the continent are part of the same larger church fellowship. The Moravian province in Southern Africa is a member of the Lutheran World Federation. Moravians and Lutherans cooperate in Tanzania in operating several seminaries, Moravian students attend the Lutheran Seminary at Makumira, Lutherans will have an opportunity to attend the Moravian seminary at Kibara.

“In terms of larger ecumenical engagements, since the 1740s, Moravians have been interested in Christian cooperation. One of the things that separated Zinzendorf and Muhlenberg in their vision of the church was Muhlenberg’s commitment that the Church should be planted here—that is to say, a church on the model of the European state church—where Count Zinzendorf had a vision of the congregation of God in the spirit, as he called it, which would unite German-speaking Protestants from a variety of confessional traditions. Moravians, perhaps because we are so small, have always reached out in Christian cooperation with other groups. We were among the founding members of the Federal Council of Churches, the World Council of Churches, and the National Council of Churches, and although those ecumenical commitments are not at the center of our ecumenical activity at this point, we still are strongly involved in conciliar ecumenism; likewise, in more decentralized efforts in state councils and conferences of churches and ecumenical activities.”

The Rev. Muriel N. Heichler [Delaware-Maryland Synod] asked, “I am interested to know the importance of the Eucharist in your worship life, and I think the frequency of celebration might be an indication of that.”

Pastor Dreydoppel said, “The Book of Order of the Moravian Church specifies seven occasions when all Moravian congregations are expected to celebrate the Eucharist over the course of the Church year—the high holy days. In addition to this, there are a number of other specific Moravian festivals—the August 13th festival being one in particular, which we find a congenial moment to celebrate the Eucharist. Some Moravian congregations, recognizing the centrality of Word and Sacrament in the Christian tradition, have moved toward a more frequent celebration of the Eucharist. There are a significant number of Moravian congregations which celebrate Eucharist at least monthly, and there is a movement toward

weekly Communion in some congregations, although this is a development to which we look to the future.

“Let me expand on the question and say something about Moravian understandings of the nature of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist. Moravians have chosen not to engage themselves in specific definition of the nature of Christ’s presence. We take seriously the words, ‘This is my body; this is my blood.’ Moravian theology indicates a strong commitment to the Real Presence, that Christ is truly present in the Eucharist, but in our theological definitions we have not found it possible to explain exactly how that presence happens.”

Bishop Mark B. Herbener [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod] said, “In Texas there are a number of congregations that are known as the Unity of the Brethren. I understand that they are not connected to the Moravian Church. Is that right, or what is the difference between *Unitas Fratrum* and the Unity of the Brethren?”

Pastor Johnson explained, “The Unity of the Brethren in Texas is a small denomination coming from Czechoslovakia, the followers of John Hus also. The best way to describe our relationship with the Unity of the Brethren in Texas is to say that we are partners, we work with them. Both Bob and I attended their legislative body just last month, and we continue to work with them. They do all of their world outreach mission work in and through our inter-provincial Board of World Mission. So, we are first cousins.”

Ms. April Coyne [South Dakota Synod] said, “I would like to know how the adoption of full communion would affect the youth of the twenty-first century.”

Pastor Wagner responded, “Not having a crystal ball in front of me at this point, let me say this. I think there are some things that Lutherans of all ages, and particularly for our young people, to come to grips with. And that is as I have observed Moravian ways and traditions, and also Otto Dreydoppel, when I teach at Moravian Seminary as my department chair, so I get to see some of the young persons who are there.

“First, it seems to me that there is something about the spirituality, the sense of commitment, of devotion, of the walk with the Savior, as Moravians would say, of the personal relationship with Jesus Christ. That will be especially important in the twenty-first century, in a time of secularization, and in the western world, of the marginalization of religion, in a time when religion will become much more important in other areas of the world. We may see that within the next century. Here for young people, that will be critically important since a lot of the non-U.S. and Northern European world is young—over 50 percent in Iran, for example, born after 1979. It will be important to develop a strong spiritual base. I think Moravians can contribute to that for the Lutherans.

“Secondly, what the Lutherans might contribute—and that would be, as Brother Otto has put it, the Moravians will need the Lutheran head if we need the Moravian heart. And that is, it may very well be that where we cannot have a lot of heart feeling, we need to be able to express that responsibly, biblically, in terms of what we really stand for that to happen clearly and for that to be communicated. This will be a critical area for us: to be able to communicate with clarity and integrity, and that, I think, can come from this full communion. We will work together especially, not only on congregational levels, especially in the areas of education and of mission.”

Ms. Katherine Kempe [Southwest Washington Synod] said, “I am interested to know if the Moravian Church has any other ecumenical connections similar to the one we are considering now, ecumenical connections within the United States.” Pastor Dreydoppel

responded, “This may be a question about your question. Are you asking whether the Moravians, like the ELCA, are involved in other full communion discussions?” Ms. Kempe replied, “Yes.”

Pastor Dreydoppel answered, “The short answer is ‘not yet.’ The Moravian Church is in the preliminary stages of discussion with the Episcopal diocese of North Carolina. This is a regional discussion which may be expanded to nationwide discussion. Moravians traditionally have not placed a lot of emphasis on church body to church body ecumenical dialogue and construction. This is something that we are from brethren and sisters. So, the ELCA-Moravian dialogue is the first formal full communion agreement that we are entering into. There is another one possible with The Episcopal Church. I should say also that Moravians in England and Anglicans in England are at a somewhat further stage in their full-communion discussions.”

Mr. Patrick Mansfield [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] said, “What I wanted to find is: on page 11, it was stated that ‘the dialogue papers were not published and distributed to clergy and others prior to...with the exception of a number of Moravian and ELCA congregations...’ due to funds. I wanted to find out how the financial status of the Moravians are at this point.” Pastor Johnson asked, “Am I correct that the question moves to a broader context from the specific issue of distributing the copies?” Mr. Mansfield answered, “Yes. What I was trying to find out is you had mentioned that certain ones are in more financial problems than others, and I just wanted to find out as a whole how the Moravians are doing at this point.”

Pastor Johnson responded, “The two provinces of the Moravian Church in America are in very solid shape financially. There are no financial problems within either of the provinces. Some of our congregations struggle financially, but I am sure that is probably true for most denominations.” Pastor Wagner continued, “Part of the question had to deal with the distribution of the papers that were part of the ‘Following our Shepherd.’ That had to do with the constraints largely through the ELCA. As Pastor Rinn had indicated, the seed money in most of the dialogue funding came through one congregation—an ELCA congregation. We probably will—we have some of the papers available. They were not distributed because of the financial constraints between the two church bodies, let us say, that were publishable, and there may be something, a booklet maybe [prepared] of some of the key papers.”

The Rev. Michael R. Stadie [Western Iowa Synod] asked, “It is obvious that this agreement passed in the Moravian churches. Could we have a report of the votes and a characterization of the debate and discussion?”

Pastor Johnson responded, “Both the Southern Province and the Northern Province, by voice vote, approved overwhelmingly full communion with the ELCA. This took place in the spring of last year with the Southern Province, and in August for the Northern Province. Again [it was] almost unanimous. There was not even a desire by the chair of either of those synods to detail the vote.”

Ms. Valerie Sites [Nebraska Synod] asked, “What I was wondering is if one of your representatives could tell us about baptism in the Moravian Church.”

Pastor Dreydoppel replied, “The normal practice in the Moravian Church is to baptize infants, symbolic of the primacy of grace in our understanding of the Sacrament. There are Moravians who feel it appropriate to defer the baptism of their children until the children themselves can make a decision on their own to present themselves for baptism. Moravian

polity does not require or force to have their children baptized, but the expectation and the clear force of tradition is that we do baptize infants.”

Mr. Christopher J. Billig [Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod] said, “Just a question as to what the Moravian Church’s position is to ministry to and with gay and lesbian persons.”

Pastor Johnson responded, “We struggle with that question as do most Protestant denominations. Our synods of both provinces—well, actually, at our Southern Province’s previous synod last year, that was not a significant issue at the synod at all. At the Northern Province’s synod last year, an evening was devoted to discussion in a non-legislative session in the hopes that individuals could sit down around the table and talk to one another, develop some understanding, and, particularly, talk about their experiences with individuals who are gay and lesbian, in the hopes that it would increase understanding and communication without the pressure of a legislative vote.

“The Southern Province’s previous synod in 1995 did deal extensively with the issue of gay and lesbian Christians, and we, as I am sure other denominations have done, listed in our Resolution a number of things on which we could agree. We also recognized that we were significantly divided on other things, and we did not feel the need to make a statement which addressed every detailed part of the issue.

“The policy of the Moravian Church, with respect to ordination, is that ordained ministers are to be either married or celibate.”

Hearing no other questions, Bishop Anderson thanked and dismissed the panel.

2000-2001 Budget Proposal: First Presentation

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 65-105 (Section I, pages 16-17); continued on *Minutes*, page 546.

BACKGROUND

One of the responsibilities of the Churchwide Assembly is to “adopt a budget for the churchwide organization” (ELCA Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions, 12.21.e.). The following material contains background information that was designed to assist voting members in fulfilling this responsibility. Included are the recommendations from the Church Council to the Churchwide Assembly about the budget proposal for the years 2000 and 2001. This material also provides commentary on process and strategy; findings of a budget conference; and exhibits on income and expense trends and churchwide unit budgets.

Budget Development: Process and Strategy

1. Who, What, Why, and When

Budget development in and by the churchwide organization is an interactive process, the purpose of which is to allocate financial resources that strengthen this church’s participation in God’s mission (4.02.) in ways appropriate to the role of the churchwide organization (11.11. and 11.12.). Budget development is an exercise of stewardship: “As a steward of the resources that God has provided, this church should organize itself to make the most effective use of its resources to accomplish its mission” (5.01.i.).

The appropriate roles of the “players” in budget development are described in the Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions. They are:

- ! Presiding Bishop provides for preparation of the budget (13.21.f.)
 - Executive for Administration, under the direction of the presiding bishop, develops the budget, reports to the Church Council and Churchwide Assembly through the Budget and Finance Committee (15.11.B91.d.)
- ! Church Council, upon recommendation of the presiding bishop, submits budget proposals to Churchwide Assembly and approves expenditure authorization (14.21.04.)
 - Budget and Finance Committee presents budget to Church Council for consideration by Churchwide Assembly (14.41.A91.)
- ! Churchwide Assembly adopts a budget for the churchwide organization (12.21.e.)
- ! Unit Boards request budget support for programs and ensure operation within expenditure authorization (16.11.31.)
- ! Cabinet of Executives and Planning Team provide common counsel and coordination (13.21.h.)
- ! Office of the Treasurer estimates income and provides advice (11.41.03.)

2. Three Challenges

The major factor during the last four years is the substantial increase of income. Some of those now engaged in budget development remember the not-so-long-ago time when the opposite was true; similar processes were used to determine ways to reduce programs, grants, and staff.

But we have a new “happy problem,” namely, how to distribute increases for expanded mission and ministry. Three challenges have emerged:

- (a) to allocate increased income in ways that do not create large permanent expense for which we might be sorry if increases do not continue at the same rate;
- (b) to fund new opportunities for mission and ministry or those important functions that had been curtailed due to insufficient income;
- (c) to redress weaknesses in infrastructure (support) areas created by past reductions or the absence of increases over the years.

3. Strategies.

Five major strategies have been employed to meet the three challenges described above.

- a. Expanded Ministry Fund. This fund is a line item in the budget that is only activated after some reasonable expectation that income estimates will be achieved. This decision is usually made by mid- or late summer. Units identify those projects which meet certain criteria. Criteria include:
 - 1) Must be “doable.”
 - 2) Will not require an ongoing budgetary commitment of the churchwide organization beyond a two-year period.
 - 3) Contract staff is a possibility.
 - 4) Ways of publicizing the Expanded Ministry Fund as a source of funding for this ministry should be included.

- 5) Responsive to expressed needs of synods and congregations.
- 6) Inter-unit and multi-institutional cooperation is encouraged.
- b. Church Council Designated Funds. These are “set aside” funds not in the budget of units (though related to unit responsibilities and activities) that tend to cut across unit lines and/or represent new and emerging needs requiring substantial churchwide response.

In the past this strategy has been used to earmark funds for implementing the Initiatives for a New Century, a capital budget, and “special” projects, such as public media evangelism, new urban ministries, Fund for Leaders in Mission, and anti-racism training. Most recently a “Second Mile Ministry Fund” was approved by the Church Council for working with the poor, the Special Needs Retirement Fund, “In the City for Good,” ethnic leader development, and reduction of the Lutheran Center mortgage.

- c. Increase expenditure authorizations of unit budgets. The first two strategies provide flexible ways to allocate new funding without increasing permanent costs, especially staffing. If, however, increased income is persistent, then it becomes possible and desirable to increase the amount of authorized spending for the churchwide units. This step leads to more stability in planning and the possibility of increasing staff. Using the information presented by the next strategy, these increases in spending can be undertaken with sound rationale. Past budget priorities—global mission, theological education, and support for new and existing congregations—continue within the context of emerging needs.
- d. Shared Information and Analysis. The Planning Team has been conducting a process of review. First, those factors that would effect budgeting assumptions and changes were identified by each unit and shared in a Planning Team meeting. Second, each unit analyzed its budget, describing potential increases and decreases including rationale for program changes. Third, a worksheet was developed for all major program areas in the churchwide organization. Each member of the Planning Team rated the major program areas according to desired increases, decreases, or remaining the same. These results were discussed and used in the allocation decisions by the Office of the Presiding Bishop.
- e. Program Evaluation. One learning from the development of budgets is the need for more effective program evaluation. A small staff group has developed ways to conduct program evaluation appropriate to the work of the churchwide organization that will strengthen the capacity to examine existing programs and think new thoughts. The Department for Research and Evaluation is providing the leadership and coordination of this effort. Three major programs are currently being evaluated: World Hunger appeal, providing demographic information, and the performance management system.

Report on the Budget Conference

A conference on the churchwide organization budget was held at the Lutheran Center on February 12-14, 1999. The conference was intended to expand and deepen the participants’ understanding of the budget. It was also designed to provide recommendations to the Office of the Presiding Bishop related to the budget. The participants were the Budget and Finance Committee of the Church Council, the advisory bishops to the Church Council,

and the Planning Team (executive directors, officers, and assistants to the bishop). In addition to their role in formulating recommendations, the participants were asked to make presentations designed to set out issues and concerns related to the budget. The presenters were asked to speak from their point of view in this church. The presentations included a wide variety of topics such as issues in Church and society, ELCA membership trends, emerging needs of congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization, the budget process, income trends, institutional and individual donor gifts, grants, Vision for Mission, deferred giving, gifts from the Women of the ELCA, World Hunger Appeal, expense trends, fixed expenses, human resource costs, ecumenical developments, and global mission.

The conference participants expressed considerable confidence in the viability of Mission Support (undesignated giving) and in the current process used to determine the budget of the churchwide organization. There were some who suggested that designated giving will be an issue in the future, but there remained a widespread support for a unified approach to the budget. As a result, the recommendations to the Office of the Presiding Bishop focused on outcomes in this church that should be pursued to ensure that the current practices will continue to work. To a significant extent, the participants in the budget conference laid out an agenda for the future that, if achieved, would go a long way toward assuring a uniquely Lutheran approach to mission and ministry well into the next century. This agenda for the future can be summarized with six key words. The ELCA churchwide organization must continue to improve its ability to help the church in leadership development, in congregational renewal, in communication and in the use of technology, in connecting with youth and young adults, in multicultural ministry and in addressing the needs of the poor.

After listening to two days of presentation and discussion, Presiding Bishop Anderson noted the close fit between these areas and the *Initiatives for a New Century*. He suggested the following “lenses” for consideration in making budget decisions at the churchwide level in the context of achieving the outcomes noted above. To what extent does the activity:

- Address the key issues identified?
- Help members see the connection between the past, the present, and where we are going as a church?
- Affirm the gifts we have while also addressing new areas of ministry?
- Increase the connection between congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization?
- Involve people—laity and especially youth—in a connection with the whole Church?
- Employ the attributes of youth?
- Address public issues?
- Stimulate increased mission support?

Bishop Anderson called upon Mr. George E. Friedline, a member of the Church Council’s Budget and Finance Committee, and the Rev. Robert N. Bacher, executive for administration in the Office of the Presiding Bishop, to come forward for the first presentation of the 2000-2001 budget proposal.

Mr. Friedline explained that the proposed budget would come before the assembly three times: at the present plenary session, at a budget hearing held later Tuesday in Convention Center A-101, and during Plenary Session Ten, when the proposal would be brought for a vote. He noted that proposed amendments to the budget must be submitted to Secretary Almen by 2:00 P.M. on Friday. He explained that the process of developing the budget is

guided by Pastor Bacher under the direction of the presiding bishop. He then introduced Pastor Bacher.

Referring to the question that members of his home congregation have for him about “where their offering money goes,” Pastor Bacher said that he would spend his presentation time answering that question.

The proposed budget for 2000 is \$96.2 million and for 2001 is \$97.6 million. Of this church’s income, 72 percent derives from mission support money from congregations, while 13 percent comes from the World Hunger Appeal, and another 15 percent is received from such sources as missionary sponsorships, endowment income, and Women of the ELCA. If World Hunger funds are not considered, 83 percent of this church’s income derives from congregational mission support and 17 percent from other sources.

Pastor Bacher said that mission in this church is understood as God’s mission. This church commits itself to participate in God’s mission in six ways: proclamation, reaching out, service, worship, nurture, and unity. A video was shown to illustrate examples of the mission that is supported by the budget.

Pastor Bacher said that the answer to the question about “where offering money goes” is that it goes to mission. He presented the following summary of budget allocations:

- \$65.5 million to support the work of ELCA divisions;
- \$1.8 million for multicultural ministries and ministries with women;
- \$7.5 million for this church’s departments;
- \$6.2 million for the offices of the treasurer, secretary, and presiding bishop;
- \$5.9 million to subsidize the health care premiums of retired church workers;
- \$4.0 million for other expenses, including the churchwide assembly;
- \$3.1 million for buildings and rent;
- \$2.3 million for *The Lutheran* and the ELCA Foundation.

Pastor Bacher said that another way to see the budget proposal is “as an offering to a loving and purposeful God.” Referring to both Jeremiah 29:11-12 and Mark 16:6-7, he said that this budget proposal is an offering with a plan for us, and that approval of it supports God’s mission to bring hope to a new century.

Bishop Anderson reminded voting members that the budget hearing would be at 3:30 P.M. Tuesday in Convention Center room A-101 and that discussion of the budget would take place on Saturday afternoon, August 21, 1999.

Hearings

Bishop Anderson told the assembly that the plenary session would recess soon so that voting members could attend two sets of hearings on agenda items. He said that these hearings serve two purposes. The first is to orient voting members to proposals for legislative action. The second purpose is to provide a less-formal setting to test responses to these proposals.

He called upon Secretary Almen to make further comments about the hearings. Secretary Almen announced the locations of the hearings and explained that hearings are intended to be forums primarily for voting and advisory members and that these members would have priority for admission should rooms become filled to capacity.

Recess

Secretary Almen announced that the deadline for proposed amendments to the social statement on economic life, "Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All," would be 8:30 A.M. on Wednesday, August 18, 1999, and that any proposed amendments should be filed in writing with the secretary's deputy.

The deadline for notifying the secretary of any removals from the *en bloc* motion concerning the constitution or bylaws was 8:30 A.M., also on Wednesday. Such notice is likewise to be filed with the secretary's deputy.

Health kit preparation for Lutheran World Relief concludes Wednesday afternoon. Contributions of money or items should be made in Hall B Tuesday or Wednesday morning.

Secretary Almen also announced that Evening Prayer would be held at 8:30 P.M. in the Convention Center Ballroom and would be followed by various receptions at the Adam's Mark Hotel.

He added that on Wednesday morning assembly members and visitors would have another opportunity to participate in the Board of Pensions "Run, Walk, 'n' Roll" event on the Cherry Creek path.

He concluded his announcements by saying that youth voting members were asked to attend a brief meeting by the public telephones at the back of the plenary hall at the conclusion of the plenary session.

Bishop Anderson called upon the Rev. David K. Johnson, a member of the Church Council, to lead a closing hymn and prayer. Following Pastor Johnson's prayer, Bishop Anderson announced at 2:55 P.M. that the assembly was in recess until 8:30 A.M. Wednesday, August 18, 1999.

Plenary Session Four

Wednesday, August 18, 1999

8:30 A.M.–12:00 NOON

The Rev. H. George Anderson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, called Plenary Session Four to order at 8:32 A.M. Mountain Daylight Time. Bishop Anderson asked the assembly to express gratitude to the Korean Glory Choir for singing before the plenary session began. Bishop Anderson then called upon Ms. W. Jeanne Rapp, a member of the Church Council, to lead the assembly in morning prayer and the hymn “Lord, Your Hands Have Formed the World.”

Bishop Anderson thanked the assembly for an excellent day on Tuesday. He reported that many of the hearings were filled to overflowing.

Bishop Anderson announced a change in the day’s agenda to accommodate the children who would participate in the Safe Haven report. The presentations of the Safe Haven report and the report of Lutheran Services in America would be exchanged on the agenda.

Bible Study I

Bishop Anderson informed the assembly that, using the theme of “Making Christ Known: Hope for a New Century,” the Bible study would focus on the book of Acts. Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Wayne E. Weissenbuehler, pastor of Bethany Lutheran Church, Englewood, Colorado, for the Bible study. Pastor Weissenbuehler’s Bible study was titled “Where is the Spirit Taking Us? Promises and Challenges from Acts.”

Pastor Weissenbuehler began his study by saying, “Wherever the Spirit takes us, it is going to be surprising—and life-giving.” Asking “Why Acts?” he suggested that the book of Acts is the second volume of a projected three-volume series. The first, he said, was the Gospel of Luke; the second the book of Acts; and “the third volume, now in process, is being written and lived out by folks like us.” He pointed to a pattern in the book of “promise and fulfillment” with “repentance and forgiveness as basic themes.” He urged listeners to think of Acts as “promise and challenge, possibility and direction.”

The text for the Bible study is Acts 1:6-11, and the theme is God’s making Christ known and giving hope through witness. “In Acts,” Pastor Weissenbuehler said, “at each critical juncture the Lord through the Holy Spirit employs extraordinary means to instruct the Church in the universality and the unconditionality of the Gospel.” After reading the story from Luke’s Gospel about Jesus’ ascension, Pastor Weissenbuehler said that the ascension is the preface to the Spirit’s coming. “Jesus is going to work differently now—through witnesses.” He asked, “Guess who that is?”

Pastor Weissenbuehler gave the assembly the assignment of memorizing Acts 1:8 with its emphasis on “you will be my witnesses.” He said, “If we know it and live it, we are going to be well prepared for today and for the days that follow.” He noted that Jesus’ disciples had asked “the millennial question” about the coming of God’s kingdom and that Jesus had responded by saying, in effect, “that is not your issue.” Rather, what matters is that “you get to be part of the kingdom’s coming. That is why we are here.” Noting that the verb “will” is a simple future indicative, he said that “it does not sound like a choice.” The Church will receive power; the Church will be witnesses. He asked the assembly to affirm that “the Spirit

has come; we have received power.” The declaration that “you will be witnesses” is not so much a description of what we do but of who we are.

He turned attention to his favorite word in the verse: “my.” This can be a little possessive pronoun, he said, reminding us that we belong to Jesus, but it can also be a genitive object, meaning that we are “witnesses to me.”

The key to every decision the assembly makes, he said, is “will this action witness to this Jesus whom we have come to know through the Holy Scriptures? Does this witness to the future of Jesus? How will it extend the grace and mercy of Jesus? Will the witness lead to repentance?” He asked one final question of the assembly, whether “Acts 4:20 is true for us.” Is it true, he asked, “that we cannot keep from speaking about what we have seen and heard?”

Greetings: Lutheran Services in America

Bishop Anderson stated that just two years ago the Churchwide Assembly had celebrated the birth of Lutheran Services in America (LSA), an umbrella organization that brings together the social ministry organizations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America with those of The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod. He said, “Our Lutheran social ministry system is one of the best-kept secrets in our society,” adding that LSA has done much in the past three years “to get the word out.” He introduced Ms. Joanne Negstad, president of Lutheran Services in America. She pointed out that Lutheran social ministry organizations go by a variety of names throughout the country and that LSA links them all together. She asked the voting members to use their keypads as part of an exercise to inform them about the scope of LSA ministries. Through this exercise they learned that LSA operates in 50 states and the Virgin Islands, is active in over 3,000 communities, employs more than 97,000 persons (37 percent of whom are persons of color or whose primary language is other than English), and receives nearly five million hours of volunteer service annually. Using the keypads, voting members indicated that nearly 75 percent of them volunteer for an LSA agency. Ms. Negstad reported that agencies provided 7.7 million meals in 1998 and that a total of \$3.2 billion was spent on human services, including nursing homes, through LSA agencies. She used a bouquet of flowers to tell the stories of persons who have been helped through adoption services, senior housing, shelters, children’s residential centers, and other agencies. She thanked Bishop Anderson and the assembly for their strong support of the work of Lutheran Services in America.

Quasi-Committee of the Whole for General Discussion: Full Communion with The Episcopal Church

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Reports*, Section IV, pages 1-10.2; Section V, pages 1-6 (Section I, pages 14-15); continued on *Minutes*, pages 42, 349.

Bishop Anderson explained, “Under the agenda that was adopted by the assembly, we now move to a time of general discussion of ‘Called to Common Mission,’ the proposal for full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church. Yesterday you had the opportunity to hear the perspectives of two parish pastors and to hear each other in the hearings in the afternoon.

“Now we are going into a form of committee of the whole discussion. Under *Robert’s Rules of Order*, the assembly can go into a committee of the whole if it wishes to discuss

something informally. However, we will still follow the rules of the assembly in terms of the length of speeches—three minutes—alternating speakers pro and con, and no applause, so that we can approach the discussion more informally, getting out what is on our hearts and minds without being bound—bound to have to speak to specific amendments. Now I mention amendments—if you have an amendment, I would just suggest that you use your three minutes to describe it and argue for it rather than to read it, because you will need to submit it anyway by 2:25 this afternoon. It will then be printed up and will be distributed so that everyone can have the exact text. We used this procedure at the last assembly. It seemed to work pretty well, so we are going to give you the opportunity to listen to each other again respectfully, seeking to understand what other people are saying, where they're coming from, what their concerns are, and also, we hope to discern what God would have us do as a church.

“Now, the text that you will need is in Section IV. It is the same section I referred to yesterday, where you will find the proposed text of ‘Called to Common Mission,’ pages 1 and following. There are also relevant materials back in Section VI on pages 9 and following. I am now going to recognize the secretary of the church to move that we go into session. Secretary Almen.”

Secretary Almen said, “Reverend Chair, as printed on page 6 of the Order of Business, I move:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To proceed as a quasi-committee of the whole for 60 minutes for the purpose of general discussion only of “Called to Common Mission,” the proposal for establishment of a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church.

The Rev. Leah K. Schafer [Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod] asked for a point of personal privilege before the assembly began as a committee of the whole, reporting, “Yesterday when we awoke, we heard news of a disastrous earthquake in Turkey. This morning the *Denver Post* is reporting that 2,000 are dead and 10,000 missing. A request and a question. Before we move into the discussion, Bishop, could you offer a prayer on behalf of this body for the victims, the relatives, and the international relief workers already on the scene? And a request: is it possible for this assembly to make a financial offering toward the ELCA international disaster relief fund?”

Bishop Anderson replied, “The answer is that we are intending to find a way, I believe, to have an offering, a special offering. Thank you for bringing that up. And, I think the assembly would certainly join with us in a moment of prayer.

“The Lord be with you. (Response: And also with you.) Let us pray. Oh, God, we who sit here in comfort and safety, remember especially now those families, those people whose lives have been forever changed by the natural disaster in Turkey. Bless those who rush to their aid, who seek survivors and who deal with grief in the enormous loss that so many are experiencing. Help us in any way to understand how you would have us be a part of the healing and the help. In Christ’s name we pray. Amen.

“Are there others—are there people wishing to speak on the motion to go into quasi-committee of the whole? I see no one doing that. Okay. You are ready to vote, then, on quasi-committee of the whole. All favoring the motion now to consider the proposal for full

communion with The Episcopal Church as a quasi-committee of the whole for purpose of general discussion only for 60 minutes, please vote now. 'Yes' press 1; 'no' press 2."

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes-895; No-37

CARRIED: **To proceed as a quasi-committee of the whole for 60 minutes for the purpose of general discussion only of "Called to Common Mission," the proposal for establishment of a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church.**

Bishop Anderson continued, "All right. We are constituted as a quasi-committee of the whole. Now I will take persons in alternating order. Microphone 12."

The Rev. John H. P. Reumann [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod] said, "I did not fare very well yesterday in getting an answer to what I hoped was a helpful question on the heart of the issue. Let me try with paragraph 12, about the middle of the document: '...Both churches value and maintain a ministry of *episkopé* as one of the ways in which the apostolic succession of the church is visibly expressed and personally symbolized in fidelity to the Gospel through the ages....' My question is, 'What are some of the other ways?' and depending on the answer, I would like to make a comment."

Bishop Anderson asked, "Do we have someone who can respond to that question?" An unidentified speaker responded, "Bishop Anderson, as yesterday, we hope that the assembly would be willing to hear voices of our resource people on these issues who may not be here on the stage, and we ask for permission for Michael Root to comment on this question by John Reumann. Bishop Anderson said, "If there is no objection, we will have Michael Root comment on that."

Mr. Michael Root, a Lutheran member of the drafting team, said, "A clearer statement, Professor Reumann, would be in paragraph eight, toward the end. I read, '...This succession also is manifest in the churches' use of the apostolic scriptures, the confession of the ancient creeds, and the celebration of the sacraments instituted by our Lord.' That would certainly be the clearer statement.

Pastor Reumann responded, "The statement I quoted uses the phrase, 'personally symbolized.' I would hope that consideration might be given in accord with the Lutheran heritage of the Confessions to speak of pastors and priests as doing this as a sign, though not a guarantee, of the things that are mentioned. And I so submit an intervention that I hope the committee will entertain."

Mr. Richard Peterson [Minneapolis Area Synod] said, "I strongly affirm CCM. At the worship service the other night when you spoke to fear, it resonated back to me 40 years ago when I wrote a paper for a religion course, which I gave the somewhat contradictory title, 'Professional Laymen'—or lay persons. The theme was simple. Lay persons in the Church should take their responsibilities as seriously as the professionals. The text I used for that was from Timothy: 'Do your best to present yourselves unto God, a workman that needs not be ashamed, for God has not given us a spirit of fear, but of power and love and self-control.'

"About 15 years ago, a bishop in a predecessor synod asked me to serve on a small group in Minnesota, with a history that goes back 25 years, called 'Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue in Minnesota,' a state in which ELCA Lutherans alone outnumber Episcopalians

20 to 1. This has been a very rich experience, but has also been a painful one, vicariously experiencing their pain of being misrepresented by Lutherans. But from this experience, I do not share many of the fears that have been expressed in this assembly. For example, this experience has expanded and not contracted my understanding of the priesthood of all believers. I do not remind my pastors that they are called just to do what I could otherwise do. I want them to expand my horizons and challenge my faith, and I want our bishop to do the same for our congregation, and this is happening. This sounds like a multi-level ministry. It is, and we practice it. But we should be mutually supportive of our different roles. We just argue over what—the terms we prefer.

“And I view CCM as perfectly consistent with the Augsburg Confession. Every time the Confessions speak of the episcopate, they do so affirmatively. And five seminaries have affirmed it, and none has affirmed Mahtomedi. As we step into the next millennium, I think we should do so not in fear, but in the power God has given us in the Gospel, in God’s love that gives us the courage to change for the sake of that Gospel, and the Gospel’s power to give us self-control.”

The Rev. Thomas A. Lyberg [Northwestern Ohio Synod] said, “I speak in opposition to CCM, and I do it with great sadness. I have been disturbed in the year or so leading up to this time—the way both sides have been treating each other. I think for those who have been in favor of CCM, they have portrayed their opponents as being misinformed rural folks who do not understand complexity. On the other hand, those who have been against CCM have looked at those in favor of it quite often as being in charge of some grand conspiracy to undermine the ELCA. I think in both cases it has been a great embarrassment to us in the way we have treated each other.

“But I think the document itself misses the point if we focus in on the historic episcopate. Now for certain, that is the bulk of the document, it does represent discussions of the historic episcopate, but yet we call this a document called ‘Called to Common Mission.’ And that is my problem with the document. I do not see this as being a mission document, but instead, as really being a political ecclesiastical document. We have talked a good bit about new paradigms for the 21st century, and what I see CCM as being is not a new paradigm, but a failed paradigm that defines mission as something other than outreach and evangelism. Mission, as I understand it in CCM, is defined as maintenance ministry to marginal congregations; that is the typical argument that I have heard regarding mission—that these are marginal congregations in both The Episcopal Church and in our church that require assistance, that, for whatever reason, we are not willing to support on our own. So mission becomes either doing maintenance ministry or mission becomes defined as agreements between our leaders. We change our upper level structure. And I do not see how this creates mission opportunities, insights, or benefits for individual congregations. So in that regard, I would ask that we reject CCM not as a rejection of our brothers and sisters from The Episcopal Church, but [as an unsatisfactory document.]”

Ms. Cecelia Johnson [Florida-Bahamas Synod] said, “Bishop Anderson, I rise in support of ‘Called to Common Mission.’ My own personal ties with The Episcopal Church go way back to my childhood. I remember the days of released-time religious education at a local Episcopal church. I worshiped in The Episcopal Church many times in college. I recall those Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogues also during the late ’60s and early ’70s. My home congregation in Florida, just 20 years old, was in part supported by The Episcopal Church. My son attends an Episcopal day school.

“However, Florida is an area of tremendous growth at this time. It is about 50 percent unchurched in many areas, and upwards of that. We had five mission starts last year and are

anticipating at least five new mission starts next year. We could have many, many more. Our congregations welcome many new Christians as adults. We have many adults who are being baptized. There are young families returning to the church, adults who have been baptized, bringing not just their infants to be baptized, but their school-age children, to hear for the first time the Good News of Jesus Christ.

“I received, just prior to coming to Denver, a letter from a pastor in the Greater Tampa area, and he described the relationship that his congregation has with a local Episcopal church. The vestry of The Episcopal Church and his congregational council have come together to seek opportunities for ministry in their own area, but even more exciting, they’re looking at a growth area just a few miles away where they can do ministry together, possibly a new mission start. I see that in our hungry secular society, our fragmented society, ‘Called to Common Mission’ offers us an exciting visionary way of doing ministry and an opportunity for a unified Christian witness in the new millennium. I urge the adoption of ‘Called to Common Mission.’”

The Rev. James H. Hanson [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod] said, “I speak in opposition. My concern, sir, is the direction. I do not have a lot of quarrels with the document, but I think it is a move in the wrong direction.

“According to Loren Mead, an Episcopalian, who has been very helpful to numbers of us, from the Alban Institute: ‘Five Challenges for the Once and Future Church,’ challenged, number one, to transfer the ownership of the Church from the clergy to the laity. In America, the Church is owned by the clergy. That is what clericalism means. Churches spend their money on clergy, decisions are made primarily by the clergy, standards are determined by the clergy, denominational decision making, skewed, often emphasizes clergy voices; the clergy—not the laity—is trained in the language of the institution, education for clergy is a major financial investment, and the clergy controls how one changes the rules. The task of this next generation will be to shift the power and ownership structures of the churches to allow lay people to fulfill their apostolic ministries, and in so doing, free the clergy from institutional power to be the catalyst of religious authority. I speak against the CCM because I believe it is a move in the wrong direction.”

The Rev. Timothy F. Lull [president, Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary] said, “Bishop Anderson, your report had that wonderful visual picture of a Lutheran document from 1901, with a picture of Martin Luther. And it got me to reflecting on the surprising thing that the Lutherans do not have a very good reputation for being open to change. We have really just been through a remarkable century in which God has led us in amazing ways. We have moved from the many different church bodies that we were part of a hundred years ago into this ELCA. We have moved from a church that was described as ‘quietistic’ on social ethics to having a vigorous public statement, as we will again affirm at this assembly, as we work in the area of economic justice. We have been through a transformation in our approach to global mission in which we now work as partners with other churches, rather than as those who come to bring not only the Gospel, but cultural imperialism. We have been able to renew our worship and regain our sacramental heritage that we had partly lost in the intervening centuries. We have been able to agree on the ordination of women, and what a renewal to the life of our church has come from that! We have planted thousands of new congregations, particularly in the west and in the Sunbelt, so that we could be a national presence. We have begun to make important commitments and some progress in the area of multicultural ministry, turning away from seeing it as a duty or burden, and beginning to understand that it is one of the greatest blessings that God puts before us. And even, Bishop

Anderson, in ecumenism, where no one a hundred years ago would have picked Lutherans as likely to be leaders, we have emerged as a formidable and important church, and others look to us for leadership in the ecumenical movement. We have done all this by the grace of God, and because we had visionary leadership along the way, and because after all the debates at assembly after assembly that went before us, people were willing to say, 'Yes, all right. There are risks, but we can live with them. Let us go forward and do this.'

"And now, at this assembly, we write the final chapter, at least for this century. And how does it end? With a kind of wonderful big bang that propels us with energy into new relationships and continuing leadership into the new century, or with the kind of whimper and squabbling that has been all too characteristic of the dark side of Lutheranism for the last 500 years? Mirror, mirror, on the wall, who is the most Lutheran of us all?

"I have good friends and important colleagues who oppose this for profound theological reasons and deep reasons of conscience. I have nothing but respect for them. We have to be very careful for other issues that lie before us, how we speak when we have these oppositions, but I urge you in light of this great cloud of witness that surrounds us, do not vote against this for light or trivial reasons because of some technicality or because you hear that the document does not really mean what it says."

The Rev. Paula J. Gravelle [Upstate New York Synod] said, "I was a voting member at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly in Philadelphia. When the Concordat was not approved at that assembly, a resolution was passed that the ELCA seek conversations with The Episcopal Church, addressing concerns that emerged during consideration of the Concordat, and then bring a revised proposal to this assembly.

"The document before us is revised. However, it does not address the major concern that emerged during discussions of the Concordat; that is, the Episcopalian version of the historic episcopate. CCM does not clarify anything for me. Please understand. I am for better relationships with my sisters and brothers in Christ. I am for making a more faithful witness to Jesus. I am for encouraging all persons in their faith journeys. 'Called to Common Mission' is not a document that addresses these important issues. Thus, I speak in opposition to the document."

Mr. Michael E. Niebauer [Southwestern Washington Synod] said, "I stand here speaking in favor of 'Called to Common Mission,' not because I have any theological framework for it or a grand philosophical position, but because of a personal feeling about the historic episcopate. It is truly a gift for us.

"I received a gift once, very much the same. In 1969, as a young sailor getting ready to go to Vietnam, I was given a St. Christopher medal. I stand here today, wearing that St. Christopher next to my heart. It was given to me by a Catholic woman who believed that St. Christopher and her praying to him would keep me safe while I was in Vietnam. I wore that St. Christopher the entire time, at the radar sites and on the rivers, and I came home safe. She believes the prayers saved me. Do I believe in St. Christopher? Not necessarily. Do I pray to him? Again, not necessarily. I believe the historic episcopate is much the same. We may not feel it is necessary. We may not feel that we have to have it, but every time we look at it, it will be a tie to our Episcopalian brothers and sisters, just like my looking at my St. Christopher is a tie to my Catholic friends back home."

The Rev. William E. Saunders [Southern Ohio Synod] said, "Many of us here today embrace our Episcopal sisters and brothers in terms of Baptism and Eucharist. We recognize that in 1997 at the Episcopal General Convention, they accepted both the Augsburg

Confession and Luther's Small Catechism as containing the true essentials of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic faith. And we hope that above all, they did this in truth and with no feeling of hypocrisy. We feel as we move forward in our unions toward—in our unions with each other that it must be done so in truth and without feeling of hypocrisy. However, many of us today cannot say the same in terms of our Episcopal brothers' view of the historic episcopate. We would feel hypocritical in accepting something that is not a true essential—the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic faith—nor is it necessary or beneficial for the good order of the Church.”

Bishop Steven L. Ullestad [Northeastern Iowa Synod] said, “I am speaking on behalf of ‘Called to Common Mission.’ I have had the opportunity to attend several district and national conventions in a predecessor church body, and synod and churchwide assemblies over the years, and there is something that I have noticed—that frequently we have dealt with strong disagreement and intense debate. It is not unique to this particular issue. I remember the Nestle Boycott conversation, the South African divestment and the intensity of that conversation, and the conversations before our merger in 1988 were quite intense, and quite strong disagreements. As uncomfortable as that is, it seems that is for us part of the discernment process, that willingness to share with each other our deep and heartfelt conviction.

“Until 1996, I opposed the Concordat. I have changed my mind for several reasons. I have learned more about The Episcopal Church. For example, I have been taught that the ministry of Christ is the ministry of the whole Church—the laity—that is what the Episcopalians believe. They believe that the laity is the foundational order of ministry. I have also been changed by the conversations with people in the most pressing mission fields in our country. They need the partnership with The Episcopal Church for the sake of effective mission. Yes, they can share food closets and food banks, excuse me, and clothes closets, and all kinds of ministries that are responses to the Gospel, but in the one place that is essential to the life of the Church, namely, the ministry of Word and Sacrament, we are still not able to share in that ministry for the sake of mission.

“But the biggest reason I think that I have changed my mind is because the Concordat has been changed. We have removed the material about bishops for life. We have decided that we will enter the historic episcopate by means of the other international Lutheran communions. This is a change from the time when Bishop Chilstrom was installed and the other international Lutheran bishops who were in the historic episcopate were told that they could look, but not touch, when it came to laying on of hands, but those not in the historic episcopate could participate. That will change if this is adopted. We have dealt with the issue of the threefold ordering of ministry, and The Episcopal Church embraces the essential nature of our Confessions, and invites us to review the ministry of their bishops as in keeping with the Gospel. And that, I think, is the greatest gift that we can offer each other and to the whole Church: the creation of an episcopate that is both evangelical and historic—evangelical from the Lutheran perspective of the primacy of the Word, historic because of the relationship between pastor, congregation, and the ministry of the whole Church, a relationship that is of historic importance because the generations have handed on the faith from one generation to the next.

“So I ask that you consider strongly supporting ‘Called to Common Mission’ for the sake not only of our relationship with The Episcopal Church, but for our witness to the world.”

The Rev. Mark M. Rydberg [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] said, “If ‘Called to Common Mission’ were really about mission, I would indeed support it. But sameness is not

oneness. I was not born into the Lutheran tradition; I am a Lutheran today by conversion and, actually, I began to read Martin Luther while attending a Methodist seminary. One of the things that attracted me to a Lutheran confessional understanding of the Gospel was its clarity and its simplicity: Word alone, faith alone, grace alone; Word and Sacrament; the priesthood of all believers.

“I live in a town of about a thousand people. There are five congregations in this town. And we at the grassroots have grown to appreciate one another’s traditions so much that my ecumenical partners in ministry in our community, without me initiating the conversation, have asked me, ‘The ELCA is considering this major shift in its practice of ministry. Why would you want to do that?’ And they asked me that question because for them it would also be a great loss. We have grown to respect one another so much not through our sameness, but through our oneness, and it has been a great witness to our community. Ecumenism at the grassroots level grows very naturally and by the Spirit; I think we all know that. It is not coerced. Ecumenism at the national level must also grow the same way, as we are here experiencing even in this assembly with the Moravian-Lutheran full communion proposal. This model is indeed the true spirit of ecumenism.”

The Rev. G. Scott Cady [New England Synod] said, “Thank you, Reverend Chair. I, too, have come from a non-Lutheran background from those very minimalist churches, and I became a Lutheran largely because of the beauty and the majesty of its liturgy.

“The original Lutheran reformers had a compelling and lofty vision. It was to return the Gospel to centrality in the life of the Church that they had received. Unlike the more radical reformers, the Lutherans did not see the richness of Christian tradition as unholy or satanic or purely human folly. They embraced the ancient traditions they had received and intended to preserve and pass on those traditions, refocused on God’s grace in Christ. But this vision was not fulfilled. A series of political, personal, and historic pressures shattered the western church into a tragic and scandalous division. The opportunity now falls to us to move closer to that Reformer’s vision. We can, and I believe we are called to, bring two Gospel-centered fragments of the Church into fuller visible unity. Two traditions, both which embrace the beauty of the great tradition—its creeds, its liturgies, its hymns, its architecture, its prayers, and its sense of order—have declared agreement in the Gospel. Let us not miss this truly joyous and blessed opportunity to carry on the Reformers’ dream: the great Christian tradition united under God’s mercy in Christ.”

The Rev. Darby J. Lawrence [Central-Southern Illinois Synod] said, “Thank you, Reverend Chair. I want to thank you, Bishop. I think you are—I have heard great things about how you handled things at the last biennial assembly, and I appreciate the pastoral way that you are handling this in allowing enough time for us to discuss this.

“It has occurred to me that I will grieve either way this vote goes. I desperately wish that I could vote for it, but my concern is not—my primary concern is not about our relationship with the Episcopalians at this time, but about our church, about the Lutheran church. We have been the ELCA for 11 years now and I do not feel that we know who we are at this point. And until we reach that point, which could take a number of years yet, I cannot vote for ‘Called to Common Mission.’ There are issues that we need to settle before we enter into this agreement.”

Ms. Beth Shoffner [North Carolina Synod] said, “A couple of weeks ago I had an experience during worship that I bet you have had, too. The passage from Matthew’s Gospel was read—one I have heard a hundred times. But that morning, maybe because I was looking toward this assembly, the words hit my ears and touched my heart in a new way.

“Peter and some of the other followers were in a boat on the sea. As the waves grew rough, the disciples became alarmed and cried out in fear. Jesus heard their voices and immediately left his meditation to offer himself. ‘It is I, do not be afraid.’ Peter, I am sure, asked, ‘If it is really you bid me come to you on the water.’ Now, we know that Peter’s attempt, he faltered and Jesus immediately stretched forth his hand and caught him.

“Like Peter, we pray and sing for our Lord to call us, to use us, to stretch us into new ministry for the sake of his Kingdom. In Christ’s call for us to be one body, especially in relationship with our Episcopalian brothers and sisters, we have gotten our toes wet. God knows we want to take steps in answer to his call to minister as one in the body, but we are looking down and paying too much attention to the—verse 30—boisterous wind of our doubts. Christ is even now reaching out to us in our distress. It is time to stop clinging to the boat, declaring we can communicate just fine from here. Thank you. It is time to follow the will of God, to clasp the outstretched hand of Christ, and to trust the power of the Holy Spirit. It is time to walk toward Christ in faith and vote ‘yes’ for ‘Called to Common Mission.’”

Ms. Linda Danielson [Southeastern Iowa Synod] said, “Bishop Anderson, I would like to use the analogy of a family that was used the other day to describe our ecumenical relations with other churches. I would like for the voting members to think of your personal families right now. I am sure many of you in this room are parents and if not, we are all certainly sons and daughters. When God blesses us with children, he gifts them, and he creates them as individuals. Our job as parents is not to change them, they are already beautifully and wonderfully made. I believe that God has created the Lutheran Church and he has also created The Episcopal Church. He is present in both and he has gifted each. Each has the ability to bring his children into a closer relationship with him, with the gifts that he has given them, each as individual and each as special. Neither should be changed. But we can be members of the same family. We can join together in mission to make our family stronger. Rituals made with human hands are dividing us.

“Yesterday when we discussed the Moravian full communion document, I felt God being glorified. It was Jesus Christ as our Lord and Savior bringing us together, not a ritual made by human hands, like the historic episcopate. This document is not simple, it is confusing, it is contradicting, and it is not the right way to make us one. We need Christ to unify us. We need nothing else. Period. Jesus Christ alone.”

The Rev. Paul H. Summer [Florida-Bahamas Synod] said, “Bishop Chair. Following my return home from Denver, I will be attending a dedication-open house celebration of a new parish center at Grace Episcopal Church in Port Orange. My presence will be in response to not only an invitation to the entire congregation of All Saints Lutheran Church, where I serve, but to years of shared ministry. All Saints Lutheran Church is 19 years old. Grace Episcopal Church is 109 years old. When Pastor Jerry Vande Mark arrived in Port Orange some 20 years ago to start a new Lutheran church, it was Grace Episcopal that offered free use of space to a young congregation. Meetings were held at Grace, Vacation Bible School was held at Grace, weddings were held at Grace, funerals were held at Grace, special and seasonal joint worship services were held at Grace. As years went by, each congregation began to take turns hosting Advent, Lent, and Ascension services. My hope and prayer is that we recognize, affirm, and celebrate this gift from God anew by the adoption of ‘Called to Common Mission.’ All Saints was not, and has never been, a threat to Grace. Grace has never forced nor lorded over All Saints any higher authority by its ecclesiastical structure or its understanding of the historical episcopate. In fact, quite the opposite. They have proven themselves as humble servants of our Lord and Savior Jesus

Christ. They were founders, with All Saints, of Project Reach, a community help outreach project. They host our Port Orange ministerial association. Their priests have already been on call and ready to serve members in times of emergency and crisis at All Saints when our pastors are not available. They have been even willing to copy bulletins and newsletters when our copier is broken.

“I encourage this assembly, in the name of our Risen Lord and Savior, not to be afraid, not to find ourselves locked in this room for fear of the Episcopalians, but to see them as God’s people, too.”

Bishop Kenneth R. Olsen [Metropolitan Chicago Synod], rising with a white card, said, “Bishop Anderson, as we heard from a representative of the Moravian Church yesterday, I would request an opportunity to hear from a representative of our Reformed partners. I know that I have seen Pastor John Thomas [president-elect of the United Church of Christ] in the plenary hall, and I would request a perspective of our Reformed ecumenical partners’ view of the issue we are discussing.”

Bishop Anderson responded, “Is there objection [from the assembly] to that? Otherwise, we will have John Thomas, if he is here. Yes. President[-elect] John Thomas, United Church of Christ.”

An unidentified person rose to a point of order, asking, “Will that time add to the hour so that these people at microphones can talk, or will we stay to the 60 minutes?” Bishop Anderson replied, “Let us give [our hour of discussion] three more minutes.”

The Rev. John Thomas [United Church of Christ] said, “Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. First, let me state the obvious. The Reformed tradition does not look at this issue with either indifference or neutrality. The obvious reason, perhaps, is that we are now in full communion. We are near to you and your future is indeed our future. We also look at this issue with expectation and hope that all of us share in the ecumenical movement for the unity of the Church, and if it were possible for you to move with integrity into this new relationship, it would be a sign, as we enter the next century, of the capacity to bring evangelical and catholic dimensions of the Church together—something that has thus far been one of the most difficult, vexing, and frustrating issues in the ecumenical movement.

“As you may know, the Reformed tradition traditionally has vested ministry of oversight in corporate bodies—classes, presbyteries, associations, conferences, synods. And this corporate understanding of oversight is cherished in our churches and we see it as a gift that we bring to the ecumenical table and will continue to offer. However, in the midst of the global ecumenical conversations in our own ecumenical, bilateral, and multilateral discussions, we have also been exploring ways in which to exercise the ministry of oversight—*episkopé*—in more personal ways, ways in which the unity of the Church can be both signified as well as effected, ways in which the integrity of the faith can be guarded and protected across the generations, ways in which the mission of the Church can be led by energetic, courageous, and bold ministers of oversight, and particularly ways in which these ministries of oversight of our various churches can be fully reconciled so they exercise their ministry not in isolation or in competition, but together, for the glory of God.

“Now this brings us to the particular issue you are addressing: the issue of the historic episcopate. This is a question that we have also been addressing in our own conversations bilaterally and multilaterally. Contrary to what you may have heard, the Consultation on Church Union [COCU] has addressed this issue for over 40 years and has not abandoned it. We have simply said that we have not found the way forward yet. And, indeed, a new

process is underway to begin to explore the ways in which our churches—Evangelical, Catholic, and Reformed—can bring together their common understandings, can honor their histories, but also reach into the future in ways that can fully reconcile our churches from these three different traditions. In a sense, you have anticipated many of the questions that we are struggling with. Lutheran fools, perhaps, have rushed in where Reformed angels have feared to tread, but you have, but you have offered us a sign of the struggles that we are also anticipating before us. And if you move forward, you will also encourage and challenge us to take up this continuing agenda in our own life. Finally, know that our prayers are with you, have been, and more importantly, will be. And in full communion, let me remind you that the quality and character of your deliberation, but also the quality and the character of your life together, whatever your vote will be, is not something for which you are simply accountable to yourselves or even to God, but now you are also accountable to us. Know that you are in our prayers. Thank you.”

Bishop Anderson continued, “Thank you. We will add four minutes to the schedule. Microphone 8.”

Mr. Paul Hinderlie [Northwest Synod of Wisconsin] said, “Thank you. My wife and I for 20 years have owned a restaurant in Pepin, Wisconsin, and have to say over those years we have supported an Episcopalian-Anglican weekly music program that glories in the traditions of the Anglican-English hymnody. And contrary to the man from New England, I still glory in that. Also, 30 years ago, one of the midwives of my conversion to a living Christian faith was Dean Hancock of St. Mark’s Cathedral in Minneapolis. At that time also, you may recall, the charismatic movement was flooding America. Those of us who were given gifts of the Holy Spirit felt that somehow we had a right to speak more than others; we had a right to have more power than others. And a very wise person said to me, ‘Paul, there are no second story Christians.’

“And again, as I have been reading now about the historic episcopate in the last five years, and contemplating it these last weeks, I realize again there are no second story Christians. One of our—the members of our choir at Immanuel Lutheran—our ecumenical choir is Jewish—was quite incensed to find out that in the pre-assembly materials was a statement that said that the historic episcopate had been a witness under fascism in communism, and since his parents—one of his parents had escaped from the camps—he turned to me and said, ‘How many bishops who have this great witness were witnesses against the Nazis?’ I said, ‘Well, I think there were two bishops who were martyred.’ And he said, ‘Well, your Holy Spirit has got a lot to answer for, then, in the persons of those bishops.’ I was rather taken aback when I realized again that after World War II, two American presidents of the Lutheran Confessions in America—President Fry, who was not a bishop, and President Aasgard, he was not a bishop—took apart the Lutheran World Federation in Germany because it had been compromised, because it had not witnessed. And look back through the history and find how many times the witness was through the pastors, the people, and where were the bishops? And I am confused about that.” Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

Mr. Kenneth E. Walstrom [East-Central Synod of Wisconsin] said, “Bishop Anderson, I want to say how much I appreciate your leadership in this very, very difficult situation. It challenges us to re-evaluate what are the very important things that we need to be concerned about as Christians.

“Jesus said, ‘Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the Kingdom.’ And we pray for the coming of the Kingdom of God every time we utter the

words of the Lord's Prayer. And one of the visible signs of the Kingdom of God is the unity within the visible Church.

"One of my deep concerns about this whole process has been the tremendous amount of money that has been expended both for and against this 'Called to Common Mission' and the previous documents. I have tried to get off a couple of the mailing lists, but nobody seems to really want to listen. And I keep hoping fervently and without cynicism that there is a fund for world hunger that is matching dollar for dollar for this effort to convince us one way or another on how to vote on this matter.

"The historic episcopacy is a gift. It is a gift that many of our Lutheran brethren throughout the world enjoy, accept, and are not afraid of. It is a sign of the apostolic and catholic nature of our church, and I do not believe that we need to fear this sign ourselves. God will be with us in the future as he has been in the past, and as Jesus said, 'Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom.' And a sign of that Kingdom may be, in our generation, a sign of the historic connection through the episcopacy with the early Church."

The Rev. Stephanie K. Frey [Southwestern Minnesota Synod] said, "Thank you, Bishop Anderson. I speak in opposition to 'Called to Common Mission.' In reflecting on the events of yesterday, I note that early in the afternoon we had a marvelous taste of the goodness of ecumenical conversation in the time spent discussing the proposal for full communion with the Moravian Church. Later in the afternoon, in the hearings on 'Called to Common Mission,' there was quickly evidenced the pain that deep division creates when we have so obviously not yet gained widespread consensus among ourselves about the best way for us to move forward with our Episcopalian brothers and sisters. In the Moravian-Lutheran proposal, which I can only describe as 'elegantly evangelical,' we have a marvelous model of a document that seems to me capable of yielding the kind of relationship that we fervently desire also to have with our Episcopalian friends.

"With regret, I urge that we reject CCM in order that we might do two things. On the one hand, to acknowledge and attend to the division and the woundedness on both sides of the matter within our own church body, that we might honor the diversity of theological reflection on matters of episcopacy within our church, and on the other hand, that we might really, truly start over to find some entirely new way that is creative, flexible, lean, mission-minded, that truly upbuilds the body so that we can widely and joyfully accept partnership in full communion with our Episcopalian friends."

Bishop Juan Cobrda [Slovak-Zion Synod] said, "My family can trace our Lutheranism to the Reformation. In Argentina, when I was young, as many of our young people there, 50 years ago, I was born into the ecumenical relation and cooperation. Thirty years ago, when the first North American was taking the first steps on the moon, we decided to merge the Lutheran and the Methodist seminary into a ecumenical seminary under the auspices of eight churches: Reformed, Presbyterian, Anglican, Methodist, Waldensian, Disciples of Christ, Lutheran—two Lutheran churches. And since that time, through three decades, this seminary has produced not genetic pastors, but faithful pastors to each church participating. Beside this, we have established a publishing house for all these churches, we have founded a Lutheran seminary, a hospital, and established a diaconic work which included the refugee resettlement after the 1973 coup in Chile. When in 1965 I was elected bishop, I received the apostolic historic succession. And in 1993, when I was elected bishop of the Slovak Zion Synod in Muhlenberg College, for the second time I have received the apostolic historic succession. It did not change my life. You can ask my wife Sofia. But you should ask my

people in Argentina and in the Slovak-Zion Synod how I have carried out my business as bishop. I have been always people-oriented, I have been mission-focused, and enthusiastic about ecumenical cooperation and life. I love the Lutheran church with all the fervor and good things, but I see my church, ELCA, as a branch among the other branches on the tree of the Church of Jesus Christ. So I invite you, please, do not lose this opportunity for what the Lord has given us and go for it!”

The Rev. Jimalee Jones [Northern Great Lakes Synod] said, “Like all who are speaking and who will speak, I speak from the heart. After deep prayer, regretfully, I oppose ‘Called to Common Mission.’

“Last Sunday, the junior high youth group of our church, the other pastor and I, from the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, worshiped at the Greater Friendship Baptist Church in Minneapolis. The preaching was powerful. The music was marvelous. The prayers were from the heart. I needed that worship. I needed to celebrate the Gospel in a voice different than my own. I needed the fire of the Holy Spirit which is deeply experienced in the Baptist Church. I needed, as a sister in Christ, their differences to help me.

“Most Wednesday mornings in our town, my co-pastor and I receive the Lord’s Supper in the local Episcopal church. We worship with two or three faithful Episcopalians and the priest. In this quiet worship, we receive the whole Christ together. We experience profound communion. We need The Episcopal Church. We love the *Book of Common Prayer*. We deeply appreciate our brother in Christ, the priest there in the local church. In these five years of worshiping at The Episcopal Church, we have developed a deep friendship with the priest. He has always maintained with us that we need each other precisely for our differences so that we can witness in a lively and new way to one another. We celebrate our diversity. We do not want or need the historic episcopate to give us unity. We have it already in the body and blood of our same Lord, Jesus Christ.”

Mr. James D. Reyner [Sierra Pacific Synod] said, “Thank you, Bishop Anderson, for giving me this opportunity. I speak for CCM. I, like some of you, had some doubts about accepting the historic episcopate. But, after studying all the information provided to me as a voting member and listening to the last few days of arguments, I am becoming convinced that Jesus would have wanted us to accept this small concession, this minor change, which means so much to our Episcopalian partners, and which is already acceptable to two-thirds of the Christian world. I am hopeful that after our two mainline churches have spent over 30 years on this long journey, our journey is near its end.

“ Finally, I ask for each voting member to vote for CCM so that we can go home as a proud member of the Churchwide Assembly that listened to John 17:23, and established full communion with our Episcopalian travelers in faith.”

The Rev. Norman W. Wahl [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] said, “I sympathize with you, Bishop Anderson. I found, particularly again through the hearings yesterday, that the historic episcopate is yet the issue in CCM. That was affirmed by Bishop Epting in the hearings, in which he indicated that was the remaining roadblock to what we would call full communion between our two churches. I think that the term, ‘the’ historic episcopate, has been used somewhat loosely by people who might be in favor of CCM in two ways.

“One, it has been suggested that we are returning to something that we have once had. A second is that there is ‘the’ historic episcopate. Certainly, Lutherans in this country have never had the historic episcopate—from a Henry Melchior Muhlenberg in the 1700s in Pennsylvania, and ever since, the Lutherans have denied opportunities to become a part of an historic episcopate.

“Second, I do not think there is ‘the’ episcopate. What version of the historic episcopate are we concerned about? The Roman Catholic historic episcopate? The Roman Catholics do not recognize the Orthodox episcopate, who do not recognize the Anglican episcopate, who do not recognize the Moravian episcopate. What episcopate do we want to be a part of as American Lutherans? Do we want to return to the Swedish Lutheran episcopate in which, I am told, about one percent of the Swedes attend worship weekly? That figure was given to me; I do not know how accurate that is, maybe someone can correct that.

“We would like to continue to practice broad ecumenism, which does not narrow ourselves. If we are to truly be the bridge church of ecumenism, we do not want to narrow ourselves to one part of the church by which we cannot more fully connect with others. May God bless those of you who find it beneficial to serve under some kind of historic episcopate, and may God bless those who would choose rather to serve without the historic episcopate and under the Gospel. We serve the same Christ, in whom we are one.”

Bishop Anderson asked the speakers to please stand closer to the microphones, as some were having trouble hearing. He also explained, “In my timekeeping, we will go to, by my watch, 10:35 [A.M.]. So we have a little over ten minutes left. Microphone 5.”

The Rev. John K. Stendahl [New England Synod] said, “Thank you, Bishop Chilstro–Bishop Anderson.” Bishop Anderson interjected, “You honor me.” Then Pastor Stendahl continued, “Some of us have been around a little too long, I think. But, like I guess just about everybody here, I have been really saddened by the acrimony that has characterized so much of this discussion in our family here in this church. But also saddening to me—and also angering—has been the way in which I have too often seen The Episcopal Church characterized as hierarchal, medieval, undemocratic (or at least sometimes undemocratic) with a mechanistic and superstitious view of ordination and ministry. If this were The Episcopal Church that I have come to know, I find it hard to believe how some of the opponents of this agreement can assure us that they really love The Episcopal Church and its traditions, and then go on to describe it that way. I think, then, we should be in a kind of Christian enmity and either moving back from this agreement or rushing forward to give whatever first aid that we could out of our evangelical kit.

“But this is not The Episcopal Church that I have come to know—not generally, though one certainly can always find examples on both sides of every fence. The Episcopal Church that I know is one in which the preaching and pastoral care has often been resplendent with the Gospel, and one in which so many members have a strong sense of their priestly identity and dignity, in which bishops and priests, in spite of this threefold way of speaking about ministry, have a more unitarian, unifying sense of the ministry of Word and Sacrament than we often have. In fact, it is that ministry of Word and Sacrament that is so important to them, that very often they speak of it as having the same unifying function that we give to the Confessions.

“But they do have this prized way of weaving the Church together, hand to hand, down through the generations, and across the distances. And that stands as a barrier for them. They are going away in this CCM towards accepting that—the end of that barrier. But we are the ones who can show how it is possible to have an evangelical.” Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

The Rev. Jaynan C. Clark Eglund [Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod] said, “I grew up with the saying ‘Anything worth doing is worth doing well.’ And I think we can do a lot better than this CCM document. I have heard people say that this is kind of our last chance

and if we do not approve this, it is 30 years wasted and we will all, like small children, pack up our toys and walk away. I am the mother of four small children, and when my kids have a dispute, they do not pack up their toys, first of all, and most of the time, they do not walk away.

“This is not the end of the line. It is the beginning of saying we have great theologians in this church and a strong laity, and we can do better, and we can do this in the united way. And I trust that The Episcopal Church—and I won’t speak for them—but I trust they won’t walk away from us either. Thirty years to me seems like one grain of sand in the perspective of eternity or at least in the time of Christendom.

“So I speak in opposition now to the CCM document, not to full communion with The Episcopal Church. I speak in opposition, not as a Lutheran, but as a Christian. I speak in opposition not based on the Confessions, but on Scripture and on the freedom of the Gospel, and I speak in opposition not as a follower of Martin Luther, but as a follower of Jesus Christ. When Jesus died, the curtain in the temple was ripped from the top to the bottom, and there was no division left between those who should lead and those who should serve. We are all in this together. The Holy Spirit is free and blows freely like the wind. We cannot direct it, nor assign it. It calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies all of us. It does not call, gather, enlighten, or sanctify bishops more purely than clergy, clergy more clearly than laity. It calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies all of us. It is worth doing, and it is worth doing well.”

Mr. Gerhard H. Fisher [Greater Milwaukee Synod] said, “Reverend Speaker, I strongly speak in favor of CCM. But I should also be honest. The episcopate will not necessarily make my day. The episcopate will have little effect on me as a lay person strongly called to issues of peace and justice in my church. There are things in the ELCA which I would like changed, but I love my church. I have found our brothers and sisters who are present here at this assembly from The Episcopal Church to be winsome and gentle, and I thank them for that. I have a strong conviction that the Holy Spirit is calling me to witness that our unity is paramount. I urge adoption.”

The Rev. Wallace S. Kemp [Florida-Bahamas Synod] said, “My concern with CCM, and I am not against episcopacy *per se*, is that it is primarily concerned—and I know that is the roadblock possibly between us and fuller union with other churches—is that it is throwing things out of balance and we are becoming curved in upon ourselves toward the structure, and not the mission of the Church. I do not believe there is anything wrong with our present church structure that we cannot amend without getting into historic episcopacy, at least as The Episcopal Church and others see that we need.

“I would like to just quote from Gustav Wingren, theologian of the Church of Sweden, ordained in the historic episcopacy as that church has stated it and sees it. If the Word is here, then an unbroken relation with Christ exists too—nothing is lacking. If doubting the power of his word, we begin to look around for an unbroken historical connection with the Apostles, we cannot come closer to Christ who has risen from the dead. It is not the case that the Christ of the past cut a channel through ages and that his power is lessened if any break in historical continuity takes place. The message gives authority to the ministry.

“Twenty-three of 21 statements in the CCM deals with episcopacy, and a form of it which, I do not believe, the Church of Sweden agrees with totally. I think we should put aside CCM for a better document. Martin Luther, speaking to this grave and important matter in 1523, in writing about the ministry in 1523, wrote: ‘In this view of the ministry,

the so-called indelible character.” Bishop Anderson interrupted the speaker, saying, “I hate to interrupt Martin Luther, but your time is up. We go to Microphone 9.”

Ms. Carla McGee [Florida-Bahamas Synod] said, “I speak in favor of ‘Called to Common Mission.’ We confess our faith with words of the Creed: ‘one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church.’ These words need to resound in our hearts and our minds, and if we truly believe what we say, then we must live what we believe. Bishop Anderson so very gently and eloquently reminded us of these very issues in our opening worship for this Churchwide Assembly. ‘Called to Common Mission’ provides us with the opportunity to bring unity among God’s people. Entering this relationship with The Episcopal Church holds promise and vision for our ministry and mission together. We have the freedom to say ‘yes’ to ‘Called to Common Mission’ and to uphold the joyfulness of the Kingdom, giving true hope for a new century. This is what God calls us to do.”

Bishop Anderson drew the discussion to a close, saying, “Thank you. We have reached our limit, and I want to thank all of those still at the microphone for their patience, but we do need to observe our orders of the day. I want to—I think you all should give yourselves a hand. This has been an excellent opportunity. I would suggest that we stand and—there is a white card. White card at Microphone 6.”

The Rev. Norman W. Wahl [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] said, “I need to make an apology. Bishop Isaksen has pointed out an egregious error I made in my little speech a couple of minutes ago, in which I somehow put into opposition people who serve under the historic episcopate and people who serve under the Gospel. I apologize for that to our Episcopal friends, to anyone in the hall who was offended by that. I did not mean that. I pray we are one in Christ.”

Resumption of Plenary Session Four

Bishop Anderson continued, saying, “Thank you. Please stand, and let us sing Hymn 36, “Day by Day.” After the hymn was completed, Bishop Anderson expressed his thanks to the assembly organist, Mr. Scott C. Weidler, and asked the assembly to be seated. “We now proceed in plenary session of the Churchwide Assembly. Those of you who did not have an opportunity to speak today will have another chance tomorrow morning. After morning prayer and our Bible study, and our decision on full communion with the Moravian Church, we will return to this discussion.

“At this time, it is my privilege to ask Dr. Addie Butler, the vice president of our church and the chair of its Church Council, to assume the chair. Excuse me, Microphone 6.”

Bishop Andrea F. DeGroot-Nesdahl [South Dakota Synod] said, “Thank you. Question about amendments to the ecumenical document we have just discussed. The deadline for those, I understand, is this afternoon. Could you remind us of when we would receive copies of those amendments? None were mentioned in the course of the previous discussion as you had invited them to be mentioned?”

Bishop Anderson responded, “Let us see if we can find out how many have come in.” Looking to Secretary Almen, he asked how many proposed amendments had been received. Secretary Almen indicated that none had been received, “But of course,” Bishop Anderson continued, “the deadline has not yet arrived. Secretary Almen says they will be turned around as quickly as possible and certainly by tomorrow morning, there will be written copies—maybe sooner, but certainly by tomorrow morning. The lack of the numbers certainly makes it easier to duplicate.”

Report: Disabilities and Deaf Ministries

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section V, pages 37-48; continued in *Minutes*, Exhibit F.

At the invitation of Bishop Anderson, Vice President Addie J. Butler assumed the chair. Chair *pro tem* Butler noted that part of the work of the Church Council is to carry out the actions of the Churchwide Assembly. She referred to the report “Final Report on Ministry With and Among Persons with Disabilities.”¹ She introduced the Rev. Charles S. Miller, executive director of the Division for Church in Society (DCS), to comment on the report. Pastor Miller said to Presiding Bishop Anderson, “Your initiative was a gift to this church,” because the action of the 1997 assembly and memorials from several synods moved this church to study and to develop a plan of action in 1998. He introduced the Rev. Lisa Thogmartin-Cleaver, director for disabilities ministries and director for deaf ministry, to present highlights of the action plan. Pastor Cleaver identified areas of emphasis, which included:

- lifting up the unique nature and language of deaf persons and deaf culture;
- striving to include persons with disabilities on the Church Council and on boards and advisory committees;
- preparing a document incorporating this church’s current policies and practices concerning persons with disabilities;
- forming a group to work with lay and ordained persons who have disabilities to assist them in ministry and to encourage those persons with disabilities who would like to prepare for ministry;
- raising issues of inclusiveness and providing resources for worship and education related to this ministry;
- working with the Lutheran Youth Organization and planning an event for youth who are disabled prior to the coming year’s youth gatherings in St. Louis, Missouri; and
- creating the position of director for disability ministries and deaf ministry.

As the newly-called director for disability ministries and deaf ministry, Pastor Cleaver noted that she is working with an advisory committee that is assisting her in developing synod teams that will be involved in this ministry.

Chair *pro tem* Butler invited questions from assembly members concerning the report on disabilities and deaf ministries.

Mr. Robert Radtke III [Metropolitan Chicago Synod] identified himself as a member of the task force that developed the recommendations. He described the report as “the end of a long and difficult journey.” Noting that he is often “frustrated,” he indicated that there is still much discrimination against the deaf, reporting that, for example, his wife, a college graduate, has been unable to secure employment because she can sign but not speak.

Initiatives: Safe Haven for Children

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 59-63.

BACKGROUND

In 1997, Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson presented the *Initiatives for a New Century: A Call to Commitment* to the 1997 Churchwide Assembly. The assembly received the report and approved the following action with an enthusiastic vote [CA97.5.19]:

¹ The full text of the “Final Report on Ministry With and Among Persons with Disabilities” has been included in these minutes for ease of reference as Exhibit F.

WHEREAS, in 1993 this church began an Inquiry process to understand current trends and realities and to examine the future mission of this church; and

WHEREAS, discussions from the Inquiry process have led, in this biennium, to the development of realistic, focused, mission-oriented initiatives following significant listening and conversation throughout this church; and

WHEREAS, we now prepare for mission in a new century; and

WHEREAS, Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson, in his report to the 1997 Churchwide Assembly, calls the initiatives a “churchwide call to action”; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the 1997 Churchwide Assembly affirm the “Initiatives for a New Century: A Call to Commitment”; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1997 Churchwide Assembly encourage the individuals, congregations, synods, churchwide organization, colleges, universities, seminaries, agencies, and institutions of this church to bring these initiatives to life; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Office of the Presiding Bishop oversee and coordinate the implementation of these initiatives.

The Seven Initiatives

The seven initiatives focus attention on critical areas where this church’s action now will make the most difference for the future. The purpose of these initiatives is to strengthen the whole ministry of our church in preparation for the challenges of the 21st century. The initiatives do this by building on existing programs and anticipating new opportunities and partnerships. The seven key initiatives are:

- ! Deepen our worship life
- ! Teach the faith
- ! Witness to God’s action in the world
- ! Strengthen one another in mission
- ! Help the children
- ! Connect with youth and young adults
- ! Develop leaders for the next century

Leadership Teams

In January 1998, Leadership Teams were organized to implement the seven *Initiatives for a New Century*. Team members were selected from throughout this church, reflecting our diversity and representing all three expressions of this church. Team members responded to Bishop Anderson’s invitation, accepting his call to serve as catalysts to fulfill the wide-ranging vision cast by the *Initiatives* document.

The bishop presented a twofold challenge to the Leadership Teams. First, each team was asked to give attention to the specific “We will” action steps endorsed by the assembly. Second, teams were asked to discover activities and projects that “bubble up” around the Church related to their respective initiative. In addition, they were encouraged to consider making small “seed money” grants or otherwise finding ways to support and enhance grassroots efforts on the part of congregations, clusters or conferences, synods, and related agencies and institutions.

Staff of the churchwide organization serve as members of some of the teams. Churchwide units provide support for the Leadership Team efforts and in some cases carry out specific projects or emphases at the discretion of the unit executive director. Contract

staff have been engaged for selected projects at the discretion of the Leadership Team in consultation with the Office of the Presiding Bishop.

In addition to the Leadership Teams working in each of the seven initiative areas, special task forces were appointed to assist in communicating initiative-related work, providing electronic networking support and undergirding the multi-cultural dimension of all projects and emphases.

Budget Support

The ELCA Church Council approved a \$1.5 million designated fund available for new ministry efforts under the umbrella of the initiatives. Of that total, \$150,000 or 10 percent was allocated in 1998-99 to synods for initiative-related work in conjunction with the Synodical Initiatives Grants program administered by the Department for Synodical Relations. Each of the seven initiatives was funded at an initial level of \$100,000. The Office of the Presiding Bishop authorized additional allocations as Leadership Teams developed programmatic emphases and identified specific projects. In addition, several of the initiatives have received generous grant support from Aid Association for Lutherans (AAL) and Lutheran Brotherhood, Inc. (LB).

Activities And Projects

The initial initiatives document as approved by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly included a sample list of “We will” statements designed to stimulate specific activities in support of each initiative. Each Leadership Team has responded to the “We will” statements with specific plans and activities. The summary which follows of work in progress is based on the most recent meeting of initiative team leaders in February 1999. Many other activities, already in place or yet to be defined, could also be added.

1. Deepen Our Worship Life

Members of this team seek to invite congregations, synod leaders, seminaries, and other ministry partners to engage in conversation about worship in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Congregations will be encouraged to see worship as an important focus of congregational life.

The “Deepen our worship life” team has:

- ! provided a grant that helped produce *Youth Can!*, a leadership guide for young people in congregations and camp settings;
- ! provided funds for a two-year leadership program to help train ELCA and Episcopalian musicians who serve in small congregations;
- ! provided a grant for Chinese translations of *Lutheran Book of Worship* liturgies;
- ! produced supplementary resources for sponsors and affirmers in Adult Catechumenate programs; and
- ! prepared print and video resources for a major proposed “conversation on worship” in all ELCA congregations during Lent 2000. These are to help congregations and leaders to explore with each other what is important for them in worship and how they can deepen the worship life of the congregation.

If additional funding becomes available, a priority will be an event for worship leaders and congregational committees to explore various aspects and varieties of worship in this church.

Members of the Leadership Team: Paul R. Nelson, chair; Susan R. Briehl; Joseph A. Donnell II; Robert D. Hawkins; Marcus J. Miller; Normal Aamodt Nelson; Thomas H. Schattauer; Richard A. Webb. Staff: Robert N. Bacher.

2. Teach the Faith

A major emphasis of this initiative is to issue a multilevel, comprehensive call to ELCA members, congregations, synods, seminaries, outdoor ministry settings, retreat and education settings, and churchwide staff to embark on a *period of focus on discipleship and faith development*.

The “Teach the faith” team has:

- ! designed resources to engage congregations in a *Call to Discipleship* churchwide emphasis that focuses on Bible study and prayer. Plans for the emphasis will be reported at the 1999 Churchwide Assembly and introduced at synod assemblies in 2000. The emphasis will begin locally on rally day 2000;
- ! embarked on major research to follow up the Search Institute research on practices, attitudes, and behavior of members a decade ago;
- ! produced a print resource, *Honoring Our Neighbors’ Faith*; and
- ! initiated a speakers’ bureau and program whereby congregations that provide examples of effective teaching can become available to speak to and mentor others (much like the current Partners in Evangelism program.)

Members of the Leadership Team: M. Wyvetta Bullock, chair; Paul J. Blom; Diane J. Hymans; Paul E. Lutz; David Poling-Goldenne; Susan Niemi; Norene A. Smith; Richard H. Summy; Theodore Schroeder; Carol Throntveit. Staff: Robert N. Bacher.

3. Witness to God’s Action in the World

This work for this initiative is divided into two parts:

A. *Evangelism* has been charged with *linking congregations to share new models and strengthen evangelism skills* for proclaiming the Gospel. The team has launched two pilot projects and a “seeker friendly” Web page and has two additional projects under consideration:

- ! Seven synods are working with a *Mid-sized Congregations Transformation Project* to help congregations of 100-300 that are “stalled” in a mid-size mode to set goals for expanding vision and growth;
- ! Five synods are involved in the *Turn Around Congregation Project* that seeks to assist five-to-seven congregations each in moving from plateau or decline to growth by focusing on being rooted in community and outreach;
- ! Launched a new Web page described as a “soft landing zone for people who are seekers.” This page is outside of—but has links to—the ELCA home page and may be found through it at www.sharingfaith.org; and

- ! Discussed two tape series: a cooperative project with Lutheran Men in Mission that focuses on men witnessing and another on evangelizing through English as a second language.

Members of the Leadership Team: Ronald B. Warren, chair; Richard A. Magnus; Marta Poling-Goldenne. Staff: Michael L. Cooper-White.

B. *Moral Deliberation and Public Witness.* The Leadership Team for Initiative 3b also works in two arenas: moral deliberation and public witness. The team brought together 12 consultants with experience in facilitating moral deliberation in various settings as a first step in a plan to publish and distribute (mid-1999) a congregational resource that can:

- ! respond to requests for assistance in dealing with tough issues,
- ! help bring diverse people together to openly and respectfully deliberate, and
- ! provide leadership that enhances the witness of the Body of Christ in the world.

In early 2000 representatives of 20 congregations and 10 teaching theologians will be invited to model a moral deliberation process. The team hopes that by 2001 there will be a host of moral deliberation projects across the country that have ELCA people working on a variety of issues.

The *Public Witness* piece of this initiative is currently focusing on four community renewal and job training pilot projects (Baltimore, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Colton, Oregon). These projects bring together congregations, synods, agencies, and communities. The commitment is to work with these to their fruition and publish replicable parts of the programs.

Members of the Leadership Team: Charles A. Miller, chair; Karen S. Parker; Paul R. Swanson. Staff: Myrna J. Sheie.

4. Strengthen One Another in Mission

Initiative 4 also has two foci: asset mapping and electronic networking.

A. The *Asset Mapping* Leadership Team is committed to “designing a process and methods to assess the resources and talents that the baptized bring to the mission and ministry of the church.” Planning has focused around several pilot programs that will help congregations look at their assets and use these to strengthen ministry. Projects in Portland, Oregon; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; New York, New York; and California’s Santa Clara Valley are currently underway. Asset mapping partnerships also are being forged for pilot projects with ELCA Youth and Young Adult Ministries and the Division for Global Mission’s Companion Synod Program. The Leadership Team also plans to provide support for training churchwide staff in asset mapping techniques.

Members of the Leadership Team: Christine H. Grumm, chair; Sandra Holloway; Hmong Ly; Glenn H. Schoonover; Kathryn Sime; Robert Sitze. Staff: Myrna J. Sheie.

B. The Leadership Team for *Electronic Networking* seeks “to create and strengthen networks linking congregations, synods, institutions, agencies, the churchwide organization, and our ecumenical and global partners” as well as to provide the support and technology needs for the other initiative teams.

Electronic Networking has been working in three areas:

- ! Tools for electronic communication through Webforums, on line chats (e.g. Bible studies), and including both the ELCA Web page and LutherLink service. Web

entries began in March 1999 and a less expensive, more inviting LutherLink transition is anticipated in early summer.

- ! Electronically linking all ELCA congregations. During 1999 congregations will have been provided information regarding which congregations are online (and who uses the connections) to move toward the goal of linking everyone in 2000.
- ! Consideration of ways to electronically connect ELCA institutions, synods, and agencies.

Members of the Leadership Team: Paul Edison-Swift, chair; Charles F. Ruthroff.; LaRue Unglaube. Staff: Myrna J. Sheie.

5. Help the Children

The Leadership Team has created a “Safe Haven for Children” campaign with the goal that “all ELCA congregations will make commitments to be safe havens for all children in their communities.”

This initiative team has focused in three primary areas and has:

- ! produced the *Safe Haven for Children* resource mailed to congregations in the November-December 1998 Action Packet and now in its third printing. (This resource also is available through the ELCA Web page at the address init/safehaven/index.html); and
- ! with Augsburg Fortress is expanding this piece as a resource to be available in July 1999 together with a logotype sign noting that a congregation is a *Safe Haven for Children*;

In addition, this initiative called for expanding the network of ELCA schools, child centers, and schools of this church. The ELCA exceeded its 1998 goal.

Members of the Leadership Team: Joanne Negstad, chair; Kay Bengtson; Terry Bowes; Lori Claudio; Miriam Dumke; Mark S. Hanson; Loretta Horton; Vickie Johnson; Dan Magnuson; Barbara Myers; John Scibilia; Shirley Teig. Staff: Myrna J. Sheie.

6. Connect with Youth and Young Adults

The youth and young adult initiative has:

- ! completed a successful *ELCA Summit on Youth* (February 5-8, 1999, in Atlanta) which brought together nearly 800 youth and adults from a variety of networks. The aim: to not only celebrate youth ministry in this church, but also to strengthen partnerships for more faithful and effective youth ministry, increase impact of youth ministry on this church’s future, and foster inter-network conversation and cooperation.
- ! launched a separate Web site online magazine for youth and young adults with updates every six weeks (some daily or weekly) to include such things as Bible study, live chats, perspectives on daily headlines, and a Names Data Base (e.g. a person could find a servant event in his or her area by ZIP code, type, time, etc. in an information exchange)—each with links to the ELCA page through several sites.

Members of the Leadership Team: Desiree Quintana, chair; Brenda Auterman; Kelly Chatman; Jonathan Reitz; Louise Thoreson. Staff: Myrna J. Sheie.

7. Develop Leaders for the Next Century

In order to encourage leadership development for church and society, the leadership team has made available grants to ELCA congregations, coalitions, synods, agencies, and institutions. The projects receiving consideration are those that foster interdependence and new partnerships; are new or expanded projects; encourage leadership development in future generations; and are replicable.

The Leadership Team for this initiative has:

- ! provided \$57,900 for 34 projects in leadership mentoring, networking, and immersion experiences from the 150 proposals received; and
- ! gathered a group of leaders who “think out of the box” to discuss “What makes good leaders tick?” It is a first step in learning about how we can identify leaders for the next century.

Members of the Leadership Team: Steven L. Ullestad, chair; Terry Baeder; Richard J. Bruesehoff; Kathie Bender Schwich; Joanne Chadwick; Anthony Koppula; Mark Staples; Gordon J. Straw. Staff: Michael J. Cooper-White

Adjunct Coordinating Teams

! The **multicultural coordinating team** assists all initiative teams in developing multicultural projects, with members assigned to each team. The committee seeks to support initiative teams, working to fulfill ELCA multicultural strategies. Activities for the multicultural coordinating team include: language translations; resource development; community organizing; identification of ethnic community leaders; and planning for youth and young adult cross-cultural experiences.

Members of the Multicultural Committee: Evelyn Soto, chair; Stephen P. Bouman, consultant; Rosemary Dyson; Susan Niemi; Nelson Rivera-Garcia; Theodore Schroeder. Staff: Robert N. Bacher.

! The **communications team** facilitates communicating the plans, programs, strategies, and events initiated by the initiative Leadership Teams. Members are assigned to each initiative team and help to gather and disseminate information about the initiatives to ELCA members and others through a variety of media, including press releases. The churchwide staff person for this committee is Kurt Reichardt. The initiative communicators are:

1. *Deepen our worship life*: Kenneth Longfield
2. *Teach the faith*: Richard Summy
- 3a. *Witness to God’s action in the world (Evangelism)*: Frederick H. Gonnerman
- 3b. *Witness to God’s Action in the world (Moral Deliberation)*: Kimberly Groninga
4. *Strengthen one another in mission (Asset Mapping and Electronic Networking)*: Kathleen Reed
5. *Help the children*: Barbara Myers
6. *Connect with youth and young adults*: Jonathan Reitz
7. *Develop leaders for the next century*: Mark Staples

In November 1998, the ELCA Church Council passed a resolution urging all bishops to encourage their synod newsletter and *The Lutheran* magazine supplement editors to include

grass-roots initiative stories and eventually perhaps a regular initiatives column in their synod publications. The committee developed an initiatives emblem available to all communicators when highlighting the initiatives.

Activities in Synods and Congregations

The Initiatives are serving as a reference point for planning in congregations and synods as well as the churchwide organization. Projects and activities related to the Initiatives have begun in several synods and many congregations and will increase during the next biennium.

In 1998, the following synods received grants totaling \$75,000:

- ! The Grand Canyon Synod received \$15,000 to develop a *Youth Ministry Certification* process on three interrelated levels (Director of Youth Ministry, Youth Minister, and Youth Peer Minister) for the synod and Region 2.
- ! The Western North Dakota, Eastern North Dakota, and South Dakota Synods received \$20,000 for *Hope For The Prairie*, a transformational leadership event and series of workshops intended to inspire and equip congregational leaders to move churches from institutional preservation to missional vision.
- ! The South Dakota Synod received \$3,000 to facilitate the transition from high school to college and the integration of social, academic, and faith concerns in the lives of college students through *Lutheran Campus Ministry and Lutheran Student Movement Ministry to High School Students*.
- ! The Southwestern Minnesota Synod received \$6,000 in support of *Child In Our Hands Initiative*. Two events and a follow-up event will be held to equip congregations to more effectively pass on the faith to new generations.
- ! The Northern Great Lakes Synod received \$3,800 to facilitate a process to recruit first call candidates to serve in the synod's rural settings. The year-long process will include three *Call to Discipleship* conferences.
- ! The Greater Milwaukee Synod received \$4,000 to launch a *Lay Worker Certification Pilot* project to encourage, train, and formally recognize emerging lay leaders in Milwaukee's urban congregations.
- ! The La Crosse Area Synod received \$4,000 to conduct a week-long *Youth Leadership Lab* for 30 high school students.
- ! The West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod received \$10,000 to explore and develop appropriate models of cooperative ministry between and among Lutheran and Presbyterian congregations in the Potomac Highlands of West Virginia. The *Eastern Panhandle Cooperative Parishes* will explore possible working models for implementation in 33 congregations.
- ! The Caribbean Synod received \$9,200 to facilitate a leadership development process that will address and involve *Multicultural Leaders for the Year 2000*. The process will include an interchange and an immersion experience between Caribbean and mainland Lutheran youth groups.

Additional grants for Initiatives-related projects and activities are scheduled to be announced in May 1999.

In 1999, the following synods received grants totaling \$89,300:

- ! The Northwest Washington Synod received \$4,000 to facilitate the development and support of catechumenate ministries in congregations. This two-year process of *Growing a Catechumenal Synod* will involve training of clergy and lay teams and development of a liturgy for bringing together all the newly baptized throughout the synod for celebration and instruction by the bishop.
- ! The Grand Canyon Synod received \$5,500 to support *Lutheran Campus Ministry Youth Leadership Development* which proposes to provide programs for the youth of the synod with the intent of discovering youth leadership candidates, train potential candidates for youth ministry, and place them in youth ministry position in local congregations.
- ! The synods of Region 3 received \$20,000 for *Mission 2000, Moving Off the Map*, a transformational leadership event and series of workshops intended to inspire and equip congregational leaders to move churches from institutional preservation to missional vision.
- ! The Central States Synod received \$10,000 to launch *Resourcing for Reaching the NeXt Generations* through which the synod will create and nurture a virtual community of evangelists to be in outreach to young adults (ages 18-32) in the synod. This virtual community will include an interactive chat room, a resource page, and a bulletin board of virtual open space.
- ! The Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod received \$13,000 in support of *Leadership for the New Millennium*. The goal of this new initiative is to develop leaders for the next century through workshops and seminars for young adults and multi-ethnic leaders.
- ! The Northwest Synod of Wisconsin received \$3,000 to host *Youth Candidacy Dinners* for pastors and high school age youth to encourage the youth to consider roster ministry.
- ! The East-Central Synod of Wisconsin received \$8,800 to facilitate cooperation and coordination among congregations in an overall effort to provide safe haven services for children from birth through age 18. Among other activities, the *Central City Appleton Safe Haven for Children* established an emergency fund for children.
- ! The New England Synod received \$1,000 in support of *Call to Discipleship, Readiness Phase*, a retreat for 10–15 key leaders whose goal was to draft a synod-wide emphasis in support of the “Teach the Faith” initiative.
- ! The Slovak Zion Synod received \$6,000 to provide scholarship assistance for congregational members to participate in *Evangelism Training* for the purposes of assisting members to identify more effectively and reach out to the unchurched and to increase community awareness of Slovak Zion congregations.
- ! The Allegheny Synod received \$10,000 in support of a three-year process for equipping leaders to transform congregations into effective missional communities of faith. The *Path to Missional Effectiveness* process will consist of teaching the marks of a missional community, providing tools and resources to equip leaders in the use of information, and providing ongoing support and encouragement for leaders in transforming congregations.
- ! The Florida-Bahamas Synod received \$8,000 to institutionalize a *Academy for Congregational Leadership* as a systemic intervention to empower rostered and congregational leadership in dealing with challenges of ministry and mission in the 21st century.

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE
CHURCH COUNCIL**

WHEREAS, Jesus modeled a concern for children when he said, "Let the little children come to me, and do not stop them; for it is to such as these that the kingdom of God belongs" (Mark 10:14, NRSV);

WHEREAS, more than 14 million children under age 18 and five million under age six in the U.S. live in poverty, a deplorable condition made more severe by reductions in public assistance (U.S. Bureau of Census, unpublished data, March 1998);

WHEREAS, 4.2 million children experience severe to moderate hunger (U.S. Department of Agriculture);

WHEREAS, 11.3 million children through age 18 have no health insurance (Children's Defense Fund, 1997 census data);

WHEREAS, homelessness has increased disproportionately among children (study of the National Coalition for the Homeless);

WHEREAS, every day more than three children die as a result of abuse or neglect (National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse, 1996 survey); and

WHEREAS, an average of 14 children die each day from gunfire (Children's Defense Fund); therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America urge congregations to work toward a Christ-centered, positive environment for children in families, congregations, and communities, and

1. pray for the well-being of all children, but in particular for the poorest and most at risk;
2. declare our congregations as "safe havens" for all children;
3. develop creative programs to meet the needs of children in the congregation and community with special emphasis on those who are hungry, homeless, abused, lonely, and subject to violence;
4. advocate in collaboration with advocacy offices of this church in support of public policy that advances the well-being of children and their families and in opposition to policies that harm them; and
5. work collaboratively with other congregations, Lutheran social ministry organizations, and groups that strive to help children thrive.

Chair *pro tem* Butler announced that the assembly would hear reports from the two *Initiatives for a New Century* that include a churchwide focus, and indicated that an update on all the initiatives was printed in Section IV of the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*. She introduced the first report, on Safe Havens for Children, saying that congregations would be urged to become Safe Havens and seek to learn about the challenges facing children in their own communities. "It is not just children that need our help," she asserted, "but that children help us to see God's determination to overcome all the evils that threaten or harm human life. In the report that follows, we will learn more about the creative ways congregations are and continue to be Safe Havens."

Assembly members also were directed to an opportunity to see a Safe Haven in action in Hall B throughout the assembly. At this exhibit, children created world hunger bowls, participated in music, arts, and crafts, and heard stories read aloud by Church Council members, bishops, and other volunteers.

She welcomed Ms. Joanne Negstad, president of Lutheran Services in America and chair of the "Help the Children 'Safe Haven' Initiative," who would present information on ways that congregations are bringing the initiative to life. She also introduced members of the task

force for this initiative, who were standing at floor microphones to help present the report. They were Ms. Kay S. Bengston, Ms. Lori Claudio, Bishop Mark S. Hanson, Ms. Barbara Myers, Mr. John J. Scibilia, and Ms. Lita Brusick Johnson.

Ms. Negstad addressed the assembly by first recalling recent newspaper headlines reporting shootings at Columbine High School and a California Day Care facility. She recalled Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson introducing the "Help the Children Initiative" to the 1997 Churchwide Assembly by saying, "The social upheavals of our time and the growing gap between rich and poor have been especially damaging to the lives of children and families. As we prepare for a new millennium, we must assure the youngest and the most vulnerable members of our world that they have a future."

Here are just a few of the ways that ELCA congregations and synods are bringing "Help the Children" Initiative to life, and are turning "We will" statements of the Initiative into vibrant realities: "We will" call on every congregation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to declare itself a Safe Haven for children and youth. "We will" help the children. Then, with the task force members, she narrated a brief videotape with the following information.

"We often hear the painful question, 'There are so many problems facing so many children and their families today, what can just one person do?' One caring adult just might be all it takes to make a difference in a child's life. A study by Search Institute demonstrates that having even one positive relationship with a non-parent adult can make a amazing difference in a child's social, moral, and academic development and self-esteem. The power of one tutoring program is a mission of St. James Lutheran Church in Crystal, Minnesota. The program was developed in conjunction with the four-school area learning center as part of the healthy community's—healthy youth initiative underway in the school district. Adult volunteers are paired with second or third grade children who are struggling academically, and who have been chosen to participate in the program. Members of St. James are deeply committed to this ministry in their community, connecting one adult with one child, and helping children, one relationship at a time.

"'We will' ask the 11,000 congregations' Safe Havens to build upon their assets and resources within the context of their local communities as they provide support and nurture to children, their families, and caregivers. 'We will' help the children. There is a Safe Haven in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The St. Barnabas Center for Ministry is a joint ministry venture between the Lower Susquehanna Synod, the Episcopal Diocese of Central Pennsylvania, and St. Paul Episcopal Church, a predominantly African-American congregation in the city of Harrisburg. At the St. Barnabas Center, a Summer Rainbow program offers an eight-week full day camp for children who have completed grades four, five, and six. Through interviews with neighborhood parents and caregivers, a task force determined there was a real need for a program that would provide full day care for those children who were too old for a babysitter, but too young to be alone. While counselors provide day-to-day supervision, volunteers are a necessary link in the program. Volunteers from neighboring ELCA congregations provide meals and snacks, and lead activities, providing a Safe Haven for the children who reside in the neighborhood around the St. Barnabas Center as an ongoing process. As new programs emerge, the Center sees its ministry as a way of continually reaching out to those children from broken streets and broken homes—children who live in a world torn by the social upheavals of poverty and change.

"'We will' redouble our efforts to aid children, youth, and young adults at risk for racism, hunger, violence, and poverty, both at home and throughout the world. 'We will' help the children.

“Over the last three decades, the United States has become a far richer nation, but its children are remaining poor. Child poverty has risen rapidly, including among children in working families. One in five children in this country lives in poverty.

“There is a Safe Haven for children in San Bernardino, California. Here is a story written by an eight-year-old girl named Marissa. Marissa lives in the central city of San Bernardino.

“‘One day there was a little rat who did not have a mom and dad. And he was very sad because he was very hungry, and no one believed that he was hungry. He was even more sad because he did not have money to buy cheese, and that is why he was really, really sad. One day he died because of sadness, coldness, and hunger, and also because he did not have his parents’ love.’

“Many children in the central city of San Bernardino go home to struggling families—people without much money and food, people with drug problems, people with gang ties and prison records. Seeing the need, five congregations in the San Bernardino area came together to revive the presence of the Lutheran church in the central city. With support from the Pacifica Synod and the ELCA Division for Outreach, Central City Lutheran Mission was developed. The parish is committed to creating a leadership development program for youth and to providing a Safe Haven for children in an area that has been impacted by poverty. In cooperation with a Jobs for Youth program, teenage youth receive training and pay to tutor younger children at the mission. Many of the teenagers are homeless and most can barely read or write. Yet, when they are entrusted to teach young children, the teens are highly motivated to improve their own basic skills. As a result, teenagers have meaningful work and a sense of responsibility while helping to educate the little ones. All of the children receive hot meals, snacks, help, love, and caring.

“‘We will’ expand by at least 50 per year our network of pre-schools and day schools which often serve as islands of hope. ‘We will’ help the children.

“Since the adoption of the Help the Children Initiative at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly, 113 congregations have opened new early childhood education centers, pre-schools, and child care centers, as well as elementary schools. That brings the total of Lutheran schools to almost 2,300. Everyone of these Safe Havens for children is an island of hope in the community.

“‘We will’ advocate with the government for public measures that support the well-being of children. ‘We will’ help the children. There is a Safe Haven for children in Truckee, California. Once a month, the members of Truckee Lutheran-Presbyterian Church take time out from their coffee hour conversations to write letters to Senator Diane Feinstein concerning WIC funding. WIC is the special supplementary nutrition program for women, infants, and children. Advocacy letter writing for poor and hungry people, especially children, is a vital part of the life of this joint Lutheran-Presbyterian mission congregation in the Sierra Pacific Synod. Using the gift of their citizenship for those who may not be able to help themselves has been something that this congregation has embraced and does with excitement and enthusiasm. One 88-year-old member writes regularly.

“‘We will’ advocate for and support our church’s efforts to meet the basic needs of children through social ministry organizations as they provide adoption, counseling, and caring services for children, and through the World Hunger program, which carries our concerns for children throughout the world. ‘We will’ help the children.

“There is a Safe Haven for children in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The commitment to be a Safe Haven for children has generated new energy, fresh ideas for the mission of Christ Ascension Lutheran Church, which has worship communities in the Mount Airy and Chestnut Hill sections of Philadelphia. The congregation took formal action at its 1999 annual meeting, affirming the congregation’s covenant with children. Inter-generational relationships, and education activities have been stepped up. The child care center, which already provides care for 65 children, is expanding to accommodate six more infants. Children in the global scene have not been forgotten. Members of the congregation are advocating that the United States sign the Ottawa Treaty to ban land mines that kill and maim children as they play in fields and open areas which have been mined in Asia, Africa, and Europe. During Lent, children and adults collected funds for the World Hunger Appeal, engaging in advocacy efforts with public representatives at all levels of government to urge that laws be enacted, resources expanded, and other public measures implemented. To support the well-being of children has been an important part of this congregation’s Safe Haven project. The congregation members react to the Safe Haven project enthusiastically, saying, ‘This is a way for the congregation to make a commitment to the needs of children in the community. We are able to communicate with them about what is safe and what feels safe.’ It is good to let children know that God cares for their safety.

“There is much work for us to do as we strive to provide programs and places where children can flourish. There are many more stories to tell. The signs of hope are clear and bright. Children are not just the future in the world; children are very much the present. They do not just receive from us; they give to us.

“Children at the model Safe Haven at this assembly are decorating hunger bowls as they learn about hunger at home and throughout the world. And they will be inviting you to give by rolling the Board of Pensions’ pink World Hunger piggy bank among us today.

“We invite you to come to the Safe Haven—thanks to those wonderful Colorado volunteers. I invite the Safe Haven children to join me on this corner of the stage. At the Safe Haven, you will experience the joy of children. You can exchange your coupons for a Puffkin®. You can receive a packet that will help your congregation in its journey with children.

“You may have met Terry Bowes at the Safe Haven—our coordinator for the Safe Haven project. I want to thank Terry Bowes for her creative, passionate, energetic leadership in this Initiative. These children are very patient because they thought they’d be on stage about half an hour ago. Little Eric and Andrew are three years old, and they’re looking for Mom, I believe.

“Bishop Anderson, we ask you to join us with the children. You gave this church and the world a great gift when you proposed this Initiative. Now the children have a gift for you in response. Amy Jean, here in the blue; Justin in the yellow shirt, and his little sister, Rachel; their hands are on this stole for Bishop Anderson. Now the children want to thank Bishop Anderson.”

Bishop Anderson returned to the platform so the children could place their stole around his neck.

Chair *pro tem* Butler thanked the task force members for their report, and asked Secretary Almen to introduce the text of the recommended action. Seeing no one at the microphones for discussion, Ms. Butler instructed the assembly to cast its vote.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-902; No-4

CA99.03.03

WHEREAS, Jesus modeled a concern for children when he said, "Let the little children come to me, and do not stop them; for it is to such as these that the kingdom of God belongs" (Mark 10:14, NRSV);

WHEREAS, more than 14 million children under age 18 and five million under age six in the U.S. live in poverty, a deplorable condition made more severe by reductions in public assistance (U.S. Bureau of Census, unpublished data, March 1998);

WHEREAS, 4.2 million children experience severe to moderate hunger (U.S. Department of Agriculture);

WHEREAS, 11.3 million children through age 18 have no health insurance (Children's Defense Fund, 1997 census data);

WHEREAS, homelessness has increased disproportionately among children (study of the National Coalition for the Homeless);

WHEREAS, every day more than three children die as a result of abuse or neglect (National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse, 1996 survey); and

WHEREAS, an average of 14 children die each day from gunfire (Children's Defense Fund); therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America urge congregations to work toward a Christ-centered, positive environment for children in families, congregations, and communities, and

- 1. pray for the well-being of all children, but in particular for the poorest and most at risk;**
- 2. declare our congregations as "safe havens" for all children;**
- 3. develop creative programs to meet the needs of children in the congregation and community with special emphasis on those who are hungry, homeless, abused, lonely, and subject to violence;**
- 4. advocate in collaboration with advocacy offices of this church in support of public policy that advances the well-being of children and their families and in opposition to policies that harm them; and**
- 5. work collaboratively with other congregations, Lutheran social ministry organizations, and groups that strive to help children thrive.**

2000 Congregations Program

References: Additional discussion on *Minutes*, page 483.

Chair *pro tem* Butler told assembly members they had an opportunity to peer into the new millennium and catch a vision of starting new congregations. "The Division for

Outreach has some exciting new ideas, based on historical patterns that will be familiar to each of us, she said before introducing the Rev. Richard A. Magnus, executive director of the Division for Outreach, and two members of his staff, the Rev. Robert S. Hoyt, director for program and new congregations, and the Rev. Kathie Bender Schwich, director for leadership for outreach ministries, to report on the “2000 Congregations” program.

The report was preceded by a short videotape overview of the program, after which Pastor Magnus described the program as an incredible opportunity. He described the United States as one of the world’s largest mission fields, with as many as 120 million people “who are not actively involved in a relationship with Jesus Christ.” He asserted that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has been gifted with the process of developing congregations that work, and with staff that coach and mentor new congregations to become significant centers for God’s mission. “We also have a rich history of congregations, which have, over their histories, started many new congregations. Now we have the opportunity to put these two gifts together,” to strengthen and multiply the number of new congregations that are developed, and the number of people who will become disciples of Jesus Christ.

“Staff in the Division for Outreach believe that, over a short period of time and with the cooperation of synods and congregations, the number of new congregation starts can be more than doubled than has been possible thus far in the life of this church. It is hoped that this will move this church to one that is both growing in numbers and involvement in God’s mission each year.” Pastor Magnus described how the program will work, saying, “As we have done in the past, we will work with our field staff, synod mission or outreach committees, and now increasingly with congregations, to increase this work. Through the field staff and synod committees, we will invite congregations to identify the field that they would like to reach out to, whether nearby or far away across the country; identify the best timing for that outreach; identify the process for raising the funds to do the outreach, and the process to identify support and encourage one of their own members to move into ministry. Only with increased recruitment of ministry leadership, both lay and ordained, will we be able to meet the goals of this program.”

Pastor Magnus expressed confidence that congregations will want to do this work, and that as congregations become more directly involved in the work, more members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will want to be involved in ministry. “We believe we are called to this work,” he said, “and we believe that, as a church, we have the capacity to raise our new congregational development activity so that over the next 20 years, we can begin 2,000 new congregations.” With the churchwide partners described above, the Division for Outreach will train staff and synod committees for this work during the next several months. He invited voting members to prayerfully consider how they, their congregations, and their synods, can work with the division as partners, deeply committed to extending what has already been done, “so that we enter the new millennium committed and prepared to provide through new and growing congregations the gift of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in diverse, colorful mission communities of Jesus Christ. Thanks in advance for your prayers and your partnership.”

Chair *pro tem* Butler expressed her thanks to Pastor Magnus. She then returned the chair back to Bishop Anderson. Bishop Anderson expressed his support for the “2000 Congregations” program, saying, “I think this idea of wedding local congregational initiative with the experience of the Division for Outreach is a really powerful combination.”

Report of the Memorials Committee

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 1-65 (Section I, pages 7, 17-18, 28); continued on *Minutes*, pages 274, 285, 492, 553.

Bishop Anderson called upon Mr. Carlos Peña and Ms. Beverly A. Peterson, co-chairs of the Memorials Committee, to introduce a number of the memorials forwarded from the 1998 and 1999 synodical assemblies and to note how these memorials would be presented. Mr. Peña said that the Memorials Committee had grouped similar memorials into categories. He called attention to the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, page 1, and indicated which categories would be considered separately and which would be considered *en bloc*. He also identified four categories of memorials that members of the assembly had requested be removed from *en bloc* consideration. These are Category 1a on “Called to Common Mission,” Category 9 on abortion, Category 18a on non-rostered clergy, and Category 20 on the ordination of non-celibate gay and lesbian persons. He announced that there also was an additional synodical memorial for Category 13 printed in the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VIII, on page 32. He noted that this memorial was inadvertently omitted from the published report of the committee’s work.

Bishop Anderson indicated that there was time available to deal with several recommendations from the committee.

Category 24: Use of Lutheran World Relief Coffee

Reference: *1999 Pre -Assembly Report*, Section VI, page 65.

A. La Crosse Area Synod (5L) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, Lutheran congregations practice ministries of hospitality and care in a great variety of ways and with many people, and these ministries often include the sharing of food and coffee fellowship; and

WHEREAS, coffee purchased through traditional sources is marketed through trade structures which do not adequately reimburse the grower, or provide sufficient protection to the natural environment; and

WHEREAS, Lutheran World Relief/Equal Exchange coffee guarantees a fair price to the coffee grower, is a high-quality, delicious beverage that coffee drinkers enjoy, and returns a percentage of the purchase price to support the hunger relief work of LWR, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the La Crosse Area Synod of the ELCA encourage its 80 member congregations to make the change from purchasing publicly traded coffee to purchasing Lutheran World Relief coffee, both for congregational use and for purchase by church members; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the voting members of the La Crosse Area Synod’s 1999 assembly memorialize the ELCA to adopt this resolution when it meets in its Churchwide Assembly in 1999.

BACKGROUND

Coffee is one of the most heavily traded commodities in the world. Yet coffee growers, estimated to be some 20 million people in countries near the equator, often struggle to make a simple living.

Lutheran World Relief’s coffee project is one effort to address the poverty of coffee growers. This project is undertaken through partnership with Equal Exchange, a worker-owned fair trade organization. The project is an opportunity for consumers to make a positive difference for small farmers in a global economy.

Congregations that participate in the Lutheran World Relief Equal Exchange project may build awareness of the global economy, the challenges faced by small farmers, and the complex issues entailed in economic justice. They also provided to support small farmers in building a sustainable future.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America's commitment to corporate social responsibility also beckons the individual members of this church to seek ways as consumers and shareholders to encourage and advocate for just practices in corporations which own and manage coffee production and trade worldwide.

Mr. Peña directed the assembly to page 65 of Section VI in the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report* to review the original memorial of the La Crosse Area Synod, the background information, and the recommendation of the Memorials Committee. He then introduced the recommendation of the Memorials Committee.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To affirm the concern of the La Crosse Area Synod for small coffee farmers and support fair trade practices that provide a just return for their labor; and

To encourage ELCA congregations and individuals to learn about the Lutheran World Relief Coffee Project, support it by purchasing Equal Exchange Coffee for use in churches and homes, and use the participation in this project to discuss issues of economic life.

The Rev. Natanael F. Lizarazo [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] rose to speak in support of the motion, saying, "I come from the country of Colombia, and I know from experience the [impact the] Lutheran church has in the area where the earthquake hit last January. That was the coffee region of Colombia, so I strongly support this project because it will benefit people from all over the world where the coffee is being produced, so I also strongly support that, besides enjoying good coffee from whatever place in this world. The opportunity will be used to really discuss the issues that lie behind the injustices for my country of Colombia, and I know that Lutheran World Relief is connected to some places in Colombia. It will bring livelihood and sustainability for those small farmers."

Ms. Clare Intress [Rocky Mountain Synod] spoke in favor of the motion, saying, "I think this is a wonderful resolution. And for environmental awareness, I hope and encourage these farmers that we are getting their Equal Exchange Coffee from, that they consider growing shade-grown coffee, which is much gentler on the environment of the tropical areas."

Ms. Shirley Gangstad [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] asked, "How do we in a small town in southeastern Minnesota get this coffee?" Bishop Anderson invited a response from the Division for Church in Society. The Rev. William E. Saunders [Southern Ohio Synod] responded, "I assume you can do it with this paper that is available over at the Augsburg Fortress display. Take some of these home and we can all share these with our congregations."

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-934; No-22

CA99.03.04 To affirm the concern of the La Crosse Area Synod for small coffee farmers and support fair trade practices that provide a just return for their labor; and

To encourage ELCA congregations and individuals to learn about the Lutheran World Relief Coffee Project, support it by purchasing Equal Exchange Coffee for use in churches and homes, and use the participation in this project to discuss issues of economic life.

Category 2b: Youth Violence

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 29-30.

A. Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod (8A) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS Jesus Himself showed us the importance of children to the Kingdom of God when He said, "Let the little children come to me; do not stop them; for it is to such as these that the kingdom of God belongs" (Mark 10:14 NRSV); and

WHEREAS Old Testament scriptures attest to the wisdom of proper instruction for children for it is written, "Train children in the right way, and when old, they will not stray" (Proverbs 22:6 NRSV); and

WHEREAS the Lutheran Church has historically stood up for truth in spite of official disagreement starting with the Reformation itself; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to establish a commission composed of both clergy and laity for the purpose of studying and reporting, no later than the churchwide assembly in 2001, on positive ways that we as individuals, congregations, and society at large may effectively work to eliminate youth violence.

BACKGROUND

In the wider society, as well as within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, much attention and study has already been given to what can be done to eliminate violence, especially among youth. In 1994 an ELCA Message on "Community Violence" was adopted, which among other things called for initiatives that "stem the proliferation of guns in our streets, schools, and homes; counter the 'culture of violence' that pervades our national culture and media; build strong anti-violence coalitions in our neighborhoods and communities; develop peer mediation skills in the schools, and protect our youth from the epidemic of violence through equitable law enforcement, and the promotion of education, social programs, anti-drug programs, and real job opportunities."

In 1997 ELCA Youth Ministries produced a retreat planning resource, "Beyond Violence: Empowering Youth to Make a Difference."

A commission to study and report on how we may effectively work to eliminate youth violence would likely repeat what has already been done through ELCA auspices, as well as the many studies this issue is currently generating in the wider society. Furthermore, establishing such a commission would require the churchwide assembly to authorize new

spending for such a purpose. Therefore, rather than such a commission, members and congregations could be encouraged to draw upon the resources that have already been developed, and to work with others to address causal factors in their own localities, including the economic factors addressed in the proposed ELCA social statement, “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All” and in the background study, “Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread.”

Mr. Peña introduced the recommendation of the Memorials Committee concerning youth violence.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To thank the Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod for raising before us the grave social concern of youth violence;

To express the deep concern of this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for the youth of our world, “especially those at risk from racism, sexism, hunger, violence, drugs, and poverty, including those who are in prison” (*Initiatives For a New Century, “Youth and Young Adults”*);

To acknowledge the ongoing work of ELCA churchwide units, synods, congregations, agencies and institutions, and parachurch organizations which support young people, promote healthy asset-building activities and relationships, address those issues which place youth at risk, and advocate for young people;

To refer this request to the Division for Congregational Ministries, the Division for Church in Society, the Lutheran Youth Organization, and other units, to assess current resources available and develop other appropriate responses that deal with the core issues of violence; and

To encourage individuals, families, Lutheran youth organizations, and congregations of this church to utilize existing ELCA resources to support a study leading to local initiatives.

Bishop Paull E. Spring [Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod] indicated that the original memorial had been adopted by his synodical assembly. He spoke in favor of the recommended action before the house, saying that it fulfills the intent of the synodical memorial in an appropriate way.

The Rev. Darlene B. Muschett [Upstate New York Synod] moved to amend the resolution by adding the word “abuse” in line four. Mr. Peña indicated that this would be considered by the Memorials Committee to be a friendly amendment. Bishop Anderson noted that, if the word “abuse” was added, the reference to “*Initiatives For a New Century, ‘Youth and Young Adults’*” should be deleted since this clause would no longer be a quotation from that source.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes - 887; No - 91

CARRIED: To insert the word “abuse” in line four between “violence” and “drugs” and to delete the reference to *Initiatives for a New Century*, “Youth and Young Adults.”

The Rev. Peter A. Pettit [Pacifica Synod] rose to speak in favor of the amended motion, “especially in light of the renewed appearance of symbols of hatred and separatism at Columbine High School as the high school reopened this week. I would hope that those who are directed among our churchwide agencies to explore resources for combating violence that, in addition to the roots of violence which are mentioned in the motion, they also would give very specific attention to those groups within our society which teach and promulgate and encourage violence among and by our young people. I do not propose an amendment, but ask that those who work under this resolution give specific attention to those groups and ways in which we can oppose them.”

Mr. Wesley R. Johnson [Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod] spoke in favor of the amended motion, and expressed concern about the time element. The memorial of the Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod called for a report on possible responses, to be presented to the 2001 Churchwide Assembly. He indicated that congregations should be encouraged to immediately implement ideas to combat violence and not wait until a study has been completed. Bishop Anderson reassured him that the action before the house, if adopted, would be implemented immediately.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes - 976; No - 6

CA99.03.05 To thank the Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod for raising before us the grave social concern of youth violence;

To express the deep concern of this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for the youth of our world, especially those at risk from racism, sexism, hunger, violence, abuse, drugs, and poverty, including those who are in prison;

To acknowledge the ongoing work of ELCA churchwide units, synods, congregations, agencies and institutions, and parachurch organizations which support young people, promote healthy asset-building activities and relationships, address those issues which place youth at risk;

To refer this request to the Division for Congregational Ministries, the Division for Church in Society, the Lutheran Youth Organization, and other units, to assess current resources available and develop other appropriate responses that deal with the core issues of violence; and

To encourage individuals, families, Lutheran youth organizations, and congregations of this church to utilize existing ELCA resources to support a study leading to local initiatives.

Category 6a: Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 37-40; continued on *Minutes*, page 274.

A. Eastern North Dakota Synod (3B) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, at the 1998 Eastern North Dakota Synod Assembly in Jamestown a resolution was passed encouraging all congregations of the Synod to study the issues involved in the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign, which is part of a worldwide movement to cancel the crushing international debt of the poorest countries by the year 2000; and

WHEREAS, Jubilee 2000: USA Education Packets were distributed last September to all pastors of the Eastern North Dakota Synod; and

WHEREAS, the congregations of the Eastern North Dakota Synod have had several months to study this issue; and

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America through actions by the board of the Division for Church in Society and by the ELCA Church Council, is now a participant in and supporter of the Jubilee 2000 Campaign; and

WHEREAS, the concept of a jubilee cancellation of debt is supported by many other churches and church leaders, such as the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), The Episcopal Church, the Lutheran World Federation, and Pope John Paul II; and

WHEREAS, Bread for the World's 1999 Offering of Letters is "Proclaim Jubilee: Break the Chains of Debt," and the Most Reverend Archbishop Desmond Tutu has asked that we support this effort of Bread for the World; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Eastern North Dakota Synod Assembly encourage congregations and individuals to write their congressional representatives and other key leaders (such as the heads of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the Secretary of the Treasury) in order to demonstrate support of this monumental effort to remove one of the key obstacles to alleviating poverty and hunger in poor nations; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Eastern North Dakota Synod Assembly urges the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to support, by resolution, the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign.

B. Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod (4D) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the year 2000, the last year of this millennium, has been designated as a year of thanksgiving by the United Nations and is also a Year of Jubilee; and

WHEREAS, the intent of a Year of Jubilee is to forgive the debts of the poor and "to proclaim liberty throughout the land" (Leviticus 25:10); and

WHEREAS, enormous and burdensome debts are being borne by many, many nations of the Third World to the nations of the First World, particularly the United States; and

WHEREAS, there has been raised again and again by church and religious leaders that something be done for the poor and that the debts of the Third World be forgiven; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana synod petition the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to formally join the call for this Year of Jubilee and call for the elimination of all debts of Third World nations to the United States who have had elections in the preceding three years.

C. Western Iowa Synod (5E) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign is part of a world wide movement, active in over 60 countries, seeking to cancel the crushing debt of impoverished countries by the new millennium; and

WHEREAS the debt service by poor countries such as Tanzania is diverting resources from education and medical services; and

WHEREAS the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America Division for Global Mission has endorsed the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that members of the Western Iowa Synod, in keeping with the biblical concept of the Jubilee, be alerted to the issues involved and encourage the President of the United States and members of Congress to push for dramatic action on debt cancellation for the most impoverished countries; and

RESOLVED, that the Western Iowa Synod in assembly memorialize the ELCA Churchwide Assembly, in keeping with the biblical concept of the Jubilee, alert this Church to the issues involved and encourage dramatic action on debt cancellation for the most impoverished countries.

D. Northwest Synod of Wisconsin (5H) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America joined the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign in 1998, the world-wide movement of faith groups and other concerned people seeking to cancel the international debts of the poorest nations by the Year 2000, which is based on the Priestly Code of Leviticus that describes a model of restoration in the community in which slaves are freed, land is returned to original owners, and debts are canceled; and

WHEREAS, debt is a problem for the 41 most heavily indebted countries who are forced to divert scarce government resources from basic health care and education to debt repayment, so that in Nicaragua, with an average annual income of \$390, each child born owes \$2,000, and in the 33 poorest African nations which owe \$220 billion, debt cancellation could save the lives of 21 million children by 2000 (per Jubilee 2000: USA, 222 East Capitol St., NE, Washington, D.C., 20003-1036); and

WHEREAS, in previous decades, Western governments often loaned money for political reasons to undemocratic or corrupt governments whose leaders squandered money on badly designed projects, military spending or personal corruption, resulting in rescheduled debts of unpaid principle and compounded interest far beyond their market value; and

WHEREAS, the debt burden inflames social conflicts, and motivates poor countries to lower labor standards, and weaken enforcement of environmental standards, which are costly to the U. S. because of needed humanitarian interventions, and by the loss of jobs and markets for U.S. goods and investments; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northwest Synod of Wisconsin, ELCA, participate in the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign by encouraging congregations to use the resources available from the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign, from Bread for the World, and from the Wisconsin Council of Churches Jubilee 2000: USA project, "Jesus, Jubilee and the Reign of God," to study about and pray for the needs of highly indebted countries; and be it further

RESOLVED, that congregations and members of the Northwest Synod of Wisconsin, ELCA, be encouraged to urge members of Congress to pass debt cancellation legislation that includes mechanisms to prevent recurrence of such debt, allows ordinary citizens to participate in determining the direction and priorities of their national economics, and ensures that debt relief does not perpetuate poverty or environmental degradation; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Northwest Synod of Wisconsin, ELCA, memorialize the voting members of The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America Churchwide Assembly, meeting in August, 1999, to adopt and implement this resolution on a churchwide basis.

E. La Crosse Area Synod (5L) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America joined the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign in 1998, the worldwide movement of faith groups and other concerned people seeking to cancel the international debts of the poorest nations by the Year 2000; and

WHEREAS the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign is based on the Priestly Code of Leviticus 25 that describes a model of restoration in the community in which slaves are freed, land is returned to original owners and debts are canceled; and

WHEREAS, in the 41 most heavily indebted countries, such as in Nicaragua where the annual per capita income is \$390 and in the 33 poorest African nations which have a total debt of \$220 billion, governments are forced to divert scarce resources from basic health care and education to debt repayment; and

WHEREAS, in previous decades Western governments often loaned money for political reasons to undemocratic or corrupt governments whose leaders squandered money on badly designed projects, military spending or personal corruption, resulting in rescheduled debts of unpaid principal and compounded interest far beyond their market value; and

WHEREAS, the debt burden inflames social conflicts, motivates poor countries to lower labor standards, and weakens enforcement of environmental standards; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the La Crosse Area Synod, participate in the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign by encouraging congregations to use the resources available from the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign and from Bread for the World to study about and pray for the needs of highly indebted countries; and be it further

RESOLVED, that congregations and members of the La Crosse Area Synod, be encouraged to urge members of Congress to pass debt cancellation legislation that includes mechanisms to promote social, political, and economic reform, including measures to prevent recurrence of such debt, to allow ordinary citizens to participate in determining the direction and priorities of their national economies and to ensure that debt relief does not perpetuate poverty or environmental degradation, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the La Crosse Area Synod, memorialize the voting members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America Churchwide Assembly, in August 1999, to support the Jubilee 2000 campaign.

F. Lower Susquehanna Synod (8D) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, hundreds of millions of people live in poverty in Africa, Latin America, and Asia and continue to struggle under a crushing burden of debt now totaling over \$200 billion, debt accrued often by corrupt governments that are no longer in power; and

WHEREAS, this debt prevents the people of the developing world from enjoying an equal share of the fruits of the earth, prevents them from living in dignity and meeting their families' basic needs, by siphoning away funds needed to strengthen human capacity, weakening civil society, and inducing a downward spiral of economic, social, and political decline; and

WHEREAS, many poor countries spend more on debt repayment to bilateral government creditors, multilateral agencies such as the International Monetary Fund, and others than they do on education and health care; and

WHEREAS, repayment of the annual interest alone is often more than the country earns in export sales; and

WHEREAS, "Jubilee" is a biblical concept for forgiving debts and freeing slaves every 50 years (Leviticus 25-27); and

WHEREAS, Jubilee 2000, a worldwide grassroots movement, including the Lutheran World Federation, Lutheran World Relief, and the National Council of Churches, calls for canceling the poorest countries' debt by the year 2000, in order to create a debt-free start for a billion people; and

WHEREAS, the Jubilee 2000 Campaign is consonant with the ELCA's commitment as expressed in its 1999 social statement calling upon ELCA member churches to "...work with and on behalf of the poor, the powerless, and those who suffer, using its power and influence with political and economic decision-making bodies to develop and advocate policies that seek to advance justice, peace, and the care of creation"; and

WHEREAS, 33 of these highly indebted countries are in Africa with one of them being Tanzania, in which our companion Konde Diocese is located; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that members of the Lower Susquehanna Synod and other synods increasingly be informed about debt cancellation as proposed by Jubilee 2000 and include this effort in their daily prayers; and be it further

RESOLVED, that congregations and members of the Lower Susquehanna Synod and other synods be encouraged to urge members of Congress to support House bill HR 1095 and its companion bill in the Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED, that petitions be made available during the 1999 Synod Assembly, in order to allow voting members and visitors to sign their names in support of Jubilee 2000; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Lower Susquehanna Synod memorialize the voting members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America Churchwide Assembly, meeting in August 1999, to adopt and implement this resolution.

G. Caribbean Synod (9F) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, 41 countries are defined by the World Bank as “Heavily Indebted Poor Countries” and owe over \$220 billion in foreign debts; and

WHEREAS, the main creditors are the world’s wealthiest nations, such as the U.S., Britain, Japan, France, and Germany. Other important creditors include the large international financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the InterAmerican Bank for Development which are controlled primarily by the world’s wealthiest nations; and

WHEREAS, each year, developing countries pay the West nine times more in service to the debt than they receive in grants; and

WHEREAS, each person in developing countries owes about \$400 to the West—much more than a year’s wage for many; and

WHEREAS, in order to pay foreign debts, many poor countries are being forced to direct government resources away from health-care, education, and other vital services; and

Whereas, in 1960, the income of the wealthiest 20 percent of the world’s population was 30 times greater than that of the poorest 20 percent. Today it is over 60 times greater; and

WHEREAS, Jubilee 2000 calls for the cancellation of the backlog of unpayable debt of the poorest countries. Such a cancellation will not eradicate poverty but will remove a barrier to progress and justice; and

WHEREAS, the year 2000 could signal the beginning of dramatic improvements in health-care, education, employment, and development for countries crippled by debt; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Caribbean Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America affirm the campaign Jubilee 2000 proposal and memorialize the ELCA assembly to encourage the 206th congress to pass specific measures to:

- write off bilateral debt owed to the U. S. government by the poorest developing countries;
- require greater disclosure and accountability by leaders, especially multilateral development banks such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund;
- reform the official debt relief program for the “Heavily Indebted Poor Countries” initiated by the World Bank, the InterAmerican Bank for Development, and International Monetary Fund in 1996, so as to provide faster and deeper debt relief on easier and more economically sustainable terms to more poor countries.

BACKGROUND

The Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign, part of a worldwide movement to cancel the crushing international debt of impoverished countries by the new millennium, addresses a crucial matter that has been the focus of education and deliberation in society and in the Church. The campaign’s basic orientation is consistent with the ELCA’s commitment, as expressed in *The Church in Society: A Lutheran Perspective*:

...this church shall...work with and on behalf of the poor, the powerless, and those who suffer, using its power and influence with political and economic decision-making bodies to develop and advocate policies that seek to advance justice, peace, and the care of creation.

The international, ecumenical, and interfaith scope of this campaign is compelling; many of our Lutheran partner churches in impoverished countries have provided first-hand accounts of the devastating human and environmental toll that further repayment of overwhelming debt would involve. Furthermore, the *communio* understanding of the Lutheran World Federation calls us as partner churches to stand in solidarity with them as they struggle with issues of poverty and underdevelopment.

African countries now spend twice as much on average repaying foreign debt as on providing health care. The United Nations Development Program in 1997 stated, "Relieved of their annual debt repayments, the severely indebted countries could use the funds for investments that in Africa alone would save the lives of about 21 million children by 2000 and provide 90 million girls and women with access to basic education."

The 1999 social statement on economic life expresses concern about international debt burdens:

When a developing country becomes heavily indebted, the poorest are usually the most adversely affected. A huge share of a country's income must be used to pay off debt, which may have been incurred unjustly or under corrupt rulers. Structural adjustment programs to pay off debt typically divert funds from much needed educational, health, and environmental efforts, and from infrastructures for economic development.... We call for...reduction of overwhelming international debt burdens in ways that do not impose further deprivations on the poor, and cancellation of some or all debt where severe indebtedness immobilizes a country's economy....

A recommendation of the Memorials Committee adopted at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly affirmed the concern expressed in the 1996 memorial of the Minneapolis Area Synod about the crushing debt burdens of many developing countries and the need for comprehensive international action to assist them to move to a position of sound economic growth and stability. At its November 1997 meeting, the ELCA Church Council approved ELCA participation in the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign.

At its March 12-14, 1998, meeting, the board of the Division for Church in Society affirmed the Jubilee 2000: USA Platform and further acted to receive, affirm, and transmit to the ELCA Church Council the division's report on findings and conclusions regarding the this church's ongoing participation in the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign.

These actions are judged to be in accordance with the tradition established by the predecessor church bodies of linking peace, justice, and development. The social statement, "For Peace in God's World" (ELCA, 1995) reminds us that we must "insist that peace and economic justice belong together. Massive hunger and poverty, alongside abundance and wealth, violate the bonds of our common humanity. Such economic disparities are a cause of conflict and war and spur our efforts to build just economic relationships necessary for peace. Justice points toward an economy ordered in ways that: respect human dignity; provide the necessities of life; distribute goods and burdens fairly and equitably; and are compatible with a life-sustaining ecosystem." Although the ELCA statement, "For Peace in God's World," does not take a position on debt cancellation, it does advocate providing "assistance with debt management" and protection for "poor nations."

In an effort to respond faithfully to the concern expressed by the 1997 ELCA Churchwide Assembly about the crushing debt burdens of many developing countries, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America joined in partnership with Bread for the World, The Episcopal Church, Lutheran World Relief, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), and other members of the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign in supporting House of Representatives (H.R.) 1095, "The Debt Relief for Poverty Reduction Act of 1999."

Mr. Peña introduced the recommendation of the Memorials Committee regarding the memorial concerning the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To affirm the concern for international debt reduction and the alleviation of poverty and hunger in poor nations raised by the Eastern North Dakota Synod, Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod, Northwest Synod of Wisconsin, La Crosse Area Synod, Lower Susquehanna Synod, Western Iowa Synod, and the Caribbean Synod;

To express support for the work of the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign promoting education and advocacy on international debt issues and to affirm continued ELCA participation in the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign; and

To transmit this action as information to the synods.

Bishop Mark B. Herbener [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod] spoke in favor of this resolution by calling attention to the situation of his synod's Companion Synod. "Sierra Leone has suffered mightily. It is the poorest nation in our world. It has suffered terribly under civil war, a situation in which the United Nations Commissioner on Refugees has called a situation far worse than anything in Kosovo. Yet it gains almost no attention because it is in West Africa. Our church has a companion church there, and we know the suffering of those people. We have learned of the maiming of children. We have pleaded from our synod for a 'Marshall Plan' for West Africa. We recently received word from West Africa saying [Jubilee 2000] is probably the most commendable thing that could happen to that world. I want to urge the passage of this resolution. I want to urge the passage of support also for a 'Marshall Plan' for West Africa."

Ms. Judy Wagner St. Pierre [Virginia Synod] said, "I want all congregations to be aware that Jubilee 2000 material should have been received, which outlines HR 1095. Many people are concerned that we are forgiving the debt without making sure that these countries realize that they need to make changes in some of their economic and political processes. The Women of the ELCA, at its triennial convention last month, approved this plan and support Jubilee 2000. I urge all of the voting members to go back to your congregations and discuss this and be advocates on behalf of the rest of the world. This is very much biblically based."

Ms. Barbara A. Miller [Southeast Michigan Synod] rose to speak in favor of the motion, saying, "To piggyback on what an earlier speaker said, I think this movement is really the underpinning for development and progress in probably all of our companion synods. We have agreed to be a companion with them. This is biblically based. And it will cost us each perhaps 33 cents, the amount of money that some people earn in a day in some of the countries which need this relief."

Ms. Bonita O. Karr [Northwestern Pennsylvania] urged the assembly to adopt this resolution. “I am from West Africa. I was not there when the civil war broke out, but I had to go back and get my kids. It was very bad out there. So, I know what everybody is going through and I urge people to vote on this and make it pass.”

The Rev. John K. Stendahl [New England Synod], in addition to urging adoption of the motion, exhorted strong follow-up action from congregations and individuals “for the sake of our identity and calling as a church.” Adoption of this resolution would be “a ‘no’ to the demonic sense that we are powerless against the forces and economics and markets and finance—that we have a choice. It is also, importantly, a sign that we who have shown that we can be concerned about what hands are laid on the heads of our pastors and candidates for ordination, also care yet more passionately about the forces that press down on the heads and lives of our sisters and brothers in this world.”

The Rev. Lucy A. Kolin [Sierra Pacific Synod] said, “I come here standing with a small cloud of witnesses from my own congregation, and from others in the Sierra Pacific Synod, who are persons who have come here from various parts of Africa. And they want you to know that not only would passage of this memorial make a difference in their homelands, it also would make a difference in their own lives, in their ability to have a just and sustainable life here, because what they are doing is to work many hours at many different jobs to send money home—money that cannot come from anywhere else. So I urge you to vote ‘yes.’”

Bishop Anderson observed that the assembly was quickly approaching the order of the day, and that there were only apparently two more speakers at microphones. He suggested that the assembly might, therefore, be ready to vote, but added that if others wished to speak they should make that desire clear.

Bishop George P. Mocko [Delaware-Maryland Synod] said, “Several of our congregations have relationships with the congregations of Nicaragua. It is interesting to note how many of these debts were incurred. Nicaragua, in 1972, suffered a devastating earthquake. The government received loans and grants from other countries for the repair of the devastation. Many of these loans and grants were stuffed into the pockets of corrupt government officials, and the people revolted against them. Many of those corrupt government officials—that money stuffed in their pockets—fled to America where they were received as political refugees. Now the poor of the land are required to repay the money that was stolen from them.”

Bishop Howard E. Wennes [Grand Canyon Synod] reported, “This spring, during Holy Week, I had the privilege, on behalf of Lutheran World Relief, to make a pastoral visit to Central America. We have, as a church, learned over the years to do emergency relief. Then we became quite good at doing development. The third arm of this now is what we call advocacy, where we learn also to influence governments and the ways by which we can bring the political will to help people of other nations that are under the great burden of debt. We witnessed families that had lost their loved ones. They had lost their homes. They had lost their crops, and they have the great challenge of just trying to make it through this year. Our relief has been of great assistance to them, but the possibility of going back and paying debts from the 1970s and 1980s is a burden they cannot even begin to take on. I have to say that the U.S. ambassadors to Nicaragua and to other Central American states have said the United States has already taken some tremendous leadership in the encouragement of the forgiveness of this debt. I am grateful for that good start, and I think our voting for this resolution will be a great education for us as we try to help lift this burden in other parts of the world.”

Bishop Anderson announced that additional speakers had come to the microphones, so he recommended not taking a vote at this time, and continuing this discussion at the next session, beginning with those speakers at microphones at that time.

Recess

Secretary Almen explained procedures for the day's unit lunches and urged voting members to attend their assigned luncheon to learn more about one of the church's units.

He announced also that the deadline for submitting floor nominations would be 2:25 P.M. this day.

He said that the offering at Wednesday evening's service of Holy Communion would be for relief efforts on behalf of the victims of the earthquake in Turkey. He reported that \$75,000 in this church's disaster response funds were released Wednesday morning. Funds will be used for tents, medical supplies, clothing, and food. This church is working through ACT (Action by Churches Together). Baskets for offerings also would be available at the close of Plenary Session Five.

Bishop Anderson called upon the Rev. Mario C. Miranda, a member of the Church Council, for the closing hymn and prayer. Bishop Anderson announced at 12:05 P.M. that the assembly would be in recess after worship until 2:30 P.M.

Plenary Session Five

Wednesday, August 18, 1999

2:30 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

The Rev. H. George Anderson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, called Plenary Session Five to order at 2:32 P.M. Mountain Daylight Time, Wednesday, August 18, 1999. He assured voting members that, as a follow up to the action at the morning session, the coffee being served at meals and coffee breaks is "Equal Exchange Coffee," and he said that "if the usual amount of coffee is consumed during this assembly, there will be 45,000 cups of support" for this effort.

Theme Focus: Signs of Hope

Bishop Anderson called Ms. Addie J. Butler, vice president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to come forward to present another "Sign of Hope," this one focusing on this church as a "gifted" church.

Report of the Secretary

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section II, pages 7-24 (Section I, page 13); *Minutes* Exhibit D.

Bishop Anderson stated that the first order of business this afternoon was to receive the Report of the Secretary from the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, referring voting members to the appropriate pages in the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*.

Bishop Anderson continued, "In the secretary of our church we have an individual who is not simply a person who keeps track of statistics and constitutional changes. In my working with Secretary Almen he is an invaluable resource in terms of the people of this church. He knows this church, I think, better than anyone else. And if any of you are looking for a good way to understand this church and to know about it, I want to recommend specifically his book, *One Great Cloud of Witnesses*. It is a great introduction to our church. Secretary Almen." The complete text of Secretary Almen's report to the Churchwide Assembly is printed in Exhibit D.

Beginning his report by quoting the song of Miriam as sung in the animated movie, "The Prince of Egypt," Secretary Almen told of writing down the lines of that song, "Though hope is frail, it is hard to kill.... There can be miracles when you believe." The experience caused him to reflect deeply on this retelling of the story of the Exodus, quoting again Miriam's words from "The Prince of Egypt": "We were moving mountains/Long before we knew we could.... There can be miracles when you believe."

While pointing out that the miraculous work of God does not depend on our faith, Secretary Almen said, "In believing, our eyes may be opened to the miracles that are before us." He said that we see this fact demonstrated and practiced throughout the history of this church. While shaped by our heritage, we are led forward in hope, embarking with courage into the third Christian millennium. "Both the past and the future shape our life as a church," he continued. "And I can report to you that both the past and the future also give form to my work as secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America."

One of the duties of the secretary is to care for the archives and official records of this church and its predecessor church bodies, which truly are a warehouse and record of miracles, including tales of vision, stories of courage, the history of leadership, signs of hope, and the pilgrimage of faith recounted in minutes, tapes, reports, correspondence, films, and artifacts. In these stories and accounts, we find “the record of prayer and hope and courage, and, most significant of all, we find a spirit of churchliness for the sake of the Gospel—that guided people in witness to Christ and in service in Christ’s name—that motivated them to treasure and seek to understand the past, even as they walked with confidence and hope into the future.”

As an example, he pointed to the decision 25 years ago to establish the World Hunger Appeal—an act of “vision and courage”—that has received some \$200 million to fight hunger in the world.

The archives, Secretary Almen noted, also reveal examples of shortsightedness and selfishness, vindictiveness and vicious characterizations of people with whom other people disagreed. The archives tell the truth, revealing “missed miracles in the grand drama of the pilgrimage of faith.”

Because the ELCA Archives and Records Center were moved from Rosemont, Illinois, to Elk Grove Village, Illinois, Secretary Almen said that he has devoted significant attention in the last two years to the archives. The new center is a 17,000-square-foot building located 20 minutes northwest of the Lutheran Center in Chicago.

At this point, a video showed a more detailed story of the archival collections of this church as well as of the predecessor bodies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Following the video, Secretary Almen reminded the assembly that the archives are a warehouse full of miracles, documenting the healthy and vibrant heritage of Lutherans in North America. The collection will be simply a source of historical fascination, however, if we refuse to learn from our experience as Lutherans in North America, for our “heritage is broad and deep and long.” This “vibrant heritage,” he continued, is calling us to stretch and grow, “to venture forth in mission and outreach in a new era—for the sake of the salvation of the world.”

Secretary Almen concluded: “There are miracles to be seen when we believe—possibilities for faithful witness in a new century. Will we listen? Will we learn? Will we venture forth? Will we go with courage? Will we journey with marvelous hope into a new century? God is calling. There are mountains yet to be moved.”

The assembly responded with applause and a standing ovation, prompting Bishop Anderson to comment, “When I was a secretary, I never got that!”

Responsibilities

The duties and responsibilities of the secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) are diverse and numerous (see 13.41., 13.41.01-13.42.02., and 11.33.). A brief summary, however, may be expressed in this way.

The Office of the Secretary shall:

1. *Prepare records for this church in as accurate, thorough, up-to-date, useable, and prompt a way as possible;*
2. *Preserve the records of this church; and*

3. *Provide service and assistance to this church and others in a punctual, friendly, and courteous manner.*

That summary was prepared by staff members of the Office of the Secretary a few years ago as a helpful reminder of the duties and responsibilities that the constitution and bylaws of this church assign to the secretary as an officer of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

In connection with each Churchwide Assembly, staff members of the Office of the Secretary and other units must devote untiring attention to planning. In accord with the bylaws of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the secretary is responsible for all arrangements for the assembly. In fulfilling that task, the efforts of many people are required. For the gracious ways in which staff and volunteers carry out their duties to help ensure a productive assembly, we all can be grateful.

Membership Trends

As we look back over the past 12 years since the constituting of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, we find that the membership statistics for this church have been generally stable. That fact contrasts with the dire predictions of some church “experts” who warned of gigantic losses in membership upon the formation of this church in 1987 and 1988.

In 1990, ELCA baptized membership was 5,240,739. By 1997, the most recent year available at this point, baptized membership was 5,185,055, a decrease of 55,684 or slightly more than one percent in that seven-year period.

We also can take a longer look to see a picture of comparable numbers over a 30-year period from 1967 to 1997.

Although ELCA membership has remained high, some decline has been experienced.² The decline has not been as steep as that experienced by some church bodies.³ The ELCA record also is unlike the experience of other church bodies that report significant increases.

In 1967, the number of congregations in the ELCA’s predecessor bodies was 10,993. In 1997) 30 years later) the ELCA had 10,889 congregations, only 104 fewer than in 1967. The decrease was primarily the result of mergers and dissolutions.

2 In 1967, the number of congregations and members of the ELCA’s predecessor bodies were:

Congregations:	10,993
Baptized members:	5,832,392
Confirmed:	4,006,135

The numbers for Canada at that time have been removed from this tabulation. To account for the later Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, 200 congregations and 91,000 baptized members and 68,000 confirmed members have been added to the combined figures for The American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America in 1967.

In 1997, the number of ELCA congregations and members were:

Congregations:	10,889
Baptized members:	5,185,055
Confirmed:	3,844,169

3 In the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), 1967 membership was reported at 4,229,537 and 1996 membership at 3,637,375) a decrease of 592,162, or 14 percent. The membership of The Episcopal Church decreased from 3,420,297 in 1967 to 2,536,550 in 1996, a decrease of 883,747, or 25.75 percent. That membership has stabilized in recent years. The United Methodist Church reported membership in 1967 at 10,289,214, while 1996 membership stood at 8,495,378) a decrease of 1,793,836 or 17.4 percent.

Numbers for the Assemblies of God are difficult to evaluate between 1967 and 1997 because that denomination’s definition of “member” changed. Two comparable membership figures are 595,231 for 1967 and 1,419,717 for 1997) an increase of 824,486 or 135.5 percent. In 1967, the Southern Baptist Convention reported 11,140,486 members; in 1996, that total was 15,691,904) an increase of 40.9 percent.

Baptized membership in 1967 was 5.8 million; in 1997, baptized membership stood at 5.2 million) a decrease of 647,337 in 30 years or about 11.1 percent.

Confirmed membership in 1967 was about four million; in 1997, ELCA congregations reported 3.8 million confirmed members) a decline of 162,000 or 4.04 percent.⁴ The number of confirmed members reflects an aging trend and a decreased Lutheran birth rate.

An important figure to bear in mind when considering offering income is the communing and contributing category. In 1997, that was reported at 2.5 million members (2,516,006).

By comparison, we note that, in 1967, The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod reported a baptized membership of 2,847,425; in 1997, that number was 2,601,144, a decrease of 246,281, or 8.6 percent. Confirmed membership in the LCMS, however, increased during that 30-year period from 1,901,339 to 1,951,391, an increase of 50,052) a sign of aging membership. If one added the numbers lost from the LCMS as a result of the formation of the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches in 1976, the LCMS confirmed membership growth for the 30-year period would have amounted to 118,052.

Regional changes in ELCA membership are noteworthy. The heaviest concentrations of ELCA members are found in a half moon stretching from the Dakotas and Minnesota, at one point, around the Great Lakes into Pennsylvania and adjacent states, at the other point. The state with the largest number of ELCA members is Minnesota (847,348). The state with the greatest number of ELCA congregations is Pennsylvania (1,345).

Since 1990, ELCA membership in Minnesota increased 3.2 percent or 26,400 people. The rate of growth, however, was less than half the percentage of increase in population of Minnesota during the same period (7.7%). In Pennsylvania, meanwhile, ELCA membership decreased by seven percent or nearly 50,000 people (47,906).

The second greatest loss of membership since 1990 in numbers by state, after Pennsylvania, was California, a state of overall population growth of more than nine percent (9.3%). The total ELCA membership loss in California amounted to nearly nine percent (-8.7% or a decrease of 16,821 baptized members).⁵

In Ohio, ELCA membership since 1990 decreased by about three percent (-2.8%) or 8,902 people, while the population of Ohio grew more than three percent (3.3%).

Although there are many communities experiencing a decrease in population, growth also persists, including growth in areas of the Upper Midwest. The rate of that growth may be somewhat slower than elsewhere, especially in the West and South. A key factor to keep in mind in assessing the implications of population growth is the number of congregations and members in a given area. In regions of high growth, we do not have as heavy a concentration of ELCA congregations as in the Upper Midwest, the Midwest, and the Northeast.

The median age of ELCA members is estimated at 47. Compared to the U.S. population, ELCA congregations have fewer members below 35 years of age but about the same

⁴ Communing membership, another indicator of active membership, in 1967 was 3,254,703 (including an allocation of 59,034 to account for the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches). In 1997, that number for communing membership was 2,818,308, representing a decrease of 436,395 or 13.4 percent. One needs to bear in mind that the pattern in 1967 was post-confirmation communion. The 1997 figure, therefore, is not directly comparable to the 1967 number.

⁵ This analysis prepared by the Department for Research and Evaluation on the basis of parochial statistics gathered by the Office of the Secretary and population data from Caritas, Inc.

proportions between the ages from 35 to 55 as the general population.⁶ One-third of the members of ELCA congregations are 55 or older. For the general population, only one-fourth are 55 or older.⁷ Overall in percentages, there are twice as many ELCA members over age 75 as in the general population.⁸ Congregations in the ELCA have 11 percent of their membership at age 75 or above. The percentage in the general population is almost half that percentage at about six percent (5.8%).

Developments in the Archives

The most all-encompassing activity that an archives can undergo, moving to a new location, took place for the ELCA Archives in May 1999. While moving causes temporary inconvenience for researchers and staff, the results for this project include a better storage environment for the historical records and improved work arrangement for both staff and researchers.

The need to relocate the archives, from Rosemont, Illinois, was due to the decision of the Village of Rosemont to embark on a development project involving the entire area in which the archives resided. The search for a new site located a building at 321 Bonnie Lane, Elk Grove Village, Illinois, approximately eight miles from the Lutheran Center office. The building required extensive renovations in order to meet the needs of the program, particularly to allow for temperature and humidity controls in the archival storage area, as well as adequate space for researchers, staff, exhibits, records center storage, and general storage of materials and equipment for the Lutheran Center. The project moved on a tight time line; a highly functional facility has emerged for the preservation and use of this church's archival records.

•Knobel Archives Grant and Microfilming

Among the major projects completed in the 1997-1999 biennium are the conclusion of a federal grant project on historical records, planning for microfilming related to that project, a joint project with the Division for Global Mission, another synodical and regional archives meeting, and coping with and planning for the ever increasing amount of reference inquiries received and materials transferred or donated to archival custody.

Through a grant, awarded by the U.S. National Archives, National Historical Publications and Records Commission, a highly significant project was undertaken in July 1996 and concluded in July 1998. That project, to organize the significant collections of the Helen M. Knobel Archives of Cooperative Lutheranism, addressed the organizing and preservation of a precious collection of records from the 20th century. All of the original 650+ cubic feet of records were organized and cataloged. Further, additional materials were located and donated to the archives during the last year of the project.

The Knobel collection, originally founded and managed by its namesake under the auspices of the National Lutheran Council (1918-1966), contains many of the records that

6 "A Profile of Members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America," ca. 1993, Department for Research and Evaluation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

7 "Research Tidbits," Department for Research and Evaluation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

8 "Trends Affecting the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America," Department for Research and Evaluation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Chicago, Illinois, December 27, 1996.

relate to the overall history and direction of Lutheranism in North America during this century, including inter-Lutheran activities, ecumenical dialogue, and expanded social action both at home and abroad.

One of the goals of the Knubel Archives project was to prepare materials not only for research, but also for selected microfilming. Funds were set aside in 1987 at the close of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. (LCUSA), former custodian of the collection, in order to complete such filming. Of particular note, records related to Lutheran World Ministries, which was the U.S.A. National Committee of the Lutheran World Federation, are among the records to be filmed, along with those of the LCUSA and other records of the National Lutheran Council (1918-1966) not already filmed.

•Global Mission History Research Project

This project began October 1, 1997, with the appointment of Joyce Bowers from the Division for Global Mission to carry out what became known as Phase 1 of the project. In that part of the project, bibliographic information related to the history of ELCA global missions was assembled, along with lists of missionaries. This information was released in a preliminary paper version and will eventually be added to the ELCA World Wide Web page in order to be accessible throughout the world and to be updated regularly. Other activities during this first year included issuing of a brochure and presentations at various gatherings about the project as well as investigation of funding sources and some work related to encouraging additional global mission archival materials to be donated to the churchwide or another archives of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Phase 2 of the project began after the board of the Division for Global Mission and the Church Council designated and approved \$150,000 from division sources for continuation of the project. In addition to completing the remaining tasks from Phase 1, the other major activity undertaken thus far was to hire a project archivist to organize and catalog the global mission records within the churchwide archives. This work will allow the records to be understood more fully and accessible for research and will aid in identifying further materials that need to be collected due to gaps in the collection or that would complement current holdings.

•Activities and Services

In 1998, the ELCA Archives hosted a meeting of the Steering Committee of the International Council on Archives—Religious Archives Section. The five archivists on the committee from throughout the U.S. participated, along with one each from Germany, Hungary, and The Netherlands. Elisabeth Wittman, archives director, is part of this committee.

The archives continues to place a high priority on providing accurate, timely, and courteous reference and research services. Beginning in the Summer of 1997 the staff noticed and the annual statistics confirmed that, the archives received an increase in the amount of electronic mail requests due to the general increases in use of the Internet. In former years, the number of requests by phone had been the largest percentage, whereby by the end of 1998, the requests by letter, which includes e-mail, were even with those received by phone. Each year since the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America began, the demand for reference service has increased.

•*Donations to the Archival Collections*

During an average year in the first decade of the ELCA's life, donations were received at the rate of 164 cubic feet per year. In 1997 the amount was 220.6 cubic feet of records and papers, and 78 miscellaneous audiovisual items. In 1998, that amount increased most dramatically to 419.7 cubic feet of records and papers, and 87 audiovisual items.

An important document related to Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue was donated by the former bishop of the Lutheran Church in America, Pr. James R. Crumley Jr. That document was the original letter, sent as part of an official exchange of letters, by Pope John Paul II, on July 22, 1985.

Another unusual donation of 15 artifacts was received in 1997 from Augsburg Fortress, Publishers. As the publishing unit's previous building in Minneapolis was sold, various items including the cornerstone, chapel altar, lectern, and wood panels, all were retained. The building had originally been not only occupied by church's publishing unit, but it was built in 1953 as the headquarters of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Then, from 1960-1987, the building served as the office of The American Lutheran Church. Several of these artifacts are on display in the new archives building in Elk Grove Village.

As part of the responsibility of serving as the repository of the Knobel Archives, the ELCA Archives continues to serve several inter-Lutheran organizations. Thus, when two of those continuing organizations themselves began the process of relocating, significant amounts of records were sent to the archives. Both Lutheran World Relief and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, who share offices, are relocating to Baltimore from New York City. Materials no longer needed for current administration were transferred, including from LWR records dating from 1946-1997 and from LIRS, 1992-1995. In both cases the bulk of the records date from the 1970s forward.

Other transfers, donations to the Knobel Archives, included records of the National Lutheran Council's Division of American Missions, c. 1940-1966. These records were transferred from the manuscript collection of the University of Illinois at Chicago, and were included in the processing of the Knobel Archives grant project. The offices of that division had been located in Chicago.

Another significant component of the Knobel collection are the records of the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship, which created *Lutheran Book of Worship* (1978). Two participants, including the executive director of the project, Pr. Eugene Brand, donated records. The other donor was Pr. Hans Boehringer, who served on the Liturgical Texts Subcommittee on Initiatory Rites. The records date from the 1960s-1982.

Other inter-Lutheran records donated came from the National Lutheran Association of Scouters, 1980-1996; film production elements from Lutheran Film Associates's major film projects, "Martin Luther" and "Joy of Bach;" the Lutheran Women's Caucus, c.1980s-1990s; and files from two presidents of the Lutheran Historical Conference, c.1960-1971.

There also were donations of valuable personal papers. Among them were those of the late Pr. E. Theodore Bachmann (1911-1995). The donation of his papers, completed by his wife Mercia Brenne Bachmann, spanned his entire career, c.1930s-1997. In collaboration with his wife, his last major publications were: *Lutheran Churches of the World: A Handbook* (1989) and *The History of the United Lutheran Church in America: 1918-1962* (1997).

Also among the personal papers received in this biennium, were those of the Rev. William F. Schmidt Sr. (1894-1981, Papers, c.1910s-1960s). Pastor Schmidt had been a missionary

pastor in the Pacific Northwest and taught at colleges and seminaries in the State of Washington and in St. Paul and Moorhead, Minnesota. His son, Pr. William F. Schmidt Jr., made this donation. The 1920 diary of Pr. Michael J. Stolee (1871-1946) was transcribed and donated by his grandson, Michael J. Stolee. The diary covers Stolee's work as Commissioner in France for the National Lutheran Commission for Soldiers' and Sailors' Welfare and National Lutheran Council.

Fascinating and precious aspects of the history of Lutherans in North America are preserved for future generations in the Archives of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Lutheran Center Library

During this biennium, the focus for the Library at the Lutheran Center has been on:

- responding to increased demand for research services from Lutheran Center staff and outside patrons who reach us via e-mail or telephone;
- finding the most economical ways to access the information needed in an ever changing arena, while eliminating our dependence on grant support; and
- upgrading or replacing the electronic systems needed for research and the library's operation.

Use of the Internet by the Lutheran Center library initially focused on gaining information to assist churchwide office staff. That remains an important function. A home page on the World Wide Web, however, now includes the library's catalog in a format appropriate for searching with a web browser, and an e-mail address to which anyone may direct inquiries. As a convenience to both internal and external patrons, an electronic bookshelf is maintained, which is an extensive collection of links to full-text resources available at <http://www.elca.org/os/library.html>.

The ELCA library belongs to the American Theological Library Association and the Chicago Library System. Like most full-service libraries, the ELCA library is a member of the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) through which we share our holdings with 33,614 libraries in 67 countries, using 45 language groups, and their 684 million holdings are made available.

The collection of books and videotapes in the Lutheran Center library has reached 12,642 through judicious purchases, gifts from Augsburg Fortress, Publishers, subscriptions to all of the publications of the Lutheran World Federation, World Council of Churches, and the Alban Institute, among others, and through gifts from individuals and units who wish to make their material more available to themselves and to others.

In order to encourage sharing of resources and economizing on periodical subscriptions in the churchwide office, the union list of all periodicals coming into the Lutheran Center is posted on the Intranet, and the library subscribes to about 100 of the most commonly used journals.

The library has proven its value to the Lutheran Center staff—saving them both time and money—as they seek the information necessary to make decisions, develop their programs, and maintain their level of expertise in their appointed areas. It is providing the same time and cost effective service to those outside the Lutheran Center, who now have equal access to its services.

Records Management

Information is one of the key resources necessary for the efficient operation of any organization. The goals of records management are rapid retrieval of accurate information, appropriate and economical storage of information, compliance with legal or administrative requirements for retention of data, consistency in policy governing similar kinds of records, protection of this church's vital records, and prompt and cost effective disposal of obsolete or extraneous records.

In keeping with the ELCA bylaws and action of the Church Council, the secretary has responsibility for developing and administering a records management program in the churchwide office. The *Records Retention Schedule*, as approved by the Church Council in November 1989 and revised in 1991, defines the operational, legal, fiscal, and historical value of records, in all formats, in the churchwide office. This schedule charts the life cycle of the records—directing the length of time each needs to be kept in the primary filing area and defining when and for how long they may be transferred to semi-active storage in the off-site records center—and identifies those which should be admitted to the Archives of this church. Supplementing the *Records Retention Schedule*, the *Records Management Manual*, revised in 1995, instructs staff in the appropriate procedures for handling various types of records—financial, programmatic, personnel, legal, and electronic, to name only a few. These manuals have been shared with several other denominations and with institutions of this church.

A database system monitors the accession, circulation, and final disposition of records in the Lutheran Center's off-site Records Center. Records, which have passed their retention date, are purged from the Records Center at the end of each fiscal year. At the end of 1997, 280 cubic feet of records were destroyed, 124 cubic feet of records were transferred to the Archives, and 36 cubic feet were returned to active use in the unit. At the end of fiscal year 1998, 343 cubic feet of records were destroyed, 97 cubic feet were transferred to the Archives and 15 cubic feet of files were returned to active use.

In March 1996, *Active Records Management: Guidelines for Synods and Congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America* was prepared and distributed by the Office of the Secretary. Documents produced by several departments were gathered under one cover, including new or revised guidelines for the care of records in synodical offices and congregations. Topics that have received attention include: the care of cash funds and financial records, personnel records, electronic records and databases, official minutes and reports, vital and legal records, the parish register, records related to pastoral care of parishioners, files on persons rostered in the ELCA, and the care of archival materials. This document was distributed to synodical offices, regional archivists, regional resource centers, and—in electronic form—on the ELCA World Wide Web site and on LutherLink.

The electronic distribution of this material has generated an ongoing conversation by e-mail with pastors and lay persons concerning these policies and the issues they raise. Synodical offices have been encouraged to duplicate and distribute this document to congregations. Copies also have been mailed to anyone who calls the director for records management for that document.

Minutes and Official Documentation

The secretary is responsible for documenting and preserving the legislative history of this church. Minutes are prepared by the secretary and staff related to the Office of the

Secretary for: the Churchwide Assembly; the Church Council and its Executive Committee; the Cabinet of Executives; and the Conference of Bishops. Protocol copies of the minutes of all boards, steering committees, and advisory committees also are collected and maintained as a permanent record, as required by churchwide bylaw 13.41.02.a.

In accord with action of the 1993 Churchwide Assembly [CA93.07.61], copies of the published minutes of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly were distributed to its voting members, synodical and regional offices, units of the churchwide organization, and libraries of the seminaries, colleges, and universities of this church. Congregations and individuals may order copies from Augsburg Fortress, Publishers.

Publication of the 1997 assembly minutes, 1216 pages in length, began with the submission of the camera-ready manuscript to the printer on Ash Wednesday, February 17, 1999. Copies were posted in the mail during the Second Week of Easter. The length of time necessary for publication can be attributed to turnover of a staff position since the 1997 assembly, and a commitment to ensuring that a complete historical record of that assembly would be produced.

The 1999 Yearbook of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America represented the eleventh churchwide directory to be printed since the inception of this church. Published in December 1998, the current edition contains 742 pages—222 pages more than the initial 1988 volume, due in part to the increasing number of congregations and rostered persons who now have e-mail addresses to be included.

The secretary provides for the publication of the governing documents of this church. Following adoption of various amendments by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly, a new edition of the *Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America* was produced.

To simplify review and adaptation, the English text of the *Model Constitution for Congregations* is available not only as a booklet but also in an ASCII text file on a 3.5 inch floppy diskette in either IBM or Macintosh formats that can be opened by most word processors. Both the booklet and diskette can be ordered through Augsburg Fortress, Publishers. The text of the *Model Constitution for Congregations* also can be downloaded directly from the ELCA's Web site at www.elca.org/os/modelcon.html. A Spanish-language translation of the *Model Constitution for Congregations* has been prepared and is available upon request from the Office of the Secretary.

Travel and Meeting Planning

In 1998, staff helped to research sites, negotiate rates and contracts, and assist churchwide units, regions, and other groups to coordinate the details of more than 150 meetings.

By agreement with a travel management firm, three on-site reservation agents handle requests of travelers for the churchwide organization, always seeking the lowest available fares at the time a reservation is made. The firm also is responsible for reviewing tickets after they have been issued to assure that a lower fare has not become available.

The churchwide organization continues to maintain the lowest average air-ticket cost of any organization participating in a monthly national survey of travel managers. The average ticket price for 8,563 tickets purchased in 1998 was \$291, while the national average price was \$560. These figures do not include missionary travel booked through another agency by the Division for Global Mission.

The chart below shows the dollar amounts for airline tickets for Church Council, board, committee, task force, and staff members since 1988.

	Total Airfare Expended	Number of Tickets Issued	Average Ticket Cost	Savings from Coach Fare
1988	\$2,380,103	8,772	\$288	52%
1989	\$2,870,164	9,548	\$301	52%
1990	\$2,602,891	8,028	\$325	54%
1991	\$2,460,662	7,601	\$324	53%
1992	\$2,256,917	7,514	\$301	66%
1993	\$2,268,572	7,540	\$301	73%
1994	\$2,114,122	7,644	\$276	76%
1995	\$2,383,933	8,067	\$295	74%
1996	\$2,414,320	8,434	\$286	65%
1997	\$2,314,912	7,882	\$294	68%
1998	\$2,552,481	8,563	\$291	68%

**Appendix A to the
Report of the Secretary**

**Additions to the Roster of
Ordained Ministers 1997-1998**

1997 Name	City/State	Admitted	Date	Region/ Synod
Abts, Howard E.	Toledo, Ohio	Received from the United Methodist Church	02/01/1997	6D
Aden, Charles R.	Lake Elsinore, Calif.	Ordained	06/29/1997	2C
Albers, Dwight D.	Mott, N.D.	Ordained	06/01/1997	3A
Albers, Joel D.	Naperville, Ill.	Ordained	08/31/1997	5B
Anderson, Eugene A.	Sherwood, N.D.	Ordained	06/27/1997	3A
Anderson, Karri L.	Maple Grove, Minn.	Ordained	03/16/1997	3G
Anderson, Kristen K.	Jeffersonville, N.Y.	Ordained	11/23/1997	7C
Anderson-Hurdle, Suzanne L.	Romeoville, Ill.	Ordained	07/13/1997	5B
Andres, Carole M.	Warren, Ill.	Ordained	09/26/1997	5B
Andriamihaja, Lalahery	Minneapolis, Minn.	Ordained	11/02/1997	3G
Apgar, Terri L.	Aberdeen, S.D.	Ordained	03/09/1997	3C
Arbaugh-Patmon, Virginia K.	Jackson, Ohio	Ordained	08/30/1997	6F
Bailey, Joseph W. Sr.	Box Elder, Mont.	Ordained	06/14/1997	1F
Baker, Curtis W.	Portage, Ind.	Ordained	07/15/1997	6C
Ballard, Brian N.	Harrisburg, N.C.	Ordained	09/21/1997	9B
Barrington, Jean M.	Point Roberts, Wash.	Ordained	03/01/1997	1B
Bauer, Norman L.	Ostrander, Minn.	Ordained	10/12/1997	3I
Baumann, R. Curtis	Underhill, Vt.	Ordained	09/14/1997	7B
Beckham, J. Steven	Orange, Calif.	Ordained	03/16/1997	2C
Bergquist, Jeri J.	Reynolds, N.D.	Ordained	06/15/1997	3B

Bernth, Erik R.	Gas City, Ind.	Ordained	07/27/1997	6C
Bertani, Douglas T.	Auburn, Calif.	Ordained	07/12/1997	2A
Biegner, Stephen C.	South Glens Falls, N.Y.	Ordained	06/29/1997	7D
Bjorn von Letzendorf, Carine E.	Anchorage, Alaska	Received	01/05/1997	1A
		from the Church of Sweden		
Blanton, Robert M.	Jackson, Miss.	Ordained	07/27/1997	9D
Bly, Paul A.	Philip, S.D.	Ordained	06/22/1997	3C
Bohot, Paul M.	Carmine, Texas	Received	09/01/1997	4F
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Borseth, Mark D.	Beloit, Wis.	Ordained	08/27/1997	5K
Braden, Paul D.	Bethlehem, Pa.	Received	07/15/1997	7E
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Bradford, John C.	Plainfield, Ill.	Ordained	02/22/1997	5B
Brandt, Terry A.	Alberta, Minn.	Ordained	06/01/1997	3F
Braxton, Donald M.	Lockbourne, Ohio	Ordained	10/26/1997	6F
Brill, Allen H.	Newberry, S.C.	Received	11/10/1997	9C
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Brock, John H.	Elysburg, Pa.	Ordained	10/11/1997	8E
Brooks, Julie A.M.	Westminster, Colo.	Ordained	12/20/1997	2E
Brundage, Victoria C.	Mulvane, Kan.	Ordained	06/22/1997	4B
Burkholder, Joel D.	Georgetown, Texas	Reinstated	09/07/1997	4E
Burroughs, Catherine A.	Johnson, Neb.	Ordained	11/02/1997	4A
Calene-Hasseries, Teresa M.	Trimont, Minn.	Ordained	04/27/1997	3F
Carpenter, Jeffery L.	Leonardville, Kan.	Ordained	06/21/1997	4B
Carter, Richard T.	Shanksville, Pa.	Ordained	07/11/1997	8C
Chapman, Robert B.	Pleasant City, Ohio	Ordained	06/11/1997	6F
Chenoweth, Gary C.	Stanley, Va.	Ordained	09/14/1997	9A
Cheung, Sai Wai Paul	Seattle, Wash.	Received	02/01/1997	1B
		from the Lutheran Church in Taiwan		
Chudd, Donald	Bell Vernon, Pa.	Ordained	02/15/1997	8B
Cirillo, Doris M.	Elmhurst, N.Y.	Ordained	11/22/1997	7C
Clay, Cheri L.	Sandusky, Ohio	Ordained	09/21/1997	6D
Claybaker, Richard W.	St. Louis Park, Minn.	Received	09/15/1997	3G
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Cobb, Judith Ann	Norfolk, Va.	Ordained	09/13/1997	9A
Cochran, Robert C.	Fruitport, Mich.	Ordained	07/06/1997	6B
Comer, Michael C.	Ellore, S.C.	Ordained	06/30/1997	9C
Cone, Cynthia G.	Griswold, Iowa	Ordained	06/20/1997	5E
Cox, Jefferson F.	Jacsonville, Fla.	Ordained	11/20/1997	9E
Creswell, Paulette A.	Hutchinson, Minn.	Ordained	03/08/1997	3F
Cromack, Gail W.	Berkeley, Calif.	Ordained	12/28/1997	2A
Current, Amy L.	Fargo, N.D.	Ordained	07/13/1997	3B
Daher, Gregory S.	New Lisbon, Wis.	Ordained	06/01/1997	5L
Dahl, David F.	Cupertino, Calif.	Received	05/01/1997	2A
		from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada		
Dahl, David G.	Nekoosa, Wis.	Ordained	09/07/1997	5L
Dahl, Jeanne L.	Homer, Neb.	Ordained	07/28/1997	4A
Dahlvang, Jay M.	Iron Mountain, Mich.	Ordained	07/27/1997	5G
Dahlvang, Tamara R.	Crystal Falls, Mich.	Ordained	08/03/1997	5G
de Oliveira, Fred H. Jr.	Houston, Texas	Ordained	11/15/1997	4F
DeBlock, Daniel G.	Dover, N.J.	Received	07/31/1997	3H
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Debner, Susan K.	Northfield, Minn.	Ordained	11/22/1997	3I
Deckinger, Keith A.	Vandergrift, Pa.	Ordained	06/24/1997	8B
Denison, Barbara J.	Meade, Neb.	Ordained	12/22/1997	4A
DePhillips, Jacquelyn M.	Windber, Pa.	Ordained	07/20/1997	8C
Derrick, David C.	Fredericksburg, Va.	Ordained	07/20/1997	9A

Derushia, Kathleen G.	North Tonawanda, N.Y.	Ordained	08/23/1997	7D
DeStephano, Douglas L.	Etters, Pa.	Ordained	09/19/1997	8D
Dietz, Dianne E.	Bethune, Colo.	Ordained	06/22/1997	2E
Dietzler, Stephen W.	New Holstein, Wis.	Ordained	08/31/1997	5I
Dougherty, Andrew F., III	Scottsdale, Pa.	Reinstated	08/01/1997	8B
Dowling, Douglas J.	Craig, Iowa	Ordained	07/27/1997	5E
Dragseth, David B.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Ordained	08/24/1997	5J
Dressel, Mark D.	Sharon, Wis.	Ordained	08/31/1997	5K
Dwiggins, Anne D.	Silver Spring, Md.	Ordained	10/19/1997	8G
East, Braxton C.	Mount Horeb, Wis.	Ordained	07/06/1997	5K
Ebersole, Edward W. Jr.	Somerset, Pa.	Ordained	07/20/1997	8C
Eckblad, Todd A.	Matteson, Ill.	Ordained	11/30/1997	5A
Edmister, Gary M.	Richmondville, N.Y.	Ordained	10/18/1997	7D
Eidson, David J.	Jonesboro, Ill.	Ordained	06/22/1997	5C
Eilert, Jonathan L.	Wooster, Ohio	Ordained	08/23/1997	6E
Elkin, Eric W.	Hegins, Pa.	Ordained	08/03/1997	7E
Elmer, Lynda L.	Mohrsville, Pa.	Ordained	08/03/1997	7E
Engelbrecht, Barbara I.	Elberton, Ga.	Ordained	07/06/1997	9D
Erickson, Darren R.	Connell, Wash.	Ordained	08/24/1997	1D
Erisman, Laura Ziehl	Marysville, Wash.	Ordained	08/30/1997	1B
Espeland, Leif J.	Gays Mills, Wis.	Ordained	08/10/1997	5L
Evans, Carl E.	Numidia, Pa.	Ordained	07/20/1997	8E
Fabac, Joan E.	Elgin, Texas	Ordained	10/12/1997	4E
Farrera, Elizabeth O.	Westville, N.J.	Ordained	06/29/1997	7A
Fernandez-Bocangel, Juan C.	St. Paul, Minn.	Ordained	02/02/1997	3H
Ferne-Johnson, Elizabeth A.	Detroit, Mich.	Ordained	10/12/1997	6A
Fickenscher, Pamela R.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Ordained	08/24/1997	3G
Fiechter, Stephen M.	Whittier, Calif.	Ordained	06/22/1997	2C
Firle, Sharon L.	Bessemer, Mich.	Ordained	03/21/1997	5G
Fisher, William G.L.	Waxhaw, N.C.	Ordained	05/30/1997	9B
Fisher-Broin, Cynthia A.	Cannon Falls, Minn.	Ordained	07/06/1997	3I
Fiske, Julie M.	Rapid River, Mich.	Ordained	07/27/1997	5G
Fitch, Andrew S.	Claysburg, Pa.	Ordained	06/01/1997	8C
Fitzgerald, Joanne S.	Villa Park, Ill.	Ordained	11/30/1997	5A
Fore, James T.	Brookville, Pa.	Ordained	06/27/1997	8A
Foreman, Larry M.	Eau Claire, Wis.	Reinstated	04/26/1997	3H
Fournier, Ronald J.	Rindge, N.H.	Reinstated	09/13/1997	7B
Friese, Robert E.	Galesburg, Ill.	Ordained	09/07/1997	5B
Frye, Christopher A.	Grosse Pointe Farms, Mich.	Ordained	03/09/1997	6A
Frye, Deborah L.	Mayport, Pa.	Ordained	06/29/1997	8A
Frystak, Janet E.	Northfield, Ill.	Ordained	06/14/1997	5A
Funk-Pihl, Marjorie A.	Shoreline, Wash.	Ordained	03/23/1997	1B
Gatzke, Sylvia Inman	Houston, Texas	Ordained	08/09/1997	4F
Geelsdottir, Deborah R.	Hecla, S.D.	Ordained	11/15/1997	3C
Gehring, Martin P.	Carmel, Ind.	Ordained	07/13/1997	6C
Gerber, Bonnie L.	Paris, Ohio	Ordained	08/03/1997	6E
Giere, Samuel D.	Fargo, N.D.	Ordained	11/01/1997	3B
Gilbertson, Richard J.	West Carrollton, Ohio	Ordained	10/24/1997	6F
Glander, James K.	North Augusta, S.C.	Ordained	07/08/1997	9C
Glesne, David J.	Paynesville, Minn.	Ordained	10/19/1997	3F
Gomez, Ralph O.	Phoenix, Ariz.	Ordained	06/01/1997	2D
Greenlund, David J.	Hill City, S.D.	Ordained	06/22/1997	3C
Grimm, Eckhard H.	Midland, Texas	Reinstated	08/12/1997	4D
Gubrud, Kent C.	White Bear Lake, Minn.	Ordained	08/23/1997	3H
Gwin, Alice J.	Washington, Ill.	Ordained	02/22/1997	5C

Hahn, David C.	Tempe, Ariz.	Ordained	08/24/1997	2D
Handschin, Richard E.	Charlotte, N.C.	Received	12/14/1997	9B
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Hanlon ¹ , Amy E.	St. Paul, Minn.	Ordained	04/13/1997	3H
Hanson, Deborah A.	Orlando, Fla.	Ordained	02/08/1997	9E
Hardy, David E.	Atlanta, Ga.	Received	05/18/1997	9D
		from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada		
Hassler, John P.	Jim Thorpe, Pa.	Ordained	08/03/1997	7E
Hatcher, Linda N.	North Branch, Minn.	Ordained	07/20/1997	3H
Hawkins, Naomi M.	Arlington Heights, Ill.	Ordained	08/24/1997	5A
Haynes-Kniseley, Carol J.	La Canada, Calif.	Ordained	07/27/1997	2B
Heaton, Gary G.	Columbus, N.D.	Ordained	06/15/1997	3A
Heide, Peter T.	Everest, Kan.	Ordained	05/03/1997	4B
Hendrickson, Solveig Larson	Lake Preston, S.D.	Ordained	05/04/1997	3C
Hess, Elizabeth A.	Holidaysburg, Pa.	Ordained	06/01/1997	8C
Heuiser-Hill, Melanie A.	Eden Prairie, Minn.	Ordained	09/28/1997	3G
Hewes, Elaine C.	Bangor, Maine	Ordained	06/06/1997	7B
Higgins, Patricia M.	Reeder, N.D.	Ordained	02/16/1997	3A
Hilfiger, Sharon A.	Knox, Pa.	Reinstated	05/04/1997	8A
Hiortdahl, Brian W.	Chico, Calif.	Ordained	07/19/1997	2A
Hoffmeyer, R. William	Harrisonburg, Va.	Ordained	09/14/1997	9A
Hohlt, Glenn E.	Oregon, Ohio	Ordained	09/07/1997	6D
Holleck, Christian G.	Pontiac, Mich.	Ordained	12/06/1997	6A
Holm, Ruthann M.	Ladysmith, Wis.	Ordained	09/13/1997	5H
Hutson ² , Cindy L.	La Crosse, Wis.	Ordained	11/02/1997	5L
Immer, Hans J. R.	Oneonta, N.Y.	Reinstated	10/25/1997	7D
Iverson, Kenneth C.	Devils Lake, N.D.	Ordained	10/05/1997	3B
Iverson, Todd J.	Cadott, Wis.	Ordained	06/15/1997	5H
Jacobson, Ann M.	Chisago City, Minn.	Ordained	09/07/1997	3H
Jacobson, Michael J.	Leola, S.D.	Received	09/01/1997	3C
		from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada		
Jaramillo, Kristie A.	Mukwonago, Wis.	Ordained	11/09/1997	5J
Jaramillo, Mark E.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Ordained	08/24/1997	5J
Jefferies, Jerry R.	Tillamook, Ore.	Reinstated	08/30/1997	1E
Jelinek, Erik P.	Savage, Mont.	Ordained	06/08/1997	1F
Jesse, Duane A.	Cortland, Ohio	Ordained	07/19/1997	6E
Johns, Danette E.	Red Oak, Iowa	Ordained	08/23/1997	5E
Johnson, Darin N.	Windsor, Colo.	Ordained	11/22/1997	2E
Johnson, Karl E.	La Grange, Texas	Ordained	08/09/1997	4F
Johnson, M. Luther	Mount Prospect, Ill.	Ordained	12/14/1997	5A
Johnson, Regina	Detroit, Mich.	Ordained	07/20/1997	6A
Jones, Douglas P.	Burtonsville, Md.	Ordained	08/03/1997	8G
Jones, Laurie A.	Watertown, S.D.	Ordained	06/15/1997	3C
Jorgensen, Karen M.	Grand Forks, N.D.	Received	11/01/1997	3B
		from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada		
Jorgenson, Barbara A.	Tomahawk, Wis.	Ordained	07/20/1997	5I
Kane, Jack P.	Lombard, Ill.	Ordained	06/14/1997	5A
Kapsch, Sharon G.	Steele, N.D.	Ordained	03/23/1997	3A
Kehler, Carol B.	Reading, Pa.	Ordained	08/03/1997	7E
Kelly, Bernard R.	Richlandtown, Pa.	Ordained	10/18/1997	7F
Kemp, Larry E.	Manorville, Pa.	Ordained	06/21/1997	8B

1 Name later changed to Amy E. Hessel.

2 Name later changed to Cindy L. Arndt.

Kennett, Cynthia S.	Douglassville, Pa.	Ordained	08/03/1997	7E
Kesselring, Tom E.	Pflugerville, Texas	Ordained	08/31/1997	4E
Kim ³ , Seok-Yon	Los Angeles, Calif.	Received	02/01/1997	2B
		from the Methodist Church of Seoul, Korea		
Kirsh-Carr, William F.	Staten Island, N.Y.	Ordained	10/04/1997	7C
Kirst, Dean M.	Sun Prairie, Wis.	Ordained	06/08/1997	5K
Knutson-Keller, Douglas M.	Oceanside, Calif.	Ordained	02/16/1997	2C
Knutson-Keller, Molly O.	Encinitas, Calif.	Ordained	02/16/1997	2C
Kontz, Janna M.	Neche, N.D.	Ordained	05/31/1997	3B
Kosky, Robert W. Jr.	Bagley, Wis.	Ordained	06/28/1997	5K
Krueger, Nancy A.	Baraboo, Wis.	Ordained	08/30/1997	5K
Kutzke, Janez M.	Colorado Springs, Colo.	Ordained	06/22/1997	2E
Kwiecien, Stanley D.	Pender, Neb.	Reinstated	06/23/1997	4A
Lantz, Leland M.	Laguna Hills, Calif.	Ordained	06/01/1997	2C
Laugaland, Ingebjorg Vik	Lenore, Idaho	Received	10/01/1997	1D
		from the Church of Norway		
Lee, Michael K.	Plymouth, Minn.	Ordained	01/12/1997	3G
Lee, Rebecca J.	Enderlin, N.D.	Ordained	06/08/1997	3B
Lervik, Bjorn	Sioux Falls, S.D.	Ordained	06/01/1997	3C
Leske, Natalie K.	Eau Claire, Wis.	Ordained	02/01/1997	5H
Lichtenberg-Schueler ⁴ , Melanie S.	Sioux Falls, S.D.	Ordained	06/29/1997	3C
Lichtenberger, Walter H.	New Providence, N.J.	Ordained	06/29/1997	7A
Lindgren, Lance R.	Ashland, Neb.	Ordained	04/13/1997	4A
Little, Walter C.	Greenville, Miss.	Ordained	03/16/1997	9D
Livingston, Linda R.	Marion, Iowa	Ordained	09/06/1997	5D
Loberger, Diane K.	Vero Beach, Fla.	Ordained	07/27/1997	9E
Lodel, Sheri B.	Pierce, Neb.	Ordained	06/22/1997	4A
Lofsvold, Laurel A.	Salem, Ore.	Reinstated	03/01/1997	1E
Lopez, Roberto	Omaha, Neb.	Received	07/01/1997	4A
		from the Roman Catholic Church		
Luecke, Carol M.	Binford, N.D.	Ordained	03/23/1997	3B
Lund, John E.	Dodgeville, Wis.	Ordained	02/15/1997	5K
Lynch, Susan P.	Newtown, Pa.	Ordained	08/24/1997	7F
Madson, Susan A.	Anoka, Minn.	Ordained	05/25/1997	3G
March, Donald L.	Palmyra, Pa.	Ordained	09/19/1997	8D
Marsh, Stacy U.	Westminster, Md.	Ordained	01/19/1997	8F
Marshall, Anita L.	Albion, Ind.	Ordained	10/19/1997	6C
Martin, Joel P.	Granby, Colo.	Ordained	06/15/1997	2E
May, Phillip A.	Avonmore, Pa.	Ordained	06/28/1997	8A
Maybee, Timothy J.	Cedar Rapids, Iowa	Ordained	07/06/1997	5D
Mbise, Denise H.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Ordained	03/16/1997	5J
McAllister, Michael J.	Beaverton, Ore.	Ordained	01/12/1997	1E
McEwen, Linda I.	St. Paul, Minn.	Reinstated	07/02/1997	3D
McGuire, Judy Ann	Burkina Faso, West Africa	Ordained	08/03/1997	9C
McInnis, Joseph E.	Hoagland, Ind.	Ordained	11/15/1997	6C
McMullan, J. Christian	Midland, Mich.	Ordained	09/07/1997	6B
Metz, Richard G.	Heppner, Ore.	Ordained	10/18/1997	1E
Michaels, Deborah M.	Ashland, Ohio	Ordained	08/24/1997	6E
Middendorf, Wayland W. Sr.	Shumway, Ill.	Ordained	04/12/1997	5C
Miller, Constance M.	Dubuque, Iowa	Ordained	01/26/1997	5F
Miller, Janet C.	Fort Worth, Texas	Ordained	09/28/1997	4D
Miller, Marcille L.	Kentwood, Mich.	Ordained	05/24/1997	6B

³ Name later changed to Sion Kim.

⁴ Name later changed to Melanie S. Lichtenberg.

Miller, Sarah J.	Green Bay, Wis.	Ordained	03/02/1997	5I
Miyamoto, Ruthann	La Crosse, Wis.	Ordained	06/28/1997	5L
Morck, Frederick L.	Oslo, Minn.	Ordained	09/14/1997	3D
Mork, Douglas J.	St. Paul, Minn.	Ordained	10/05/1997	3H
Mossman, James A.	Jefferson, Iowa	Ordained	04/20/1997	5E
Mullins, Paul E.	Louisville, Ky.	Ordained	09/15/1997	6C
Munker, Cynthia Rasschaert	Oak Park, Ill.	Ordained	03/01/1997	5A
Murphy, Edward F.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Ordained	02/01/1997	8B
Nauschultz, James L.	Belview, Minn.	Ordained	11/08/1997	3F
Negeri, Melkamu	Minneapolis, Minn.	Received	01/01/1997	3G
		from the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus		
Nelson ⁵ , Shelley J.	Wind Lake, Wis.	Ordained	06/29/1997	5J
Nemitz, Douglas E.	Kalispell, Mont.	Ordained	11/23/1997	1F
Nesheim, Kelvin B.	Concord, Calif.	Ordained	03/23/1997	2A
Nielsen, William F.	Chariton, Iowa	Ordained	06/07/1997	5D
Noel, Roy A.	Pekin, N.D.	Ordained	06/22/1997	3B
Norquist, John C.	Toledo, Ohio	Ordained	06/08/1997	6D
Oas, Paul C.	Del Mar, Calif.	Reinstated	09/06/1997	2C
O'Brien, Shawn K.	Crestview Hills, Ky.	Ordained	10/10/1997	6C
Olivier, Delwyn L.	Watertown, S.D.	Ordained	09/07/1997	3C
Olson, Jared A.	Naples, Fla.	Ordained	09/13/1997	9E
Olson, Linda Salmonson	Ferndale, Calif.	Ordained	08/09/1997	2A
Olson, Shelley K.	Lake Park, Minn.	Ordained	05/11/1997	3D
Orris, Glenn W.	Chicago, Ill.	Ordained	06/14/1997	5A
Oslovich, Timothy R.	Shishmaref, Alaska	Ordained	10/04/1997	1A
Parham, James C. III	Immo, S.C.	Ordained	06/22/1997	9C
Paulson, Daniel J.	Alexander, N.D.	Ordained	02/09/1997	3A
Paulson, Darren L.	Great Falls, Mont.	Ordained	05/31/1997	1F
Paulson ⁶ , Gail N.	North Oaks, Minn.	Ordained	12/20/1997	3H
Paulus, Lorna L.	Phillipsburg, Kan.	Ordained	06/22/1997	4B
Peltomaa, Bonnie J.	Mansfield, Ohio	Ordained	06/22/1997	6E
Percy, David E.	Springfield, Pa.	Ordained	11/01/1997	7F
Perger, Dennis G.	South Wayne, Wis.	Ordained	06/29/1997	5K
Perry, Peter S.	Mesa, Ariz.	Ordained	02/23/1997	2D
Peterson, Barbara J.	Bock, Minn.	Ordained	08/03/1997	3E
Peterson, Scott C.	Galata, Mont.	Ordained	03/22/1997	1F
Petkovich, Cynthia L.	Oklahoma City, Okla.	Ordained	07/12/1997	4C
Pflibsen, Troy P.	Hawkeye, Iowa	Ordained	02/23/1997	5F
Phoenix, David P.	Berlin Center, Ohio	Ordained	12/06/1997	6E
Pipho, Steven L.	Charlotte, N.C.	Ordained	05/30/1997	9B
Plummer, Jeffrey S.	Bealeton, Va.	Ordained	05/31/1997	9A
Polanzke, Elizabeth C.	Capac, Mich.	Ordained	06/22/1997	6A
Polanzke, James D.	Brown City, Mich.	Ordained	06/14/1997	6A
Poole, Patrick W.	Seminole, Fla.	Ordained	06/08/1997	9E
Popp, Wendy S.	Highmore, S.D.	Ordained	07/26/1997	3C
Poston, Timothy L.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Ordained	08/10/1997	7F
Pretzer, Michael J.	Benedict, N.D.	Ordained	06/29/1997	3A
Price, James M.	Elk River, Minn.	Ordained	07/20/1997	3G
Randall, Joan R.	Cupertino, Calif.	Ordained	06/15/1997	2A
Rauscher, Todd A.	Taylorsville, N.C.	Ordained	05/30/1997	9B

⁵ Name later changed to Shelley J. Nelson Olson.

⁶ Name later changed to Gail D. Nord.

Reeves, Nancie R.	Broken Arrow, Okla.	Ordained	11/22/1997	4C
Reiter, Donald A.	Port Charlotte, Fla.	Received	11/23/1997	9E
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Reuss, Peter W.	Benson, Ill.	Ordained	06/14/1997	5C
Rice, Daniel E.	Long Beach, Miss.	Ordained	03/16/1997	9D
Ridenhour, William C.	Wheeling, W.Va.	Ordained	05/03/1997	8H
Rigney, Ildiko'	Yoakum, Texas	Ordained	05/03/1997	4E
Rittmann, Mark D.	Broomfield, Colo.	Received	12/01/1997	2E
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Rivera, Olga I.	Elizabeth, N.J.	Ordained	06/29/1997	7A
Robb, Robert R.	Laconia, N.H.	Received	07/01/1997	7B
		from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada		
Rogness, Julie L.	Rochester, Minn.	Ordained	04/13/1997	3I
Rohland, Curtis E.	Chippewa Falls, Wis.	Received	09/14/1997	5H
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Rohrer, Blake E.	Rancho Santa Margarita, Calif.	Ordained	08/03/1997	2C
Rosenholtz, Cathy E.	Jamaica, N.Y.	Ordained	08/31/1997	7C
Rosenwald, William P.	Houston, Texas	Received	10/01/1997	4F
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Rosholt Bianchi, Theresa	Manchester, N.H.	Reinstated	04/20/1997	7B
Rothfusz, John M. Eklund	Arenzville, Ill.	Ordained	07/25/1997	5C
Rothfusz, M. Elise Eklund	Bluff Springs, Ill.	Ordained	07/25/1997	5C
Ryneiwicz, Douglas A.	West Hatfield, Maine	Ordained	06/06/1997	7B
Sachs, Robert E. Jr.	Cozad, Neb.	Reinstated	09/07/1997	4A
Sanderson, Christopher E.	Fort Wayne, Ind.	Ordained	06/29/1997	6C
Saraka, John P.	Buffalo, N.Y.	Ordained	07/06/1997	7D
Sauerberg, Susan D.	Tucson, Ariz.	Ordained	07/13/1997	2D
Schara, Jerald W.	Mazomanie, Wis.	Ordained	10/11/1997	5K
Scherer, Julie L. Reuning	Manchester, Conn.	Ordained	01/19/1997	7B
Scherer, Karen E.	Lititz, Pa.	Ordained	03/01/1997	8D
Schmidt, Paul W.	Wooster, Ohio	Ordained	08/03/1997	6E
Schroeder, David K.	Columbus, Ohio	Reinstated	03/01/1997	6F
Schroeder, Kristine D.	Monona, Iowa	Ordained	11/09/1997	5F
Schubert, Stacie L.	Chippewa Falls, Wis.	Ordained	06/28/1997	5H
Selboe, Sonja L.	Nagaunee, Mich.	Ordained	02/21/1997	5G
Sgarioto, Mary N.	Palatine, Ill.	Ordained	01/19/1997	5A
Shackelford, Michael T.	Clearwater, Fla.	Ordained	06/09/1997	9E
Shank, Elizabeth D.	Saginaw, Mich.	Ordained	07/19/1997	6B
Shannon, Angela L.	Houston, Texas	Ordained	01/12/1997	4F
Shaw, Lois S.	High Point, N.C.	Ordained	10/24/1997	9B
Shealy, Wallace H.	Prattville, Ala.	Ordained	08/09/1997	9D
Shores, Samuel W. II	Liberty, N.C.	Ordained	09/07/1997	9B
Simonson, Michelle L.	Wahpeton, N.D.	Ordained	08/17/1997	3B
Spaulding, Barbara J.	Sloan, Iowa	Ordained	08/17/1997	5E
Springer, Stephen A.	Angleton, Texas	Ordained	01/12/1997	4F
Sprowls, Susan F.	Phoenix, Ariz.	Ordained	12/20/1997	2D
Stabe, Matthew C.	Fairview, Pa.	Ordained	07/20/1997	8A
Stevenson, Tarja K.	Woodbridge, Va.	Ordained	06/22/1997	8G
Steward, Vera Guebert	Wheat Ridge, Colo.	Ordained	05/25/1997	2E
Stewart, Benjamin M.	Hillsboro, Ohio	Ordained	07/23/1997	6F
Straiton, John C.	Mahtomedi, Minn.	Received	04/13/1997	3H
		from the Evangelical Church Alliance		
Strang, Lori A.	Luckey, Ohio	Ordained	10/11/1997	6D
Swan, Darlis J.	Chicago, Ill.	Ordained	06/13/1997	8D
Swander, Joan L.	Weatherford, Okla.	Ordained	03/15/1997	4C
Swanson, Daniel T.	Kingshill, St. Croix, Virgin Islands	Ordained	06/08/1997	9F

Sweet, Stephen E.	River Edge, N.J.	Ordained	10/19/1997	7A
Talley, Gene A.	West Boylston, Mass.	Ordained	11/22/1997	7B
Talsness, Jason W.	Aitkin, Minn.	Ordained	09/07/1997	3E
Taylor, Karen R.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Ordained	08/10/1997	8B
Teeples, Jeffrey D.	Whitefish, Mont.	Ordained	06/28/1997	1F
Terry, Bill J. Jr.	Stuttgart, Kan.	Ordained	06/29/1997	4B
Thomas, Gerald P. Jr.	Marshall, Texas	Ordained	06/29/1997	4D
Tiede, Connie Forsberg	Vining, Minn.	Ordained	06/22/1997	3D
Tiede, Mark A.	Vining, Minn.	Ordained	06/01/1997	3D
Trout, Gwenn L.	Columbia, Pa.	Ordained	09/19/1997	8D
Turner, Patricia J.	Madison, Minn.	Ordained	07/13/1997	3F
Uecker, Timothy J.	Glendale, Ariz.	Reinstated	02/23/1997	2D
Van Haneghan, John H.	Hamburg, N.Y.	Received from the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)	06/01/1997	7D
Venne, Kristen A.	Manchester, Iowa	Ordained	06/29/1997	5F
Vieker, Nancy L.	Greene, Iowa	Ordained	10/11/1997	5F
Villemaire, Claude L.	Parrottsville, Tenn.	Ordained	07/13/1997	9D
Voelker, Linda P.	Granite Quarry, N.C.	Ordained	05/30/1997	9B
Voelker, Robert A.	Granite Quarry, N.C.	Ordained	05/30/1997	9B
Vogt, Myron P.	Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	Received from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod	04/14/1997	9E
Vogt, Wayne F.	Grand Meadow, Minn.	Ordained	10/05/1997	3I
von Schlichten, David P.	Youngstown, Pa.	Ordained	05/24/1997	8B
Wallace, Pamela J. Carnes	Penryn, Pa.	Ordained	09/19/1997	8D
Walters, Michael E.	Pickerington, Ohio	Ordained	10/11/1997	6F
Walters, Paul E.	Churchville, Va.	Ordained	09/14/1997	9A
Wanner-Schaunaman, Robin R.	Milbank, S.D.	Ordained	04/13/1997	3C
Ward, Michael R.	Charlotte, N.C.	Ordained	05/30/1997	9B
Warn, Kathryn L.	Grand Prairie, Texas	Ordained	11/02/1997	4D
Warp, ⁷ Mark D.	Missouri City, Texas	Ordained	08/24/1997	4F
Webb, Christopher D.	Gainesville, Fla.	Ordained	06/22/1997	9E
Weber, Kristina C.	Meadowlands, Minn.	Ordained	10/26/1997	3E
Weber, Ronald R.	La Grange, Texas	Ordained	05/17/1997	4F
Weimer, Clifford R.	Cathlamet, Wash.	Ordained	04/06/1997	1C
Wendland, Christina L.	Columbia, S.C.	Ordained	12/03/1997	9C
Wenzel, Christine A.	Kenosha, Wis.	Ordained	07/27/1997	5J
Wertz, John E. Jr.	Walterboro, S.C.	Ordained	08/25/1997	9C
White, Richard A.	Vadnais Heights, Minn.	Ordained	03/02/1997	3H
White, Robert J.	Toledo, Ohio	Ordained	01/12/1997	6D
Wilcox, Bonnie L.	Apple Valley, Minn.	Ordained	09/27/1997	3H
Wildermuth, Deanna M.	Wyndmere, N.D.	Ordained	06/08/1997	3B
Willadsen, Carol S.	Scandia, Kan.	Ordained	09/17/1997	4B
Williams, Betsy M.	New Lexington, Ohio	Ordained	01/19/1997	6F
Witkop, David S.	Bellevue, Neb.	Ordained	05/11/1997	4A
Wolf, Judy Heinrich	Andover, Iowa	Ordained	10/11/1997	5D
Woods, Patricia R.	Oswego, Ill.	Ordained	06/21/1997	5B
Yates, Kathleen W.	Orange City, Fla.	Ordained	09/08/1997	9E
Yatta, Susan Haas	Emmitsburg, Md.	Ordained	07/13/1997	8F
Yoak, Russel T.	Baker, W.Va.	Ordained	04/12/1997	8H
Young, David N.	Cincinnati, Ohio	Ordained	08/01/1997	6F
Young, James F.	Hanover, Pa.	Ordained	09/19/1997	8D

⁷ Name later changed to Mark D. Warpmaecker.

Young, Karen Kay	West Columbia, S.C.	Ordained	06/16/1997	9C
Zeiders, Joel L.	Biglerville, Pa.	Ordained	06/13/1997	8D
Ziegler, August G.	Pelican Rapids, Minn.	Reinstated	11/19/1997	3D
Zorn, Henry E.	Cincinnati, Ohio	Ordained	01/05/1997	6F

1998

Aldrich-Dale, Janelle D.	Salem, Ore.	Ordained	09/27/1998	1E
Alle, Robert V.	Outing, Minn.	Ordained	08/16/1998	3E
Allison, D. Elinor	Lewisburg, Pa.	Ordained	06/13/1998	8E
Anderson, Judith A.	West Collingswood, N.J.	Ordained	09/19/1998	7A
Anderson, Kirk E.	Prescott Valley, Ariz.	Reinstated	12/01/1998	2D
Anderson, Lisa C.	Winston-Salem, N.C.	Ordained	06/06/1998	9B
Arnold, Andrew H.	Wasilla, Alaska	Ordained	06/21/1998	1A
Ashley, Mary K.	Mounds View, Minn.	Ordained	08/23/1998	3H
Authier, James B.	Wheeling, W.Va.	Ordained	06/14/1998	8H
Baardseth, Katherine E.	Huntington Beach, Calif.	Ordained	07/19/1998	2C
Bailey, Pari R.	Benson, Minn.	Ordained	05/09/1998	3F
Bailey, Trevor A.	Murdock, Minn.	Ordained	05/09/1998	3F
Baldus, Benjamin M.	Lansing, Mich.	Received	09/12/1998	6B
		from the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)		
Barnett, Edward G.	Dublin, Ohio	Ordained	03/13/1998	6F
Barrantes, Patricio	Houston, Texas	Ordained	07/12/1998	4F
Baumann, Richard W.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Ordained	07/05/1998	3G
Beecher, Miriam E.	Peachtree City, Ga.	Ordained	05/31/1998	9D
Bell, Michael J.	Bakersfield, Calif.	Ordained	07/24/1998	2B
Bence, Nancy Nord	Minneapolis, Minn.	Ordained	09/12/1998	3G
Benninghove, David M.	Sellersville, Pa.	Ordained	11/14/1998	7F
Berg, John C.	Trevorton, Pa.	Ordained	09/06/1998	8E
Bergerson, Marilee J.	Eau Claire, Wis.	Ordained	05/29/1998	5H
Bergren, Benjamin B.	Las Vegas, Nev.	Ordained	05/24/1998	2D
Bielfeldt, Dennis D.	White, S.D.	Ordained	11/01/1998	3C
Bjerke-Ulliman, Kris A.	Windom, Kan.	Ordained	12/11/1998	4B
Blum, Julie M.	Boise, Idaho	Ordained	06/28/1998	1D
Bocko, Joseph M.	Chicago, Ill.	Received	07/01/1998	5A
		from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Tanzania		
Boedecker, Matthew A.	Ceylon, Minn.	Ordained	06/27/1998	3F
Bolz-Weber, Matthew E.	Ephrata, Wash.	Ordained	07/18/1998	1D
Boschee, Gary M.	Cuba City, Wis.	Ordained	01/11/1998	5K
Botten, Gaylon G.	Dodge City, Kan.	Ordained	11/07/1998	4B
Brady, Stacey L.	Frederick, Md.	Ordained	06/21/1998	8F
Brandenburg, Gary L.	Leesville, S.C.	Ordained	06/05/1998	9C
Brauner, Steven A.	Renovo, Pa.	Ordained	05/16/1998	8E
Brendefur, Kari A.S.	Madison, Wis.	Ordained	08/29/1998	5K
Breyley, Loranell R.	Perrysville, Ohio	Ordained	08/22/1998	6E
Britton, Seth A.	Tustin, Calif.	Ordained	02/08/1998	2C
Brooks, William D. Jr.	Madison, Va.	Ordained	07/12/1998	9A
Brucklacher, Chad E.	Beresford, S.D.	Ordained	06/14/1998	3C
Bruning, Jonathan T.	Mount Pleasant, Mich.	Ordained	06/13/1998	6B
Bummer, Kristi G.	Davenport, Iowa	Ordained	10/24/1998	5D
Burch, Henry A.	Monroeville, Ohio	Ordained	11/14/1998	6D
Burgdorf, C. Ann	Worcester, Mass.	Ordained	11/15/1998	7B
Burgess, Richard M.	West Haven, Conn.	Ordained	09/13/1998	7B
Burkhalter, Scottie J.	New Sweden, Maine	Ordained	06/24/1998	7B
Burnette, Catherine M.	Woodhull, Ill.	Ordained	11/14/1998	5B
Bustard, Jon S.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Ordained	07/18/1998	8B
Butler, Roy M.	Woodstock, Va.	Ordained	05/17/1998	9A

Caiazzo, Janice C.	Amsterdam, N.Y.	Ordained	07/12/1998	7D
Campbell, Russell T.	San Antonio, Texas	Ordained	11/14/1998	4E
Carey, Julie L.	Hillsdale, Mich.	Ordained	06/26/1998	6B
Casper, Margaret C.	Pomeroy, Iowa	Ordained	05/08/1998	5E
Castro, Robert C.	Platteville, Wis.	Ordained	06/28/1998	5K
Catalano, Audree	Canton, Minn.	Ordained	06/07/1998	3I
Christensen, David A.	Hutchinson, Minn.	Ordained	07/12/1998	3F
Christianson, Carol J.	Dubuque, Iowa	Ordained	07/26/1998	5F
Church, Ronnie L. Jr.	Fremont, Neb.	Ordained	06/06/1998	4A
Cline, Laurie B.	Bellmore, N.Y.	Ordained	06/12/1998	7C
Cole, Bruce A.	Mundelein, Ill.	Ordained	04/04/1998	5A
Collinsworth, Beverly A.	Santa Fe, Texas	Ordained	11/14/1998	4F
Coltvet, Timothy J.	Stillwater, Minn.	Ordained	07/12/1998	3H
Combs, Mark A.	Greensburg, Pa.	Ordained	11/14/1998	8B
Conner, Frank J.	Appleton, Wis.	Ordained	07/12/1998	5I
Cosmas, Robert L.	Vero Beach, Fla.	Ordained	06/04/1998	9E
Costa, Gary E.	Aberdeen, N.J.	Ordained	06/14/1998	7A
Crocker, Brian J.	Lebanon Church, Va.	Ordained	08/16/1998	9A
Cruson, David E.	Albuquerque, N.M.	Ordained	07/25/1998	2E
Dager, Sandra D.	North Hollywood, Calif.	Ordained	09/20/1998	2B
Dahlberg, William T.	Oregon, Ill.	Ordained	06/20/1998	5B
Dale, Luther P.	North Oaks, Minn.	Ordained	08/16/1998	3H
Deal, Norman L. Jr.	Lone Star, S.C.	Ordained	10/14/1998	9C
Delkeskamp, Timothy C.	Mission Viejo, Calif.	Ordained	08/09/1998	2C
Dent, Elaine M.	Hummelstown, Pa.	Ordained	01/24/1998	8D
Deye, Harold A.	Rochester, Minn.	Received	01/02/1998	3I
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Dietrich, Lisa A.	Iowa City, Iowa	Ordained	03/29/1998	5D
Doherty, Jill P. Witte	Hartford, Conn.	Ordained	09/13/1998	7B
Donmoyer, Daniel O.	Felton, Pa.	Ordained	06/12/1998	8D
Drum, Margaret L.	Altoona, Pa.	Ordained	07/11/1998	8C
DuMond, James X.	Gastonia, N.C.	Ordained	08/09/1998	9B
Dunbar, Jesse L.	North Canton, Ohio	Ordained	08/22/1998	6E
Dusso, Anthony L.	Ashtabula, Ohio	Ordained	11/15/1998	6E
Dziadik-Willingham, Bryan C.	Hobart, Okla.	Ordained	08/09/1998	4C
Edwards, Robert L.	Almira, Wash.	Ordained	06/14/1998	1D
Edwardson, Nancy A.	Kenyon, Minn.	Ordained	04/19/1998	3I
Eidahl, Susan M.	Stratford, Wis.	Ordained	06/28/1998	5H
Ekern, LaDonna J.	East Grand Forks, N.D.	Ordained	06/21/1998	3D
Emgarten, Randy P.	Turtle Lake, N.D.	Ordained	07/19/1998	3A
Erb, Sharon C.	Roaring Spring, Pa.	Ordained	03/22/1998	8C
Erickson, Jonathan O.	Center, N.D.	Ordained	06/28/1998	3A
Erickson, Peter F.	Chester, Mont.	Ordained	07/11/1998	1F
Erskine, Karen R.	Aaronsburg, Pa.	Ordained	07/12/1998	8C
Fatzinger, Robert E. Jr.	Wyomissing, Pa.	Ordained	03/29/1998	7E
Fong, M. Timothy	Alhambra, Calif.	Received	03/08/1998	2B
		from the Lutheran Church of Hong Kong		
Fritz, Donald C. Sr.	Pomery, Ohio	Ordained	06/25/1998	6F
Fugate, Daniel W.	Wapakoneta, Ohio	Ordained	06/28/1998	6D
Fuhrman, Corey P.	Milan, Minn.	Ordained	06/21/1998	3F
Gackle, Jason R.	Comanche, Texas	Ordained	07/12/1998	4D
Gahagen, Patrick P.	Detroit, Mich.	Ordained	08/01/1998	6A
GebbenGreen, Julie M.	Gresham, Ore.	Ordained	03/01/1998	1E
Gentry, Laura E.	Burbank, Calif.	Ordained	12/20/1998	2B
Gipson, Ralph E.	Dallas, Texas	Ordained	10/25/1998	4D

Glaeske, Larry C.	Noonan, N.D.	Received	04/01/1998	3A
			from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada	
Gordon, Wendi C.	Williamsport, Pa.	Ordained	05/16/1998	8E
Gramza, Jeffery G.	Wessington Springs, S.D.	Ordained	06/20/1998	3C
Greenwald, Timothy J.	Wausau, Wis.	Ordained	07/12/1998	5I
Grimm, Frederick A.	Jefferson, Ohio	Ordained	06/29/1998	6E
Groenke, Matthew W.	Sterling Heights, Mich.	Ordained	07/26/1998	6A
Gruen, William C. Jr.	Princeton, Ind.	Ordained	02/01/1998	6C
Hall, Tiffany Jeske	Fargo, N.D.	Ordained	05/31/1998	3B
Hamrin, Jaci A. Meade	Bottineau, N.D.	Ordained	03/15/1998	3A
Haney, Eileen M.	Easton, Pa.	Ordained	10/11/1998	7E
Hannan, Shauna K.	Moorhead, Minn.	Ordained	07/19/1998	3D
Hansen, Carl J.	Goldendale, Wash.	Ordained	06/21/1998	1D
Harber, Shelly Cunningham	Bloomington, Minn.	Ordained	11/22/1998	3G
Hart, John A.	Hellertown, Pa.	Ordained	08/30/1998	7E
Hasty, Mark D.	Verdon, Neb.	Ordained	08/07/1998	4A
Haug, Joan E.	Spragueville, Iowa	Ordained	03/22/1998	5D
Haugerud, Clifford P.	Max, N.D.	Ordained	07/12/1998	3A
Haxton, Cecelia C.	Buchanan, Va.	Ordained	09/26/1998	9A
Hedrick, Keith E.	Fayetteville, Ga.	Ordained	06/14/1998	9D
Heinecke, Timothy J.	Memphis, Tenn.	Ordained	08/02/1998	9D
Hellwig, Mary Z.	St. Louis, Mo.	Ordained	05/10/1998	4B
Hesterberg, Kathleen M.	Waverly, Iowa	Ordained	06/28/1998	5F
Hildahl, Ronnie R.	Springtown, Texas	Ordained	08/30/1998	4D
Hinojosa, Arnold R.	San Antonio, Texas	Ordained	06/26/1998	4E
Hlavin, William A.	Sandusky, Ohio	Ordained	06/13/1998	6D
Hoadley, David E.	Plymouth, Minn.	Ordained	11/09/1998	3G
Hoffmann, Leonard A.	Baldwin, Wis.	Reinstated	09/26/1998	5H
Holck, Philip C.	San Antonio, Texas	Ordained	06/27/1998	4E
Holdsworth, Daryn A.	Colorado Springs, Colo.	Ordained	06/28/1998	2E
Holliday, John C.	Old Tappan, N.J.	Ordained	06/14/1998	7A
Holmes, Lawrence F.	Raleigh, N.C.	Ordained	06/06/1998	9B
Holmquist, Peter A.M.	Richmond Hill, N.Y.	Ordained	09/12/1998	7C
Horlacher, Valerie G.	Ridgefield, N.J.	Ordained	06/14/1998	7A
Horman, Jean M.	Howard, Pa.	Ordained	02/07/1998	8C
Houck, Mary A.	Bradford, Pa.	Ordained	05/19/1998	8A
Hower, Elaine M.	Natrona Heights, Pa.	Ordained	08/30/1998	8B
Hulme, Dale A.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Ordained	04/19/1998	3G
Huntley, Michael J.	Philo, Ill.	Ordained	07/12/1998	5C
Iacobazzi, Jeffrey M.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Ordained	10/17/1998	6C
Izzo, Dana K.	Johnson City, N.Y.	Ordained	06/14/1998	7D
Jackson, Jill N.	Florence, S.D.	Ordained	09/20/1998	3C
Jarrell, Jane E.	Bellevue, Ky.	Ordained	08/23/1998	6C
Jaskiewicz, Tricia A.	Bethlehem, Pa.	Ordained	08/30/1998	7E
Jeffers, Doreen F.	Beulah, N.D.	Ordained	11/28/1998	3A
Jerpseth, James G.	San Diego, Calif.	Ordained	01/18/1998	2C
Johannes, Nicholas A.	Seymour, Wis.	Received	05/11/1998	5I
			from the Roman Catholic Church	
Johnson, Felice A.	Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	Ordained	06/11/1998	9E
Johnson, Mark E.	Kasson, Minn.	Ordained	08/02/1998	3I
Johnson, Mark K.	San Bernardino, Calif.	Ordained	07/28/1998	2C
Johnson, Peter C.	Webster, N.Y.	Ordained	10/03/1998	7D
Johnson, Peter E.	Cedarville, Mich.	Ordained	07/12/1998	5G
Johnson, Stacy K.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Ordained	10/11/1998	3G
Jorstad, Larry R.	New Richmond, Wis.	Received	07/01/1998	5H
			from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada	

Jortack, Hilda G.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Ordained	01/18/1998	5J
Joseph, Milana L.	Bellevue, Neb.	Ordained	09/26/1998	4A
Josephson, Cynthia R.	Calhan, Colo.	Ordained	08/15/1998	2E
Kaufmann, Wolf W.	New York, N.Y.	Received	11/01/1998	7C
		from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany		
Kelley, Eileen Sudbrink	Baltimore, Md.	Ordained	06/14/1998	8F
Kelly, Sean S.	Fridley, Minn.	Ordained	07/19/1998	3G
Kemppainen, Dale J.	San Francisco, Calif.	Ordained	01/24/1998	2A
Killeen, David S.	Lisbon, N.D.	Ordained	11/01/1998	3B
King, M. Jill	Durham, N.C.	Ordained	05/17/1998	9B
Kirkpatrick, Melody A.	Waubun, Minn.	Ordained	09/06/1998	3D
Kirkpatrick, Ralph L.	Indianapolis, Ind.	Ordained	06/04/1998	6C
Kisner, Marcia A.	Cambridge, Iowa	Ordained	07/19/1998	5D
Klappenbach, David E.	Malinta, Ohio	Ordained	06/06/1998	6D
Knape, Marguerite D.	Fremont, Ohio	Ordained	08/16/1998	6D
Knepp, T. Gregory	Baltimore, Md.	Ordained	08/15/1998	8F
Knowlton, Richard W.	Northridge, Calif.	Ordained	12/06/1998	2B
Knutson, Paula M.	Maddock, N.D.	Ordained	06/27/1998	3B
Koberlein, Ivan E.	Bethlehem, Pa.	Reinstated	10/11/1998	7E
Koch, Dennis W.	Greensburg, Ind.	Ordained	06/04/1998	6C
Kolb, Cynthia J.	Pottstown, Pa.	Ordained	01/10/1998	7F
Koopmann, Frances A.	Lawton, Okla.	Ordained	08/15/1998	4C
Kotovskiy, John R.	Glendale, Ariz.	Ordained	11/22/1998	2D
Kratzer, Darla Ann	Beach City, Ohio	Ordained	08/22/1998	6E
Krejcarek, Amy S.	Johnson, Neb.	Ordained	03/22/1998	4A
Krogstad, Jeffrey A.	Williston, N.D.	Ordained	09/27/1998	3A
Kuemmerle, James A.	North Freedom, Wis.	Ordained	07/12/1998	5K
Kuemmerle, Melissa F.	Merrimac, Wis.	Ordained	07/19/1998	5K
Larson, Timothy E.	Warren, Mich.	Ordained	08/23/1998	6A
Lartz, Elizabeth L.	Williamstown, Pa.	Ordained	06/12/1998	8D
Lavelle, Leah L.	Union, N.J.	Ordained	07/07/1998	7G
Le, Thuong Ngoc	Westminster, Calif.	Received	05/15/1998	2C
		from the Vietnamese Evangelical Church in Europe		
Leiseth, Tessa Moon	Moundsview, Minn.	Ordained	06/21/1998	3H
Lenning, Christopher T.	Hooper, Neb.	Ordained	03/15/1998	4A
Lerseth, Mark J.	Ontonagon, Mich.	Ordained	07/05/1998	5G
Lerseth, Peder J.	Mass City, Mich.	Ordained	08/02/1998	5G
Limenih, Charlene L.	Inglewood, Calif.	Ordained	03/22/1998	2B
Lindberg, James C.	Lakeville, Minn.	Ordained	06/28/1998	3H
Lineberger, Thomas L. Jr.	Leesville, S.C.	Ordained	06/05/1998	9C
Luedeke, James E.	Glenwood, Md.	Ordained	04/19/1998	8F
Lund Burchill, Paula M.	Bainbridge Island, Wash.	Ordained	10/31/1998	1B
Lynum, Todd D.	San José, Costa Rica	Ordained	08/02/1998	2B
Macht, Frank R.	Nome, Alaska	Ordained	06/07/1998	1A
Mahler, Naomi Lynum	San José, Costa Rica	Ordained	08/09/1998	2B
Mahnke, Terrance D.	Atalissa, Iowa	Ordained	08/02/1998	5D
Malek, Timothy D.	Neenah, Wis.	Ordained	01/24/1998	5I
Manicke, Michelle E.	Portland, Ore.	Ordained	06/07/1998	1E
Manning, Elizabeth Davis	Tullahoma, Tenn.	Ordained	10/18/1998	9D
Manning, Matthew A.	Tullahoma, Tenn.	Ordained	10/18/1998	9D
Marlow, Judith K.	New Martinsville, W.Va.	Ordained	07/19/1998	8H
Marohl, Matthew J.	La Grange, Ill.	Ordained	06/13/1998	5A
Masterson, Michael J.	Plano, Texas	Ordained	05/03/1998	4D
Mather, Neal F.	DeWitt, Neb.	Ordained	07/12/1998	4A
Mattheis, Amy Jo	Richmond Hill, N.Y.	Ordained	09/12/1998	7C
Mayer, George E.	Great Barrington, Mass.	Received	03/20/1998	7B
		from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada		

McCoy, William C.	Fort Jackson, S.C.	Ordained	08/27/1998	9C
McDowell, Russell A.	Alvarado, Minn.	Ordained	10/10/1998	3D
McFarland, Shaun T.	Oconto Falls, Wis.	Ordained	06/21/1998	5I
McGuffin, Sherry E.	Petoskey, Mich.	Ordained	07/19/1998	6B
Meier, Scott A.	Cushing, Iowa	Ordained	02/15/1998	5E
Melber, David W.	Austin, Texas	Received	02/01/1998	4E
		from The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod		
Mellum, Loren D.	North Branch, Minn.	Ordained	08/28/1998	3H
Meyer, Timothy A.	Hamilton, Mont.	Ordained	07/12/1998	1F
Michaud, ⁸ Joy M.	Palm Harbor, Fla.	Ordained	05/20/1998	9E
Miller, Gwendolyn E.	Chicago, Ill.	Ordained	03/21/1998	4C
Miller, John D.	Baltimore, Md.	Ordained	06/28/1998	8F
Miller, Lee M. II	Canden, N.J.	Ordained	06/20/1998	7A
Millerville, Deron J.	Skaneateles, N.Y.	Ordained	06/26/1998	7D
Mims, Cathy J.	Tionesta, Pa.	Ordained	04/26/1998	8A
Mims, Scott A.	Sheffield, Pa.	Ordained	05/24/1998	8A
Mitcham, Jane Pope	Salisbury, N.C.	Ordained	06/06/1998	9B
Moehring, Eric K.	Columbus, Ohio	Ordained	08/02/1998	6F
Moore, Scott A.	Merrillville, Ind.	Ordained	02/28/1998	6C
Morton, MeLinda S.	Lubbock, Texas	Ordained	06/28/1998	4D
Munter, Ellen L.	Black Earth, Wis.	Ordained	04/18/1998	5K
Mustafa, Marjorie J.	Norristown, Pa.	Ordained	07/19/1998	7F
Nairn, Janice A.	Ojai, Calif.	Ordained	11/22/1998	2B
Nardi, Nancy A.	Parlin, N.J.	Ordained	06/14/1998	7A
Nau, T. Joel	Richland, Wash.	Ordained	08/09/1998	1D
Nelson, David P.	Hicksville, N.Y.	Reinstated	07/21/1998	7C
Nelson, Eileen M.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Ordained	08/23/1998	3G
Nelson, Jamey A.	Saginaw, Mich.	Ordained	07/26/1998	6B
Nelson, Martha Uecker	St. Charles, Ill.	Reinstated	10/07/1998	5A
Nessel, Scott D.	Atlantic City, N.J.	Ordained	06/14/1998	7A
Nickel, Helen A.	LeRoy, Ill.	Ordained	06/21/1998	5C
Nickodemus, Michelle L.	Butler, Pa.	Ordained	10/24/1998	8B
Nicolai, Lillian C. Russell	Lancaster, Pa.	Ordained	08/30/1998	8D
Ninke, Rebecca M.	Phoenix, Ariz.	Ordained	09/26/1998	2D
Norris-Weber, Robert H.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Ordained	08/30/1998	3G
Offhaus, Paul A.	Shelby Township, Mich.	Ordained	07/03/1998	6A
Ohsiek, Frederick C. III	Ocean Springs, Miss.	Ordained	12/13/1998	9D
Olsen, Linda S.	Edgewood, Wash.	Ordained	12/11/1998	1C
Olson, James A.	Cypress, Texas	Ordained	07/19/1998	4F
Olson, Steffan L.	Morris, Ill.	Ordained	06/20/1998	5B
Owensby, Sherry L.	Swansea, S.C.	Received	12/01/1998	9C
		from the United Church of Christ		
Pannkuk, Steven W.	Newton, Iowa	Ordained	07/12/1998	5D
Papke-Larson, Linnea M.	Bemidji, Minn.	Reinstated	04/19/1998	3D
Paquette, Jon M.	Dothan, Ala.	Ordained	07/12/1998	9D
Park, Min Chan	Flushing, N.Y.	Received	09/27/1998	7C
		from the Korean Presbyterian Church in America		
Parks, Robert A.	Somerset, Ohio	Ordained	07/26/1998	6F
Patterson, Grant W.	Medicine Lake, Mont.	Ordained	02/15/1998	1F
Pedersen, Kelley L.	Oklahoma City, Okla.	Ordained	08/30/1998	4C
Pederson, Craig A.	Cottage Grove, Minn.	Ordained	11/14/1998	3H
Pederson, Jonathan J.	Mequon, Wis.	Ordained	07/26/1998	5J
Pederson, Maria C.	Brookfield, Wis.	Ordained	07/12/1998	5J

⁸ Name later changed to Joy Michaud Waters.

Pesonen, Jorma J.	Berkeley, Calif.	Reinstated	06/01/1998	2A
Peterson, Brian R.	Trenton, Ohio	Ordained	07/25/1998	6F
Peterson, Terri L.	West Alexandria, Ohio	Ordained	07/24/1998	6F
Petrevics, Edgars R.	New Baltimore, Mich.	Received	07/13/1998	6A
				from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Latvia
Petruschke, Joel D.	Klingerstown, Pa.	Ordained	06/12/1998	8D
Pfaff, Margaret A.	Round Rock, Texas	Ordained	08/09/1998	4E
Pilger, Peter L.	Flaxville, Mont.	Ordained	06/07/1998	1F
Plasencia, Paul H.G.	Solvang, Calif.	Reinstated	09/01/1998	2B
Portillo, Pedro B.	Grand Prairie, Texas	Received	12/06/1998	4D
				from the Roman Catholic Church
Poston, Mary M.	Franklin, W.Va.	Ordained	08/29/1998	8H
Prin, Andrew H.	Brainerd, Minn.	Ordained	07/12/1998	3E
Ramey, Martha	Lincolnton, N.C.	Ordained	12/20/1998	9B
Rasmussen, Donald R.	Minnepapolis, Minn.	Ordained	03/29/1998	3G
Rathjen, Glatha G.	Lincoln, Neb.	Ordained	06/20/1998	4A
Rau, Vicki Saude	Rutland, N.D.	Ordained	05/03/1998	3B
Rautenberg, Beverly	Pringhar, Iowa	Ordained	10/04/1998	5E
Redelsheimer, Karl N.	Woodstock, Ill.	Ordained	06/20/1998	5B
Reimers, Philip P.	Billings, Mont.	Ordained	05/03/1998	1F
Riina, Gail V.	Williamsville, N.Y.	Ordained	06/06/1998	7D
Riley, Michael F.	Morganton, N.C.	Ordained	06/06/1998	9B
Rilling, Fred C. III	Prairie du Sac, Wis.	Ordained	09/06/1998	5K
Robbins, Aileen A.	Penn Yan, N.Y.	Ordained	10/24/1998	7D
Robinson, James M.	Hannaford, N.D.	Ordained	01/04/1998	3B
Robles-Harant, Patricia A.	Roundup, Mont.	Ordained	05/23/1998	1F
Rockswold, Kristi L.	Creston, Neb.	Ordained	01/03/1998	4A
Rockswold, Paul G.	Creston, Neb.	Ordained	01/03/1998	4A
Ruggiero, Alfred A.	Pen Argyl, Pa.	Ordained	08/30/1998	7E
Ryan, Angela R.	Columbia, S.C.	Ordained	06/05/1998	9C
Rymut, Jane S.	Aurora, Ill.	Ordained	06/13/1998	5A
St. George, Victor L.	Napoleon, N.D.	Ordained	06/07/1998	3A
Sanchez-Guzman, Rose Mary	El Paso, Texas	Ordained	03/21/1998	2E
Schaefer, James H.	Eau Claire, Wis.	Reinstated	05/10/1998	5H
Schaus, Maurice A.	Hoisington, Kan.	Ordained	08/07/1998	4B
Schlesinger, Jeffrey N.	Barron, Wis.	Ordained	02/01/1998	5H
Schoenhals, Mark D.	Bloomington, Minn.	Ordained	07/29/1998	3G
Schroeder, Paul C.	Gig Harbor, Wash.	Ordained	07/26/1998	1C
Schroeder, Richard A.	Southfield, Mich.	Ordained	05/02/1998	6A
Schwartz, Detlef A.	Santa Monica, Calif.	Received	07/01/1998	2B
				from Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany
Scott, Barry D.	St. Charles, Ill.	Ordained	04/04/1998	5A
Seiffert, Stephen C.	Big Lake, Minn.	Reinstated	01/01/1998	3F
Seyenkulo, D. Jensen	Chicago, Ill.	Received	07/01/1998	5A
				from the Lutheran Church of Liberia
Shanahan, Mary E.	Gardner, Mass.	Ordained	06/05/1998	7B
Shao, Herbert C.	Bellevue, Wash.	Ordained	12/13/1998	1B
Shepherd, Victoria L.	South Wayne, Wis.	Ordained	04/05/1998	5K
Sherrill, Richard T.	Salinas, Calif.	Ordained	07/12/1998	2A
Shuman, Kenneth E.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Ordained	06/13/1998	8B
Siegler, Patrick E.	Oregon, Wis.	Ordained	08/23/1998	5K
Silliker, M. Josita	Harrisburg, Pa.	Ordained	02/28/1998	8D
Silvernail, Jeffrey D.	Bemus Point, N.Y.	Ordained	06/06/1998	7D
Simmers, Barbara A.	Covington, Ohio	Ordained	08/14/1998	6F
Sipe, Martha S.	Easton, Pa.	Ordained	08/30/1998	7E
Sjaavaag, Andre	Milwaukee, Wis.	Ordained	02/22/1998	5J
Smith, Joseph B.W.	Hartland, Wis.	Ordained	08/30/1998	5J

Smith, Julie A.	Clarkfield, Minn.	Ordained	09/13/1998	3F
Stalheim Lane, Pamela I.	Robbinsdale, Minn.	Ordained	01/17/1998	3G
Stallings, Joanna C.	Blacksburg, Va.	Received	07/01/1998	9A
		from the United Methodist Church		
Stein, Timothy J.	East Boston, Mass.	Ordained	06/05/1998	7B
Stelle, Rebecca J.	Princeton, Minn.	Ordained	12/19/1998	3E
Stockton, Donald G.	Yeadon, Pa.	Ordained	08/30/1998	7F
Stone, Edward R.	Cullom, Ill.	Ordained	06/28/1998	5C
Strawn, Raymond E.	Stockton, Calif.	Ordained	06/13/1998	2A
Stumme, Sarah J.	Trevorton, Pa.	Ordained	09/05/1998	8E
Sturm, Craig M.	Three Rivers, Texas	Ordained	06/28/1998	4E
Sullivan, Rebecca A.	North Mankato, Minn.	Ordained	09/13/1998	3I
Swanson, Susan H.	Chicago, Ill.	Ordained	12/27/1998	5A
Swartz, Alan R.	Botkins, Ohio	Ordained	08/01/1998	6F
Tappert, ⁹ Carla L.	Nanticoke, Pa.	Ordained	03/29/1998	7E
Taylor, Sharon L.	Devon, Pa.	Ordained	02/28/1998	7F
Taylor-Schaus, Kelly A.	Hoisington, Kan.	Ordained	08/07/1998	4B
Teichmann, Thomas E.	South Paris, Maine	Ordained	09/13/1998	7B
Thelander, Laura J.	Moose Lake, Minn.	Ordained	01/17/1998	3E
Thom, Rodwell G.	East Orange, N.J.	Received	04/01/1998	7A
		from the Lutheran Church in Guyana		
Thomas, Jennifer J.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Ordained	07/26/1998	5J
Thomas, Rebecca L.	Sauk Centre, Minn.	Ordained	12/13/1998	3F
Thorkelson, ¹⁰ Marcia A.	Beaverton, Ore.	Ordained	02/22/1998	1E
Tillberg, Sonja M.	Woodstock, N.Y.	Ordained	09/13/1998	7C
Toavs, Kari L.	Woodstock, Ga.	Ordained	07/11/1998	9D
Tobin, Phillip E.	Golden, Ill.	Ordained	08/15/1998	5C
Tollefson, Marty D.	Grand Forks, N.D.	Ordained	11/21/1998	3B
Vak, Sharon Fetterolf	Lebanon, Pa.	Ordained	06/12/1998	8D
Valeriano, Teresita C.	Tulare, Calif.	Ordained	07/05/1998	2A
Vargas, Alicia	Milpitas, Calif.	Ordained	07/26/1998	2A
Wagner, Andreas	Philadelphia, Pa.	Received	05/17/1998	7F
		from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany		
Wallace, Bethany J.	Gahanna, Ohio	Ordained	08/23/1998	6F
Wallis, William P.	Phoenix, Ariz.	Ordained	06/28/1998	2D
Wallschlaeger, Melanie J. S.	Oconomowoc, Wis.	Ordained	08/30/1998	5J
Wangsness, Jodi L.	Minot, N.D.	Ordained	01/11/1998	3A
Waskow, Glenn A.	Line Lexington, Pa.	Ordained	12/06/1998	7F
Weaver, Andrew C.	Mount Pleasant Mills, Pa.	Ordained	08/15/1998	8E
Weaver, C. Nelson	Groveland, Fla.	Ordained	07/23/1998	9E
Weaver, Michael T.	Sugar Grove, Ohio	Ordained	10/17/1998	6F
Wellons, Pamela R.	Palatka, Fla.	Ordained	06/10/1998	9E
Werner, Mark A.	Orrstown, Pa.	Ordained	06/12/1998	8D
White, Norman D.	New Hyde Park, N.Y.	Ordained	06/12/1998	7C
Whritenour, Jack R.	Sidman, Pa.	Ordained	06/14/1998	8C
Wiegman, Bette J.	Glenford, Ohio	Ordained	07/12/1998	6F
Wilkins, Meredith A.	Lexington Park, Md.	Ordained	06/28/1998	8G
Williams, Dena L.	Littleton, Colo.	Ordained	11/08/1998	2E
Wilson, Jennifer L.	Baxter, Minn.	Ordained	03/29/1998	3E
Wind, Laura M.	Jacksonville, Fla.	Ordained	07/05/1998	9E
Woida, Karen L.	Antioch, Calif.	Ordained	05/24/1998	2A

⁹ Name later changed to Carla L. Tappert Reiersen.

¹⁰ Name later changed to Marcia A. Rosa.

Woods, John M.	Altamont, Ill.	Ordained	06/13/1998	5C
Worch, Ross L.	Hollister, Mo.	Ordained	06/05/1998	4B
Wothke, Charles A.	Waianae, Hawaii	Reinstated	05/01/1998	2C
Wrightsmann, Lauren J.	Burnsville, Minn.	Ordained	07/19/1998	3H
Young, S. Matthew	Milton, Ky.	Ordained	11/07/1998	6C
Zaske, Michael J.	Adrian, Minn.	Ordained	08/09/1998	3F
Zatroch, Shirley W.	St. Paul, Minn.	Ordained	10/11/1998	3H
Zavadil, Leon E.	Enderlin, N.D.	Ordained	07/05/1998	3B
Zeller, Eugene R.	Sterling, Colo.	Ordained	04/04/1998	2E
Zima, Jennifer E.	Falls Church, Va.	Ordained	08/16/1998	8G
Zima, William C. II	Falls Church, Va.	Ordained	08/23/1998	8G
Zimany, Roland D.	Des Moines, Iowa	Ordained	08/02/1998	5D
Zitzewitz, Marianne H.	Des Moines, Iowa	Ordained	07/19/1998	5D

Appendix B to the Report of the Secretary

Removals from the Roster of Ordained Ministers 1997-1998

Corrections

The following persons were removed from the roster of ordained ministers prior to 1997. The removals, however, were not reported in the minutes of prior churchwide assemblies.

Name	City/State	Reason	Date	Region/ Synod
Pruess, Frederick E.	College Grove, Tenn.	Deceased	01/04/1988	7C
Wittler, Robert C.	Ormond Beach, Fla.	Resigned	09/19/1995	9E

1997

Adix, Paul W.	Chicago, Ill.	Deceased	12/02/1997	3I
Ahlstrom, J. Millard	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	11/02/1997	3G
Airey, Christian G.	Chicago, Ill.	Removed	03/31/1997	5A
Allen, Paul D.	La Crosse, Wis.	Removed	03/11/1997	5L
Andersen, Johannes E.	Hamlin, Iowa	Deceased	01/20/1997	5E
Anderson, John T.H.	Kissimmee, Fla.	Resigned	01/10/1997	4F
Ansorge, Peter G.	New Braunfels, Texas	Resigned	01/01/1997	4E
Arnold, Trudy K.	Southworth, Wash.	Resigned	03/25/1997	1B
Arthur, Abner W.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	11/10/1997	3G
Astrup, Edwin C.	Moorhead, Minn.	Deceased	11/11/1997	3D
Auel, Carl A.	Purcellville, Va.	Deceased	08/15/1997	8G
Bacon, Floyd R.	Hudson, S.D.	Deceased	05/13/1997	3C
Baertschi, Walter	Plymouth, Minn.	Deceased	06/18/1997	3G
Bardy, Robert R.	Colorado Springs, Colo.	Resigned	02/01/1997	4D
Basich, Matthew J.	St. Paul, Minn.	Removed	06/07/1997	3H
Basich, Thomas L.	St. Paul, Minn.	Removed	06/07/1997	3H
Bastian, Edwin P.	Robeson, Pa.	Deceased	08/18/1997	7E
Bayer, Wayne C.	Bothell, Wash.	Removed	02/01/1997	1B
Beamer, James R.	Largo, Fla.	Deceased	04/22/1997	9E
Beck, Paul V.	Akron, Ohio	Deceased	05/12/1997	6E

Beck, Robert D.	Grimes, Iowa	Resigned	07/15/1997	5D
Becker, Harold G.	Waverly, Iowa	Deceased	06/07/1997	5F
Becklund, Ronald R.	Superior, Wis.	Removed	09/27/1997	5H
Behrens, William F. Jr.	Whiting, N.J.	Deceased	02/16/1997	7A
Benson, Caryl V.	Vero Beach, Fla.	Deceased	11/11/1997	7B
Benson, Howard B.	Cedar Falls, Iowa	Deceased	11/19/1997	5F
Berg, Sigval M.	Atlanta, Ga.	Removed	03/11/1997	5A
Bergendoff, Conrad J.	Rock Island, Ill.	Deceased	12/23/1997	5B
Berndt, Jule F.	River Falls, Wis.	Deceased	12/07/1997	5H
Berry, Stephen M.	Mount Joy, Pa.	Removed	06/12/1997	8D
Besecker, Samuel L.	Fayetteville, Pa.	Deceased	12/17/1997	8D
Birnbaum, David T.	Saginaw, Mich.	Removed	06/01/1997	9C
Bischoff, Jeffrey D.	Napoleon, Ohio	Removed	11/15/1997	6D
Bittikofer, Weldon F.	Durham, N.C.	Deceased	08/25/1997	6F
Bjorkman, A. Theodore	Salina, Kan.	Deceased	11/18/1997	4B
Blake, King C.	Ruffin, N.C.	Removed	01/19/1997	9B
Bodaski, Albert A. Jr.	Ogden, Utah	Removed	07/31/1997	2E
Boe, Gary N.	Urbandale, Iowa	Resigned	01/10/1997	5D
Boe, Rolf D.	Howard, Ohio	Deceased	11/03/1997	6F
Boelter, Phillip R.	St. Louis Park, Minn.	Resigned	12/15/1997	6B
Bosch, Austin L.P.	South Augustine Shores, Fla.	Deceased	03/14/1997	9E
Bougher, Aubrey N.	Rosedale, N.Y.	Removed	02/15/1997	7C
Boyd, Robert H.	Blooming Prairie, Minn.	Deceased	09/04/1997	3I
Brewton, Anthony W.	Richmond, Va.	Removed	01/16/1997	9A
Brosi, Daniel A.	Fond du Lac, Wis.	Removed	06/25/1997	5K
Brown, Donald	Tiffin, Ohio	Deceased	07/26/1997	6D
Brown, Donald L.	Allentown, Pa.	Deceased	01/16/1997	7E
Buenting, Herman	Litchfield, Minn.	Deceased	04/11/1997	3F
Bullock-Tiffany, Barbara J.	Camanche, Iowa	Deceased	11/08/1997	5D
Bumgarner, Elvin L. Jr.	Hickory, N.C.	Deceased	06/20/1997	9B
Burkhardt, Albert R.	Baltimore, Md.	Deceased	08/31/1997	8F
Burrack, Clifford J.	Greenfield, Iowa	Deceased	02/16/1997	5E
Busse, Carl N.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Deceased	10/03/1997	6D
Byus, Joyce K.	North Georgetown, Ohio	Resigned	07/31/1997	6E
Cadwallader, James K.	Conover, N.C.	Deceased	03/19/1997	9A
Callahan, Hazel J.	Arnold, Pa.	Deceased	02/18/1997	8B
Callander, Jeffrey H.	North Mankato, Minn.	Resigned	09/05/1997	3I
Cheek, Dean C.	Parma, Ohio	Deceased	09/10/1997	6E
Cizmar, Thomas J.	Sylmar, Calif.	Removed	04/30/1997	2B
Clutz, Frank H.	Tucson, Ariz.	Deceased	02/10/1997	2D
Cornils, Edwin J.	Thousand Oaks, Calif.	Deceased	04/19/1997	2B
Czerkus, Paul	Big Spring, Texas	Deceased	12/22/1997	4E
D'Aprile, Jan T.	Chalfont, Pa.	Resigned	07/22/1997	7F
Davis, James S.	St. Paul, Minn.	Resigned	06/16/1997	3H
Davis, Sarah J.	Nisswa, Minn.	Removed	12/05/1997	3E
DePorte, Howard D.	Fremont, Calif.	Resigned	11/01/1997	2A
Dieter, Henry E.	Cedar Falls, Iowa	Deceased	01/27/1997	5F
Dietterle, John A.	Feasterville, Pa.	Deceased	10/19/1997	7F
Dietze, Max A.	Roseville, Minn.	Removed	02/15/1997	5H
Dockter, Theodore O.	Rockford, Ohio	Deceased	05/23/1997	6D
Dordal, Harald	Moorhead, Minn.	Deceased	12/01/1997	3D
Domer, Edgar A.	Battle Creek, Mich.	Deceased	11/21/1997	6B
Dunbar, Mark E.	Sylmar, Calif.	Resigned	06/02/1997	2B
Dyer, Walter G.	Naples, Fla.	Deceased	01/21/1997	9E
Eberhardt, Karl A.	Rocky Point, N.Y.	Deceased	08/27/1997	7C
Elefante, Don A.	Coplay, Pa.	Deceased	04/23/1997	7E

Ellefson, Elmer M.	Viroqua, Wis.	Deceased	03/14/1997	3F
Enerson, Bradley J.	Cottage Grove, Wis.	Removed	10/13/1997	5K
Engen, David E.	Bloomington, Minn.	Removed	05/08/1997	3H
Erlandson, Paul R.	Sioux Falls, S.D.	Deceased	09/14/1997	3C
Ernst, David W.	Washington, Pa.	Removed	12/01/1997	8B
Evans, Robert O.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	07/25/1997	3G
Faddis, William H.	Savannah, Ga.	Deceased	12/08/1997	9D
Faillettaz, Pierre H.	Bronx, N.Y.	Resigned	01/31/1997	7C
Feickert, William F.	Uhrichsville, Ohio	Deceased	01/10/1997	6E
Ferrara, Jennifer M.	Fleetwood, Pa.	Resigned	12/31/1997	7E
Fetter, Lester E.	Athens, Pa.	Deceased	02/19/1997	7F
Fisher, Wallace E.	Lancaster, Pa.	Deceased	10/25/1997	8D
Fitzgerald, Robert	Charles City, Iowa	Deceased	07/08/1997	5F
Flaxbart, Dan R.	St. Louis, Mo.	Resigned	04/30/1997	2E
Folkemer, Carl W.	Linthicum, Md.	Deceased	03/16/1997	8F
Folkers, Eric C.	Marmarth, N.D.	Removed	11/15/1997	3C
Fortin, John E. Jr.	Scandia, Minn.	Removed	02/21/1997	5K
Friedmann, Otto H.	Mulberry, Ind.	Deceased	03/18/1997	6F
Fuerbringer, Alfred O.	Norman, Okla.	Deceased	02/26/1997	4C
Furler, Robert W.	Kempton, Pa.	Removed	02/10/1997	7E
Galezewski, James E.	Chicago, Ill.	Resigned	08/08/1997	5A
Ganz, Virgil A.	San Antonio, Texas	Deceased	10/01/1997	4E
Garbus, Richard A.	Irving, Texas	Resigned	04/25/1997	4D
Gast, William L.	Colorado Springs, Colo.	Deceased	11/05/1997	2E
Gedde, Larry A.	Fargo, N.D.	Resigned	08/11/1997	2A
Geiger, William G.	Arlington, Ohio	Resigned	01/18/1997	6E
Gillis, Thomas L.	Floyd, Va.	Resigned	01/21/1997	2E
Goldsmith, James H.	Detroit Lakes, Minn.	Resigned	07/01/1997	3D
Gonzalez, J. Edward	New York, N.Y.	Deceased	03/31/1997	9E
Gregg, Elmer J.	Sebring, Fla.	Deceased	02/25/1997	9E
Grindal, Harald D.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	05/26/1997	3G
Gustafson, Herbert	Jeffersonville, Vt.	Deceased	08/10/1997	7B
Gustafson, Thorsten A.	West Dennis, Mass.	Deceased	11/12/1997	7B
Habin, Eugene F.	Jefferson, Mass.	Removed	05/17/1997	7B
Hafer, Glenn T.	Chambersburg, Pa.	Deceased	06/28/1997	8D
Hagstrom, Jane S.	Iowa City, Iowa	Resigned	11/24/1997	5D
Hamilton, Erik J.	Sioux Falls, S.D.	Removed	11/15/1997	3C
Hankey, William C.	Bradford Woods, Pa.	Deceased	02/17/1997	8B
Hannemann, Herbert R.	Hastings, Neb.	Deceased	01/28/1997	4A
Hansen, Kenneth D.	Arcadia, Calif.	Deceased	10/28/1997	2B
Harrington, Michael O.	Spokane, Wash.	Resigned	09/04/1997	1D
Harter, Nathan F.R.	Anderson, Ind.	Deceased	06/05/1997	6C
Hartzell, Ralph R.	Williamsport, Pa.	Deceased	09/20/1997	7E
Hays, Samuel K.	Southfield, Mich.	Removed	02/10/1997	6A
Hedin, J. Melvin	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	04/26/1997	3G
Heidmann, Gerd E.	Englewood, Fla.	Deceased	01/26/1997	6A
Heineman, Richard R.	Venice, Fla.	Resigned	10/28/1997	9E
Heins, Lester F.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	09/27/1997	3G
Helleson, Manley J.	Montesano, Wash.	Deceased	01/12/1997	1C
Henricks, Kevin C.	Plainfield, Ill.	Removed	03/06/1997	5A
Henry, Paul E. Sr.	Syracuse, N.Y.	Deceased	11/06/1997	7D
Heumann, Arnold A.	St. Paul, Minn.	Deceased	03/24/1997	3H
Heyde, Luther	Butler, Pa.	Deceased	06/02/1997	8B
Hill-Hanson, James A.	Scottsdale, Ariz.	Resigned	11/13/1997	3B
Holmgren, James E.	Embarrass, Minn.	Resigned	06/21/1997	3E
Hove, Susan M.	Berhton, Va.	Deceased	08/16/1997	9A

Humphreys, William B.	Everett, Wash.	Removed	03/01/1997	1B
Hunstad, Gary D.	San Diego, Calif.	Removed	09/06/1997	2C
Huntley, Joseph	Ashland, Va.	Deceased	03/14/1997	9A
Im mendorf, Charles H.	Burlington, N.J.	Deceased	10/06/1997	7A
Ingberg, Mary Beth	Chicago, Ill.	Removed	03/27/1997	5A
Iverson, Albert E.	Southbury, Conn.	Deceased	11/07/1997	7B
Iverson, Mary R.	Mankato, Mich.	Resigned	08/21/1997	5H
Jacobi, Fredrick D.	Bowie, Texas	Deceased	09/05/1997	4D
Jacobs, Lawrence E.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Deceased	09/30/1997	5J
Jacobsen, Cindy L.	Waterloo, Ontario, Canada	Transferred	12/12/1997	9D
			to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada	
Jacobson, Robert C.	Colorado Springs, Colo.	Deceased	01/09/1997	2E
Jensen, William	Vero Beach, Fla.	Deceased	05/23/1997	9E
Jerstad, Mark A.	Sioux Falls, S.D.	Deceased	03/29/1997	3C
Johanson, John O.	Northwood, N.D.	Deceased	05/18/1997	3B
Johnson, David M.	East Grand Forks, Minn.	Resigned	04/14/1997	3D
Johnson, Eleanore H.	Wittenberg, Wis.	Removed	06/21/1997	3E
Johnson, Leighland E.	Silverton, Ore.	Deceased	03/16/1997	1C
Johnson, Peter K.	Stillwater, Minn.	Removed	08/25/1997	3G
Johnson, R. Dean	Oconomowoc, Wis.	Deceased	09/07/1997	5J
Johnson, Raymond E.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	08/27/1997	3G
Johnson, Vernon W.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	09/14/1997	3G
Jones, Herbert W.	Cambridge, Md.	Deceased	11/13/1997	8D
Jorgensen, Sidney E.	Eureka, Calif.	Deceased	09/15/1997	2A
Jorgenson, Einar	Atlanta, Ga.	Deceased	08/09/1997	9D
Juhasz, Emery S.	Hideaway Hills, Ohio	Deceased	11/16/1997	6E
Kaesar, David W.	Washington, N.C.	Deceased	03/03/1997	9B
Kappel-Hansen, Jorgen	Hadersley, Denmark	Removed	08/01/1997	1B
Keim, Evans R. Jr.	Martinsville, Va.	Deceased	10/09/1997	9A
Kempson, J. Obert	Chapin, S.C.	Deceased	07/21/1997	9C
Kinsey, Robert S.	Hermitage, Tenn.	Deceased	04/17/1997	9D
Kittelson, R. Peder	Oswego, Ill.	Resigned	04/01/1997	5A
Klemm, Keith E.	Woden, Iowa	Deceased	06/10/1997	5E
Knutson, Evans L.	Bella Vista, Ark.	Deceased	04/13/1997	4C
Koehnlein, C. Edgar	Ellicott City, Md.	Deceased	04/23/1997	8F
Kolsky, Harold E.	Lafayette, Ohio	Deceased	12/15/1997	6D
Koltash, Mark J.	Fort Wayne, Ind.	Removed	10/07/1997	8B
Konschak, Ralph H. Jr.	Colorado Springs, Colo.	Removed	03/06/1997	7A
Koski, Alex W.	Sonoma, Calif.	Deceased	01/30/1997	2A
Kraly, Joseph R. Jr.	Loyal, Wis.	Deceased	04/12/1997	5H
Krapf, Richard L.	Douglasville, Pa.	Deceased	03/31/1997	7E
Krause, David E.	Dallas, Texas	Resigned	12/07/1997	4D
Kretzmann, Justus P.	St. Charles, Mo.	Deceased	09/15/1997	4B
Kunnie, Julian	Tucson, Ariz.	Removed	10/01/1997	2A
Kunnie, Kim M.	Tucson, Ariz.	Removed	02/01/1997	6C
Langsdale, Richard M.	Dallas, Texas	Deceased	12/26/1997	4D
Larsen, Gregory J.	Princeton, Minn.	Resigned	04/11/1997	3E
Larson, Arthur J.	Morton, Ill.	Deceased	12/28/1997	5C
Larson, Dennis W.	St. Cloud, Minn.	Resigned	02/01/1997	3F
Larson, N. Eugene	Park Ridge, Ill.	Deceased	06/23/1997	5A
Larson, Patricia A.	Geneseo, Ill.	Deceased	05/05/1997	3D
Larson, Steven M.	Seymour, Wis.	Deceased	05/05/1997	5I
Laval-Yeh, Lynne M.	Lowell, Mass.	Resigned	12/11/1997	7B
Leavitt, Charles E.	Morganton, N.C.	Removed	08/25/1997	9B
Leininger, John C.	Spokane, Wash.	Removed	01/11/1997	1D

Leschensky, Eugene J.	Cornell, Wis.	Deceased	01/05/1997	5H
Lidums, Olaf R.	Detroit, Mich.	Removed	07/01/1997	6A
Lillie, Reynold J.	Orland Park, Ill.	Deceased	01/22/1997	5A
Lindler, David F.	Lewisville, N.C.	Removed	02/01/1997	9B
Loeffler, H. Kenneth	New Braunfels, Texas	Removed	10/07/1997	4E
Loeschen, Bernhard A.	Ogden, Ill.	Deceased	01/29/1997	5C
Lokensgard, Gerhard W.	St. Paul, Minn.	Deceased	01/17/1997	3H
Long, Barry A.	Wyoming, Ill.	Resigned	08/31/1997	5C
Lorimer, Paul A.	Greensboro, N.C.	Deceased	12/15/1997	9B
Lovaas, Archie	Salem, S.D.	Deceased	08/18/1997	3C
Lubold, Guy M.	Hillsboro, Ohio	Deceased	04/19/1997	6F
Luhn, Charles W.	Pleasant Hill, Tenn.	Deceased	04/09/1997	9D
Lundeen, Roger P.	Maplewood, Minn.	Removed	05/08/1997	3H
Lundeen, Ronald A.	San Anselmo, Calif.	Removed	03/13/1997	2A
Mathews, Juanita L.	Chandler, Ariz.	Removed	03/07/1997	2D
McConomy, John A.	Villas, N.J.	Deceased	03/03/1997	7A
McMeekin, Robert K.	Centuria, Wis.	Resigned	07/20/1997	5H
Mensch, Rudolph	Chilliwack, British Columbia, Canada	Deceased	05/12/1997	1B
Mesecher, Wayne K. Sr.	Hastings, Neb.	Deceased	02/06/1997	4A
Meyer, Duane L.	Maplewood, N.J.	Removed	10/07/1997	8B
Mgebroff, J. Fred	Clifton, Texas	Deceased	11/03/1997	4E
Mild, Andrew E.	Lubbock, Texas	Deceased	09/18/1997	4D
Miller, John W.	Tesquesta, Fla.	Deceased	06/25/1997	9E
Misenheimer, David L.	Charlotte, N.C.	Resigned	12/06/1997	9B
Mitchell, William H.	Royal Oak, Mich.	Deceased	12/18/1997	8B
Moen, Clayton B.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	07/12/1997	3G
Moline, Ragnar O.	Rockford, Ill.	Deceased	02/03/1997	5B
Molter, Frederick J.	Tacoma, Wash.	Deceased	10/07/1997	1C
Mose, Douglas W.	Washington, D.C.	Removed	05/01/1997	8G
Moyer, Steven K.	Telford, Pa.	Resigned	07/22/1997	7F
Mueller, Dennis D.	Weskan, Kan.	Deceased	05/27/1997	4B
Mueller, Philip	Spokane, Wash.	Deceased	09/05/1997	1D
Myers, Gordon H.	Peachtree City, Ga.	Removed	03/11/1997	2E
Nagashima, Glenn J.	Lakewood, Calif.	Removed	09/06/1997	2C
Natwick, E. David	Hutchinson, Minn.	Deceased	05/02/1997	3F
Nelson, Laura J.	Princeton, N.J.	Resigned	09/18/1997	5K
Nelson, Martha Uecker	St. Charles, Ill.	Removed	03/06/1997	5A
Nelson, Oliver A.	Park Ridge, Ill.	Deceased	05/04/1997	6A
Nesting, Joyce A.	Brooklyn Park, Minn.	Deceased	12/07/1997	3G
Nickel, Pamela J.	Bismarck, N.D.	Removed	10/18/1997	3A
Norman, George S.	Walnut Creek, Calif.	Deceased	11/11/1997	2A
Norquist, N. Leroy	Batavia, Ill.	Deceased	07/24/1997	5A
Ohlogge, Theodore A.	Appleton, Wis.	Deceased	08/08/1997	5I
Olson, Jeremiah	South St. Paul, Minn.	Resigned	05/15/1997	3H
Olson, Walter A.	De Forest, Wis.	Deceased	10/08/1997	5K
Onstad, Peter E.	Moorhead, Minn.	Deceased	02/27/1997	3D
Opdahl, Bennett	Glenwood, Minn.	Deceased	12/14/1997	3F
Orling, Robert A.	San Luis Obispo, Calif.	Removed	12/01/1997	2B
Ormsom, Gregory A.	Marquette, Mich.	Resigned	09/26/1997	6F
Otterstein, Paul L.	Schenefeld, Germany	Removed	03/11/1997	2A
Otto, Jeffrey L.	Owensboro, Ky.	Resigned	11/23/1997	6C
Outten, Ednold	Miami, Fla.	Removed	02/28/1997	9E
Oye, Robin L.	Hancock, Mich.	Removed	02/08/1997	3B
Ozolins, Karlis L.	St. Paul, Minn.	Deceased	06/18/1997	3G

Pearson, Walter F.	St. Peter, Minn.	Deceased	04/20/1997	3F
Pedersen, James K.	St. Peter, Minn.	Deceased	01/30/1997	3F
Peterman, Richard L.	Madison, N.J.	Deceased	08/08/1997	7A
Peters, Olen A.	Port Charlotte, Fla.	Deceased	10/14/1997	9E
Petersen, Lester L.	Stewartville, Minn.	Deceased	08/05/1997	3I
Pfeiffer, J. Adrian	Decorah, Iowa	Deceased	08/23/1997	5F
Pietsch, John A.	Temple, Texas	Deceased	12/03/1997	4E
Plasencia, Paul H.G.	Torrance, Calif.	Removed	02/01/1997	2B
Probst, H. Paul	Fulton, Texas	Deceased	07/06/1997	4F
Raaum, Ernest J.	Lynnwood, Wash.	Deceased	05/06/1997	1B
Rajala, Oliver A.	Miamisburg, Ohio	Deceased	08/06/1997	6F
Rasmussen, John H.G.	Elmhurst, Ill.	Removed	05/24/1997	5B
Reesnes, Arthur J.	Pangburn, Ark.	Deceased	05/10/1997	5I
Reid, James D.	Ashland, Ore.	Deceased	03/17/1997	2C
Reiner, John L.	Latrobe, Pa.	Deceased	08/30/1997	8B
Rice, Jeffrey M.	Summit, N.J.	Removed	07/17/1997	3G
Richter, Thomas J.	Laguna Hills, Calif.	Deceased	02/14/1997	2C
Riensch, Reinhart H.	Loveland, Colo.	Deceased	03/18/1997	2E
Robertson, George J.	Anaheim, Calif.	Deceased	12/17/1997	2B
Rogers, Howard	Chester, N.H.	Deceased	01/05/1997	7B
Root, John A.	Lehigh Acres, Fla.	Deceased	06/10/1997	9E
Rostedt, Lynn M.	Houston, Texas	Resigned	01/14/1997	4F
Rozentals, Janis	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	10/02/1997	3G
Rudiger, Roberta A.	Rice Lake, Wis.	Removed	02/15/1997	5H
Safrit, Donald L. Sr.	China Grove, N.C.	Deceased	10/31/1997	9B
Samuelson, Peter L.	Avondale Estates, Ga.	Removed	08/23/1997	5F
Sand, Daniel L.	Brookville, Ohio	Deceased	05/24/1997	6F
Sandager, John C.	Colorado Springs, Colo.	Removed	11/30/1997	2E
Sandberg, Harold R.	Seminole, Fla.	Deceased	07/26/1997	9E
Sander, Robert G.	Johnstown, Pa.	Deceased	05/12/1997	8C
Sandvig, Edwin E.	Tigard, Ore.	Resigned	12/22/1997	1E
Sass, Lyle A.	Blair, Neb.	Removed	12/06/1997	4A
Schiffler, Henry C.	Waverly, Iowa	Deceased	07/25/1997	5F
Schmidt, Orval A.	St. Peter, Minn.	Deceased	08/30/1997	3G
Schroeder, Lynnette C.	Casper, Wyo.	Removed	04/18/1997	3C
Schroeder, Victor H.	San Diego, Calif.	Deceased	01/12/1997	2C
Schulz, Philip H.	Nashville, Tenn.	Resigned	09/16/1997	9D
Schwilk, Christopher L.	Harrisburg, Pa.	Resigned	01/27/1997	7E
Scott, Randall R.	University City, Mo.	Resigned	06/10/1997	5C
Segerhammer, Robert E.	Lindsborg, Kan.	Deceased	12/31/1997	4B
Seibert, Duane G.	Flagstaff, Ariz.	Deceased	08/14/1997	2D
Seiffert, Stephen C.	St. Paul, Minn.	Removed	03/11/1997	5D
Sharp, Kenneth O.	Sandusky, Ohio	Deceased	07/22/1997	6D
Sharp, Nancy L.	Yukon, Okla.	Removed	03/11/1997	4B
Shelton, James L.	Ashton, Pa.	Resigned	03/06/1997	7F
Shiell, Wendell C. Jr.	Venice, Fla.	Resigned	06/30/1997	9E
Shilling, Russell T.	York, Pa.	Deceased	01/31/1997	8D
Shimizu, Kohei	Torrance, Calif.	Removed	02/01/1997	2B
Shumate, Alfred R.	Wytheville, Va.	Deceased	03/09/1997	9A
Sievert, M. Luther	Largo, Fla.	Deceased	11/11/1997	9E
Simonsen, Arthur M.	Omaha, Neb.	Deceased	06/05/1997	4A
Simonson, James W.	Eastpointe, Mich.	Deceased	06/12/1997	6A
Sinclair, Andrew G.	Mount Pleasant Mills, Pa.	Deceased	08/26/1997	8E
Singer, Gilbert M.	Poynette, Wis.	Deceased	10/20/1997	5K
Sink, Olin W.	Salisbury, N.C.	Deceased	03/04/1997	9B
Smith, Eugene L.	Booneville, Ark.	Deceased	12/30/1997	4C
Spaid, James R.	Sun City, Ariz.	Deceased	03/03/1997	2D

Spilos, James T.	Novi, Mich.	Removed	02/10/1997	6A
Spindler, John A. Jr.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Deceased	09/28/1997	7A
Spittiger, Barbara E.	Mülheim, Germany	Removed	02/10/1997	6A
Stahl, Glenn L.	Martinsburg, Pa.	Deceased	12/25/1997	8C
Stangland, Irving E.	Loves Park, Ill.	Deceased	06/28/1997	5B
Steen, Ernest B.	Bloomington, Minn.	Deceased	01/26/1997	3G
Steenssen, George G.	New Concord, Ohio	Deceased	11/11/1997	6F
Swanson, Clifford E.	Rimrock, Ariz.	Deceased	11/26/1997	2D
Swenson, C. Philip	Lincoln, Neb.	Resigned	06/22/1997	4A
Swygert, Luther L.	Lexington, S.C.	Deceased	08/06/1997	9C
Tate, Frederick Jr.	Columbia, S.C.	Resigned	10/24/1997	9C
Taylor, Clifford C.	Mesa, Ariz.	Deceased	12/29/1997	2D
Tomlinson, Joe H. Jr.	Seattle, Wash.	Removed	03/21/1997	1D
Tong, Far-Dung	San Pedro, Calif.	Removed	09/27/1997	5A
Tweeten, John O.	Yankton, S.D.	Removed	10/07/1997	3C
Van de Ven, Robert E.	Culver City, Calif.	Deceased	04/10/1997	2B
Vardell, Russell A.	Grand Prairie, Texas	Resigned	01/31/1997	4D
Vogen, N. Paul	Mooreville, N.C.	Deceased	09/07/1997	9B
Volker, Wilbur G.	North Fort Myers, Fla.	Deceased	01/22/1997	9E
Walfrid, Alvar B.	Austin, Texas	Deceased	01/25/1997	3H
Wallace, H. Jefferson	Columbia, S.C.	Resigned	09/22/1997	9C
Walle, David C.	Denton, Texas	Removed	02/10/1997	6A
Wallin, Ralph A.	Storm Lake, Iowa	Deceased	10/08/1997	5E
Waznik, Arnold H.	Hudson, Wis.	Deceased	07/07/1997	5H
Weber, Gustave W.	Selinsgrove, Pa.	Deceased	07/12/1997	8E
Weber, Mark A.	Mount Morris, Ill.	Deceased	09/01/1997	5B
Weeks, Michael	Charlotte, N.C.	Deceased	05/25/1997	9B
Weiss, Joseph E.	Nederland, Colo.	Resigned	03/29/1997	2E
Westenbarger, Lewis C.	Richardson, Texas	Deceased	07/06/1997	6C
Whay, Thomas D.	Windom, Kan.	Deceased	10/24/1997	4B
Whitley, J. Robin	Charlotte, N.C.	Resigned	09/17/1997	9B
Wieder, Raymond F.	Altoona, Pa.	Deceased	11/26/1997	8C
Wingate, Roy B.	Iowa City, Iowa	Deceased	03/11/1997	5D
Wirsing, George E.	Manassas, Va.	Resigned	01/10/1997	8C
Wolter, Keith R.	Spokane, Wash.	Removed	10/10/1997	1F
Yeh, James C.	San Gabriel, Calif.	Removed	01/01/1997	2B
Zoerb, Ernest L.	Santa Maria, Calif.	Deceased	05/13/1997	2B
1998				
Aaseng, Scott D.	Chicago, Ill.	Removed	08/10/1998	5A
Acheson, Steven J.	Scottsdale, Ariz.	Resigned	03/23/1998	5I
Aden, Ross E.	Janesville, Wis.	Resigned	01/21/1998	5K
Albers, Joel D.	Naperville, Ill.	Deceased	09/30/1998	5B
Albertson, Myron L.	Moline, Ill.	Resigned	11/02/1998	5F
Als Dorf, Howard A.	Bainbridge Island, Wash.	Deceased	10/03/1998	6C
Anderson, Edgar A.P.	Crystal Lake, Ill.	Deceased	09/21/1998	5B
Anderson, Theodore J.	Sioux City, Iowa	Deceased	02/08/1998	5E
Arber, Darlene A.	Evergreen, Colo.	Resigned	03/31/1998	2E
Aronsen, Viggio	Kerrville, Texas	Deceased	02/25/1998	4E
Bader, Sylvester	Skaneateles, N.Y.	Deceased	10/28/1998	7D
Baglin, George R.	Bethany Beach, Del.	Deceased	08/06/1998	8G
Bailey, Thomas H.	State College, Pa.	Deceased	08/05/1998	8C

Baumgarten, Thomas	Marietta, Ga.	Removed	06/16/1998	9D
Beaumont, Sara M.	Hatboro, Pa.	Removed	01/10/1998	7F
Beilstein, Emmett H.	Cupertino, Calif.	Deceased	03/24/1998	2A
Bell, Francis R.	Williamsport, Pa.	Deceased	11/18/1998	8E
Bell, William L.	Memphis, Tenn.	Deceased	11/21/1998	9D
Bennetch, John H.	Lebanon, Pa.	Deceased	01/01/1998	8D
Berg, Thomas A.	Kempner, Texas	Deceased	09/24/1998	7E
Bergeson, A. Robert	Lake Park, Minn.	Deceased	02/07/1998	3D
Berglund, Gregory G.	West Fargo, N.D.	Resigned	08/20/1998	3H
Bernard, Geroge P.	La Grange Park, Ill.	Deceased	06/22/1998	5A
Bigelow, Phillip D.	Safety Harbor, Fla.	Resigned	03/16/1998	9E
Biorn, Boral R.	Bloomington, Minn.	Deceased	08/09/1998	2D
Bittner, James B.	Duluth, Minn.	Removed	11/07/1998	8H
Blobaum, August F.	St. Joseph, Ill.	Deceased	07/21/1998	5C
Bohls, Alvin H.	Bastrop, Texas	Deceased	11/20/1998	4E
Boldman, James W. Jr.	Miami, Fla.	Resigned	09/12/1998	5A
Boman, Sten	Tallsberg, Sweden	Removed	05/16/1998	7B
Bomgren, L. Vincent	Tulsa, Okla.	Deceased	04/23/1998	4C
Bomhoff, Merritt L.	Waverly, Iowa	Deceased	04/27/1998	5F
Borlaug, Donald A.	Viroqua, Wis.	Deceased	08/05/1998	5L
Bosserman, Elmer E.	Madison, Va.	Deceased	02/28/1998	9A
Boyer, Robert L.	Penndel, Pa.	Deceased	05/02/1998	7F
Bracher, Edwin W.	Des Moines, Wash.	Deceased	12/16/1998	1B
Brachna, Gabor	Fairview Park, Ohio	Deceased	01/10/1998	6E
Brady, James L.	Petersburg, Va.	Resigned	07/01/1998	9A
Bragstad, William R.	Fremont, Calif.	Removed	11/01/1998	2A
Brandt, Leslie F.	Vista, Calif.	Deceased	01/14/1998	2C
Brenneis, Rebecca L.	Kissimmee, Fla.	Deceased	06/09/1998	9E
Brink, Carl A.	Hartford, Conn.	Deceased	10/02/1998	7B
Brinkman, Cheryl L.	Tiro, Ohio	Deceased	12/24/1998	6D
Browne, Carl A. Jr.	Willingboro, N.J.	Removed	08/15/1998	7A
Buck, Wesley J.	San Antonio, Texas	Deceased	06/14/1998	4E
Budke, John A.	Sunman, Ind.	Deceased	08/20/1998	6C
Burkat, Hubert L.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Resigned	11/01/1998	7F
Burke, Lloyd L.	Chico, Calif.	Deceased	11/23/1998	2A
Camac, Robert C.	Millmont, Pa.	Deceased	11/26/1998	8E
Campbell, Jeffrey	Columbus, Ohio	Resigned	10/17/1998	6F
Carlson, Todd S.	Merrimac, Wis.	Resigned	03/19/1998	5K
Cawkins, John M.	Homestead, Pa.	Resigned	07/16/1998	8B
Chapman, Mark E.	Chambersburg, Pa.	Resigned	05/04/1998	8D
Chiu, Philip	Los Angeles, Calif.	Removed	12/31/1998	2B
Christianson, Keith D.	Menasha, Wis.	Resigned	06/24/1998	5I
Clark-Johnson, John V.	Woodstock, Ill.	Resigned	09/14/1998	5B
Connor, Robert J.	Minot, N.D.	Deceased	03/13/1998	3A
Conrad, William R.	Stromsburg, Neb.	Deceased	11/11/1998	2B
Couts, James M.	Marietta, Ohio	Resigned	12/07/1998	6F
Davoux, David E.	Brandon, S.D.	Deceased	03/09/1998	3G
Deisher, Harold G.	Topton, Pa.	Deceased	08/28/1998	7E
DeVos, Douglas P.	Marblehead, Ohio	Removed	08/01/1998	6D
Dickert, James C.	Chapin, S.C.	Deceased	02/12/1998	9C
Dietz, Carl W.	Russel, Kan.	Deceased	02/20/1998	4C
Dillard, Nancy B.	Albuquerque, N.M.	Resigned	03/31/1998	2E
Dinkel, J. Edward	Petersburg, Mich.	Deceased	02/11/1998	6A
Dotd, Edwin H.	Defiance, Ohio	Deceased	04/08/1998	6D
Dohmeier, Ervin W.	Belgrade, Minn.	Deceased	11/17/1998	3F
Ducker, William J.	Charleston, S.C.	Deceased	11/15/1998	9C
Dumins, Arthur	Port Colborne, Ontario, Canada	Deceased	05/10/1998	5B

Durkop, David A.	Pickerington, Ohio	Deceased	10/09/1998	6F
Earp, John C.	Lake Wales, Fla.	Resigned	10/20/1998	9B
Eckert, Frederick J.	Rockville, Md.	Deceased	02/02/1998	8F
Ede, Emil S.	Edina, Minn.	Deceased	06/21/1998	3G
Eiche, Elmer H.	Orwigsburg, Pa.	Deceased	10/18/1998	7E
Eichner, Malcolm S.	Fairlawn, Ohio	Deceased	11/03/1998	7F
Eller, William R.	Laguna Hills, Calif.	Deceased	03/02/1998	2C
Ellison, James B.	Rowland Heights, Calif.	Removed	09/12/1998	2B
Ericksen, Fred M.	Northbrook, Ill.	Deceased	12/24/1998	9E
Erickson, Gerald W.	Bothell, Wash.	Deceased	05/23/1998	1B
Erickson, Jon G.	Brush, Colo.	Removed	05/31/1998	2E
Ernst, Glen J.	Wilmington, Del.	Resigned	09/02/1998	7F
Espinoza, Rudy E.	Houston, Texas	Removed	10/24/1998	4F
Evenson, Thorval T.	Middletown, Calif.	Deceased	10/30/1998	2A
Fischer, Jack R.	Enid, Okla.	Deceased	11/12/1998	4C
Flora, George R.	Oakland, Calif.	Deceased	02/02/1998	2A
Folk, Tomi J.	Sorrento, Fla.	Removed	10/31/1998	3C
Foutz, Martin F. Sr.	Valdosta, Ga.	Deceased	10/15/1998	9E
Francis, Perry C.	Greeley, Colo.	Removed	01/31/1998	2E
Frank, James N.	Beaver Falls, Pa.	Deceased	07/08/1998	8B
Franzen, Kenneth E.	Omaha, Neb.	Deceased	11/20/1998	4A
French, Ernest C.	Sarasota, Fla.	Deceased	02/11/1998	9E
Frick, Frederick W.	Niantic, Conn.	Deceased	10/16/1998	7B
Friese, Keith H.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	07/05/1998	3G
Fritch, David S.	Kutztown, Pa.	Deceased	04/03/1998	7E
Fulmer, G. Alvin	Chapin, S.C.	Deceased	06/06/1998	9C
Futchs, John F.	Wilmington, N.C.	Deceased	08/27/1998	9B
Gensel, John G.	Muncy, Pa.	Deceased	02/06/1998	7C
Gerberding, David R.	Plymouth, Minn.	Deceased	03/25/1998	3G
Gerdes, E. Lee	San Francisco, Calif.	Removed	01/16/1998	2A
Geske, August H.	Waverly, Iowa	Deceased	02/21/1998	5F
Gibney, Herbert N.	Stratford, Conn.	Deceased	04/11/1998	7B
Goodwin, Stanley R.	Bagley, Minn.	Deceased	02/09/1998	3D
Grabenstein, Michael J.	Hayden, Idaho	Resigned	08/01/1998	1D
Grant, Gaylord O.	Eagan, Minn.	Deceased	01/17/1998	3H
Greenhagen, Mark R.	Hogenville, Ky.	Removed	05/16/1998	7B
Groth, Ulrich F.	Chassel, Mich.	Deceased	06/17/1998	5F
Guinther, Diane M.	Emmaus, Pa.	Removed	12/01/1998	7E
Gustafson, David A.	Duluth, Wis.	Resigned	02/28/1998	5H
Haas, Clyde P. Jr.	Lexington, N.C.	Deceased	10/12/1998	9B
Habig, Ernest E.	Dunedin, Fla.	Deceased	05/14/1998	9E
Hacker, Carl E.	Hemet, Calif.	Deceased	06/02/1998	2C
Hafner, Victor R.	Omaha, Neb.	Deceased	03/04/1998	4A
Hahn, L. Clement Sr.	Mount Pleasant, N.C.	Deceased	04/08/1998	9B
Haines, J. Leon	Lutherville, Md.	Deceased	08/15/1998	8F
Halvorson, Maynard G.	Sandwich, Ill.	Deceased	06/16/1998	5B
Hammer, Margaret L.	Haderslev, Denmark	Removed	12/20/1998	1B
Hankins, Thomas J.P.	Waverly, Iowa	Deceased	03/09/1998	5F
Harms, Raymond	Waverly, Iowa	Deceased	06/23/1998	5F
Harner, J. Wilson	Littlestown, Pa.	Deceased	02/11/1998	8D
Harrison, Walter R. Jr.	Bernville, Pa.	Removed	01/31/1998	7E
Haskel, Robert F.	Grayling, Mich.	Deceased	10/03/1998	6B
Hawk, Kenneth W. II	Mahanoy City, Pa.	Deceased	10/06/1998	7E
Heavner, Laura H.	Clemson, S.C.	Resigned	08/16/1998	9C
Heide, Robert S.	Racine, Wis.	Deceased	01/12/1998	5J

Hein, Joseph E.	Binghamton, N.Y.	Resigned	02/25/1998	7D
Heinecken, Martin J.	Middlebury, Vt.	Deceased	02/24/1998	7B
Hellier, Michael J.	Portland, Ore.	Deceased	02/26/1998	1E
Helmly, Cecil C.	Severn, Md.	Deceased	01/20/1998	9C
Helsel, Frank E.	Westminster, Md.	Deceased	08/20/1998	8F
Henderson, Alan J.	Ankeny, Iowa	Deceased	12/07/1998	5D
Hendrickson, Hensel E.	Bismarck, N.D.	Deceased	12/09/1998	3A
Hepner, R. Timothy	Golden Valley, Minn.	Removed	06/15/1998	3G
Herrig, Otto W.	Salem, Ohio	Deceased	02/06/1998	6E
Herwynen, Theresa A.	Fargo, N.D.	Resigned	06/03/1998	3D
Hinsch, John C.	Laurel, N.Y.	Deceased	06/17/1998	7C
Hoferer, Dean W.	Des Moines, Iowa	Resigned	06/30/1998	5D
Hoffmeyer, Ralph W. Jr.	Harrisonburg, Va.	Deceased	06/16/1998	9A
Hollensen, Martin E.	Marion, Ohio	Deceased	04/14/1998	6D
Hook, Wade F.	Gettysburg, Pa.	Deceased	01/27/1998	8D
Hougum, Daniel J.	Grand Forks, N.D.	Removed	04/24/1998	3B
Hult, Bertil E.	Sun City, Ariz.	Deceased	12/22/1998	2D
Ireland, Patricia Sodano	Marlton, N.J.	Resigned	01/01/1998	7A
Jacobs, Elmer W.	Charles City, Iowa	Deceased	08/31/1998	5F
Jamison, Mark G.	Willmar, Minn.	Resigned	10/31/1998	3F
Johnson, Eugene A.	Rindge, N.H.	Deceased	02/25/1998	7B
Johnson, Lyle J. Jr.	Fridley, Minn.	Removed	03/31/1998	3G
Johnstone, Theodore E.	Tacoma, Wash.	Deceased	09/02/1998	1E
Jones, Bruce	Griffith, Ind.	Removed	11/30/1998	6C
Jothen, Arthur M.	Apple Valley, Minn.	Deceased	12/08/1998	3G
Juhkental, Julius	Shoreline, Wash.	Deceased	07/27/1998	1B
Kahle, Roger R.	Chicago, Ill.	Deceased	12/01/1998	5A
Kangas, Daniel B.	Ironwood, Mich.	Removed	08/08/1998	5G
Kazar, Andrew P.	Torrington, Conn.	Deceased	09/30/1998	7G
Keen, Marvin L.	Fargo, N.D.	Deceased	09/17/1998	3B
Kimm, Wesley K.	Utica, N.Y.	Deceased	02/02/1998	7E
Kirkwood, Gergory N.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Removed	06/15/1998	3G
Kittel, Ronald A.	Hamden, Conn.	Resigned	09/01/1998	7B
Klafter, Oliver K. Jr.	Middletown, Ohio	Deceased	08/18/1998	6F
Klinger, Curtis C.	Milford, N.J.	Deceased	04/10/1998	7A
Klopfer, Frederick E.	Canal Winchester, Ohio	Resigned	11/10/1998	6F
Klover, Alice R.	Boise, Idaho	Deceased	07/26/1998	1D
Knaack, Joachim A.	Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Transferred	11/27/1998	7F
to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada				
Knudson, George J.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	03/05/1998	3G
Kohl, Kenneth W.	Madison, Wis.	Deceased	12/09/1998	5K
Kramins, Fridrichs F.	St. Petersburg, Fla.	Deceased	04/22/1998	9C
Kristbergs, Zanis	Lakewood, N.J.	Deceased	07/04/1998	7A
Kuester, I. Harold	Milwaukee, Wis.	Deceased	12/23/1998	5J
Kvamme, Alfred I.	Mesa, Ariz.	Deceased	12/06/1998	2D
Lampe, Edwin F.	Brenham, Texas	Deceased	08/16/1998	4F
Larsen, Lars M.	Moorhead, Minn.	Deceased	08/07/1998	3D
Larson, Clifford O.	San Jose, Calif.	Deceased	04/19/1998	2A
Lau, Randall S.	Great Falls, Mont.	Resigned	10/06/1998	1F
Ledum, Clare H.	Cypress, Calif.	Resigned	10/02/1998	2C
Lee, Sylvan E.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	02/22/1998	3G
Lehmann, Helmut T.	Rockport, Maine	Deceased	04/06/1998	7E
Lenhardt, Howard A.	Anaheim, Calif.	Deceased	11/07/1998	2C
Leonard, Frank J.	San Francisco, Calif.	Resigned	12/06/1998	2A
LePoris, A. Elaine	Ravenna, Ohio	Deceased	01/21/1998	6E

Lind, J. Blix	Logan, Ohio	Deceased	09/22/1998	6F
Linnerson, LaVerne W.	Pueblo, Colo.	Deceased	01/28/1998	2E
Locker, Lambert H.	Slidell, La.	Deceased	09/24/1998	4F
Loges, Ralph G.	Owatonna, Minn.	Deceased	04/28/1998	3I
Lund, Earl J.	Waseca, Minn.	Deceased	01/15/1998	3I
Magnussen, O. Victor	Anaheim, Calif.	Deceased	02/14/1998	2C
Martin, Michael S.	Houghton, Mich.	Resigned	03/26/1998	5G
Mayer, Jacob L. Jr.	Blacksburg, Va.	Resigned	09/02/1998	9A
Mayer-Caes, Pamela	La Grange, Ill.	Removed	07/15/1998	5A
McCullough, LaVeme B.	Seattle, Wash.	Deceased	02/24/1998	1B
McLaughlin, Fred	Gettysburg, Pa.	Deceased	03/01/1998	7C
Messner, Herbert L.	Painesville, Ohio	Deceased	08/10/1998	7A
Meyers, Peter E.	Rockford, Minn.	Removed	08/10/1998	3G
Michelsen, Heidi A.	Lowell, Mass.	Resigned	05/15/1998	2A
Mickelson, Richard A.	New South Wales, Australia	Deceased	04/20/1998	3F
Miller, Catherine E.	El Cajon, Calif.	Removed	06/01/1998	2B
Miller, Eldon R.	Sun City, Calif.	Deceased	09/16/1998	2C
Mohrhoff, Karl E.	Fort Meyers, Fla.	Deceased	07/24/1998	9E
Monnich, Henry T.	Nickerson, Neb.	Deceased	03/01/1998	4A
Mull, R. Lee	Natrona Heights, Pa.	Deceased	07/11/1998	8B
Navta, James R.	Elgin, Ill.	Resigned	05/26/1998	5A
Nedeau-Owen, Laura M.	Sioux City, Iowa	Removed	08/28/1998	5E
Nelson, Elof G.	Asheville, N.C.	Deceased	03/25/1998	9B
Nelson, Robert H. Jr.	Chicago, Ill.	Resigned	09/30/1998	5A
Nesset, Eldred J.	Decorah, Iowa	Deceased	03/23/1998	5F
Neunaber, Herman F.	Swansea, Ill.	Deceased	07/26/1998	5C
Nguyen, Ha Xuan	Mesquite, Texas	Deceased	02/04/1998	2C
Nielsen, Thad A.	Chetek, Wis.	Removed	01/22/1998	3B
Nieman, Richard G.	Bellevue, Wash.	Deceased	03/20/1998	1B
Nissen, Fredrik P.	Rochester, N.Y.	Deceased	10/02/1998	7D
Norson, Asmund E.	Hampton, Iowa	Deceased	01/21/1998	5F
Nygaard, Dennis W.	Hastings, Minn.	Removed	01/01/1998	3H
Nyquist, Ralph E.	Cohasset, Minn.	Resigned	10/14/1998	3E
Obenauf, Paul F.	Greeley, Colo.	Deceased	02/13/1998	3G
Ocker, Joseph S.	Neola, Iowa	Removed	11/01/1998	5E
Olson, Arlyn G.	Wautoma, Wis.	Removed	06/01/1998	2B
Olson, Mary J.	Chicago, Ill.	Removed	09/26/1998	5H
Orellana, A. Armando	Carpentersville, Ill.	Resigned	07/01/1998	5A
Oslund, Carl E.	Waseca, Minn.	Deceased	06/27/1998	3I
Otto, Robert E.	Oak Lawn, Ill.	Deceased	08/17/1998	5A
Pabst, Gary L.	Alvord, Iowa	Resigned	08/28/1998	5E
Patterson, Richard E.	Secaucus, N.J.	Removed	06/01/1998	2B
Patterson, Roger W.	Claremont, Calif.	Resigned	05/31/1998	2C
Peterson, Roger W.	Decorah, Iowa	Deceased	12/29/1998	5L
Platt, Thadius J.	South Windsor, Conn.	Resigned	08/17/1998	7B
Ploeger, John H.	Columbia, Md.	Deceased	05/14/1998	8F
Poehlmann, Waldemar C.	Brenham, Texas	Deceased	03/02/1998	4F
Pretty, Loren C.	Lincoln, Neb.	Deceased	02/14/1998	4A
Price, John A.	Albuquerque, N.M.	Deceased	05/04/1998	2E
Ralph, Jane	Kansas City, Mo.	Removed	04/30/1998	4B
Rasmussen, Halbert J. Jr.	Palm Harbor, Fla.	Deceased	10/07/1998	9E
Rasmussen, Lawrence R.	Whitewater, Wis.	Deceased	03/14/1998	5J
Reeser, Richard A.	Blackfoot, Idaho	Deceased	01/31/1998	1D
Reinert, Webster K.	Oley, Pa.	Deceased	04/16/1998	7E

Renninger, Jesse B.	Allentown, Pa.	Deceased	08/27/1998	7E
Risty, Nancy J.	Framingham, Mass.	Removed	10/31/1998	3C
Rivera Cruz, M. Christina	Santa Clara, Calif.	Removed	05/01/1998	2B
Robinholt, John C.B.	Newark, Del.	Deceased	09/07/1998	8F
Robinson, John K.	Fairview, Mont.	Resigned	08/30/1998	1F
Roddis, Linda M.	Champlin, Minn.	Resigned	10/28/1998	3G
Roeger, William C.	Perkasie, Pa.	Deceased	11/10/1998	7F
Roepke, James A.	Staunton, Va.	Removed	09/01/1998	9A
Ronning, Merrill D.	Eden Prairie, Minn.	Removed	06/15/1998	3G
Rosenkvist, Peter J.	St. Paul, Minn.	Resigned	10/08/1998	3E
Rossman, Calvin H.	Boone, Iowa	Deceased	01/10/1998	5E
Roth, David W.C.	Glen Ellyn, Ill.	Deceased	03/25/1998	5A
Rowold, Michael P.	Haden, Conn.	Deceased	04/06/1998	7B
Running, Paul H.	Oak Harbor, Wash.	Deceased	12/20/1998	1C
Rupley, John B. Jr.	Gautier, Miss.	Deceased	07/26/1998	2E
Ruppar, William A.	Wethersfield, Conn.	Deceased	09/22/1998	7B
Sabin, Steven P.	Ames, Iowa	Removed	09/28/1998	5D
Sager, Felix T.	Taylor, Texas	Deceased	05/08/1998	4E
Salveson, Jerold B.	Fargo, N.D.	Deceased	03/25/1998	3D
Samuelson, Wesley A.	Grand Rapid, Mich.	Deceased	06/15/1998	6B
Sandberg, Dean R.	White Sulphur Springs, Mont.	Resigned	09/15/1998	1F
Sassman, James R.	Lincoln, Neb.	Removed	03/18/1998	4A
Saugstad, Allan M.	Taylor, Wis.	Resigned	05/05/1998	5H
Schaper, Richard L.	San Francisco, Calif.	Removed	10/30/1998	2A
Schedler, Alfred J.	Portland, Ore.	Resigned	10/30/1998	1E
Scheffel, I. Frederick	San Antonio, Texas	Deceased	02/25/1998	4E
Schexnayder, Manfred J.	Slidell, La.	Resigned	10/24/1998	4F
Schliesser, Raymond S.	Taylor, Texas	Deceased	06/07/1998	4E
Schmitt, Herman M.J.	Littleton, Colo.	Deceased	03/08/1998	2E
Schnaible, Norman M.	Woodland, Calif.	Deceased	06/03/1998	2A
Schreiber, David R.	Burton, Mich.	Resigned	02/12/1998	6A
Schulz, Delbert O.	Thousand Oaks, Calif.	Deceased	06/10/1998	2B
Schwandt, Roland L.	New Hope, Minn.	Deceased	06/10/1998	3G
Schwartz, Thomas W.	Gaylord, Minn.	Deceased	04/11/1998	3F
Schwerin, Laura B.	West Linn, Ore.	Removed	11/01/1998	2B
Sibert, Joseph B.	Bradenton, Fla.	Deceased	01/12/1998	5D
Sidney, Oliver	Alexandria, Minn.	Deceased	11/26/1998	3D
Sloop, Jerry L.	Salisbury, N.C.	Deceased	10/20/1998	9B
Smyser, Harry E. Jr.	State College, Pa.	Deceased	08/10/1998	8C
Sodergren, James R.	Bruno, Minn.	Resigned	09/07/1998	3E
Spande, Thomas K.	Culpeper, Va.	Deceased	04/16/1998	9A
Spenny, Lorin L.	Dayton, Ohio	Deceased	02/18/1998	6F
Stein, A. Christian	Libertyville, Ill.	Removed	09/22/1998	3F
Stirewalt, James C.	Salisbury, N.C.	Resigned	09/14/1998	9B
Stohl, Lasse J.	Hopkins, Minn.	Deceased	09/03/1998	3G
Stomski, William L.M.	Houston, Texas	Resigned	08/17/1998	8D
Sutorius, Carlton J.	Westerville, Ohio	Deceased	11/05/1998	6F
Sutter, Carl J.	Staten Island, N.Y.	Deceased	10/11/1998	7C
Tammaru, Philip A.	Bridgeton, N.J.	Deceased	09/03/1998	7A
Thompson, A. Milford	Mankato, Minn.	Deceased	07/26/1998	3I
Thompson, Richard A.	Moorhead, Minn.	Deceased	05/30/1998	3D
Thoreson, Roger D.	Fargo, N.D.	Removed	09/03/1998	3B
Tobias, Jan D.	Charlottesville, Va.	Removed	09/13/1998	9A
Tomo, Andrew	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Deceased	03/01/1998	7G
Torvik, Torval G.	Solvang, Calif.	Deceased	05/14/1998	2B
Trexler, Floyd C.	Louisville, Ky.	Deceased	07/06/1998	6C
Tsui, Lou	New York, N.Y.	Deceased	08/06/1998	7C

Turinetti, Greg J.	Wausau, Wis.	Removed	09/10/1998	5I
Tusing, Charles G.	Roanoke, Va.	Deceased	01/14/1998	9A
Unruh, George	Bismarck, N.D.	Deceased	10/03/1998	3A
VanDeusen, Clayton G.	Albany, N.Y.	Deceased	04/07/1998	9E
Vensel, Harry E.	Clearwater, Fla.	Deceased	10/15/1998	9E
Vieker, Nancy L.	Greene, Iowa	Deceased	10/27/1998	5F
Volz, Carl A.	St. Paul, Minn.	Deceased	12/03/1998	3H
von Blon, A. Peter	Hilliard, Ohio	Resigned	10/02/1998	6F
Wagner, John H. Sr.	Oakland, Calif.	Deceased	10/20/1998	2A
Wahl, Palmer A.	Lodi, Wis.	Deceased	01/09/1998	5K
Waldkoenig, Gilson C.	Gettysburg, Pa.	Deceased	12/01/1998	8B
Wall-Brown, Doreen J.	North Syracuse, N.Y.	Removed	10/23/1998	7D
Wandersee, Robert E.	Jos Plateau State, Nigeria	Deceased	08/07/1998	7C
Wang, Norman P.	Temperance, Mich.	Deceased	07/28/1998	6A
Wattman, Alf A.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	05/25/1998	3G
Wee, Steven P.	Spokane, Wash.	Resigned	09/09/1998	1F
Wiger, Alfred J.	St. Paul, Minn.	Deceased	10/02/1998	3H
Wilkman, Martti J.	Prescott, Ariz.	Deceased	09/13/1998	2D
Wilson, Howard A.	Columbus, Ohio	Deceased	04/15/1998	6F
Withrock, John W. Jr.	New Port Richey, Fla.	Resigned	08/01/1998	9E
Wogsland, John D.	Randall, Iowa	Deceased	06/12/1998	5F
Wolber, Herbert W.	Englewood, Fla.	Deceased	03/07/1998	9E
Woodrich, Glen R.	Waverly, Iowa	Deceased	04/27/1998	5F
Zacher, Charles H.	Newport, Pa.	Deceased	11/02/1998	8B
Zamzow, Michael N.	Bellevue, Iowa	Resigned	07/15/1998	5D
Zander, Christine	Reinholds, Pa.	Removed	06/30/1998	7E
Zeilinger, Otto L.	Lindsborg, Kan.	Deceased	01/27/1998	4B
Zumstein, Ray O.	Olney, Ill.	Deceased	02/02/1998	5C

Appendix C to the Report of the Secretary

Additions to the Roster of Associates in Ministry 1997-1998

Correction

The following person was added to the roster of associates in ministry prior to 1997. The addition, however, was not reported in the minutes of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly.

Name	City/State	Date of Certification or Commissioning	Region/ Synod
Essig, Aina	Minneapolis, Minn.	09/23/1995	3G
1997			
Aebischer, Judith D.	Marietta, Ga.	02/17/1997	9D
Batcher, Lynn	Bettendorf, Iowa	09/20/1997	5D
Bischmann, Kenneth A.	Waukesha, Wis.	03/23/1997	5J
Bjorkman, Debra L.	Eden Prairie, Minn.	08/10/1997	3G
Boeck, Susan M.	Sussex, Wis.	01/12/1997	5J
Carlsen, Martha C.	Columbus, Ga.	01/12/1997	9D
Christnagel, Diane L.	Hastings, Minn.	04/13/1997	3H

Cole, Linda L.	Dayton, Ohio	04/06/1997	6F
Davis, Angela G.	Bloomsburg, Pa.	09/14/1997	8E
Furby, ¹¹ Cheryl K.	Omaha, Neb.	04/06/1997	4A
Gaskamp, William R.	Caldwell, Texas	09/28/1997	4F
Gjere, Patricia R.	Decorah, Iowa	09/21/1997	5F
Guard, Carol E.	Monticello, Iowa	04/13/1997	5D
Haase, Patricia A.	Toledo, Ohio	09/14/1997	6D
Hansen, Elizabeth T.	Fremont, Neb.	12/21/1997	4A
Hartman, Robert S.	Fremont, Ohio	06/15/1997	6D
Henrikson, Karen E.	Missoula, Mont.	01/12/1997	1F
Hershey, Freda S.	Chambersburg, Pa.	02/09/1997	8D
Hultgren, Heather	Hastings, Minn.	04/13/1997	3H
Jacobson, Kathy J.	Plymouth, Wis.	08/23/1997	5J
Kor, Donna M.	Slayton, Minn.	09/07/1997	3F
Larson, Curtis R.	Longview, Wash.	01/06/1997	1C
Lightfield, Wanda M.	Waverly, Iowa	03/02/1997	5F
McWilliams, Brent A.	Birmingham, Ala.	05/31/1997	9D
Messeccar, Carol J.	Tustin, Calif.	09/28/1997	2C
Middleswarth, Brian J.	Bettendorf, Iowa	05/25/1997	5D
Mueller, Laurie S.	Smithtown, N.Y.	07/01/1997	7C
Neighbors, Lana W.	Atlanta, Ga.	07/20/1997	9D
Olson, Phyllis D.	Hope, N.D.	08/31/1997	3B
Sargeant, Harold A.	Springfield, Va.	05/18/1997	8G
Smith, Janeen G.	Puyallup, Wash.	09/14/1997	1C
Terry, William R.	Fort Walton Beach, Fla.	03/09/1997	9E
Thomson, Julia A.	Barrington, Ill.	06/15/1997	5A
Torrin, Margaret L.	Denver, Iowa	03/16/1997	5F
Vogel, Elizabeth Moore	Beaumont, Texas	05/25/1997	4F
Wilson, Carolyn R.	Overland Park, Kan.	11/01/1997	4B
1998			
Basner, Kathleen A.	Freeland, Mich.	08/30/1998	6B
Borden, Andrew H.	West Boylston, Mass.	06/05/1998	7B
Byrd, Gwendolyn K.	Irvine, Calif.	06/14/1998	2C
Fox Stofac, Leslie J.	St. Paul, Minn.	06/27/1998	3H
Gerke, ¹² Krista S.	Minneapolis, Minn.	03/29/1998	3G
Heinaman, Angela A.	Mission Viejo, Calif.	11/08/1998	2C
Hood, Jo A.	Norcross, Ga.	05/10/1998	9D
Hurst, V. Wayne Jr.	San Marcos, Calif.	01/04/1998	2C

¹¹ Name later changed to Cheryl K. Griess.

¹² Name later changed to Krista S. Lind.

Ingelson, Nancy A.	Davenport, Iowa	01/01/1998	5D
Mann, Elaine F.	Chippewa Falls, Wis.	02/15/1998	5H
Martin, Judilou H.	Glasgow, Mont.	02/01/1998	1F
Mendenhall, Susan C.	Dunedin, Fla.	03/15/1998	9E
Mikulski, Mary Jo	Harlan, Ind.	05/28/1998	6C
Mitchell, Jeffrey C.	Lima, Ohio	03/07/1998	6D
Mize-Baker, Jacquelyn J.	New York, N.Y.	05/29/1998	7C
Olsen, Kevin L.	Littleton, Colo.	07/12/1998	2E
Olsgaard, Bonnie M.	Missoula, Mont.	09/28/1998	1F
Pyeatt, Carol L.	Minneapolis, Minn.	06/28/1998	3G
Sinnott, Paul D.	Worcester, Mass.	06/05/1998	7B
Watts, Jerry W.	Glendale, Calif.	05/03/1998	2B
Weaver, Susan M.	Brooklyn Park, Minn.	04/26/1998	3G
Weston, Elsie H.	Bridgeport, Conn.	06/05/1998	7B
Wheeler, ¹³ Tonya R.	Lansdale, Pa.	10/04/1998	7F
Wilson, Larry D. Jr.	Fremont, Neb.	03/29/1998	4A
Yenser, Kathleen A.	Whitehall, Pa.	08/30/1998	7E
Zimmerman, L Gay W.	Houston, Texas	05/03/1998	4F

**Appendix D to the
Report of the Secretary**

**Removals from the Roster of
Associates in Ministry 1997-1998**

The several rosters under Associates in Ministry, representing the various roster categories that existed in ELCA predecessor churches, are identified as follows:

- ALC-CCS The American Lutheran Church:
Commissioned Church Staff
- LCA-LPL Lutheran Church in America:
Lay Professional Leaders
- ALC-D The American Lutheran Church:
Deaconesses
- AELC-CT The Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches:
Commissioned Teachers
- AELC-D The Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches:
Deaconesses and Deacons

ELCA certified and commissioned associates in ministry, indicated in this list as ELCA-C, were rostered according to the standards and practices of this church.

¹³ Name later changed to Tonya R. Rike.

Corrections

The following persons were removed from the roster of associates in ministry prior to 1997. The removals, however, were not reported in the minutes of the 1993 or 1995 Churchwide Assemblies.

Name	City/State	Reason	Date	Region/ Synod	Roster Identi- fication
Nichols, Bruce M.	Coon Rapids, Minn.	Removed	06/01/1991	3B	ALC-CCS
Lueck, John W.	Daly City, Calif.	Removed	06/01/1992	2A	AELC-CT
Peterson, Reid	Minnetonka, Minn.	Removed	01/01/1994	3G	LCA-LPL

1997

Ackerman, Nancy J.	Hummelstown, Pa.	Removed	04/15/1997	8E	ELCA-C
Aldrich-Dale, Janelle D.	Columbia Heights, Minn.	Removed	10/07/1997	1B	ALC-CCS
Anderson, Paul A.	Bothell, Wash.	Removed	02/01/1997	1B	ALC-CCS
Andreasen, Sheryl L.	Rockford, Ill.	Removed	06/01/1997	5B	LCA-LPL
Bracht, Glenn H.	Brooklyn Park, Minn.	Removed	03/11/1997	3G	ALC-CCS
Brock, John H.	Elysburg, Pa.	Ordained	10/11/1997	8E	ELCA-C
Buchinger, Laura A.	High Point, N.C.	Removed	03/07/1997	9E	ELCA-C
Busse, Madelyn H.	Chicago, Ill.	Consecrated	06/13/1997	5A	LCA-LPL
Cobb, Judith Ann	Norfolk, Va.	Ordained	09/13/1997	9A	LCA-LPL
Coffey, Brian T.	Pekin, Ill.	Resigned	04/08/1997	5C	ELCA-C
Curtiss, Marcella T.	Phoenixville, Pa.	Resigned	12/11/1997	7F	LCA-LPL
Dark, Gladys E.	Wethersfield, Conn.	Deceased	06/24/1997	7B	LCA-LPL
DeVan, Benjamin	Calgary, AB, Canada	Removed	10/07/1997	8D	ELCA-C
Dreyling, Carol M.	Paynesville, Minn.	Removed	03/01/1997	3F	ALC-CCS
Dunstan, Ina	Ely, Minn.	Deceased	09/22/1997	3E	LCA-LPL
Dwyer-Voss, Ron N.	Sacramento, Calif.	Removed	09/01/1997	2A	ELCA-C
Erb, M. Ruth	Abbottstown, Pa.	Removed	02/18/1997	8D	LCA-LPL
Fischer, Edith E.	Zelienople, Pa.	Deceased	12/19/1997	8B	ALC-D
Flemming, Anna M.	Brooklyn Center, Minn.	Resigned	02/27/1997	3H	ELCA-C
Foerster, David J.	Akron, Ohio	Resigned	08/01/1997	6E	LCA-LPL
Geer, Mary L.	San Antonio, Texas	Removed	09/20/1997	4E	LCA-LPL
Glander, James K.	North Augusta, S.C.	Ordained	07/28/1997	9C	AELC-CT
Golembeck, Karen S.	Alsip, Ill.	Removed	03/15/1997	5A	ALC-CCS
Hall, Myrtle M.	Youngstown, Ohio	Deceased	05/24/1997	6E	ALC-CCS
Hartshorn, Edna	Shell Rock, Iowa	Deceased	05/14/1997	5F	ALC-CCS
Hatcher, Linda N.	North Branch, Minn.	Ordained	07/20/1997	3H	LCA-LPL
Haulotte, Shirley J.	Austin, Texas	Removed	03/01/1997	4E	LCA-LP
Headley, Matthew C.	Grapevine, Texas	Resigned	02/04/1997	4D	AELC-CT
Heaton, Gary G.	Columbus, N.D.	Ordained	06/15/1997	3A	ALC-CCS
Hench, Joanne R.	Landenberg, Pa.	Removed	03/11/1997	8F	LCA-LPL
Housel, Charles C. Jr.	Catasauqua, Pa.	Deceased	02/09/1997	7E	ELCA-C
Jacobus, Mary Beth	Astoria, N.Y.	Removed	03/15/1997	5A	ELCA-C
Jorgenson, Carol E.	Lemont, Ill.	Removed	03/15/1997	5A	ALC-CCS
Leong, Carol E.	Tigard, Ore.	Removed	10/07/1997	1E	ALC-CCS
Lofstad, Duane G.	Circle Pines, Minn.	Removed	09/04/1997	3H	AELC-CT
Ludwig, Karen	Marysville, Ohio	Removed	02/10/1997	6A	AELC-D

Malchow, Nancy D.	Mound, Minn.	Removed	03/11/1997	3G	LCA-LPL
Malone, Cathleen K.	Hinton, Iowa	Resigned	01/28/1997	4A	ELCA-C
Marten, Diane L.	Santa Rosa, Calif.	Removed	03/11/1997	2A	LCA-LPL
McConnell, Joan H.	Starksville, Miss.	Removed	03/11/1997	6F	LCA-LPL
McDermott, Konnie K.	Burnsville, Minn.	Removed	05/08/1997	3H	LCA-LPL
Miller, Katherine S.	West Des Moines, Iowa	Consecrated	04/13/1997	5D	LCA-LPL
Mills, Janice R.	Highspire, Pa.	Removed	02/18/1997	8D	ELCA-C
Park, Frederick L.	Arden, N.C.	Removed	02/01/1997	9B	LCA-LPL
Pertschi, Gail	Plantation, Fla.	Removed	09/05/1997	9E	ALC-CCS
Phoenix, David P.	Berlin Center, Ohio	Ordained	12/06/1997	6E	LCA-LPL
Quaintance, Jane A.	Reading, Pa.	Removed	01/01/1997	7E	LCA-LPL
Richards, Janet	Ormond Beach, Fla.	Resigned	12/15/1997	7F	LCA-LPL
Rogness, Julie L.	Rochester, Minn.	Ordained	04/13/1997	3I	ALC-CCS
Simmons, Deborah D.J.	Grantsburg, Ill.	Removed	07/01/1997	6C	ALC-CCS
Soltvedt, Susanne	Camp Douglas, Wis.	Removed	10/07/1997	5L	ALC-CCS
Steward, Vera Guebert	Wheat Ridge, Colo.	Ordained	05/25/1997	2E	LCA-LPL
Thompson, Carol G.	Mount Vernon, Wash.	Removed	10/07/1997	1B	ALC-CCS
Ulland, Rose M.	Willmar, Minn.	Deceased	10/20/1997	3F	ALC-CCS
Voelker, Janet E.	Omaha, Neb.	Resigned	11/24/1997	4A	LCA-LPL
Wallace, Pamela J. Carnes	Penryn, Pa.	Ordained	09/19/1997	8D	LCA-LPL
Will, Jacqueline V.	Chicago, Ill.	Removed	03/15/1997	5A	LCA-LPL
Williams, Betsy M.	Columbus, Ohio	Ordained	01/19/1997	6F	AELC-D
Wold, Wayne L.	Hagerstown, Md.	Removed	11/11/1997	8F	LCA-LPL
Zimmerman, Erin E.	Champlin, Minn.	Removed	03/11/1997	3G	LCA-LPL

1998

Anderson, Linda O.	Columbus, Ohio	Resigned	02/12/1998	5A	LCA-LPL
Anderson, Susan J.	Apple Valley, Minn.	Removed	01/12/1998	3G	LCA-LPL
Bakken, Hazel E.	Bagley, Minn.	Resigned	06/24/1998	3D	ALC-CCS
Bergsma, Sandra S.	Waterloo, Iowa	Removed	11/03/1998	3G	ALC-CCS
Brice, Collette U.	Beachwood, N.J.	Deceased	01/26/1998	7A	LCA-LPL
Bridges, Richard O.	Snohomish, Wash.	Resigned	01/21/1998	1B	ALC-CCS
Burgdorf, C. Ann	Worcester, Mass.	Ordained	11/15/1998	7B	AELC-D
Carlson, Ruth D.	San Francisco, Calif.	Deceased	06/17/1998	2A	ALC-CCS
Dewey, Alan M.	Fort Wayne, Ind.	Deceased	10/23/1998	6C	LCA-LPL
Eidahl, Susan M.	Stratford, Wis.	Ordained	06/28/1998	5H	ALC-CCS
Fiebig, Ronald	Fort Wayne, Ind.	Removed	08/01/1998	6C	ALC-CCS
Giles, James C.	Roseville, Minn.	Removed	03/12/1998	3G	ELCA-C
Henriksen, George G.	Rockville, Md.	Deceased	09/14/1998	8G	LCA-LPL
Hurst, V. Wayne Jr.	San Marcos, Calif.	Resigned	10/01/1998	2C	ELCA-C
Irwin, Suzanne T.	Reading, Pa.	Removed	10/30/1998	7E	ELCA-C
Jacobson, Louise I.	Richmond, Va.	Deceased	09/04/1998	9A	LCA-LPL
Johnson, Daniel A.	Valley City, N.D.	Removed	04/24/1998	3B	LCA-LPL

Kline, Edward W.	Topeka, Kan.	Removed	07/31/1998	7A	AELC-D
Knepp, T. Gregory	Baltimore, Md.	Ordained	08/15/1998	8F	ELCA-C
Krause, Tina B.	Chicago, Ill.	Resigned	12/15/1998	5A	LCA-LPL
Larson, Timothy E.	Warren, Mich.	Ordained	08/23/1998	6A	ELCA-C
Linders, Terri	Racine, Wis.	Removed	09/01/1998	5J	LCA-LPL
Martin, Nikki R.	Mount Angel, Ore.	Removed	10/24/1998	1E	ELCA-C
Mickelson, Arnold R.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	09/22/1998	3G	ALC-CCS
Nelson, Lucille M.	Mankato, Minn.	Deceased	04/12/1998	3I	ALC-CCS
Oines, Iola	Sioux Falls, S.D.	Deceased	09/08/1998	3C	ALC-CCS
Rathjen, Glatha J.	Lincoln, Neb.	Ordained	06/20/1998	4A	LCA-LPL
Schlotter, John W.	Butler, Pa.	Resigned	07/25/1998	8A	LCA-LPL
Seltz, Joanne	Minneapolis, Minn.	Removed	08/15/1998	6A	AELC-CT
Sharp, Tammy J.	Alvin, Texas	Resigned	09/02/1998	4F	ELCA-C
Shinn, Elizabeth A.	Arvada, Colo.	Removed	09/30/1998	2E	LCA-LPL
Sorensen, Holly J.	Maple Valley, Wash.	Removed	06/24/1998	3G	ELCA-C
Wadman, Lorraine	Lakewood, Calif.	Removed	09/01/1998	2B	ALC-CCS
Weatherspoon, Roselle J.	Detroit, Mich.	Removed	08/15/1998	6A	ELCA-C
Wrasse, Joanne	Ashland, Ohio	Resigned	10/17/1998	6E	LCA-LPL
Zima, Mark S.	Eagle River, Wis.	Resigned	12/12/1998	1E	ELCA-C

**Appendix E to the
Report of the Secretary**

**Additions to the Roster of Deaconesses of the
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America 1997-1998**

1997			Region/ Synod
Name	City/State	Date of Consecration	
Rebelein, Ruth Ellen	Papua New Guinea	06/15/1997	4A
1998			
Cecille, Ramona	Philadelphia, Pa.	07/26/1998	7F

**Appendix F to the
Report of the Secretary**

**Removals from the Roster of Deaconesses of the
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America 1997-1998**

1997				Region/ Synod
Name	City/State	Reason	Date	
Damme, Sophie	Gladwyne, Pa.	Deceased	10/29/1997	7F
Ebert, Anna K.	Gladwyne, Pa.	Deceased	07/12/1997	7F

Fischer, Edith E.	Zelienople, Pa.	Deceased	02/19/1997	8B
-------------------	-----------------	----------	------------	----

1998

Brice, Collette U.	Beachwood, N.J.	Deceased	01/26/1998	7A
Erling, I. Astrid	Minneapolis, Minn.	Deceased	08/09/1998	3G

**Appendix G to the
Report of the Secretary**

**Additions to the Roster of Diaconal Ministers of the
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America 1997-1998**

1997

Name	City/State	Date of Consecration	Region/ Synod
Barkhau, Beth A.	Appleton, Wis.	10/12/1997	5I
Busse, Madelyn H.	Chicago, Ill.	06/13/1997	5A
Miller, Katherine S.	West Des Moines, Iowa	04/13/1997	5D
Neumann, Karla J.	Janesville, Wis.	10/05/1997	5K
Rossmann, Jay T.	Dubuque, Iowa	09/21/1997	5F
Schroeder, Judith A.	Beloit, Wis.	09/13/1997	5K
Senft, Ardith L.	Phoenix, Ariz.	09/14/1997	2D

1998

Brant, Elaine E..	St. Paul, Minn.	05/03/1998	3H
Mirabella, Jennifer A.	Aurora, Colo.	10/11/1998	2E
Spiotta, Douglas B.	Eden Prairie, Minn.	11/01/1998	3G
Wentz, Dianna S.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	06/13/1998	8B

**Appendix H to the
Report of the Secretary**

**Congregations Received, Removed, Consolidated,
Disbanded, Merged, or Withdrawn 1997-1998**

Congregations received, removed, consolidated, disbanded, merged, or withdrawn prior to 1997 but not previously reported in minutes of churchwide assemblies are included in this list. The ELCA congregation identification number (in parentheses) follows the name of each congregation.

The process for withdrawal of a congregation from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is specified by constitutional provisions 9.62. and 9.71. in the Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

“Merged” is defined as involving a congregation giving up its separate identity and uniting with an already existing congregation (i.e., being merged into an existing congregation).

“Consolidated” is defined as involving two or more congregations that join together to become a new entity with a new name and a new congregation identification number (i.e., the congregations are consolidated to become a new congregation).

State/City	Congregation and Congregation Number	Region/ Synod	Action	Date
Arizona				
Chandler	Light of Christ (30320)	2D	Received	05/28/1998
Phoenix	Light of the Desert (30280)	2D	Received	05/30/1997
Arkansas				
Bentonville	Christ the King (30244)	4C	Received	04/19/1997
Edgemont	Peace (30415)	4C	Received	05/03/1998
California				
Berkeley	Shepherd of the Hills (30409)	2A	Received	01/01/1998
Covina	Ascension (05199)	2B	Merged with Grace (13789)	05/17/1998
Fresno	Resurrection (07811)	2A	Disbanded	06/30/1998
Huntington Park	St. Luke's (05103)	2B	Disbanded	10/19/1997
North Highlands	St. Mary Mother of God (05129)	2A	Disbanded	12/31/1997
Pasadena	Bethany (13921)	2B	Merged with Trinity (05210)	07/01/1997
Pomona	Trinity (05211)	2B	Disbanded	12/31/1997
San Fernando	St. Mark (05075)	2B	Merged with The Church of Hope ELCA, Canyon Country (30122)	07/01/1998
Colorado				
Aurora	Lord of the Hills (30319)	2E	Received	04/25/1997
Colorado Springs	Korean (30212)	2E	Received	05/29/1998
Estes Park	Shepherd of the Mountains (30265)	2E	Received	04/25/1997
Florida				
Boca Raton	Affirmation (16060)	9E	Disbanded	02/16/1997
Hialeah	Resurrection (01791)	9E	Disbanded	05/03/1998
Miami	Bethany (01799)	9E	Disbanded	06/30/1997
Miami	St. John (01803)	9E	Disbanded	10/01/1997
Welaka	Hope (30267)	9E	Received	05/15/1998
Georgia				
Hartwell	Faith (30220)	9D	Received	05/23/1997
Lithonia	Gloria Dei (16287)	9D	Disbanded	01/05/1997
Iowa				
Ogden	Swede Valley (02485)	5D	Merged with Immanuel (02484)	01/10/1997
Idaho				
Priest Lake	Lamb of God (30413)	1D	Received	06/19/1998

Illinois

Belvidere	Christ (30304)	5B	Received	06/21/1997
Chicago	All Saints (01824)	5A	Disbanded	01/11/1998
Chicago	Ascension (01825)	5A	Disbanded	03/22/1998
Chicago	Atonement (01919)	5A	Withdrew	01/26/1997
Chicago	Bethlehem Evangelical (01924)	5A	Consolidated with Good Samaritan (20048)	05/18/1997
Chicago	Bethlehem Evangelical (30469)	5A	Formed by consolidation of Bethlehem Evangelical and Good Samaritan	05/18/1997
Chicago	Gladstone Park (01859)	5A	Consolidated with Holy Communion (01853), Medill Avenue (10607), Nebo Evangelical (01863), Our Lord's (10611), Our Saviour's English (10612), Peace (01865), and St. Andrew (01866)	04/12/1998
Chicago	Good Samaritan (20048)	5A	Consolidated with Bethlehem Evangelical	05/18/1997
Chicago	Holy Communion (01853)	5A	Consolidated with Gladstone Park (01859), Medill Avenue (10607), Nebo Evangelical (01863), Our Lord's (10611), Our Saviour's English (10612), Peace (01865), and St. Andrew (01866)	04/12/1998
Chicago	Iglesia Luterana La Sagrada Familia (30214)	5A	Received	06/07/1997
Chicago	L'eglise Ev Lutherieenne de la Sainte Trinite (30068)	5A	Disbanded	04/01/1997
Chicago	Medill Avenue (10607)	5A	Consolidated with Gladstone Park (01859), Holy Communion (01853), Nebo Evangelical (01863), Our Lord's (10611), Our Saviour's English (10612), Peace (01865), and St. Andrew (01866)	04/12/1998
Chicago	Nebo Evangelical (01863)	5A	Consolidated with Gladstone Park (01859), Holy Communion (01853), Medill Avenue (10607), Our Lord's (10611), Our Saviour's English (10612), Peace (01865), and St. Andrew (01866)	04/12/1998
Chicago	Our Lord's (10611)	5A	Consolidated with Gladstone Park (01859), Holy Communion (01853), Medill Avenue (10607), Nebo Evangelical (01863), Our Saviour's English (10612), Peace (01865), and St. Andrew (01866)	04/12/1998
Chicago	Our Saviour's English (10612)	5A	Consolidated with Gladstone Park (01859), Holy Communion (01853), Medill Avenue (10607), Nebo Evangelical (01863), Our Lord's (19611), Peace (01865), and St. Andrew (01866)	04/12/1998
Chicago	Peace (01865)	5A	Consolidated with Gladstone Park (01859), Holy Communion (01853), Medill Avenue (10607), Nebo Evangelical (01863), Our Lord's (10611), Our Saviour's English (10612), Peace (01865), and St. Andrew (01866)	04/12/1998

Chicago	Ridge (01933)	5A	Consolidated with Bethel, Evergreen Park	11/29/1998
Chicago	St. Andrew (01866)	5A	Consolidated with Gladstone Park (01859), Holy Communion (01853), Nebo Evangelical (01863), Medill Avenue (10607), Our Lord's (10611), Our Saviour's English (10612), and Peace (01865)	04/12/1998
Chicago	United by Faith (30397)	5A	Formed by consolidation of Gladstone Park, Holy Communion, Medill Avenue, Nebo Evangelical, Our Lord's, Our Saviour's English, Peace, and St. Andrew	04/13/1998
Cicero	Iglesia Luterana San Jose (30165)	5A	Received	06/14/1997
Country Club Hills	House of Prayer (01945)	5A	Merged with Holy Trinity, Matteson (01955)	04/06/1997
Elgin	Lutheran Church of Our Savior (20054)	5A	Merged with Holy Trinity	09/07/1997
Evergreen Park	Bethel (20056)	5A	Consolidated with Ridge, Chicago	11/29/1998
Evergreen Park	United by Faith (30435)	5A	Formed by consolidation of Bethel (20056) and Ridge, Chicago (01933)	11/29/1998
Frankfort	Living Hope (30296)	5B	Received	06/19/1998
Johnsburg	Joyful Harvest (30297)	5B	Received	06/19/1998
Lombard	Peace (30256)	5A	Received	06/12/1998
Oswego	Lord of Life (30259)	5B	Received	06/21/1997
Schaumburg	True Light Christian Church (30108)	5A	Received	06/13/1997
Indiana				
Greenwood	Risen Lord (30306)	6C	Received	05/31/1997
Lynnville	St. Paul (10711)	6C	Disbanded	11/09/1997
Patrickburg	Community (16002)	6C	Disbanded	06/30/1997
Kansas				
Onaga	New Hope (30362)	4B	Received	06/14/1997
Topeka	Good Shepherd (16404)	4B	Disbanded	10/25/1998
Tribune	St. Paul (01688)	4B	Disbanded	10/04/1997
Kentucky				
Louisville	Trinity (02356)	6C	Disbanded	01/05/1997
Prospect	Grace and Glory (30307)	6C	Received	06/04/1998
Louisiana				
New Orleans	Holy Trinity (16345)	4F	Disbanded	01/01/1998
Maryland				
Baltimore	St. Mark's (10279)	8F	Disbanded	07/01/1997
Lexington Park	Good Samaritan (30403)	8G	Received	06/11/1998
Massachusetts				
Middleboro	Advent (30237)	7B	Received	06/05/1998
Michigan				
Cascade	Emmaus (30292)	6B	Received	05/18/1997
Detroit	Messiah (02800)	6A	Withdrew	08/15/1998
Detroit	Mount Zion (11258)	6A	Disbanded	10/19/1997

Greenville	Trinity (02863)	6B	Merged with St Paul (11284)	04/05/1998
Jenison	Bread of Life (30104)	6B	Received	05/17/1998
Kalamazoo	Our Redeemer (02834)	6B	Disbanded	04/27/1997
Oak Park	St. Timothy (02810)	6A	Disbanded	03/16/1997
Plymouth	New Life (30261)	6A	Received	05/02/1997
Warren	Amazing Grace (30396)	6A	Formed by consolidation of Holy Redeemer and St. Stephen	11/09/1997
Warren	Gethsemane (11403)	6A	Disbanded	06/29/1997
Warren	Holy Redeemer (11404)	6A	Consolidated with St. Stephen (02781)	11/09/1997
Warren	St. Stephen (02781)	6A	Consolidated with Holy Redeemer (11404)	11/09/1997
Minnesota				
Barrett	Immanuel (11993)	3D	Disbanded	12/31/1998
Clarkfield	Spring Creek (12032)	3F	Disbanded	08/24/1997
Farmington	Lord of Life (30278)	3H	Received	06/05/1997
Gary	Norman (11526)	3D	Disbanded	04/30/1998
Gilbert	United (02965)	3E	Merged with United in Christ, Eveleth (07162)	09/01/1997
Mentor	Hitterdal (11585)	3D	Disbanded	08/16/1998
Minneapolis	Laos Evangelical (16426)	3G	Received	06/06/1997
Minneapolis	Lutheran Church of the Master (11842)	3G	Disbanded	03/09/1997
Minneapolis	Oromo Evangelical (30325)	3G	Received	06/06/1997
Minneapolis	St. Andrew's (03149)	3G	Disbanded	11/14/1997
St. Paul	Advent (03080)	3H	Withdrew	06/07/1997
St. Paul	Messiah (11926)	3H	Disbanded	01/19/1997
Wilder	Delafield (12238)	3F	Disbanded	11/01/1998
Missouri				
Eagle Rock	Community (30406)	4B	Received	06/12/1998
Richmond Heights	Luther Memorial (20158)	4B	Disbanded	02/06/1997
Mississippi				
D'Iberville	Galilean (16008)	9D	Disbanded	04/30/1998
Gulfport	Resurrection (07843)	9D	Disbanded	06/08/1997
Montana				
Westby	Emmaus (13482)	1F	Disbanded	12/31/1998
Nebraska				
Ames	Resurrection (03310)	4A	Disbanded	06/07/1998
Hildreth	Emmanuel (10121)	4A	Consolidated with St. Paul's and St. Peter's	09/21/1997
Hildreth	St. Paul's (10122)	4A	Consolidated with Emmanuel and St. Peter's	09/21/1997
Hildreth	St. Peter's (03398)	4A	Consolidated with Emmanuel and St. Paul's	09/21/1997
Hildreth	Trinity (30394)	4A	Formed by consolidation of Emmanuel, St. Paul's, and St. Peter's	09/21/1997
Lewiston	Peace (10146)	4A	Disbanded	01/01/1995
Omaha	Abiding Savior (16125)	4A	Disbanded	05/21/1998
New Jersey				
Camden	Christ (03741)	7A	Consolidated with Advent, Mount Ephraim and Bethany, Gloucester City	04/13/1997

Englewood	St. John (03680)	7A	Disbanded	03/04/1998
Flemington	Living Waters (30283)	7A	Received	05/10/1997
Gloucester City	Bethany (03750)	7A	Consolidated with Christ, Camden and Advent, Mount Ephraim	04/13/1997
Mount Ephraim	Advent (03759)	7A	Consolidated with Christ, Camden and Bethany, Gloucester City	04/06/1997
Mount Ephraim	Spirit of Hope (30383)	7A	Formed by consolidation of Christ, Camden, Bethany, Gloucester City, and Advent, Mount Ephraim	04/27/1997
New York				
East Taghkanic	Evangelical (06966)	7D	Disbanded	04/18/1998
Hempstead	Iglesia Luterana Resurrección (30115)	7C	Received	06/13/1998
Kingston	St. Paul (03900)	7C	Disbanded	11/01/1998
New York	Bible (07791)	7C	Disbanded	12/31/1998
New York	Christ (03988)	7C	Removed	11/18/1997
New York	St. James (03982)	7C	Merged with St. James-St. Matthew's, South Ozone Park (03983)	12/31/1998
New York	St. Martin (16266)	7C	Disbanded	09/01/1998
New York	Salam Arabic Church (30308)	7C	Received	06/13/1998
New York	Salem (10307)	7C	Disbanded	06/13/1998
Seward	Zion (07073)	7D	Consolidated with St. John, Sharon Springs	01/25/1998
Seward	Zion St. John's Evangelical (30414)	7D	Formed by consolidation of Zion with St. John, Sharon Springs	01/25/1998
Sharon Springs	St. John (07074)	7D	Consolidated with Zion, Seward	01/25/1998
North Carolina				
Apex	Circle of Grace (30288)	9B	Received	05/31/1997
North Dakota				
Arnegard	Zoar (12562)	3A	Disbanded	11/30/1997
Carbury	Turtle Mountain (12589)	3A	Disbanded	09/07/1997
DeLamere	DeLamere (12294)	3B	Disbanded	09/27/1998
Denbigh	Norway (12605)	3A	Disbanded	09/28/1997
Douglas	Spring Lake (12610)	3A	Disbanded	06/29/1997
Ruso	First (12715)	3A	Disbanded	06/01/1997
Wabek	First (12753)	3A	Disbanded	06/14/1998
Ypsilanti	Ypsilanti (12548)	3B	Disbanded	10/31/1997
Ohio				
Cincinnati	Lutheran Church of the Cross (13100)	6F	Disbanded	09/07/1997
Steubenville	St. John (10517)	6E	Disbanded	12/28/1997
Oklahoma				
Broken Arrow	Shepherd of the Hills (20233)	4C	Disbanded	10/31/1998
Oregon				
Springfield	Resurrection (13013)	1E	Withdrew	01/26/1997
Pennsylvania				
Cranberry Township	St. John's (Lovi) (10406)	8B	Withdrew	10/18/1998
East Pittsburgh	Emmanuel (10351)	8B	Disbanded	10/31/1998

Glen Rock	Bethlehem (Steltz) (01082)	8D	Disbanded	11/22/1997
Harrisburg	St. Paul (01111)	8D	Merged with Zion (01115)	04/07/1997
Hyde Park	Hope (06424)	8B	Disbanded	05/03/1998
Jerome	Jerome (01351)	8C	Disbanded	12/28/1997
New Florence	Faith (30340)	8B	Formed by consolidation of St. John and Zion, Robinson	01/01/1997
New Florence	St. John (06519)	8B	Consolidated with Zion, Robinson	01/01/1997
Philadelphia	Bethel (00413)	7F	Disbanded	12/14/1997
Philadelphia	Peace (00426)	7F	Disbanded	06/08/1997
Philadelphia	St. Simeon (00660)	7F	Disbanded	04/20/1997
Raubsville	St. Paul (00497)	7E	Disbanded	02/23/1997
Robinson	Zion (06520)	8B	Consolidated with St. John, New Florence	01/01/1997
Seiberlingsville	St. Paul (00630)	7E	Withdrew	04/23/1997
WilliamSPORT	St. Paul (01469)	8E	Disbanded	12/31/1997
York	Messiah (01479)	8D	Merged with Grace Evangelical (01477)	09/07/1997
South Carolina				
Charleston	Holy Cross (05676)	9C	Disbanded	12/31/1998
Columbia	Ministry with the Deaf (07760)	9C	Disbanded	11/08/1998
Orangeburg	New Creation (30186)	9C	Received	05/22/1997
Savannah Lakes Village	Lutheran Church by the Lake (30369)	9C	Received	06/05/1998
Spartanburg	Nativity Evangelical (05660)	9C	Disbanded	12/27/1998
South Dakota				
Beresford	Skrefsrud (13510)	3C	Withdrew	10/26/1997
Freeman	Unity (13574)	3C	Disbanded	06/29/1997
LaBolt	Grace (05382)	3C	Disbanded	12/31/1998
Texas				
Bracketville	Our Redeemer (30372)	4E	Received	05/30/1997
El Campo	Trinity (14118)	4F	Merged with Christ (14117)	07/13/1997
Fort Worth	San Miguel (30268)	4D	Received	05/01/1998
Junction	Trinity (14163)	4E	Disbanded	08/09/1996
Utah				
Logan	Prince of Peace (30172)	2E	Received	04/25/1997
Virginia				
Haymarket	Shepherd of the Hills (30241)	8G	Received	06/19/1997
Lake Gaston	Lakeside (30284)	9A	Received	05/31/1997
Pembroke	Pembroke Lutheran Memorial Church (06061)	9A	Merged with Redeemer, Pearisburg (06074)	09/26/1997
Washington				
Duvall	Lord of Life (30310)	1B	Received	06/19/1998
Mattawa	Grace (30393)	1D	Received	06/06/1997
Tacoma	Bethel (04913)	1C	Consolidated with Mount Zion and Gethsemane	06/14/1998
Tacoma	Gethsemane (04915)	1C	Consolidated with Mount Zion and Bethel	06/14/1998
Tacoma	Mount Zion (13027)	1C	Consolidated with Bethel and Gethsemane	06/14/1998

Tacoma	United (30410)	1C	Formed by consolidation of Mount Zion, Bethel, and Gethsemane	06/21/1998
Tukwila	Riverton Heights (12986)	1B	Disbanded	02/01/1998
West Virginia				
Wheeling	Warwood (06616)	8H	Disbanded	08/16/1998
Wisconsin				
Green Bay	Christ Community (30269)	5I	Received	06/12/1998
Pewaukee	St. Francis (30110)	5J	Disbanded	04/06/1997

Roster of Congregations

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America counted 10,862 congregations on December 31, 1998, including congregations under development.

The record of congregations added to the roster of congregations indicates:

Additions to the Roster of Congregations 1993-1998

Congregations	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Received by synodical action	22	30	20	17	25	20
Resulting from consolidations	3	6	4	8	5	4
Totals	25	36	24	25	30	24

The record of removals from the roster of congregations by categories shows:

Removals from the Roster of Congregations 1993-1998

Congregations	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Withdrawn	8	8	2	4	5	2
Disbanded	36	32	34	35	40	31
Merged	7	7	5	5	9	4
Consolidated	6	13	10	18	12	15
Removed	-	-	3	-	1	-
Totals	57	60	54	62	67	52

The roster of congregations is published annually in the Yearbook of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, prepared by staff of the secretary. Congregations that have been received into this church or that have been consolidated, merged, withdrawn, disbanded, or removed are listed at the end of the roster of congregations in the yearbook.

Synodical Relationships

Any change in a congregation's synodical relationship is to be reported to the Churchwide Assembly. As provided by ELCA bylaw 10.02.02., "Any congregation in a border area desiring to change its synod relationship may do so upon approval of the synod assemblies of the synods concerned, which shall report any such change to the Churchwide Assembly."

The following changes of synodical relationships for congregations have been reported by synods:

Change of Synodical Relationships

Year of Transfer	Congregation	Identification Number	Location	Former Synod	Receiving Synod
1997	Trinity	13488	Wibaux, Mont.	1F	3A
1997	St. Olaf	12271	Brinsmade, N.D.	3A	3B
1997	Immanuel	12317	Esmond, N.D.	3A	3B
1997	Trinity	12318	Esmond, N.D.	3A	3B

Appendix I to the Report of the Secretary

Rosters and Statistics

Roster of Ordained Ministers

As of December 31, 1998, the roster of ordained ministers of this church listed a total of 17,589 ordained ministers (active and retired). Of that number, 419 were persons of color or persons whose primary language was other than English.

As of December 31, 1998, the number of clergywomen in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America was 2,228, up 115 from a year earlier, accounting for 12.7 percent of all (17,589) ordained ministers.

In 1993, the number of clergy women was 1,633, which was 9.4 percent of all ordained ministers. At the end 1991, the number of pastors who were women was 1,403 or 8.0 percent of ordained ministers.

The numbers of additions to the roster of ordained ministers and removals from that roster are shown in the table that follows:

Ordained Ministers 1993-1998

Additions	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Ordained	310	298	338	333	331	341
Reinstated	20	14	13	15	17	11
Received from other churches	33	18	21	18	25	20
Totals	363	330	372	366	373	372
Removals	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Death	197	182	188	212	202	210
Resignation	51	41	50	45	56	57
Removal	71	89	55	95	75	50
Transfer to ELCIC*	5	2	4	2	1	1
Totals	324	314	297	354	334	318

*Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada

The names of persons added to and removed from the roster of ordained ministers are listed annually in the Yearbook of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Official Rosters of Laypersons

This church has established three rosters of laypersons. They are associates in ministry, deaconesses, and diaconal ministers.

The names of persons approved by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for admission to the roster of associates in ministry, the roster of deaconesses, and the roster of diaconal ministers—as well as the names of persons removed from those rosters—are listed annually in the Yearbook of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Roster of Associates in Ministry

As of December 31, 1998, the roster of associates in ministry numbered 1,097 persons.

Associates in Ministry 1993-1998

Additions	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Approval	36	31	31	32	36	26
Reinstatement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	36	31	31	32	36	26
Removals	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Death	5	8	6	5	7	8
Ordination	12	2	9	9	10	5
Resignation	7	16	7	12	8	9
Removal	49	37	23	30	33	14
Consecrated Diaconal Minister	—	—	—	3	2	0
Totals	73	63	45	59	60	36

Roster of Deaconesses

As of December 31, 1998, the roster of deaconesses numbered 86 persons.

Deaconesses 1993-1998

Additions	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Approval	3	1	2	1	1	1
Reinstatement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	3	1	2	1	1	1
Removals	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Death	2	2	6	3	3	2
Resignation	0	0	1	0	0	0
Removal	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	2	2	7	3	3	2

Roster of Diaconal Ministers

The roster of diaconal ministers, established by the 1993 Churchwide Assembly, was started in 1996 with the consecration of seven persons.

Diaconal Ministers 1996-1998

Additions	1996	1997	1998
Approval	7	7	4
Reinstatement	0	0	0
Totals	7	7	4
Removals	1996	1997	1998
Death	0	0	0
Resignation	0	0	0
Removal	0	0	0
Totals	0	0	0

**Comparison between 1996 and 1997
Congregational Statistics**

With a total of 5,185,055 baptized members in congregations, the ELCA remained stable in membership for 1997. That figure represented a slight decrease of 2,308 noted from 5,187,363 in 1996. The decrease represented four one-hundredths of a percent (0.04%).

Confirmed membership in 1997 for ELCA congregations remained steady at 3.8 million (3,844,169), up 1,014 from 1996. Communing and contributing membership, indicators of active participation, however, declined for the second consecutive year to 2,516,006 in 1997 compared with 2,541,505 in 1996. This drop might be due to lack of reporting rather than decreased participation. It appears that fewer congregations are counting and recording the exact number of persons who partake of the sacrament of Holy Communion.

The average number of persons at worship on Sundays, which is another indicator of participation by members in the life of congregations, remained constant in 1997. About 1.6 million (1,580,961) or 30 percent (30.49%) of all baptized members attend worship each week. Since 1988, average worship attendance has fluctuated slightly between 30 and 31 percent.

The number of congregations decreased by 47 from 10,936 in 1996 to 10,889 in 1997, largely as a result of the disbanding, merging, or consolidating of existing congregations.

The slight but steady decline in the number of baptisms of children over the past eight years continued in 1997. From 1996 to 1997 the decrease was 1,844, down from 83,944 in 1996 to 82,100 in 1997. The decline in baptisms of children reflects the slowed birth rate in the population in general. Congregations did report, however, a slight increase in baptisms of adults 16 years and over (up 141 persons from 8,108 in 1996 to 8,249 in 1997).

The number of unconfirmed children partaking of the sacrament of Holy Communion continued to grow in 1997 to 259,187 (up from 248,340 in 1996), an increase of 4.36 percent.

The number of youth confirmed in 1997 declined 219 from 1996 to 59,123 in 1997. This ended seven consecutive years of increases.

Losses of baptized members attributable to roll cleaning by congregations were up slightly from 165,866 in 1996 to 166,668 in 1997. The number of losses due to death increased over 1996 by fewer than 100 members (50,482 in 1997 compared to 50,387 in 1996).

The average number of baptized members per congregation was 481, and the average confirmed membership was 356. In 1997, the average number for communing and contributing members per congregation was 236.

For 1997, 2.19 percent of ELCA baptized members are African American, Black, Asian, Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native people. For 1996, the percentage of the total

ELCA membership was 2.14. Hispanic membership increased the most with 1,561 members added to the baptized rolls of congregations. The actual numbers were: African American or Black membership, 49,438, down 274; Asian and Pacific Islander membership, 21,769, down 168; Hispanic membership, 30,988, up 1,561; and American Indian and Alaska Native membership, 6,896, down 117. Some 7,000 (7,044) members declared their race or ethnic heritage as “other.”

In the year of its start in 1988, the ELCA counted 98,166 African American, Asian, Hispanic, and Native American members. By 1997 that number increased 18.3 percent to 116,135 persons.

Income for the 10,889 congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) in 1997 exceeded \$2 billion (\$2,006,953,384), up \$133 million (\$133,397,469) or seven percent (7.12%) from 1996.

Of total congregational receipts, \$1.4 billion (\$1,384,266,794) was received in regular, unrestricted offerings, up almost four percent (3.88%). For 1996, the percent increase in regular giving by members over the year before was 2.68 percent.

The average regular giving per confirmed member increased from \$401.39 in 1996 to \$423.23, up five percent (5.44%) or an increase per confirmed member of \$21.84.

Total disbursements by ELCA congregations for local operating expenses was \$1,289,625,392. That amounted to an increase of \$50 million or four percent (4.06%) over 1996.

Regular “mission support”) that is, monies passed from congregations to the 65 synods and to the churchwide organization to support the national and international ministries of this church) increased four times what it had from 1995 to 1996. Total “mission-support” funding for 1997 was \$123,573,865, up \$2.6 million (\$2,646,555) from \$120,927,310 in 1996, for an increase of 2.18 percent.

What is known as “Specific Mission Support”) formerly called Designated Gifts) increased by 3.59 percent or by \$176,960 to \$5,097,339 in 1997.

Contributions reported by congregations to the World Hunger Appeal and Lutheran Disaster Response jumped 23 percent (23.37%) or \$2.3 million (\$2,288,649) from \$9,792,901 in 1996 to \$12,081,550. Funds for 1997 Red River Valley flood relief in the Dakotas and western Minnesota were seen as a significant factor in this increase.

Funding for missionary sponsorship grew by almost nine percent (8.58%) to \$4,971,079 in 1997. At the same time, Mission Partner giving increased 12 percent (11.83%) last year to \$3,685,468.

Synodically related “Special Benevolences” increased more than 14 percent (14.27%) from \$14,696,720 in 1996 to \$16,795,037 in 1997. Money for community benevolent causes was up 2.36 percent (\$544,603) to \$23,610,146 in 1997.

Congregations reported a nearly twelve and one-half percent increase (12.49%) in other expenses, up \$8.5 million (\$8,456,493) to \$76 million (\$76,110,950). Over sixty-three percent (63.58%) of ELCA congregations reported that they had no debt in 1997.

Congregations reported for 1997 over \$1.2 billion (\$1,230,771,759) in savings and investments, endowments, and memorial funds) up \$151 million (\$150,845,301) from the previous year.

Comparison between 1996 and 1997 Congregational Statistics

[Tables follow.]

**Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Summary of Congregational Statistics as of December 31, 1997**

Summary of Membership Statistics

Total Number of Congregations
Baptized Members
Confirmed Members
Communing Members, Confirmed
Communing Members, Unconfirmed
Communed and Contributed

Analysis of Membership Gains and Losses

Baptized Members—Accessions

By Baptism—Children under Age 16
By Baptism—Adults Age 16 and above
By Affirmation of Faith
By Transfer from ELCA Congregations
By Transfer from Other Lutheran Congregations
From Non-Lutheran Congregations
From Other Sources and Statistical Adjustment

Total Accessions—Baptized Members

~~1996~~
3,843,155
2,811,996
2,543,405

~~1997~~
3,844,169
2,818,308
83,944
259,187
2,516,806
Change
83,996

Summary of Financial Statistics

Totals—End of Year
Total Receipts
Total Disbursements
Assets, Value on December 31
Total Indebtedness on December 31
Average Giving per Baptized Member
Average Giving per Confirmed Member
Indebtedness Compared with Assets
Congregations with no debt

Detail of Financial Statistics

Receipts for Regular Operation

Regular Giving by Members
Designated Giving by Members
Earned Income, Unrestricted
Earned Income, Restricted
Grants and Subsidies
Cash
Other Receipts
1996

934,708,629

\$2,006,953,384

297,380,921,574

1997

994,760,676

1,332,464,205

\$133,397,469+

310,788,032

42,319,527+

56,013,081+

35,853,936

60,052,047+

**Summary of Financial Statistics (continued)
Disbursements for Regular Operation**

Current Operating Expenses
 Capital Improvements
 Payment on Debts
 Mission Support
 Designated Gifts
 World Hunger Appeal/Disaster Response
 Mission Partners
 Vision for Mission
 Missionary Sponsorship
 Synodical Benevolences
 Local Community Benevolences
 Other Benevolences
 Other Expenses

Assets, Value on December 31

Church Edifice and Lot
 Parish House and Lot
 Parsonage (s) and Lot(s)
 Other Real Estate
 Endowment and Memorial Funds
 Cash, Savings, Bonds, etc.
 Other Assets

Received During Year

Bequests Received
 Gifts of Bequests Received
 Mission Support
 23,065.543
 10,074.325
 17,081.350
 60,690.432+
 2,187,468.9+
 8,974.319,662
 4,099.639+
 6,646,637.3
 23,860,514.67
 10,088,049.26
 7,931,309,509
 1,481,987,909
 9,215,451,837

Summary of Congregational Information

Worship Services

Total Attendance at Worship Each Week
 Average Sunday Attendance per Congregation
 Percent of Baptized Members Attending Worship

White
 American Indian and Alaska Native People
 African American/Black
 Asian/Pacific Islander
 Hispanic/Spanish
 Other

Total Ethnic Baptized Membership

White
 White Hispanic
 American Indian and Alaska Native People
 American Indian and Alaska Native Hispanic
 African American/Black
 African American/Black Hispanic
 Asian/Pacific Islander
 Asian/Pacific Islander Hispanic
 Other
 Other Hispanic

1,443
 1,580,961
 1,977
 3,765
 2,874
 1,619
 8,228
 10,658
 1,443
 3,458
 8,677
 25,886
 2,893
 7,012

Distribution of Congregations by Size

Very Small
 Small
 Moderately Small
 Medium Sized
 Moderately Large
 Large
 Very Large

1-175
 176-350
 351-500
 501-700
 701-950
 951-1,500
 1,500+
Total
 Small
 Moderately Small
 Medium Sized
 Moderately Large
 Large
 Very Large

867
Total
 455
 351-500
 501-700
 5606
 701-950
 23,071
 951-1,500
Total
 12.06
Confirmed Members
Total Baptized
 3,921
 31,599

Comparison Between 1997 and 1998 Congregational Statistics

With a total of 5,178,225 baptized members in 10,862 congregations, the membership of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America decreased in 1998 about one-tenth of a percent (0.13%). That figure represented a decrease of only 6,830 baptized members from 5,185,055 in 1997.

Confirmed membership in 1998 for ELCA congregations remained steady at 3.8 million (3,840,136), down 4,033 from 1997. Communing and contributing membership, indicators of active participation, however, declined for the third consecutive year to 2,501,669 in 1998 compared with 2,516,006 in 1997, a decrease of 14,337 or one-half percent.

The average number of persons at worship on Sundays, which is another indicator of participation by members in the life of congregations, remained level in 1998. About 1.6 million (1,579,871) or 31 percent (30.50%) of all baptized members attend worship each week. Over the past 10 years, average worship attendance has fluctuated slightly between 30 and 31 percent.

The number of congregations decreased by 27 from 10,889 in 1997 to 10,862 in 1998, largely as a result of the disbanding and consolidating of existing congregations. This is 20 fewer than the decrease between 1996 and 1997.

The slight but steady decline in the number of baptisms of children over the past nine years continued in 1998. From 1997 to 1998 the decrease was 876, down from 82,100 in 1997 to 81,224 in 1998. The decline in baptisms of children reflects the slowed birth rate in the population in general. For the second year in a row, congregations did report, however, a slight increase in baptisms of adults 16 years and over (up 219 persons from 8,249 in 1997 to 8,468 in 1998).

The number of unconfirmed children partaking of the sacrament of Holy Communion continued to grow in 1998 to 270,125 (up from 259,187 in 1997), an increase of 4.22 percent. It was at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly that a new statement on sacramental practices was adopted.

The number of youth confirmed in 1998 was practically the same as the number confirmed in 1997. The number of confirmations reported for 1998 was 59,129, up six youth from the number reported for 1997.

Losses of baptized members attributable to roll cleaning by congregations again were up slightly from 166,668 in 1997 to 172,561 in 1998. The number of losses due to death remained relatively unchanged for 1998 (50,383 in 1998 compared to 50,482 in 1997).

The average number of baptized members per congregation was 480, and the average confirmed membership was 356. In 1998, the average number for communing and contributing members per congregation was 236.

For 1998, 2.29 percent of ELCA baptized members were African American, Black, Asian, Hispanic, American Indian, or Alaska Native people. For 1997, the percentage of the total ELCA membership of persons of color or whose primary language is other than English was 2.19.

African American or Black membership increased to 50,635, up 1,197; Asian and Pacific Islander membership, 22,467, up 698; Hispanic membership, 32,295, up 1,307; and American Indian and Alaska Native membership, 7,134, up 238. Some 8,700 (8,696) members declared their race or ethnic heritage as "other."

Income for the 10,862 congregations of the ELCA in 1998 was over \$2 billion (\$2,120,307,630) for the second year in a row, up \$113 million (\$113,354,246) or six percent (5.64%) from 1997.

Of total congregational receipts, almost \$1.5 billion (\$1,452,160,882) was received in regular, unrestricted offerings, up almost five percent (4.90%). For 1997, the percent increase in regular giving by members over 1996 was 3.88 percent.

The average regular giving per confirmed member increased from \$423.23 in 1997 to \$447.89, up six percent (5.82%) or an increase per confirmed member of \$24.66.

Total disbursements by ELCA congregations for local operating expenses was \$1,346,301,718. That amounted to an increase of \$57 million (\$56,676,326) or four percent (4.39%) over 1997.

Regular “mission support”—that is, monies passed from congregations to the 65 synods and to the churchwide organization to support the national and international ministries of this church—increased over two and one-half percent (2.70%). Actual “mission-support” funding for 1998 was \$126,910,520, up \$3.3 million (\$3,336,655) from \$123,573,865 in 1997.

“Specific Mission Support”—formerly called Designated Gifts—increased dramatically by 38.19 percent to \$7,044,456 in 1998. The increase from 1996 to 1997 was almost \$2 million (\$1,947,117).

Another benevolence category that showed dramatic increase in 1998 was “Vision for Mission,” an annual special appeal of this church. The increase was 51 percent from a total of \$358,651 in 1997 to \$542,626 in 1998.

Contributions reported by congregations to the World Hunger Appeal and Lutheran Disaster Response was 3.06 percent higher in 1998. The actual dollar amount for 1998 was \$12,451,681.

Funding for missionary sponsorship grew slightly (1.73%) after experiencing a nine percent increase from 1996 to 1997. In 1998, the actual figure for missionary sponsorship was reported at \$5,057,490, up \$86,411. Mission Partner giving increased one percent (1.13%) in 1998 to \$3,727,367.

Synodically related “Special Benevolences” decreased a little (2.25%) from \$16,795,037 in 1997 to \$16,416,918 in 1998. Money for community benevolent causes, however, was up 7.34 percent (\$1,733,815) to \$25,343,961 in 1998.

Congregations reported a 13 percent increase (13.00%) in other expenses, up \$9.9 million (\$9,898,240) to \$86 million (\$86,009,190). Over 63 percent (63.57%) of ELCA congregations reported that they had no debt in 1998.

Congregations reported for 1998 over \$1.3 billion (\$1,376,911,028) in savings and investments, endowments, and memorial funds) up \$146 million (\$146,139,269) from 1997.

Comparison between 1997 and 1998 Congregational Statistics

[Tables follow.]

**Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Summary of Congregational Statistics as of December 31, 1998**

Summary of Membership Statistics

Total Number of Congregations
Baptized Members
Confirmed Members
Communing Members—Confirmed
Communing Members—Unconfirmed
Communed and Contributed

Analysis of Membership Gains and Losses

Baptized Members—Accessions

By Baptism—Children under 16
By Baptism—Adults 16 and Older
By Affirmation of Faith
By Transfer from ELCA Congregations
By Transfer from Other Lutheran Congregations
From Non-Lutheran Congregations
From Other Sources and Statistical Adjustment
Total Accessions—Baptized Members

~~10,088,055~~
3,844,169
2,818,308

2,591,8706

~~10,088,225~~
3,840,136
2,815,334
82,100
~~8,749,269~~
~~84,434~~
Change

Analysis of Membership Gains and Losses (continued)

Baptized Members—Losses	
By Death	
By Transfer to ELCA Congregations	
By Transfer to Other Lutheran Congregations	
To Non-Lutheran Congregations	
For Other Reasons and Stat Adjustment	
Total Losses—Baptized Members	
Confirmed Members—Accessions	
By Baptism—Adults 16 and Older	
By Affirmation of Faith	
By Transfer from ELCA Congregations	
By Transfer from Other Lutheran Congregations	
From Non-Lutheran Congregations	
From Other Sources and Stat Adjustment	
Baptized Members Confirmed	
Total Accessions—Confirmed Members	

Confirmed Members—Losses	
By Death	
By Transfer to ELCA Congregations	
By Transfer to Other Lutheran Congregations	
To Non-Lutheran Congregations	
For Other Reasons and Stat Adjustment	
Total Losses—Confirmed Members	

1998
Total Associate Members
 65,917

13,018	
142,650	
677,281	
677,281	
Change	
15,351	
89,926	
59,743	
23,047	
49,665	
64,884	
Percent	
63.09	

Summary of Financial Statistics

Totals—End of Year
 Total Receipts
 Total Disbursements
 Assets, Value on December 31
 Total Indebtedness on December 31
 Average Giving per Baptized Member
 Average Giving per Confirmed Member
 Indebtedness Compared with Assets
 Congregations with no debt

Detail of Financial Statistics

Receipts for Regular Operation
 Regular Giving by Members
 Designated Giving by Members
 Earned Income, Unrestricted
 Earned Income, Restricted
 Grants & Division for Outreach Support
 Cash Borrowed
 Other Receipts
 2,006,953,384
 1,932,921,574
 12,070,784,694
1997
 994,760,676

23,120,807,630
 240,323,691,90
 12,626,272,302
1998
 1,073,874,543
 1,384,266,794

242,727,799
 137,954,246+
 601,789,043
 45,518,7608+
 428,077,8858

**Summary of Financial Statistics (continued)
Disbursements for Regular Operation**

Current Operating Expenses
 Capital Improvements
 Payment on Debts
 Mission Support
 Specific Mission Support-Designated Giving
 World Hunger Appeal and Disaster Response
 Mission Partners
 Vision for Mission
 Missionary Sponsorship
 Synodical Benevolences
 Local Community Benevolences
 Other Benevolences
 Other Expenses

Assets, Value on December 31

Church Edifice and Lot
 Parish House and Lot
 Parsonage (502) and Lot(s)
 Other Real Estate
 Endowment and Memorial Funds
 Stocks, Bonds, Etc.
 Other Assets

Bequests Received During Year

Number of Bequests Received
 Total Value of Bequests Received
 Total Value of Mission Support
 Other Assets
 719,447.50
 17,170.85
 56,676.32+
 9,385.16
 54,153.42
 5,156.26
 8,336.55
 42,926.26
 1,047.55
 296,007.19
 9,666.27
 9,666.27

Distribution of Congregations by Size

Very Small
 Small
 Moderately Small
 Medium Sized
 Moderately Large
 Very Large

1-175
 176-350
 351-500
 501-700
 701-950
 951-5000
 Total
 Small
 Moderately Small
 Medium Sized
 Moderately Large
 Very Large

864
 768
 1,500
 351-500
 361-400
 401-500
 501-5000
 Total

795
 Confirmed Members
 Total Baptized
 3,140
 Members

Quasi-Committee of the Whole for General Discussion: Full Communion with the Moravian Church

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 11-43 (Section I, pages 14-15); continued on *Minutes*, pages 132, 299.

Bishop Anderson said that the assembly would now move into a time of general discussion of “Following our Shepherd to Full Communion,” the proposal for a relationship of full communion between this church and the Moravian Church. He said that the assembly would follow the same procedure of a quasi-committee of the whole that was followed in the earlier discussion of the proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church. He commended the voting members for that earlier discussion in which views were expressed respectfully and during which voting members listened to each other and to the prompting of God’s Spirit. He said that he was looking forward to a session now that would be equally thoughtful and edifying. He then referred the assembly to the proposed agreement with the Moravian Church and memorials from synods on this proposal.

Bishop Anderson recognized Secretary Almen who moved the following:

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Voice Vote

CARRIED: **To proceed as a quasi-committee of the whole for 60 minutes for the purpose of general discussion only of “Following our Shepherd to Full Communion,” the proposal for the establishment of a relationship of full communion with the Moravian Church.**

Bishop Anderson invited voting members to come to the microphones to share their views on this proposal, reminding them of the rules that would be followed: no applause, three-minute limits, and alternating viewpoints.

Bishop Jon S. Enslin [South-Central Synod of Wisconsin] said, “I speak strongly in favor of supporting this proposal. It was my privilege to serve my internship in the second oldest church in the Western hemisphere—Frederick Lutheran Church, St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands, established in 1666. They were Danish islands back then, and soon became a major stopover for the slave trade between Africa and North America. The slave market was next to the church and it was a place where often Danish landowners would purchase slaves to work the sugar cane fields. It is now part of the educational unit of that church. In 1732, the Moravians came to witness to Jesus Christ among those slaves. The Danish landowners were not excited about this, and they made a demand that those Moravians would have to sell themselves into slavery in order to do that. The Moravians agreed, and this so shocked the Danish landowners, they never followed through on that demand. But they lived among the slaves in the same economic conditions as the slaves. And the end result was to shame the Lutheran church, and they, too, began to preach to the slaves. You see, before they only thought they needed to preach to the Danes. As a result of that, something really strange happened. The result was that they could no longer countenance enslaving people to whom they were bringing the freedom of the Gospel. And as a result of the work of that congregation in the Danish Lutheran Church, Denmark became the first European nation to outlaw slavery.

“If you go to the Caribbean today, you will see myriads of very vital Moravian congregations, all of whom are children from those early missionaries who were willing

themselves to become slaves in order to set slaves free in the Gospel. We learned much from them back then, and it is my conviction that we have much to learn from our sisters and brothers in Christ through Moravians today.”

Bishop Richard J. Foss [Eastern North Dakota Synod] said, “I am deeply grateful for the content and spirit of this proposal. It has been a pleasure in the months leading up to this assembly to be able to say to people, ‘I support that.’ It is a delight to be able to say after yesterday and today, ‘I support it even more strongly than before, if that is possible.’”

Mr. R. Guy Erwin [New England Synod] said, “Thank you, Bishop Anderson. I would like to add my voice to those who have thanked you for your fair leadership of these debates. You are also an important symbolic figure for me because you are living proof that a young church historian can grow up to amount to something.

“There are two things that, being historians, you cannot escape. One is a very strong sense of the inter-connectedness of all things—that every decision that we make and action that we undertake has not only the anticipated consequences, but also unanticipated ones; and also a sense of irony that no matter how hard humans work and try to figure out how things are going to work, it never quite works out that way.

“I teach at a non-denominational seminary—the Yale Divinity School—and there, ecumenism is not a subject for us to study, but a way of life. And when I was waiting in line this morning to speak in favor of ‘Called to Common Mission,’ I realized that I myself represent an ecumenical paradox. This year, at least, I was a Lutheran who spent most of his time teaching Episcopalians about Moravianism.

“So, I think it is a wonderful thing that we have the chance this week to vote to be in full communion with the Moravian Church. I, personally, have been spiritually very deeply nourished by the Moravian witness to God’s grace and inspired by the Moravian steadfastness in proclaiming the Gospel, often against difficult odds. And as a Lutheran scholar, I believe that the Moravian stress on personal response to God’s love is the necessary next step after our Lutheran insistence on justification by faith. And even more, I applaud the Lutheran emphasis that being a Christian is not a solitary activity, but is carried out in community. We are all just members of Christ’s body.

“When this resolution has passed, I will personally feel that two related, but distinct, aspects of my own life will have been united: a Lutheran trust in God and in clear doctrine, and a Moravian love for Jesus. These will become fused in my heart.

“But before I sit down, I want to leave you with a historical irony. We have heard about the faithful disagreement between Count Zinzendorf and Pastor Muhlenberg that led to a split between Lutherans and Moravians in America in 1742. Ironically, a few years, just a few years before that, the unity of brethren had received full recognition by the same English crown whose call Muhlenberg was carrying out. A special act of Parliament in the 1730s, sponsored by the archbishops of Canterbury in York, had recognized Zinzendorf’s movement as an ancient Protestant Episcopal church, and fully equal to the Church of England in authority within England. I think it is strange that the Anglicans recognized in the 18th century what Lutherans were then about to reject. And so, I leave you with that thought: that every ecumenical gesture we make affects all of our partners. And I leave you with a prayer that Jesus Christ, the great Shepherd of all the sheep and the only head of the church, may soon lead us all to full communion. ‘Jesus, still lead on!’”

The Rev. James E. Sudbrock [Metropolitan New York Synod] said, “In reading the Moravian document about the Good Shepherd, I am interested that there are items like a

threefold ordained ministry, the fact that it is bishops who are those who ordain people to become deacons, and issues like that which seem to trouble us so much in another discussion we are having today. I assume that the big difference for some is that in this case, we do not have to change, we are simply honoring them—what they do. But it strikes me that you never enter a relationship without being changed. So I am just wondering, since there do not seem to be a lot of speakers, whether someone could share some more of the benefits that we will receive in this relationship where we will undoubtedly change and grow because of it.”

Bishop Anderson responded, “I think we will continue with the order of speakers, and if a platform group wishes to think about that question, and if time permits, we might address it. Microphone 11.”

Ms. Gloria Ware [Greater Milwaukee Synod] observed, “Reverend Chair, I see no one speaking against [the resolution]. I doubt that there will be. Might we continue on with other business? Bishop Anderson replied, “That is possible. Usually that is done by a procedural vote. I think that I would like to honor the speakers who are presently standing and then we will certainly move to that closure. Microphone 9.”

Ms. Mary B. Heller [Metropolitan New York Synod] said, “Bishop Anderson, I have heard many compelling reasons to accept the recommendation to establish full communion with both the Moravians and the Episcopalians. There was something that was said in the presentations yesterday, asking us to broaden our vision as Lutherans. We are, first and foremost, Christians. We accept the Great Commission in Matthew 28 to ‘go into all the world...’ and yet, after all these years, Christianity is still a minority. And a lot of what we take for granted some of our brothers and sisters have been giving up their freedom and their lives to do what we just normally do. So it seems that we have an awful lot of work to do, and it would seem also that this ‘Following our Shepherd to Full Communion’ and ‘Called to Common Mission’ are indeed about mission, that joining hands and in sharing our resources, we can give to the world a firm statement of our commitment to bring the Gospel, to spread this Gospel, to make Christ known throughout the world.”

The Rev. John H. P. Reumann [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod] said, “I seem to end up at the ‘Opposed’ microphone partly as a matter of convenience; it is closer to where I sit. But I want to raise a question or indicate my problem with one of the arguments used in the document before us, while affirming that I will vote for the recommendation.

“That has to do with the device of achieving ecumenical agreement by mutual complementarities. In our Moravian statement, it appears, for example, on page 30, C. Mutual Complementarities. It was also a phrase used in the Lutheran-Reformed *A Formula of Agreement*, and I am probably the only person that spoke against it at the assembly in Philadelphia. There it was a complementarity of mutual affirmation and mutual admonition. There was the claim that differences historically over the presence of Christ in the Lord’s Supper and predestination were complementary. If you read *A Formula of Agreement*, I think they solved it not by simply making them complementary, but finding other ways to bridge the gap. It is fascinating to ask if ‘complementarity’ had been used in Episcopal-Lutheran relations, what would have happened.

“My problem with complementarity, as it is worked out in pages 31 and following of the Moravian document, is that it can seem to imply two equally correct, equally proper, understandings in need of expansion. Unless there is more to it than that, then the real presence and the real absence complement each other. There have to be things in our history besides complementarities, and it is a principle that I hope will not be used without further

examination and consideration in further ecumenical statements. Having said that, and that what we are engaged in here is not simply a salute to Moravian piety and Lutheran doctrine, I want to affirm the agreement and, above all, its importance in the Caribbean and in Africa. I would want to put it more positively than one seminary statement that was drafted, and concluded: 'The Moravian Agreement offers no challenge to the Lutheran church.' I think it does, including areas of piety, and I as one will continue to read the *Losungen*, which I have read gratefully for 40-some years while having my questions about complementarity as an ecumenical principle."

The Rev. Stephen P. Gerhard [North Carolina Synod] spoke in response to the question about what the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America would gain by this relationship of full communion. "I was received in Winston-Salem by a Moravian pastor, when I accepted the call there four years ago, in a way that enabled me to know immediately the sense of consensus with which the Moravian Church responds to many issues. We would gain greatly there, and even though there are very few Moravian churches where our congregations are strong in number, we have models that enable us to grow in strength as mission people. I, too, served my internship in the Caribbean at Christiansted, St. Croix, and know the same history that was presented a few minutes ago. And there is a significant challenge to us in our understanding of mission that comes through the experience and stalwart strength of the Moravian Church in the history of Christianity. But we have experienced in our congregation some significant growth in mission simply by working with a joint youth group with the Moravian and Presbyterian neighbors, going on a three-year cycle mission trip, the first to a far-flung place. In this case, it was a Jamaican mission of the Moravian Church, where we worked two years ago; then we gathered strength from doing one regionally and then one locally for our youth. It has surely expanded their understanding of the church and their understanding of what the Moravian Church offers us."

Bishop Anderson stated, "I see one more speaker at microphone 11, and then we will hear from one of our members of the panel concerning the same question of benefits. Microphone 11."

Bishop Floyd M. Schoenhals [Arkansas-Oklahoma Synod] said, "There are very few Lutherans in Arkansas and Oklahoma, and there are even fewer Moravians. In fact, I have never met one yet. I am enthusiastically supporting this full communion proposal. In many respects—I am going to say this just primarily for the record because even though there are no Moravians, to my knowledge, presently in Arkansas and Oklahoma, their presence is powerfully evident. A hundred and fifty years ago, Moravian missionaries accompanied, they walked with Cherokee people as they were driven from their homes in the southeastern part of the United States along the Trail of Tears to what at that time was Indian territory. And outside the little community of Oaks, Oklahoma, where presently we have Oaks Indian Center and Ebenezer Lutheran congregation as ministries of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in a little cemetery called New Spring Place, Moravian missionaries are buried there. And they are constant witnesses to us of their involvement with our sisters and brothers who are native peoples, and we—they bequeathed that gift of mission and ministry with the Cherokee to the Lutherans. I am very grateful for that, and I urge us to keep learning from their witness."

Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Martha Sheaffer, a member of the panel on the platform, who responded in part to the question about benefits to this church.

Pastor Sheaffer said, "I live in Lititz, Pennsylvania, which originated as a Moravian community, and within the last hundred years has become an open community so that we

Lutherans could establish congregations in that area. So, therefore, the community itself has worked very closely regarding local initiatives. Our local ministerium includes both Lutherans and Moravians, and we meet for curriculum study and begin to do some things together so that we can come to an understanding of who we are. Of course, you must remember we are in that heart of the ministerium country where we continue those legends about Muhlenberg and all that has happened with Muhlenberg and Zinzendorf. So, here are things happening on our local level and we look forward to carrying them further.”

Resumption of Plenary Session Five

Seeing no more speakers at the microphones and hearing no objections to concluding this discussion as a quasi-committee of the whole, Bishop Anderson reconvened the plenary session of the churchwide assembly. He informed the assembly that after Morning Prayer and Bible study on Thursday morning, August 19, 2000, debate on the resolution on full communion with the Moravian Church would begin.

Bishop Anderson recognized the Rev. Daniel F. Martensen, director of the Department for Ecumenical Affairs, and the members of the Lutheran-Moravian Coordinating Committee who helped to introduce “Following our Shepherd to Full Communion.” He then asked the assembly to stand and sing “Savior Like a Shepherd Lead Us.”

Report of the Memorials Committee (continued)

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 1-65; continued on *Minutes*, pages 188, 285, 492, 553.

Category 6a: Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 37-40; continued on *Minutes*, page 193.

Bishop Anderson called to the podium Mr. Carlos Peña and Ms. Beverly A. Peterson, co-chairs of the Memorials Committee, for continuing consideration of the resolution on Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign.

Ms. Nancy C. Fricke [Northwest Pennsylvania Synod] indicated that if the resolution is approved, she would like to ask that a list of representatives in Congress be distributed so that voting members could, while still at the assembly “and full of passion for this issue,” send letters to supporting House Resolution 1095.

The Rev. Darlene B. Muschett [Upstate New York Synod] moved to amend the resolution, adding a short paragraph between paragraphs 1 and 3, “To affirm initiatives which sustain the earth.”

Moved;

Seconded: To insert the following phrase after paragraph one:

To affirm initiatives which sustain the earth.

Pastor Muschett spoke to her amendment, saying, “There is a program some of you are aware of called ‘Debt for Nature,’ which asks developing nations, where debt is being eliminated, to use natural resources—land, air, and water—in such ways as to protect the environment not only for themselves, but for future generations. Secondly, in the Jubilee

2000 proposal, we seek to offer long-term, as well as immediate, help and support. It is in light of these concerns that I make the amendment.”

Bishop Anderson advised the assembly that discussion would now be upon the amendment.

Ms. Louise P. Shoemaker [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod] said, “I speak for the amendment in addition to affirming Jubilee 2000. During the time I worked in Nigeria, one of my Nigerian colleagues made an extensive study of all the international help that had come to sub-Sahara Africa. In every instance, that help had depleted natural resources and had gone against women. In affirming the action, I think it is very important that developing countries be helped to maintain their resources, and, of course, this will have to be done through multinational companies who are raping the resources. But the follow-up to Jubilee 2000 is very important, both by the ELCA and politically.”

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—839; No—101

***CARRIED: To insert the following phrase after paragraph one:
To affirm initiatives which sustain the earth.***

Mr. Ronald Lawrence [La Crosse Area Synod] spoke in favor of the resolution on Jubilee 2000, but also commented that “for those that are not aware of it, the Jubilee 2000 committee came out with a nice little 2000 lapel pin. I became aware of that through attending the Global Mission Events, where they were available. They are really neat, and some of the people here probably have them. They are available in the Augsburg Fortress display area. There are probably a few left, but if not, there is a method there where people could get information on ordering them. I thought that was information that the people here might want to be aware of. I fully support the resolution and support the adoption of it.”

Ms. Velma Amundson [Western North Dakota Synod] said, “It is not so much that I am opposed to this memorial. My concern is this: My understanding that Jubilee 2000 is to encourage the relief of debts from the governments. We have already acknowledged that many of the governments are corrupt, and while reducing their debt is a good thing, I do not know how it helps the people that we want to help: the individual poor farmer, or congregations. I guess I just do not see how it helps them.”

Ms. Edith E. Radig [Eastern North Dakota Synod] concurred with Ms. Amundson’s concerns, saying, “I would like to reiterate what she said. I have read quite a bit about Jubilee 2000, and I am in favor of the proposal. But I would like to have some safeguards that it really would help the people it is supposed to help, rather than [repeating the error], as someone said earlier, when we helped the Nicaraguan people and the government authorities stole the money.”

Mr. Karl Gingrich [Northwestern Ohio Synod] rose to speak in favor of this memorial. “I do so as a pledge that I made to Bubba Nyerere, and he in turn—which rather answers one of the questions here. He pledged to me that within the ruling party, he would do what he could to take that debt reduction and use it on education and health care in Tanzania.”

Bishop Curtis H. Miller [Western Iowa Synod] recalled, “A year ago I had the opportunity to visit our companion synod in Tanzania and to attend the meeting of the Lutheran Mission Cooperation group that coordinates the support of various Lutheran

churches to the ELCT. In the midst of that, we had the opportunity to discuss this [Jubilee 2000] at some length. My understanding is clearly that the forgiveness of debt would be tied to specific commitments by governments to, in effect, transfer what would have been debt repayments into educational ministries, into medical services to citizens of the country, so that the negotiation to release this debt would be bound directly to actions of the local governments to strengthen the support they provide and the help they provide to the citizens of the country. So this proposal does address the need to make this proposal help the people, the citizens of individual countries.”

Ms. Karen Jenkins [Minneapolis Area Synod] stated, “I attended the [eighth assembly of the] World Council of Churches in Zimbabwe last December [1998]. [Jubilee 2000] was a major topic and [resolutions] were passed on this issue. The basic thing that will happen with this is that it has to be directed to infrastructure, and while that may not feed people *per se* at the beginning, it does allow them to get their food to market. It does support the entire system. Some of the countries will be balking at the idea that we are essentially setting conditions on how they can use the money that is diverted, but it is definitely a step forward. It will not solve all their problems, but it is a great help to them, and I strongly urge you to support it.”

Mr. Norman E. Barth [Lower Susquehanna Synod] asserted, “I can well appreciate the views of some of our fellow voting members who are concerned that canceling debt will not be of any help to the people living under this very deep burden. I know that in the case of the Sudan, 104 percent—if you can imagine—of their export earnings goes just to service their debt. And we also must remember that much of this debt was incurred by dictators no longer around, who did indeed squander this money. But this burden is on the medical, the educational, the infrastructure, life of the people of these countries.

“Some years ago I was in Zimbabwe. The [International Monetary Fund] required the government of Zimbabwe to revalue their money from one-to-one—one Zimbabwe dollar to one U.S. dollar—to four-to-one—four Zimbabwe dollars for one U.S. dollar. Talking to women in villages, everyone said, ‘You know, it costs us a hundred Zimbabwe dollars to send our children to school, and now it is going to cost four hundred. We could almost ill afford the hundred, and we certainly cannot afford the four hundred. And so I am going to have to make a decision: Is my son going to go to school, or my daughter?’ And the answer was clear: daughters would not go to school.

“Increase the rate of exchange in order to pay off the debt. Believe me, if we take this burden off the people of some 42 countries—highly indebted countries—most of them in Africa, and let them change their expenditures from paying off service on debt interest, and increase their medical, education, and social infrastructure [expenditures], we would be remiss if we did not do this. I urge everyone to vote in favor of this particular memorial.”

The Rev. Obed E. Nelson [Alaska Synod] moved to end debate on this matter.

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes—911; No—54

CARRIED: To move the previous question.

At Bishop Anderson’s invitation, Mr. Peña read the entire text of the amended resolution aloud.

Ms. Patricia A. Dunlop [Saint Paul Area Synod] rose to a point of order, saying that when Mr. Peña read the resolution aloud, “I noticed the first paragraph says that ‘the alleviation of poverty and hunger in poor nations raised by the Eastern North Dakota Synod...’ I do not believe the North Dakota Synod raised the hunger in poor nations.” Bishop Anderson explained that “raised” modifies the word “concern,” meaning in essence, “to affirm the concern raised by the Eastern North Dakota Synod.” He then instructed the assembly to vote on the resolution.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-949; No-29

CA99.03.06 To affirm the concern for international debt reduction and the alleviation of poverty and hunger in poor nations raised by the Eastern North Dakota Synod, Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod, Northwest Synod of Wisconsin, La Crosse Area Synod, Lower Susquehanna Synod, Western Iowa Synod, and the Caribbean Synod;

To affirm initiatives which sustain the earth;

To express support for the work of the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign promoting education and advocacy on international debt issues and to affirm continued ELCA participation in the Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign; and

To transmit this action as information to the synods.

Category 8: Persecution of Christians

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 44-45.

A. Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod (4F) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, St. Paul has written concerning the church, “If one member suffers, all suffer together...” (1 Corinthians 12:26a); and

WHEREAS, the widespread persecution of Christians in the world today has been clearly documented in the media and in such books as *In the Lion’s Den* by Nina Shea and *Their Blood Cries Out* by Paul Marshall; and

WHEREAS, more Christians have died in this century simply for being Christian than in the first nineteen centuries after the birth of Jesus Christ; and

WHEREAS, the persecution of Christians continues yet today in many countries including Algeria, Burma, China, Ethiopia, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, and Sudan (where more than 100,000 Christians are currently enslaved); and

WHEREAS, the charter of the United Nations forbids religious persecution and yet the members of the United Nations including the United States of America have done very little until recently to acknowledge or address the issue of Christian persecution; and

WHEREAS, mainline Christian denominations and in particular the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America have, for the most part, remained silent about the persecution of their brothers and sisters in Christ elsewhere in the world; and

WHEREAS, one of the basic premises of Lutheranism is to acknowledge and express ecumenical unity with all Christians who are baptized into the one Lord Jesus Christ and not merely with certain denominations with which we are engaged in formal dialogue; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the 1999 assembly of the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America memorialize the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to:

1. Stand in greater solidarity with all Christians throughout the world who are suffering persecution for their faith.
2. Make a strong effort immediately to raise the consciousness of its members about the plight of persecuted Christians in the world today.
3. Encourage its members to offer continuing prayer for their brothers and sisters who are under attack for being Christian.
4. Seek additional ways to express Christian compassion and genuine ecumenism toward all Christians who suffer persecution.
5. Urge its members to support changes in United States foreign policy which would assure justice for, and the humane treatment of, all the people of the world.

BACKGROUND

In response to growing concern about religious persecution, the U.S. Department of State established, in November 1996, an Advisory Committee on Religious Freedom Abroad. Among the members of this committee are representatives of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (of which the ELCA is a member), the National Association of Evangelicals, several Christian denominations including the Orthodox Church in America, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Roman Catholic Church, the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, academicians as well as representatives of the Jewish, Muslim, and Baha'i communities.

The 105th Congress passed and the President signed into law the "International Religious Freedom Act," a bill to strengthen U.S. advocacy on behalf of individuals persecuted in foreign countries on account of religion and to authorize U.S. actions in response to violations of religious freedom. The original version of the bill, as passed in the House, would have imposed several economic sanctions on countries that engage in severe forms of religious persecution and took a "one-size-fits-all" approach that was not sensitive to the particular situations in which religious minorities find themselves. The Senate-passed bill, "Nickles-Lieberman," to which the House finally agreed, reflected the comments and concerns raised from across the political spectrum. The bill serves as a bipartisan alternative to automatic economic sanctions. The ELCA supported this bill for its creation of a meaningful structure for reporting religious persecution worldwide; its use of a broad, internationally accepted definition of religious persecution; its mechanism for required action with appropriate Presidential waivers; and its recognition that the President must be permitted to tailor, on a case-by-case basis, our government's response to countries engaging in religious persecution. The bill provides the President a menu of options, ranging from a private diplomatic protest to limited and targeted economic sanctions.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, created by the "International Religious Freedom Act," replaces the Advisory Committee on Religious Freedom Abroad. The commission has as its primary responsibility:

1. the annual and ongoing review of the facts and circumstances of violations of religious freedom presented in the State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, the Annual Report, and the Executive Summary, as well as information from other sources as appropriate; and

2. the making of policy recommendations to the President, the Secretary of State, and Congress with respect to matters involving international religious freedom.

The Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs worked with various faith groups in supporting the “International Religious Freedom Act,” the version of religious persecution legislation that eventually passed in the U.S. Congress. The task ahead is to monitor U.S. implementation of the bill and to advocate for appropriate application of its provisions as cases arise. The Lutheran World Federation, in a statement on Human Rights at its Sixth Assembly in 1977, said, in part: “We affirm that it is our task as Christians to promote, together with those who have different beliefs, the realization of full freedom of thought, conscience and religion; and we emphasize the right to practice the community of faith across national borders. We explicitly declare that freedom of conscience includes the right not to adhere to any religion.”

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1966, and ratified by the United States in 1992, includes Article 18:

1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching.
2. No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice.
3. Freedom to manifest one’s religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.
4. The State Parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of parents and, when applicable, legal guardians, to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.

In its social statement, “For Peace in God’s World,” the ELCA affirmed human rights as “a common universal standard of justice for living with our differences, and they give moral and legal standing to the individual in the international community.” It also committed the ELCA “to teach about human rights, protest their violation, advocate their international codification, and support effective ways to monitor and ensure compliance with them.” The statement included religious persecution among the ELCA’s priorities in the area of human rights.

Ms. Peterson introduced the recommendation of the Memorials Committee regarding the memorial regarding the persecution of Christians.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To respond to the memorial of the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod by calling upon members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to pray for all victims of religious persecution, both Christians and non-Christians, and for their oppressors;

To direct the Division for Church in Society to continue its work with other appropriate churchwide units to study the matter of religious persecution and religious freedom and assist this church to respond effectively and sensitively to violations of the human right of freedom of thought, conscience, and religion;

To call upon members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to continue to foster respect, tolerance, and understanding of other faiths, including an examination of the causes and manifestations of religious extremism in a variety of religious contexts; and

To call upon members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to communicate to the President of the United States, the Department of State, and both Houses of Congress, their concern for all victims of religious persecution in other parts of the world, conveying their conviction that such human rights violations are contrary to the international community's standards for freedom of conscience and religion.

Mr. John Prabhakar [Northern Illinois Synod] spoke in favor, saying that he was brought up in India and that there is persecution of Christians in India. This memorial speaks well as a witness to the Gospel, he said, and asked the assembly to vote for it.

Seeing no indication of further discussion, Bishop Anderson called for a vote.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-967; No-7

CA99.03.07

To respond to the memorial of the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod by calling upon members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to pray for all victims of religious persecution, both Christians and non-Christians, and for their oppressors;

To direct the Division for Church in Society to continue its work with other appropriate churchwide units to study the matter of religious persecution and religious freedom and assist this church to respond effectively and sensitively to violations of the human right of freedom of thought, conscience, and religion;

To call upon members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to continue to foster respect, tolerance, and understanding of other faiths, including an examination of the causes and manifestations of religious extremism in a variety of religious contexts; and

To call upon members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to communicate to the President of the United States, the Department of State, and both Houses of Congress, their concern for all victims of religious persecution in other parts of the world, conveying their conviction that such human rights violations are contrary to the international community's standards for freedom of conscience and religion.

Bishop Anderson, noting the time, moved to the next item on the agenda and called on Vice President Butler to assume the chair.

Greetings: Women of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section III, pages 92-97.

Chair *pro tem* Addie J. Butler introduced the newly-elected president of the Women of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Ms. Linda Chinnia from Baltimore, Maryland, stating that Ms. Chinnia was elected at the Women of the ELCA's triennial convention in St. Louis, Missouri, in July 1999. Ms. Chinnia is a member of Holy Comforter Lutheran Church in Baltimore and is the director for elementary schools for the Baltimore City Public School system.

Ms. Chinnia said it was an honor to bring greetings from the Women of the ELCA. The name identifies the organization, she said. First, Women of the ELCA is a community of women, called by Jesus Christ, empowered by the Holy Spirit to engage in ministry and promote healing in our church and in society. Second, this organization is a full partner with this church. It has supported the churchwide *Initiatives for a New Century* and supported the work of this church through gifts of time, talent, and money. She pointed out that the Women of the ELCA has made an average annual gift of \$1 million dollars since 1987. She noted that the work of women has been important to all expressions of the church and invited voting members to read the full report about Women of the ELCA in Section III of the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*.

Ms. Chinnia described the Women of the ELCA as a visionary force within this church, identifying needs and resources for ministry, such as literacy, women and children in poverty, violence, anti-racism training, and leadership development. She identified four areas of focus for the organization: active participation of young women, support for families, promotion of anti-racism, and inclusiveness, addressing the needs of all.

Ms. Chinnia concluded by stating that the Women of the ELCA will be a cooperative and challenging voice within this church and invited the assembly to attend the reception in Ballroom A of the Adam's Mark Hotel immediately following this plenary session.

Report: Women and Children Living in Poverty

Reference, *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section III, pages 43, 94.

Chair *pro tem* Butler asked the assembly to turn its attention to one of the most pressing issues facing society, the growing number of women and children living in poverty, noting that since the 1993 Churchwide Assembly, this church has intensified its work in this area. Part of that commitment, she said, is to receive reports on this subject at each of the churchwide assemblies in the 1990s, pointing out that previous assemblies have celebrated the many ways congregations, synods, church-related institutions, and the churchwide organization have worked to address poverty more effectively and become a church that is welcoming to the poor. She then called to the podium the Rev. Charles S. Miller, executive director of the Division for Church in Society (DCS); Ms. Tina Dabney, project director for the Women and Children Living in Poverty Program; the Rev. Stephen P. Bouman, bishop of the Metropolitan New York Synod; Mr. Tony C. Aguilar [Metropolitan New York Synod]; and Ms. Doris E. Streiter, program team leader for Women of the ELCA.

Ms. Dabney said that the Woman and Children Living in Poverty (WCLIP) program has been an emphasis of this church since 1993, resulting in the development of congregation-

based programs such as shelters, day care, adult literacy classes, entry-level job training, community-organizing efforts, and food pantries. Many will say, she said, “been there, done that,” but the WCLIP project team and staff continue to be there. In June 1998, at the WCLIP consultation on welfare reform, there were many recommendations made to reform others. However, “if we are going to reform welfare, we must reform our own attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors,” she said. “We are in a position to eliminate poverty,” she reminded the assembly. The United Nations has declared October 17, 1999, as the International Day for Eradication of Poverty.

Ms. Dabney said that this church must join resources and provide models of ministry. She highlighted four synods involved in pilot projects in this church: Metropolitan New York, Southeastern, Metropolitan Chicago, and Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast synods. The goal is to enhance existing ministries for women and children living in poverty, and the focus is on community assets rather than deficits, she reported.

Ms. Streiter talked about the cooperation of the Women of the ELCA with this project, stating, we have “been there, done that” since 1987, sensitizing women of this church to the issue and providing money. She said that the four pilot projects provide another opportunity for synodical W/ELCA units to add their resources and join in partnership in seeking justice.

Mr. Aguilar of the Metropolitan New York Synod spoke about the project undertaken by that synod, relating the story of a woman from Hoboken, New Jersey, who negotiated a living wage bill in their legislature. “In her,” he said, “we have bequeathed a leader for justice.” He went on to say that “we have seen the power of this church to bring change through an abundance of skills, time, and money; many have answered the call to help women and children living in poverty.” This church is in a position to make a bold statement, not only to this church but to the nation, he said. “We inherit women and children living in poverty, and bequeath women and children living in hope and power.”

Bishop Bouman stated that “our resolve comes from the heart of Jesus.” He related three stories: Electra, a young girl in a shelter, who asked to be taught “the God words,” so she could teach them to others; Maria and her daughters in Transfiguration Church in the South Bronx who went forward for the offering, saying that they had no money, but that they would like to sing them some songs of Jesus; and New Hope Church near Yankee Stadium, where 90 percent of the people are living one day at a time. He further stated that “our resolve comes because we were poor yet Jesus lifted us up in baptism.”

Ms. Dabney concluded the report by saying that this church needs to renew and increase opportunities for involvement with those immersed in poverty. Although “we have been there, done that,” we need to stay there. “Join us, so we can do even better.”

Churchwide Initiatives: Call to Discipleship

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section II, pages 2, 4.

Chair *pro tem* Butler asked the assembly to turn its attention to the second of the *Initiatives For a New Century*, the “Teach the Faith” initiative about a churchwide call to discipleship. She invited the Rev. M. Wyvetta Bullock, executive director of the Division for Congregational Ministries (DCM), to come to the podium to introduce “Living Faith: An ELCA-wide Call to Discipleship.” Pastor Bullock introduced others who would present the report: Bishop Paul J. Blom [Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod]; Bishop Andrea F. DeGroot-Nesdahl [South Dakota Synod]; the Rev. Paul E. Lutz, associate director for adult education in the Division for Congregational Ministries; and the Rev. David Poling-

Goldenne, director for witness, evangelism, and Christian education in the Division for Congregational Ministries.

Pastor Bullock spoke of God the Holy Spirit “leading us into the next century with a commitment for faith formation and discipleship,” and said “we are reclaiming our heritage as a teaching church.” She introduced a video presentation highlighting a renewed commitment to live the faith, teach the faith, and live a life of discipleship.

Bishop DeGroot-Nesdahl spoke about some practical helps that will assist in planning for this initiative: the video and a synod planning guide to be received in the fall of 1999; the conference, “At the Name of Jesus,” to be held in the fall of 1999 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to empower and train leaders; and congregational planning guides to help implement the call to discipleship. In addition, \$250,000 has been set aside by Lutheran Brotherhood to support this project, she said. Speakers will be available as well. Bishop DeGroot-Nesdahl said that this initiative is one that voting members can talk about when they return home from the assembly. She said that this “Call to Discipleship” will echo in every possible gathering place in this church.

Bishop Blom called attention to another resource placed on voting members’ tables, “Living Faith, Basic Practices for Growing Christians,” and asked the assembly to renew their role as faith-forming communities. You can begin now, he said, by loving God and praying constantly. Finally, he urged voting members to step forward as leaders in their synods and congregations, bringing copies of this booklet back to evangelism, education, and outreach leaders. He said “this initiative has great potential to move our church forward.” He invited the assembly to grow in discipleship “as we deepen our faith as followers of Jesus.”

Presentation: Hunger Bowl Design Winners

Reference: 1999 Churchwide Assembly Program, page 13.

Chair *pro tem* Butler informed the assembly that before it moves into college corporation meetings, she would take a moment to speak about the bowls on display in the adjacent hall. She said that each of these bowls were fashioned on the campuses of the 28 ELCA colleges and universities as a result of an invitation to be part of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the World Hunger Appeal. Aid Association for Lutherans (AAL) offered support for this project. On Saturday, after a simple meal, these bowls will be distributed so that they can be taken back to synods. Chair *pro tem* Butler said that there they can remind us “first, of the commitment you are making here, on behalf of the whole church, to continue to walk with the 840 million people who still go to bed hungry each night, and, second, of the web of connections that make us stronger in responding to God’s call to do justice in a hungry world.” She reminded the assembly that every congregation of this church has been invited to recommit itself to the World Hunger Appeal during a 25-day period in this twenty-fifth anniversary year, from November 1 (All Saints Day) to November 25 (Thanksgiving). She continued, “Each bowl is a symbol of our church-wide commitment to end chronic malnutrition in God’s world. It is a tangible link between our church colleges, the assembly of this church, the congregations of this church, and the Bread of Life who binds us together and gives us daily bread.”

Chair *pro tem* Butler explained that because of the generosity of Aid Association for Lutherans, scholarships will be given to five students whose bowls were judged exemplary

in presentation and unique in design by a panel of professors and artists coordinated by Mr. Keith Williams, a member of this church and professor of art at Concordia College, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Commenting on a picture of a broken bowl, Ms. Butler said the broken pieces can remind us of our own brokenness and of our broken world. She asked, "Is not it through Christ's brokenness that we have become whole?" Chair *pro tem* Butler then invited the assembly to express appreciation with applause to the colleges for being part of this effort.

College Corporation Meetings

Reference: *College Corporation Booklet*.

Vice President Butler returned the chair to Bishop Anderson, who thanked her and then introduced six of the nine new presidents of this church's colleges: Mr. Daniel A. Felicetti of Capital University [Columbus, Ohio], the first Roman Catholic president of one of the colleges of this church; Mr. Richard L. Torgerson of Luther College [Decorah, Iowa]; the Rev. Robert L. Vogel, interim president of Grand View College [Des Moines, Iowa]; Ms. Jennifer L. Broaten of Midland College [Fremont, Neb.], the first woman president of one of the colleges of this church; Mr. Lance A. Masters of Thiel College [Greenville, Pa.]; and Mr. Jack R. Ohle of Wartburg College [Waverly, Iowa]. Not present were: Mr. William V. Frame of Augsburg College [Minneapolis, Minn.], the Rev. Thomas W. Thomsen of Concordia College [Moorhead, Minn.], and the Rev. Thomas L. Jolivette of Waldorf College [Forest City, Iowa].

Bishop Anderson explained that the governing documents of this church provide for a variety of relationship patterns between this church and its colleges and universities and that four of the 28 colleges and universities have chosen to relate to this church through the churchwide assembly: Dana College, Blair, Nebraska; Luther College, Decorah, Iowa; St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota; and Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa. He read ELCA bylaw 8.32.06., namely, "Subject to approval by the appropriate synods, a college or university may be owned by a not-for-profit corporation which has voting members, at least 90 percent of whom shall consist of members of the biennial Churchwide Assembly. Meetings of such corporations shall be held in conjunction with the Churchwide Assembly for the purpose of electing or ratifying members of the governing board and approving amendments in the governing documents...."

Bishop Anderson then declared the churchwide assembly in recess and convened the meetings of the four Lutheran college corporations, Dana College, Luther College, St. Olaf College, and Wartburg College.

Subsequent to adjournment of the corporation meetings, the plenary session of the Churchwide Assembly resumed.

Report of the Committee of Reference and Counsel

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section X, page 1; continued on *Minutes*, pages 482, 548, 628

Bishop Anderson called upon Ms. Linda J. Brown, chair of the Reference and Counsel Committee. The committee's first action was to grant an appeal for distribution, as requested of a copy of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of the Anglican Communion.

Motion A: Military Expenditures and Economic Conversion

The following motion was submitted by Mr. Gerhard H. Fischer and Ms. Joyce A. Caldwell [Greater Milwaukee Synod]:

WHEREAS, in the current economy of the United States, a huge portion of public funds is used for military expense, for war and for the preparation for war (this year \$281 billion is allocated for direct military spending); and

WHEREAS, it is recognized that war and the preparation for war has a fundamentally adverse effect on the economy and the ability to provide a sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all; and

WHEREAS, the amount of money so expended is diverted from the productive uses of society which could support a large number of people if the money were devoted to productive works; and

WHEREAS, this assembly is considering the adoption of a statement on a just and Christian economy; and

WHEREAS, this statement makes no reference whatever to any drain on the economy by military expenditures in this nation, or in the world; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that this assembly now express its great concern over the nation's military expenditures and military expenditures in the world generally, and that this assembly call upon the people of the United States and of the world, especially in the faith communities, to commence sharp curtailment of military expenditures and to devote the sums thus released to helping the economically underprivileged people of our nation and the world to an improved economic status.

Ms. Brown observed that the issue of military expenditures and economic conversion is addressed in the 1995 social statement, "For Peace in God's World," and in the proposed social statement on economic life, "Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All." She continued by reporting that the Division for Church in Society is engaged in ongoing study and advocacy regarding military expenditures and economic conversion. Therefore, the Committee of Reference and Counsel offered the following recommendation.

Moved;

Seconded: To refer the resolution on military expenditures, submitted by Gerhard H. Fischer and Joyce Caldwell, to the Division for Church in Society.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-696; No-95

CA99.03.08 To refer the resolution on military expenditures, submitted by Gerhard H. Fischer and Joyce Caldwell, to the Division for Church in Society.

Report of the Memorials Committee (continued)

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 1-65; continued on *Minutes*, pages 188, 274, 492, 553.

Bishop Anderson asked Mr. Peña and Ms. Peterson, co-chairs of the Memorials Committee, to come forward again to continue the report of the committee.

Category 3: Economic Crisis in Rural America

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 30-33.

A. South Dakota Synod (3C) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the rural economy of our state and heartland are declining, comparative commodity prices are at an all-time low while costs for production are ever increasing, and a growing farm crisis looms over us all; and

WHEREAS, in South Dakota alone, 17 percent of individual farming operations were eliminated in the last five years and predictions are that an additional 20 percent of farm operations will be lost by the year 2000, which threatens the stability of our rural communities and churches; and

WHEREAS, the domination of transnational corporations is privatizing the profits and socializing the costs of farming operations; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the South Dakota Synod express its deep concern for the present and future of individuals, communities and churches who suffer as a result of the farm crisis; and be it further

RESOLVED, that a Synod Task Force from the Rural Life Network be formed to prepare educational materials for and provide training to congregations and pastors about the economic crisis in rural America; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the South Dakota Synod in assembly encourage Bishop Andrea DeGroot-Nesdahl to work with the Synod Task Force from the Rural Life Network to bring attention to the rural crisis on the local, state and national levels, and that our Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson continue to call for political action, education, and pastoral care regarding this crisis, and that the South Dakota Synod Assembly memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly in Denver, Colorado, to observe one minute of silence and prayer for those in the middle of this rural crisis.

BACKGROUND

Recent ELCA Actions

The 1993 Churchwide Assembly had a major emphasis on rural ministry and adopted a rural resolution raising up a variety of issues related to this subject. That resolution charged the Division for Outreach with coordinating this church's response to the type of concerns that are raised in the memorial from the South Dakota Synod. In addition, the Division for Congregational Ministries and the Division for Church in Society support rural ministry and raise up rural concerns in their ongoing work.

The 1997 Churchwide Assembly, having received memorials from the Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod and the Western North Dakota Synod related to rural ministry, took the following action [CA 97.06.38.]:

To reaffirm the commitment to ministry in small-town and rural settings that was set forth by the 1993 Churchwide Assembly;

To express deep appreciation for the ongoing and faithful work of synods, congregations, and their members who do ministry in small town and rural settings;

To express appreciation for the counsel, support, consultants, and resources that support small town and rural ministries, which have been provided by synods, synodical outreach committees, and churchwide units;

To refer the request for a rural ministries "desk" (found in the memorials of the Western North Dakota Synod and Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod) to the Division for Outreach, as it works for increased churchwide coordination of the activities that support small-town and rural ministry;

To encourage the Division for Outreach, as part of its ongoing work, to consult with persons who minister in small towns and rural settings and with staff members of other churchwide units, and to develop with them a plan for improving the coordination and effectiveness of those ministries;

To develop a plan for establishing a rural and small town ministries “desk” at the ELCA churchwide office, with this plan to be presented to the Church Council for action no later than at its spring 1998 meeting; and

To request that the Secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America convey this report and the Church Council’s response to the Western North Dakota Synod and Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod.

A consultation was convened by the Division for Outreach in February 1998 of 20 persons, including small town and rural practitioners; assistants to bishops who work with small town and rural ministry; a representative of the Conference of Bishops; a seminary representative; and staff from the Office of the Presiding Bishop, the Division for Church in Society, the Division for Congregational Ministries, the Division for Ministry, the Division for Outreach, the Commission for Women, and the Commission for Multicultural Ministries; broadly representing the interests of small town and rural ministry. That consultation recommended that a full-time executive staff person be in place by February 1999.

The Church Council in April 1998 requested that the Division for Outreach (in consultation with the Office of the Presiding Bishop, the Division for Congregational Ministries, the Division for Ministry, and the Division for Church in Society) bring a report and recommendations regarding staffing for rural ministry to the November 1998 Church Council meeting.

In November 1998, the ELCA Church Council voted (CC98.11.65) “to create a Rural Desk as a response to the action of the 1997 ELCA Churchwide Assembly Memorial on Churchwide Staff for Rural Ministries.” Ms. Sandra A. LaBlanc began work as the ELCA director for rural ministry resources and networking in May 1999.

The ELCA Church Council, at its November 1998 meeting, adopted the following resolution (CC98.11.56):

WHEREAS, foreign economic problems have reduced substantially U.S. farm exports in recent years; and

WHEREAS, severe weather conditions in the Red River Valley of the North during the past five years and a major drought in 1998 in Texas and Oklahoma have adversely affected agricultural income in those regions; and

WHEREAS, depressed market prices for many commodities, some of which are the lowest since the 1940s, have reduced income below the cost of production in many circumstances; and

WHEREAS, the costs of crop production have increased at the same time that a declining share of the food dollar is retained by farmers; and

WHEREAS, decreases in the number of family farms have occurred in some areas; and

WHEREAS, lending institutions are unable or are reluctant to provide needed financing for ongoing farm operations; and

WHEREAS, unintended consequences of the 1996 Congressional farm-programs reforms have jeopardized the existence of many communities and their farms; and

WHEREAS, a rural desk has been established in the churchwide office to respond to those concerns; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that we call upon all expressions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in the light of these circumstances, to listen, learn, and pray with and for people and their future in America’s rural communities and their farms; and be it further

RESOLVED, the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America call upon the Administration and Congress to:

1. Acknowledge the severity of the plight of farmers;
2. Enact measures to restore some security for those in greatest need;
3. Begin immediately to re-examine policy changes that may have played a role in causing the present crisis; and
4. Take such steps as may be necessary to forestall further critical farm losses; and be it further

RESOLVED, that federal and state governments be encouraged to provide “beginning farmer loans and grants” in response to situations of need; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the appropriate units of the ELCA churchwide organization prepare materials to interpret for members the scope of the farm crisis affecting so many Lutherans and others to indicate ways in which people may help meet this crisis.

Also in May 1999 the bishops of the six ELCA synods in Minnesota released the “Lutheran Bishops’ Statement on the Farm Crisis.” The statement reads:

As pastors and bishops of our church, we acknowledge the profound transformation taking place in the social and economic foundation of Minnesota’s agricultural industry: increasing globalization of the economy, changing structure of corporate ownership, greater concentration and control in production and distribution, increasing constriction of the resource base, and the deteriorating condition of land, air, and water.

The effects of these major changes are most apparent in communities where farming and other earth-derived activities (such as mining and timbering) form the core of the economy, and especially in the area of agriculture and food production.

A number of things concern us:

- the historic low in farm prices (which increasingly do not cover even the cost of labor and production);
- the consolidation of farms;
- the exodus of farm families from the land;
- the decline of many rural communities and their institutions;
- environmental degradation; and
- the deepening rates of rural poverty.

These are issues which affect all Minnesotans—regardless of their economic status, or the region of the state or type of community in which they live.

We understand only too well that many of the changes are supported and opposed by neighbors, fellow-citizens, worshipers in the same congregations, and even members of the same family. All too often our discussions about these changes ignite the fires of blaming, destructive behavior, conflict, and even violence against others or self.

As leaders in Minnesota’s Lutheran community, we join our colleagues from a broad spectrum of religious faiths in calling on the people of Minnesota to reflect with one another on the moral and ethical implications of what is happening to our land, to farmers, to our rural communities—to all of us.

Lutherans understand that farming is a vocation—a calling—and that agriculture is basic to the survival and security of people at home and throughout the world. Agriculture provides the grain for our daily bread as well as producing the rest of our food supply. Without a bountiful and affordable food supply Americans would not enjoy the quality of life we do.

Farmers are challenged to produce this food in ways that contribute to the regeneration of the land and the vitality of their communities. Those who consume are often unaware of the moral and ethical implications or the high levels of risk and low prices faced by farmers coupled with the consumer demand for abundant and low-cost food.

We join with leaders of many denominations and religious collaborations in Minnesota in calling upon public officials to enact public policies that:

- ensure farmers a just income including adequate compensation for the costs of production;
- promote sustainable agricultural practices;
- protect and preserve agricultural land;
- create opportunities for beginning farmers;
- provide those wishing to leave farming with job counseling and training as well as assistance with legal and financial advice; and
- support health care access, education, jobs, housing and other services in rural communities.

We call on all Minnesotans, and particularly those who are members of our ELCA congregations, to:

- pray for and support those who farm the land and their families;

- become more aware of the social and economic situation facing farming and rural communities;
- study and seek to understand the global economic changes which challenge the way of life many have known for generations;
- create ways to reflect on the moral and ethical dimensions of the crisis facing farmers, and especially to understand that *their* situation is *our* situation;
- celebrate the contribution that farming makes to our common life;
- develop face-to-face dialogue among and between urban, suburban, rural and smaller-town residents, so that mutual understanding can develop;
- invite policymakers at all levels into our dialogue; and
- find ways to provide better pastoral and neighborly care to farm families facing dislocation and to communities in decline.

We join especially with the Roman Catholic Bishops in Minnesota in calling on our Christian tradition of respecting human life and dignity, promoting the common good, practicing good stewardship of land and environment, and giving voice to those who are among the least powerful and most marginalized: "Farming is not only about production, marketing, and supply and demand. It is also about land, people, and a way of life. It is about community."

ELCA Advocacy

An agricultural summit in St. Louis, Missouri, in May 1999 gathered the leadership of 29 U.S. farm and rural life organizations. The summit was an historical event, combining a diverse grouping of organizations that reached broad consensus on several critical issues facing family farm agriculture, including a farm safety net, risk management, industry concentration, and trade. The Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs (LOGA) in Washington, D.C., has utilized the specific initiatives for rural life advocacy in its continuing work.

Ms. Peterson introduced the recommendation of the Memorials Committee regarding the memorial on the economic crisis in rural America.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To acknowledge the concerns raised by the memorial from the South Dakota Synod regarding the current farm and rural crisis and to call all members and congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to:

- pray for family farmers, their families, and rural communities;
- learn about the challenges facing family farms;
- support family farmers through advocacy for just legislation that protects family farms, the land, and the small towns they make possible;

To observe a moment of silence in prayer at this Churchwide Assembly for those in the middle of this rural crisis;

To reaffirm the commitment of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to small town and rural congregations through the work of churchwide units including the Division for Church in Society, the Division for Outreach, and the Division for Congregational Ministries as well as through synodical outreach committees; and

To request that the director for rural life ministry resources and networking continue to assist the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to respond to

the farm and rural crisis and identify resources that can be used in that response.

Mr. Gary Preston [Northwest Synod of Wisconsin] rose to speak in favor of this proposal, saying, "I know it is late and we would like to go, but I think this is very important for each person sitting in this room, and it pertains to everyone. I would just like to highlight a little bit of the proposal, and that is 'to pray, to learn, and to support our family farms.' I speak with a little bit of experience. I was a dairy farmer in western Wisconsin for 26 years—sold my cows nine years ago—and most of us thought that the farm crisis of the 1980s was well past us. That crisis is ongoing, continuing daily. Yesterday, a friend of mine [held a farm sale]. I think of it as a funeral, the funeral of a family farm. The sale was yesterday. Their lifelong possessions, their farm machinery, cattle were all sold. Now what most of us do not realize is the impact each one of these funerals has on every person sitting in this room. Food does not come from the supermarket. It comes from farmers—family farms—and it is sad to see that this is ongoing and continues each day. I would ask that you not only vote, hopefully in favor of this resolution, but not only that; to go from this place and remember each time you sit down to a meal where that food actually does come from. You can help by supporting. There are several items in *The Lutheran* [September 1999]. Read that [issue]. Take it home. But most of all, be sure to daily think about where that food comes from. Your grandchildren will thank you."

Mr. Leroy L. Simonson [Western Iowa Synod] expressed his desire to move an amendment, but since it was not in written form, Bishop Anderson asked him to bring it forward when it was ready.

The Rev. Joel A. Bacon [La Crosse Area Synod] reported, "At our synod assembly, as we debated the Coffee Resolution about Lutheran World Relief coffee, I was sitting beside two dairy farmers and with a great deal of pain, they asked, 'How come no one has ever done that for us?' I speak in favor of this resolution, and that what we do for the coffee growers near the Equator, we can do for our own farmers."

Mr. Bernard Falkenstein [Western North Dakota Synod] spoke in favor of the resolution, saying, "I also urge everyone to be knowledgeable, and we have to be active in the political arena as well as [with] other support, and I urge everyone to contact their Congressman and urge some help from those people."

Mr. Frank Slagle [South Dakota Synod] rose to speak in favor of the resolution. "I would like to just mention that, being from South Dakota, we are the originators of the resolution, and I have seen firsthand the pain that has been spoken of here, in terms of the destruction of not only family farms, but I think also of the lifestyle of those people who are accustomed to living on farms, who have made a career and a lifetime endeavor of those important activities that are important to all of us, as these folks try to feed our nation and also the peoples of the world." He, too, directed the assembly to the September 1999 issue of *The Lutheran* for supporting information. "Finally, I would also like to mention what we are bringing from our South Dakota Synod the 'Green Ribbon Campaign.' We have brought with us just a very short description of what we are trying to do, and if I may, I would like to read the slip of paper we are handing out with the green ribbons. You may have seen this on many people who are attending the assembly. 'The Green Ribbon Campaign' lets hurting farmers and ranchers know that people care for those trying to make a living in rural America. Record low prices, adverse weather conditions, implementation of the 1996 farm bill, and natural disasters all add to the economic pressure on farmers and ranchers

throughout the United States. They need to know that we care and that we are there with them, and that we are there to help them. I urge your support of the motion.”

Bishop Anderson indicated that the amendment had been received, and he invited Mr. Simonson to read it aloud.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To amend the resolution by adding as a fourth point in paragraph one:

- encourage congregations to help farm families in crisis by forming, facilitating, and hosting support groups, and providing information on and access to social services, including mental health services.

Mr. Simonson then spoke to his amendment, saying, “I am a farmer. In the 1980s, there was a lady who came down from the Mental Health [agency] in Spencer and helped us form a support group. That support group was essential in living through it. I am the third generation on the farm and it is surprising what you feel when you go through this crisis. The mental health and the support group—I cannot say how great it was to have had that then. So, I think that [amendment] puts a little more action and gets more people involved, and we need people involved. You need support when you are going through that. You are just not thinking quite clear at the time.”

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—809; No—17

CARRIED: To amend the resolution by adding as a fourth point in paragraph one:

- encourage congregations to help farm families in crisis by forming, facilitating, and hosting support groups, and providing information on and access to social services, including mental health services.

Bishop Lee M. Miller [Upstate New York Synod] said, “I think it is important to realize that in New York the principal industry is agriculture. It is the number one industry in the state. All that is being described in various other parts of the country is also occurring in a place like New York. I rise to make that point because this is the kind of resolution that can breeze right by. And you cannot do that. I had the opportunity to meet with farmers and legislators and bankers in Devils Lake, North Dakota, in 1986, when that particular crisis was going on. While it is true in New York our farms are much smaller, there are, therefore, that many more farmers who are affected with what is going on. So please, do not let this one just slide by. Do indeed vote for it, but then do something with it when you get home, whether you live in the inner city, in the suburbs, or anywhere else.”

The Rev. James H. Hanson [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana] spoke in favor of the motion. “I would like to share with the assembly what Jerry Turner, president of the Idaho Farmers Union, is suggesting will happen if this crisis is not dealt with in a positive way.

“Steven Blank writes in his book, *The End of Agriculture in the American Portfolio*, that ‘the time will inevitably and shortly come when Americans cease to support the system that fills their tables and their bellies with domestic raw commodities.’ If Blank is right, ‘our

prairies will again become the habitat of the noble bison and the sagebrush will stand majestically as a symbol of what should always be. The land will revert to those who once claimed it, streams will run clean and clear, dams will be breached, transmission lines will come down, and salmon will again make their uninhibited journey to the crystal spawning grounds called home. The only productive agriculture supported by Americans will be grass for golf courses and public parks, and sod farms to supply the ever-increasing needs of people whose houses dot the countryside. All food will be imported from developing nations, and Americans will say "Amen" to the ancient industry of growing their own food. Agricultural towns will join the mining towns and the march of history in progress. Country folk will move to the cities where the lifestyle is good, they will get productive jobs, and, together, we will worship the concrete and glass gods of the urban communities. As we face the future met by multinational corporate executives whose vision is limited to the next quarter's profits and stock values, and as art is manifest in the creation of gigantic food chain clusters, we can rest assured that the American free enterprise system has assumed a course like Sherman on his march to the sea, burning the industries and cities along the way.' Are we ready for this kind of progress?"

"Time is short. Therefore, I would like to amend this motion." Bishop Anderson interrupted Pastor Hanson saying, "You have made your speech. You should have moved your amendment at the beginning of your presentation." Pastor Hanson responded, "Is there no forgiveness?" Bishop Anderson explained, "There are other speakers who assumed that you were just speaking and not amending. So, we will first hear from them; we can come back to you."

Bishop Floyd M. Schoenhals [Arkansas-Oklahoma Synod] rose to support the motion, sharing an anecdote that he experienced this summer that helped him to understand the nature of the crisis facing farmers today. "I was raised on a farm where we raised wheat, and I remember my father always saying, 'Well, maybe if we have a good wheat crop this summer, we can buy a new pickup.' I remember in 1961 it took a thousand bushels of wheat to buy a pickup. The price of wheat at one point in Oklahoma this summer was \$2.03 a bushel, which means that it probably would take eight to ten thousand bushels or more to buy a pickup."

Bishop Richard N. Jessen [Nebraska Synod] said, "Farming and ranching people will appreciate it so much if we can adopt this resolution, as it appears we will. Each Sunday, as I visit a congregation in a rural area, and mention in the message of the day that we are concerned about what is happening to farming and ranching families, there is a tremendous outpouring of gratitude at the conclusion of the service, as people speak with me individually. We are going through a gigantic revolution in how we do agriculture in this country. This is not a temporary crisis. As we experience larger and larger units of production, there is less and less room for family operations. A whole way of life is being threatened here. There are no easy answers, but by expressing concerns of these memorials before us, we will say to people that we care."

Ms. April Coyne [South Dakota Synod] moved to end debate on this matter.

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes-833; No-10

CARRIED: To move the previous question.

Bishop Mark B. Herbener [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod] rose to a point of order. He reminded Bishop Anderson that he had advised Pr. Hanson to ask for the floor in order to make an amendment. Bishop Anderson responded that, while he had said he could come back to make an amendment, “the assembly is the one that decides whether or not they want to have that happen. They did not, apparently, wish to hear any more on the matter.” Bishop Anderson proceeded with the vote on the main motion before the house.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-833; No-10

CA99.03.09

To acknowledge the concerns raised by the memorial from the South Dakota Synod regarding the current farm and rural crisis and to call all members and congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to:

- **pray for family farmers, their families, and rural communities;**
- **learn about the challenges facing family farms;**
- **support family farmers through advocacy for just legislation that protects family farms, the land, and the small towns they make possible;**
- **encourage congregations to help farm families in crisis by forming, facilitating, and hosting support groups, and providing information on and access to social services, including mental health services;**

To observe a moment of silence in prayer at this Churchwide Assembly for those in the middle of this rural crisis;

To reaffirm the commitment of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to small town and rural congregations through the work of churchwide units including the Division for Church in Society, the Division for Outreach, and the Division for Congregational Ministries as well as through synodical outreach committees; and

To request that the director for rural life ministry resources and networking continue to assist the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to respond to the farm and rural crisis and identify resources that can be used in that response.

Bishop Anderson noted that, as a part of that resolution, the assembly was asked to observe a moment of silence in prayer for those in the middle of this rural crisis. “It seems

to me this is a good point to do that, after we have heard the presentations. So, I ask you to join me at this time of prayer in silence.” Following the time of silence, Bishop Anderson concluded, “Loving God, we commend them all into your hands, and ask that we may be instruments of your mercy and hope, through Christ our Lord. Amen.”

Category 15: Older Adult Ministry

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 52-53.

A. Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod (4F) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the United Nations has called upon religious and other organizations to celebrate 1999 as the International Year of Older Persons, and to publicize its intergenerational theme “Towards a Society for All Ages” and

WHEREAS, there exists about equal proportion of older people and children in our society and the church; and

WHEREAS, the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod affirms the U.N. declaration as an opportunity for our church to have a broader focus and promote the interdependence and interconnections of generations; and

WHEREAS, older adults are uniquely free to share their faith, wisdom, and perspectives with persons of every generation; and

WHEREAS, God calls persons of all ages to respond to their baptismal covenant in mission, ministry and service to others; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod memorialize the ELCA Churchwide Assembly to direct the Division for Church in Society to lift up the celebration of the U.N. International Year of Older Persons, 1999, throughout the ELCA, and make determined efforts to promote a vital age-integrated church through intentional intergenerational ministry and dialogue in the year 2000 and beyond.

B. Indiana-Kentucky Synod (6C) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Psalmist declares the righteous will flourish like a palm tree: “...They will still bear fruit in old age; they will stay fresh and green proclaiming ‘the Lord is upright; He is my rock’” (Psalm 92:12-15); and

WHEREAS, the United Nations has declared 1999 the International Year of Older Persons; and 39 percent of the members in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America are over 55 years of age; and

WHEREAS, there are many opportunities and challenges of this ministry as older adults can be healthy and active, ill but active, transitionally impaired, homebound or institutionalized, and often times forgotten, or dying; and

WHEREAS, religion, spiritual nurturing and church life is a powerful force and influence upon lives of older adult members; and

WHEREAS, many older adults outside of church life are searching for spiritual guidance, and are open to hearing the “Good News”; and

WHEREAS, older adults serve the church as role models, teachers, assisting ministers, lectors, cantors, volunteers and leaders; and their gifts of wisdom, experience and resources benefit the church in significant proportion; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Indiana-Kentucky Synod of the ELCA develop a ministry with and for older adults under the auspices of synod council to uplift the need for intentional older adult ministry in local congregations by providing resources for evangelism, spiritual nurture, mentor support, educational opportunities, volunteer service, programs, and activities; be it further

RESOLVED, that the Indiana-Kentucky Synod in assembly, memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to consider developing a ministry with and for older adults by providing resources for evangelism, spiritual nurture, mentor support, educational opportunities, volunteer service, programs, and activities.

BACKGROUND

When the United Nations General Assembly resolved to observe 1999 as the International Year of Older Persons, it did so “in recognition of humanity’s demographic coming of age” and of the promise that this holds for “maturing attitudes and capabilities in social, economic, cultural, and spiritual undertakings” (UN Resolution 47/5). The theme, “Toward a Society for All Ages,” reflects a growing concern for ensuring age integration. The objective of the United Nations 1999 International Year of Older Persons is to ensure that priority attention will be given to addressing the independence, participation, care, self-fulfillment, and dignity of older individuals.

In 1978 the Lutheran Church in America adopted a social statement, “Aging and the Older Adult,” which affirmed that “life is a gift of God and aging is a natural part of living.” The statement provided an agenda for action that called for purposeful action by families, congregations, synods, social service agencies and institutions, high education institutions, seminaries, retirement policies of the church, and public policy. The statement concluded:

All persons have worth and dignity because they are created in God’s image. This church calls upon its members and all elements of its corporate life to embody this truth in all their relationships, especially—in the context of this statement—those affecting older persons.

In 1989 the Standing Consulting Committee on Aging of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America provided an updated view of the challenges that face our maturing church and society in the coming years. The intent of the guide, entitled “A Christian Perspective on Aging and the Older Adult,” was to move the church toward action in planning the implementation of ministries that involve older persons.

In celebration of the International Year of Older Persons, staff participated at the United Nations opening celebration of the year. The following activities are part of the ongoing observance:

- information is provided on the ELCA Division for Church in Society Web page about the International Year;
- staff is revising a publication on older adult ministry that will support this ministry into the 21st century;
- board and staff members of the Division for Church in Society are participating in a satellite teleconference in October 1999 to examine aging from a global perspective;
- staff worked with the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. on the production of a resource for family week 1999, around the theme “Binding Generations Together” (which emphasizes the theme of the International Year, “Towards a Society for All Ages”);
- staff is providing support for the Association for Lutheran Older Adults (ALOA) and assisting in the planning for a Lutherhostel; and
- staff is working with older adult ministry consultants in congregations across the country.

Ms. Peterson introduced the recommendation of the Memorials Committee regarding the memorial on older adult ministry.

MOVED;

SECONDED; To affirm the support for the International Year of Older Persons as expressed by the Indiana-Kentucky Synod and the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod;

To express support for the celebration of the International Year of Older Persons in 1999 through the promotion of churchwide, synodical, and congregational events and activities, including on-going dialogue under the theme “Toward a Society for All Ages”;

To encourage churchwide units responsible for evangelism, spiritual nurture, mentor support, educational opportunities, and volunteer service to develop ministry resources that focus on and are inclusive of older adults; and

To refer this memorial to the ELCA Cabinet of Executives with the request that the Cabinet of Executives facilitate discussion of older adult ministry in the planning processes of churchwide division boards and commission steering committees during the next biennium.”

Mr. Leroy L. Simonson [Western Iowa Synod] began to speak on the previous motion and was ruled out of order by Bishop Anderson.

Ms. Dorothy M. Stein [Metropolitan Chicago Synod] said that as a member of the Association of Lutheran Older Adults she was encouraged that this church was considering this issue. She urged churchwide units to develop resources to meet the needs of the swelling number of aging baby boomers.

Ms. Kristine Gernes [Minneapolis Area Synod] said that, as a nursing home administrator, she knows that we must give care as well as receive it. She encouraged this church to recognize and celebrate the wisdom of our elders, and hold them up as valuable members of society.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes—823; No— 14

CA99.03.10 To affirm the support for the International Year of Older Persons as expressed by the Indiana-Kentucky Synod and the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod;

To express support for the celebration of the International Year of Older Persons in 1999 through the promotion of churchwide, synodical, and congregational events and activities, including on-going dialogue under the theme “Toward a Society for All Ages”;

To encourage churchwide units responsible for evangelism, spiritual nurture, mentor support, educational opportunities, and volunteer service to develop ministry resources that focus on and are inclusive of older adults; and

To refer this memorial to the ELCA Cabinet of Executives with the request that the Cabinet of Executives facilitate discussion of older adult ministry in the planning processes of churchwide division boards and commission steering committees during the next biennium.

Recess

Secretary Almen notified the assembly that a voting member had submitted an amendment to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America Constitution, 8.72.24., related to voting privileges for ordained ministers, and an amendment to 8.72.15., related to ordained ministers voting when serving a congregation of a church with whom this church is in full communion.

He announced that 150 health kits had been prepared for Lutheran World Relief but that items still could be brought to the World Hunger display area.

Secretary Almen shared the good news that the Rev. Daniel F. Martensen, director of the Department for Ecumenical Affairs, and Mr. John G. Kapanke, president of the ELCA Board of Pensions, had both become grandfathers earlier in the day, and that it was also the eighteenth birthday of Ms. Leona Thomas-Breitfeld, a member of the Youth Convocation.

He announced that a reception for everyone would be held following this plenary session in Hall B of the Colorado Convention Center, hosted by ELCA colleges and universities and sponsored by Lutheran Brotherhood.

Secretary Almen reminded voting members that the deadline for bylaw amendments was 12:30 P.M., Thursday, August 19, 1999, and the deadline for the submission of business items not on the established agenda was 1:00 P.M., Thursday, August 19, 1999.

Bishop Anderson called upon Ms. Karen Dietz, a member of the Church Council, for the closing hymn and prayer. Bishop Anderson announced at 5:50 P.M., following the hymn and prayer, that the assembly was in recess until 8:30 A.M. Mountain Daylight Time, August 19, 1999.

Plenary Session Six

Thursday, August 19, 1999

8:30 A.M.–12:00 NOON

The Rev. H. George Anderson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, called Plenary Session Six to order at 8:30 A.M. Mountain Daylight Time. Bishop Anderson thanked the Rev. Steven B. Eulberg for the gathering music, and called upon Mr. Robert S. Schroeder, a member of the Church Council, to lead the assembly in morning prayer and the hymn, “O Morning Star.”

Bishop Anderson announced that there would be a number of legislative items on the morning’s agenda following the Bible study, particularly consideration of the full communion proposals, first with the Moravian Church and then with The Episcopal Church. If the work was completed early enough, he said there might be time to deal with a few resolutions submitted by voting members.

Bible Study II

Bishop Anderson called upon the Rev. Wayne E. Weissenbuehler for the second Bible study on the theme, “Making Christ Known: Hope for a New Century.” He indicated that Pastor Weissenbuehler’s emphasis for the day would be: “Through the Character of Our Life.” Pastor Weissenbuehler began his study by telling the story of a bishop’s wife who had missed the prior day’s Bible study, because on her way she had stopped to assist two women from Ethiopia who were on their way to apply for a job. After she had assisted them, they had asked the bishop’s wife why she was in Denver, and she had told them about the work of this church and in so doing had witnessed to Christ. “She may have missed the Bible study,” he said, “but she did it.”

He spoke of the Church being renewed one text at a time, one person at a time, one congregation at a time, one synod at a time, one church body at a time. He described that “as a tall order for the Holy Spirit, but God is up to it.” He indicated that his text for the day, Acts 2:37-47, immediately following Peter’s Pentecost sermon, follows the pattern suggested by Jesus’ remarks to his disciples before his ascension, with Peter using the Psalms and the prophets to point to the resurrection. Such preaching, he said, is powerful, because “witnessing and preaching work.”

“Remember,” he said, “there is salvation in no other name, because Jesus is Israel’s Messiah.” The book of Acts, he said, helps Christians to draw the right conclusions because of this.

Describing verse 42 as his theme verse for the day, he said it provides “a summary statement for the life of the first Christian community.” As such, the verse also points to four characteristics that must be present in the Church in any age. They are:

- Being grounded in the apostles’ teaching, “the witness of the eyewitnesses to the resurrection” who interpret the Scriptures Christologically;
- Having all things in common, which is more than potluck suppers: it is a matter of Christians being of one mind; seeing the need to resolve all problems; discerning the presence of the Holy Spirit; allowing diversity; “being big enough to include all believers;” and practicing the stewardship of sharing;

- Breaking of bread, probably a reference to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, but also including sharing meals together; and
- Praying for boldness to witness, and for the privilege of signs and wonders in order to witness.

Referring to Verse 46, Pastor Weissenbuehler asked whether churches today also “engender fear and awe by what we do?” He concluded the second Bible study with a prayer that the Spirit continue to renew the Church today.

Proposal on Full Communion: The Moravian Church (continued)

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV:11-43 (I:15); continued on *Minutes*, pages 132, 270.

Bishop Anderson called upon the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to read the recommendation of the Church Council regarding the proposal to establish a relationship of full communion with the Moravian Church. He reported that the resolution was not amendable nor were substitutions permitted since the Moravian Church had adopted the document in 1998.

MOVED;

SECONDED: The Northern and Southern Provinces of the Moravian Church in America, hereinafter termed the Moravian Church in America, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby agree that in their respective assemblies there shall be one vote to accept or reject, without separate amendment, the resolutions which follow. If adopted by both churches, each church agrees to take these measures to establish full communion:

WHEREAS, Jesus our Shepherd calls us to unity so that the world may believe; and

WHEREAS, Moravians and Lutherans share common theological traditions and commitments to mission; and

WHEREAS, in North America Lutherans and Moravians have developed distinct church bodies while cooperating in serving our Lord; and

WHEREAS, “Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion,” the report of the Lutheran-Moravian dialogue, affirmed that there are no “church-dividing differences” precluding full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America; therefore be it

RESOLVED that:

1. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby recognize in one another the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic faith as it is expressed in the Scriptures, confessed in the Church's historic creeds, attested to in the *Unaltered Augsburg Confession* and *Small Catechism*, and the *Ground of the Unity of the Unitas Fratrum*;
2. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby
 - recognize the authenticity of each other's Baptisms and Eucharists, and
 - extend sacramental hospitality to one another's members;

3. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby

- recognize each other's ordinations of persons to the Ministry of Word and Sacrament; and
- recognize each other's polity and ministries of oversight (including the interpretation of church doctrines, discipline of members, authorization of persons for ordained and lay ministries, and provision for administrative functions);

4. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby recognize the full interchangeability and reciprocity of all ordained ministers of Word and Sacrament, subject to the constitutionally approved invitation for ministry in each other's churches;

5. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby authorize the establishment of a joint commission by June 2000

- to coordinate the implementation of these resolutions,
- to assist joint planning for mission,
- to facilitate consultation and common decision-making through appropriate channels in fundamental matters that the churches may face together in the future, and
- to report regularly and appropriately to each church;

6. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America through the aforementioned joint commission shall

- encourage the development of worship materials to celebrate the churches' full communion,
- encourage on-going theological discussion,
- encourage joint formulation of educational materials, and
- encourage continuing education for church professionals regarding the churches' full communion;

7. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby affirm that neither will issue an official commentary on the text of these resolutions that has not been approved by the joint commission as a legitimate interpretation thereof;

8. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby agree that each will continue to be in communion with all the churches with which each is in communion presently;

9. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby

- pledge to take each other and these agreements into account at every stage of their dialogues and agreements with other churches and faith traditions,
- pledge to seek to engage in joint dialogue when appropriate, and pledge not to enter into formal agreements with other churches and faith traditions without prior consultation with the other.

Ms. Gloria Ware [Greater Milwaukee Synod] moved to amend the rules of the assembly to reduce the time allotted for speeches from three minutes to two minutes per speaker for deliberation on both of the ecumenical proposals, noting that this would allow more speakers to address their concerns.

MOVED; *Two-Thirds Vote Required*
SECONDED; *Yes-821; No-173*
CARRIED: **To amend the rules of the Assembly to limit speakers on the Moravian and Episcopal proposals to two minutes.**

Mr. Marc S. Williams [La Crosse Area Synod], given the character of the debate in previous plenary sessions, moved to close debate on the Moravian proposal.

MOVED; *Two-Thirds Vote Required*
SECONDED: *Yes-819; No-182*
CARRIED: **To move the previous question.**

Bishop Anderson explained, “This means we will proceed immediately without debate on the vote for full communion with the Moravian Church. Now, normally, we would ask that the resolution be re-read, but if there is no objection, I think we can dispense with the reading of those RESOLVES. Hearing no objection, I am going to ask Pastor Lowell Almen to lead us in prayer, and following the vote, whatever its outcome, I will make a few brief comments and then I will ask us all to rise and sing ‘Beautiful Savior.’ The text to that hymn will appear on the screen. Secretary Almen, will you please lead us in prayer?”

Secretary Almen said, “The Lord be with you. [Response: And also with you.] Let us pray. Ruler Eternal, Comforter, Spirit of Truth, present in all places and filling all things; treasury of good things and giver of life, come and dwell in us and purify us from every stain. We call upon you and seek now your guidance. To you we commit this decision, for you know all things, and in your will is our peace. Deliver us from self-interest, cowardice, and lack of faith in you, and give us vision and strength to do your will for the well-being of the Church in witness to the Gospel and in the service of faith, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen”

Bishop Anderson continued, “We now come to a vote on the proposal for full communion with the Moravian Church. Press 1 if you wish to vote in favor of this resolution; press 2 if you wish to vote no on the resolution. Please vote now.”

ASSEMBLY *Two-Thirds Vote Required*
ACTION *Yes-1007; No-11*
CA99.04.11 **The Northern and Southern Provinces of the Moravian Church in America, hereinafter termed the Moravian Church in America, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby agree that in their respective assemblies there shall be**

one vote to accept or reject, without separate amendment, the resolutions which follow. If adopted by both churches, each church agrees to take these measures to establish full communion:

WHEREAS, Jesus our Shepherd calls us to unity so that the world may believe; and

WHEREAS, Moravians and Lutherans share common theological traditions and commitments to mission; and

WHEREAS, in North America Lutherans and Moravians have developed distinct church bodies while cooperating in serving our Lord; and

WHEREAS, “Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion,” the report of the Lutheran-Moravian dialogue, affirmed that there are no “church-dividing differences” precluding full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America; therefore be it

RESOLVED that:

1. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby recognize in one another the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic faith as it is expressed in the Scriptures, confessed in the Church’s historic creeds, attested to in the *Unaltered Augsburg Confession* and *Small Catechism*, and the *Ground of the Unity of the Unitas Fratrum*;
2. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby
 - recognize the authenticity of each other’s Baptisms and Eucharists, and
 - extend sacramental hospitality to one another’s members;
3. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby
 - recognize each other’s ordinations of persons to the Ministry of Word and Sacrament; and
 - recognize each other’s polity and ministries of oversight (including the interpretation of church doctrines, discipline of members, authorization of persons for ordained and lay ministries, and provision for administrative functions);
4. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby recognize the full

interchangeability and reciprocity of all ordained ministers of Word and Sacrament, subject to the constitutionally approved invitation for ministry in each other's churches;

5. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby authorize the establishment of a joint commission by June 2000

- **to coordinate the implementation of these resolutions,**
- **to assist joint planning for mission,**
- **to facilitate consultation and common decision-making through appropriate channels in fundamental matters that the churches may face together in the future, and**
- **to report regularly and appropriately to each church;**

6. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America through the aforementioned joint commission shall

- **encourage the development of worship materials to celebrate the churches' full communion,**
- **encourage on-going theological discussion,**
- **encourage joint formulation of educational materials, and**
- **encourage continuing education for church professionals regarding the churches' full communion;**

7. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby affirm that neither will issue an official commentary on the text of these resolutions that has not been approved by the joint commission as a legitimate interpretation thereof;

8. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America hereby agree that each will continue to be in communion with all the churches with which each is in communion presently;

9. The Moravian Church in America and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby

- **pledge to take each other and these agreements into account at every stage of their dialogues and agreements with other churches and faith traditions,**
- **pledge to seek to engage in joint dialogue when appropriate, and pledge not to enter into formal agreements with other churches and faith traditions without prior consultation with the other.**

“Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”

Preface

I am the good shepherd. I know my own and my own know me, just as the Father knows me and I know the Father. And I lay down my life for the sheep. I have other sheep who do not belong to this fold. I must bring them also, and they will listen to my voice. So there will be one flock, one shepherd (John 10:14-16 [NRSV]).

The themes of the Good Shepherd, following Jesus, and fellowship through discipleship were at the forefront from the very start of the Lutheran-Moravian Dialogue. Also present was the realization that this dialogue is unique for both churches.¹ It is unique for the Northern and Southern Provinces of the Moravian Church in America (*Unitas Fratrum*) because it is the first such dialogue in which those provinces have engaged.² It is also unique for the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (hereinafter ELCA) because Lutheran churches and Moravian Provinces worldwide have been in virtual full communion, including the interchangeability of ordained clergy and eucharistic hospitality, for decades. In this sense, then, the Lutheran-Moravian Dialogue in the United States is catching up with where other Lutherans and Moravians are already. Moravians and Lutherans are regarding themselves as members of one flock who are following their Shepherd in mission and ministry.

I. *The Journey to Full Communion:*

Historical Background from Prague to Philadelphia

If the image of Jesus leading forth sheep from various folds to form one flock applies to our churches, our respective histories show that while we are institutionally separate, we share the same fold geographically and historically. At crucial times and in diverse places Lutherans and Moravians have contributed to each other's continuance and renewal. Likewise, for historical and geographical reasons rather than for theological causes, we have diverged from each other. The time has come for us to review key elements in our backgrounds in order to resume our journey toward full communion.

Chronologically and logically the journey begins with the origins of the *Unitas Fratrum*. Moravian dialoguers commented that their theology was expressed most often and most clearly not in formal propositions or confessional documents, and certainly not in polemics or dialectics. The Unity is best understood through its story (history), praise of God (worship), and commitment to discipleship (community). The Ancient Moravian Church underwent a number of transitions in doctrinal perspective as it developed and articulated its expressions of the Christian faith and mission.

1 The word Church (with the initial letter capitalized) refers to the one, holy, Christian Church except when it is used as part of the title of a particular denomination. The word church (with the initial letter in lower case) refers to a general denominational entity, e.g., the Lutheran church.

2 The formal name of the international Moravian church is the "*Unitas Fratrum* (Moravian Church)." It consists of provinces located in various countries in Africa, Europe, Great Britain, Central America, South America, North America, the Caribbean, and related organizations in India, China, and Israel. The two Provinces of the Moravian Church in North America (North and South) presently consist of congregations in the lower 48 states of the United States and the Canadian provinces of Alberta and Ontario. The ELCA has congregations in the fifty states of the United States, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Bahamas. When Moravians refer to the Ancient Church, they mean that expression of their ecclesial existence which traces its origins to the martyred Bohemian reformer, Jan Hus (ca. 1371-1415) and the establishment of the *Unitas Fratrum* at Kunvald, Bohemia, in 1457. The term "Renewed Moravian Church" or "Renewed *Unitas Fratrum*" refers to the eighteenth century re-emergence of the Unity from persecution and dispersion. That renewal was focused in Saxony at the estate of the Lutheran noble and ordained minister, Nicholas Ludwig, Count von Zinzendorf.

Jan Hus (1371-1415) of the University of Prague serves as a seminal figure for all Protestants and pre-eminently for Moravians. His reliance on the primacy of Scripture, insights into the nature of the Church, zeal for reform, and courageous martyrdom provide motifs both theological and communal for his spiritual descendants. Movements in Bohemia and Moravia which developed after his death and subsequent conflicts led to the formation of the *Unitas Fratrum* at Kunvald, Bohemia, in 1457. The ensuing decades were marked by persecution, privation, and spiritual searching. The desire was not to champion a theological principle as such but to seek to live as fully as possible in the love of Christ, in concord with fellow believers, and in harmony with the Sermon on the Mount. Their concern for the welfare of other Christians was manifested in their offering refuge to persecuted Waldensians around 1460. By 1467 the Brethren realized that they needed a more explicit organization. They gathered in Lhotka near Rychnov where they selected three persons as priests. A member having Roman ordination was sent to the Waldensians to seek their ordination, for it was believed they had a valid apostolic ministry. Returning he ordained the three selected and then resigned his Waldensian and Roman priesthood. Thus a connection was established with two lines of succession. Mathias of Kunwald was appointed to first place among the three colleagues, thus beginning a position which had episcopal authority and evolved into episcopal office though, it was also understood that there was no fundamental difference between a priest and bishop.³ The episcopal office among Moravians is, therefore, of long standing and is intended for the preservation of the apostolic mission of the Church and the administration of its faith, life, and mission. This also indicates that from its origins the Unity understood itself as participating in the wider Church catholic, and was willing to gain from as well as to share with other Christians.

Events and personalities in sixteenth century Germany soon brought the Bohemian Brethren (as they were then called) into contact with Martin Luther (1483-1546). Widespread distortions by enemies and fears about heresies and rebellion in Bohemia were attached to the Brethren. Perhaps the slander lingered in the minds of Evangelical Germans for decades. When Eck and others attacked Luther as a Hussite and a “Bohemian,” the charge was not simply limited to one person and a kingdom within the Holy Roman Empire. In the aftermath of the Leipzig Disputation (1519) and Diet of Worms (1521), the Bohemians provided the “Saxon Hus” with some of the writings of the martyr. Luther and his colleagues began to communicate and share ideas with the Brethren through Lukáš of Prague, Jan Roh, and Jan Augusta. Generally, the Wittenbergers’ theological influence was so pronounced that the years 1520 to 1546 are termed the Unity’s “Period of Lutheran Orientation.”

The intersections of personalities and exchanges of ideas were not uniformly smooth or without disagreement. The movement associated with Luther centered on theological and hermeneutical issues, although cultural and political matters were highly influential. The Lutheran focus on its understanding of justification by faith without works of the Law as the teaching on which the Church stood or fell served to animate and inform the developing theology and practice of the evangelical movement. As Lutherans debated among themselves, against other Reformation movements, and with Rome, doctrinal clarity became a priority. And those debates often were belligerent, even hostile, in tone. Among the disputed topics were the centrality of justification, the place of good works, and the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Lutheran confessors at the Diet of Augsburg stated that the

³ Rudolf Říčan, *The History of the Unity of the Brethren: A Protestant Hussite Church in Bohemia and Moravia*, translated by C. Daniel Crews, Bethlehem, Pa: The Moravian Church in America, 1992, pgs. 39-41.

“Church is the assembly of all believers among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel. For it is sufficient for the true unity of the Christian Church that the Gospel be preached in conformity with a pure understanding of it and that the sacraments be administered in accordance with the divine Word. It is not necessary for the true unity of the Christian church that ceremonies, instituted by men, should be observed uniformly in all places.⁴” The statement lost its irenical openness in subsequent debates.

The leaders of the Unity who were in contact with Luther presented him with drafts of their *Apologia* and *Confessio*. They received and considered Lutheran suggestions and criticisms. Lutherans and Brethren agreed on justification and the nature of the Gospel. The final texts of the Brethren’s documents clearly were influenced by the doctrinal portions of the *Augsburg Confession* (Articles I-XXI) and the *Smalcald Articles* (especially 2 and 3). The Lutheran insistence on further exposition about Christ’s presence in the sacrament of the altar moved the Unity’s leaders to greater clarity, but Lutherans still pushed for more detail. The final text of the *Confessio Bohemica*, 1535, was presented to the Lutheran margrave, George of Brandenburg. Luther provided a commendatory preface in which he wrote,

We, too, ought to give the greatest possible thanks to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to the riches of his glory, commanded this light of His word to shine out of darkness, in order thereby to abolish death among us again and to bring life to light. We ought also to congratulate both them [the Brethren] and ourselves that we who have been far apart from each other have been brought together, now that the well of suspicion, by which we seemed to each other to be heretics, has been removed, and that we have been led into one fold under one Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, who is blessed forever. Amen.⁵

Luther and his associates acknowledged the criticisms of the Brethren concerning the lack of discipline and morality within Evangelical congregations. Melancthon and Luther continued to struggle with these issues through the catechisms, worship, and a stronger emphasis on prayer. On their part, the Brethren grew increasingly wary and weary of the seemingly interminable and divisive doctrinal wrangling among the proponents of the Reformation. Some within the Unitas advised merging with the Lutherans, but the decision was made to preserve the Brethren’s identity with its sense of personal commitment to Jesus and close fellowship among its members. Clearly the contact between the Bohemians and Lutherans during Luther’s lifetime was mutually helpful: the Brethren undertook to clarify their theological concerns and positions, the Lutherans were given vibrant examples of Christian unity and discipleship, and both were prepared for future ventures in following the Shepherd.

Protestant defeats in the Smalcaldic Wars (1546-48) pushed Lutherans and the Brethren to look to their own political and spiritual survival. Driven from Bohemia and Moravia into eastern Prussia, Hungary, and Poland, the Brethren lived under precarious conditions and were often the victims of dreadful persecution. Usually when German Lutheran rulers and city officials achieved measures of political stability and recognition, they held to the general assumption that there should be religious conformity in a state, in so far as that was possible.

4 *Augsburg Confession*, Article VII.

5 See Jaroslav Pelikan. *Luther and the Confessio Bohemica of 1535*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1946. Translation is Pelikan’s.

Consequently, they insisted that Christians in those territories should be Lutherans. For that reason the exiles from England during Queen Mary's reign who sought refuge in German Lutheran territories were given the choice of conforming to the Wittenberg theology or leaving. Many departed for the more hospitable climes of Calvin's Geneva. The Brethren who fled to Lutheran areas in Prussia often faced similar pressures. Again, the issues between the two communions were political, not theological.

Experiences of persecution and marginalization strengthened the Unity's dedication to be a servant community and underscored their perception that doctrinal polemics were inimical to God's will. They also developed a wide network of contacts with Reformed congregations and leaders in Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, and Germany.

The century between the ends of the Smalcaldic War and the Thirty Years War (1548-1648) was turbulent both politically and religiously. In the latter sphere rifts among Luther's associates escalated into personal animosities and theological factionalism. Philipists and Gnesio-Lutherans, two major camps which vied for dominance within the German Lutheran context, exchanged accusations of crypto-Calvinism and crypto-Romanism while demanding of themselves and others clearer and more detailed expositions of what was felt to be "orthodox teachings."

Nor were Lutherans alone in the quest for doctrinal "truth." The Roman Catholic Council of Trent (1545-63), Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England (1563), Second Helvetic Consensus Formula (1566) and Synod of Dort (1618) for the Reformed, Formula of Concord and *Book of Concord* among Lutherans (1577 and 1580), and Westminster Confession (1646) for English Presbyterianism all indicate the breadth and intensity of attempts to formulate Christian truth often over and against other Christians. Those who attempted to act as intermediaries were few in number and were usually vilified by one or both sides.

Such activity evidences both the anxieties and stabilization of the Reformed and Lutheran communions. Beneath these developments is the assumption that a society's security was at least partially dependent on the highest possible degree of religious conformity within its borders. Whether the times required such conformity is debatable, but in such a polemical atmosphere, many lay persons and clergy felt their hearts strangely chilled. A reaction was probably inevitable.

The Unity, too, attempted to formulate its positions. In 1616 the Brethren drew up the *Ratio Disciplinae Ordinisque Ecclesiastici in Unitate Fratrum Bohemorum*. Seven chapters spelled out the Essential, Ministerial, and Incidental things of the Christian faith. The Essentials are those things which are necessary for human salvation. These are given by God and not of human derivation, and consist of the grace of the Father, the merit of Christ, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. On the part of humans, the Essentials are responded to through faith, love, and hope. "The Ministerials" are the necessary means by which divine grace, Christ's merit, and the operation of the Spirit are conferred on humans, that is, by which faith, love, and hope are enkindled, cherished, and strengthened. The Ministerials are the Word of God, the keys, and the sacraments. The Word reveals the Essentials, the keys assign them, and the sacraments seal them. The ordained ministry of the Church is necessary to advance the purity of faith, the ardor of love, and the firmness of hope. The Incidentals are ceremonies and rites of human derivation and origin.⁶ The *Ratio* or *Church Order*, given a final revision by Amos Comenius (1592-1670), has provided the language and categories

⁶ B. Seiffert. *Church Constitution of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren*. London: W. Malklieu, Co., 1866.

which the Unity has used throughout its subsequent history to relate to its own internal situations and to reach out to other Christians.

The Protestant defeat at the battle of White Mountain (1620) was catastrophic for the Brethren. To force Protestants to return to the Roman Catholic Church and to dismantle their conventicles, the Hapsburg victors criminalized religious dissent while denying dissenters permission to depart legally from Moravia and Bohemia. The “Period of the Hidden Seed” (1620-1732) was marked by danger and anxiety as small groups meet clandestinely for fellowship, worship, and study. Many fled their Czech homelands to become refugees in Poland and Germany, often seeking support from Brethren who had preceded them as well as with Reformed and Lutheran sympathizers. “Hidden” as they may have been, they were, nevertheless, the seed for a new growth of discipleship. The Reformed in Poland, also subject to religious repression, recognized the devotion and religious integrity of the members of the Unity.

Their courageous witness, devotion to Scripture, cultivation of communal fellowship, and spiritual warmth inspired many to associate with and then join the Unity. One such person, the shepherd-carpenter-soldier, Christian David, (1690-1756), was sustained physically and spiritually by Lutherans, and became a member of the Lutheran church in Berlin. His several Lutheran connections and his conviction that a shelter for his sisters and brothers could be found in Germany led him eventually to Count von Zinzendorf’s estate in 1722. The section on which the Brethren settled was called Herrnhut (“Watching for the Lord” and “The Lord Watches”). Gradually a community took physical and spiritual shape under Zinzendorf’s patronage. The Ancient Church was poised for renewal.

The traumas of the Thirty Years War together with the Enlightenment had profound effects on continental Protestantism. Simultaneously, a complex cross-fertilization took place through which the writings of Lutheran and Reformed leaders influenced English Anglicans and Puritans. Their writings, in turn, circulated in Germany, Switzerland, and Scandinavia, gaining attention and promoting further developments. The religious winds were to cross the Channel again and the Atlantic during the mid-eighteenth century. Where once the *desiderata* of churches had been doctrinal precision and subscription, now there was a *Pia Desideria*, a “heart-felt desire for a God-pleasing reform of the true Evangelical Church.”⁷

Pietism, a complex and variegated movement, still defies definitions. F. Ernst Stoeffler noted that Pietism insisted on:

the need for, and the possibility of an authentic and vitally significant experience of God on the part of individual Christians; the religious life as a life of love for God and man, which is marked by social sensitivity and ethical concern; utter confidence, with respect to the issues of both life and death, in the experientially verifiable authenticity of God’s revelation in Christ, as found in the biblical witness; the church as a community of God’s people, which must be ever renewed through the transformation of individuals, and which necessarily transcends all organizationally required boundaries; the need for the implementation of the Reformation understanding of the Priesthood of all believers through responsible lay participation in the varied concerns of the Christian enterprise; a ministry which

7 The full title of Philip Jacob Spener’s 1675 seminal work is *Pia Desideria or Heartfelt Desire for a God-pleasing Reform of the true Evangelical Church, together with Several Simple Christian Proposals looking toward this End*. See the edition by Theodore G. Tappert, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964, reprinted 1982.

is sensitized, trained, and oriented to respond to the needs and problems of a given age; and, finally, the continual adaptation of ecclesiastical structures, practices, and verbal definitions to the mission of the church.⁸

Zinzendorf, like Luther, was a larger than life character: highly influential within and beyond his circle of associates, a creative thinker, and not above criticism. Again, like Luther among those who regard him as a spiritual forebear, Zinzendorf serves as an inspirational guide, while his ecclesial descendants have gone on to adapt to new challenges and circumstances. Indeed, Lutherans and Moravians have literally moved into a new world and on territory uncharted by Zinzendorf and Luther.

The Count's journey with the Savior included an austere upbringing steeped in Lutheran pietism which also made him acutely aware of his noble lineage. His guardians expected him to enter government service, and planned for him to focus on jurisprudence in his education. His baptismal sponsor was Spener, and a significant portion of his early education was undertaken at the pietist center, the Paedagogium at Halle, under the strict tutelage of August Hermann Francke (d. 1727). His departure to study law at Halle's rival, Wittenberg, generated a lasting animosity toward him that influenced Halle's later representative in Philadelphia, Henry Melchior Muhlenberg.⁹ The leaders of Halle regarded the theology at Wittenberg to be stultified, while others considered Luther's academic base to be the true custodian of Reformation truth. While at Wittenberg, Zinzendorf expressed his devotion to God through engaging in a regimen which emphasized Bible study and prayer.

Later, Zinzendorf reflected that while at Wittenberg he was immersed in orthodox Lutheranism and took Luther as his theological guide. His engagement with Luther led him out of the intra-pietistic arguments about struggles for salvation and sanctification and to a reliance on God's justifying grace in Jesus Christ. Using the Augustinian-Lutheran theme of *simul justus et peccator*, Zinzendorf turned away from the predilections in pietism toward legalism and a rigid construction of the steps involved in conversion. While at Wittenberg, he developed an intense loyalty to the *Augsburg Confession*, the *Small Catechism*, and Luther's hymns and devotional writings.

He also organized several fellow students into small groups which pledged themselves to mission work. One of these, the Order of the Mustard Seed, grew to become an ecumenical fellowship. The young man was convinced that God called him to the ministry of Word and Sacraments through the Lutheran Church, and he studied theology more assiduously than law. His family resisted his desires on the grounds that the pastorate was beneath his social station. Following his marriage and eventual refusal to pursue a career in state offices, Zinzendorf determined to return to the family estates where Christian David and his associates had already settled. And so his life intersected with Christian David and the fugitive Brethren on a regular basis.

The youthful Zinzendorf gradually was drawn toward the Brethren, and increasingly became one of their leaders. Deeply impressed with their courage, devout prayer life, and reliance on the mercy of God in Christ, he undertook to be responsible for their public worship. He was delighted to discover the *Ratio* and its provisions for ordered church life,

⁸ Peter C. Erb, *Pietists. Selected Writings*, New York: Paulist Press, 1983, pg. 7. The Stoeffler quotation is from his *German Pietism during the Eighteenth Century*, Leiden: n.p., 1973 pg. ix.

⁹ Zinzendorf's major disagreement with the Hallesian form of pietism concerned the stages a person was thought to experience on the way to conversion. Zinzendorf considered Halle's insistence on a particular universal pattern to be rigid and open to question.

and was especially interested in the Essentials. Because he understood that God could only be known in Christ, and because of the nature of his own religious experience, he expressed that which was essential as a saving relationship with Christ. In other words, he gave the Essentials a Christocentric focus. To provide for a regular ministry of Word and Sacraments among the Brethren at Herrnhut, Zinzendorf arranged for Lutheran pastors to conduct services, preach, and celebrate communion among the Brethren. His activities appeared to some Lutheran political and ecclesiastical authorities as a promotion of schism and sectarianism. That suspicion and subsequent opposition focus on grace and the *simul justus* of justification which were the key issues at dispute between the Halle and Wittenberg versions of Lutheran theology and piety. At every turn, however, the Count was able to show that he personally and the Brethren were well within the Lutheran fold.¹⁰ Concerned about having an official validation of his theology and still convinced that he was called to the ordained ministry, he satisfied church and royal officials in Denmark, Sweden, and Germany about his theological training. In 1734 the Pastoral College of Stralsund certified his orthodoxy and the Theological Faculty of Tübingen University issued an affidavit that Zinzendorf was a man in good standing, had all the knowledge of Christian faith in a manner which was fully acceptable for Lutheran orthodoxy, and indicated that they could see no objection as to why a man of high nobility should not also preach the Gospel. With this certification he publicly entered ministry in the *Stiftskirche* in Tübingen.¹¹

The Unity was renewed spiritually and physically at the portion of Zinzendorf's estate called Herrnhut. This was a process of spiritually bringing together divergent groups in the Herrnhut settlement including Reformed, Lutherans, and the migrants from Moravia longing for renewal of their church. Zinzendorf provided pastoral care. Rules governing life on the Manor were signed by inhabitants, and in 1727, in the Lutheran parish church of Berthelsdorf, there was an experience of unity and renewal Moravians have since called their Pentecost. By 1732 missionaries were sent to the Caribbean following the testimony of an ex-slave to the Herrnhut community and the great age of Moravian experimentation in mission was begun. The missionaries' purpose was not to establish a new church body but to bring the Gospel to the poor and the enslaved on the islands. In addition, Herrnhut served as the matrix from which the Unity developed marks which endure to the present, e.g., poetry, hymnody, musicianship, love feasts and communal decision making. By 1741, when having difficulty replacing the Chief Elder of their church, they were inspired to claim that Jesus was the Chief Elder and Lord of the Church and that in the Moravian church they would submit to his governance rather than electing someone to this central governmental position.

With the growing needs of the Unity and its developing mission, it became important to establish an ordained ministry. Because of the concerns of the significant segment of persons

10 In 1732 a commission from Dresden investigated the Herrnhuters' orthodoxy and found them theologically sound. Friedrich Christoph Oettinger, of the University of Tübingen's theological faculty spent 1733-34 at Herrnhut, leading the community and the Count in biblical and theological studies. The animosities between the Halleians and Zinzendorf were enlarged when August Gottlieb Spangenberg (1704-1792), dismissed as superintendent of Halle's orphan house because of his sympathies for Zinzendorf, joined the Brethren at Herrnhut. One of Spangenberg's successors at Halle was Henry Mekhior Muhlenberg. It is important to recognize that the developing differences between Halle and the Moravians revolved around Zinzendorf's assertion of "grace alone," not only in terms of justification but also regarding the holiness which was also a gift of God. Thus Moravian pietism was not Halle pietism.

11 Erich Beyreuther, *Die grosse Zinzendorf-Trilogie*, Marburg an der Lahn: Franck-Buchhandlung GmbH, 1988, Band III, *Zinzendorf und die Christenheit*, pp 73-87. Zinzendorf's progress toward certification of theological orthodoxy was complicated largely by political-religious rivalries in several German states and Swedish domination of other German states. The Count always considered himself a loyal and theologically sound Lutheran, and was considered so even by his ecclesiastical detractors. See John R. Weinlick, *Count Zinzendorf: The Story of His Life and Leadership in the Renewed Moravian Church*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1956, especially pgs. 114-127.

who had come from Moravia to reestablish their church, the Unity turned to the last remaining bishops of the Ancient Moravian Church. In 1699 Daniel Ernst Jablonsky, one of Comenius' grandsons, had been consecrated a bishop for the Brethren. Subsequently he became a Reformed pastor and then served as the court preacher in Berlin. To retain the historic episcopacy and to provide for the Unity's continuity, he with the concurrence of the other surviving Brethren bishop, Christian Sitkovius, ordained David Nitschmann as a bishop (1735). King Frederick William I of Prussia encouraged an initially reluctant and now ordained Zinzendorf to be consecrated as a bishop for the Brethren as well. In 1737 at the urging of Herrnhuters and other supporters, Jablonsky consecrated Zinzendorf as a bishop for the Brethren.

Whereas bishops in the Ancient Moravian church had been diocesan, in the Renewed church they were intended to provide a ministry for the Unity's mission and not to be related to dioceses and thus competitive to the established church and their offices. This continues to be a feature of the Moravian episcopacy where bishops are bishops of the international Unity and do not only belong to and care for a particular jurisdiction. Frederick William specifically stated that the creation of bishops with the authority to ordain others to the ministry did not constitute the formation of a church separate from the legally recognized Lutheran, Reformed, and Roman Catholic communions. Nevertheless Zinzendorf's detractors became suspicious of the Unity and its new bishop. The Hallesians could not but see Zinzendorf and those associated with him as rivals at best, and as potential schismatics.

The Count was moved by these events and his own study to give careful consideration to the nature of the Church and the meaning of unity in Christ. His Christocentric theological vision was a bold one. He began to understand the one, holy, catholic Church in terms which presaged the modern ecumenical movement, but gave cold comfort to his critics. By 1744 he envisioned the Church as a unity created by God, animated through the Spirit, and headed by Jesus Christ. His Christocentric focus on the Essentials led him to envision the unity of the Church as involving differing *tropes* or "methods of training" such as the Lutheran, Moravian, Reformed and, as it developed, Anglican and Methodist tropes.¹² Each had its own God-given mission and method for leading persons to a relationship with Christ. An obvious corollary was that no one church had a corner on the truth and that theological wrangling was inimical to the true unity of the Church which God willed.

Waves of immigrants to British North America and the Caribbean challenged Protestants at the same time that their missionary impulses were leading them to consider bringing the Gospel to Asia and Africa. Renewed political and religious tensions in Austria, together with the accession of the Hanoverians to the throne of the United Kingdom, gave the new world the appearance of being both a haven and a home for many German-speaking Protestants. An atmosphere of communal experimentation, particularly in Georgia and Pennsylvania, attracted different groups and individuals as did the more usual reasons for departing from one's homeland: economic opportunities, avoidance of military conscription, and venturesomeness. Where Germans and Scandinavians went, so did the Lutheran and Reformed understandings of Christianity. And so did the members of the Unity. Although the mutual relationships and influences among the Episcopalians, nascent Methodist movement, Lutherans, and Brethren are beyond the scope of this report, it is worth noting

12 The development of the idea of *tropes* was also partially influenced by the persistence of the refugees from Moravia in continuing the existence of their ancient church while Zinzendorf wanted his community to remain a society within the Lutheran Church. Thus it became important to recognize the different approaches and religious traditions not only outside but within the Moravian Church.

that the Unity provided crucial links which mediated Lutheran understandings of justification and devotional life to English-speaking evangelicals in Great Britain and the Americas. In turn and from their origins, the small Moravian communities first in Georgia and then in Pennsylvania engaged in mission work among Native Americans, established schools, and ministered to the orphaned and poor.

The spiritual needs of the German immigrants became painfully clear. The Psalmist's question of how can the Lord's song be sung in a foreign land was compounded by ecclesiastical fragmentation and rivalry between Reformed and Lutheran leaders, and the immigrants' inexperience with not being part of a state church which provided fiscal support, certified clergy, and authority to resolve disputes. For all the resemblances the colonies bore to the old world, the settlers soon realized that they were in a new world geographically, intellectually, and spiritually. Naturally, there were those who sought to bring order and coherence into their situations, and there were others who sought to exploit the unsettled conditions for their own ends.

The provision of Word and Sacrament ministry and the development of German-speaking congregations in and around Philadelphia involved Reformed, Lutheran, Schwenkfelder, and Mennonite Christians. Sometimes each went its separate way and occasionally they cooperated. Joint efforts tended to be less on the basis of theology than their shared ethnicity. The Moravian emphasis on heartfelt religion and following the Savior led them neither into doctrinal debates nor the establishment of specifically Moravian congregations. They became part of the founders and leaders of German-speaking congregations, advocating the provision of ministry to German individuals and communities, joint efforts with English-speaking Christians, and mission work among the unchurched of all races in the colony. In order to move that work forward and to inform himself of the opportunities in America, Zinzendorf traveled to the colonies.

At the same time relations between pietists and orthodoxists in Germany deteriorated. The latter considered the former as near-schismatics largely because of the pietist emphases on the laity and conventicles, both of which seemed prone to undermine the stability of the official church, its clergy, and doctrinal interpretations. More specifically, the Hallesian pietists were becoming increasingly critical of the Herrnhuters and particularly Zinzendorf. Several congregations in the Philadelphia area requested that the Halle authorities send to them at least one certified pastor. These congregations were embroiled in disputes with men who either were pastors but aroused controversy or men who had dubious credentials. Concerned that the congregations would not be willing or able to support a pastor, the leaders at Halle delayed until they learned that Zinzendorf planned to go to Pennsylvania. Halle responded by ordaining and dispatching Henry Melchior Muhlenberg as the called pastor to those congregations which had requested Halle's assistance.¹³

The sole meeting between the two men (1742) can be understood on the levels of personal encounter, ecclesiastical polity, and different perspectives on the establishment of the Church in Pennsylvania. Muhlenberg felt responsible for planting a church which retained the European traditions and institutions. Zinzendorf wanted to explore a new

13 Before his departure from Germany, Muhlenberg was accused of being a schismatic because he held prayer meetings in his rooms. Zinzendorf's aunt, one of the Count's severest critics, gave Muhlenberg her version of her nephew's character. That description seems to have framed the new pastor's perspective on the man he met in Philadelphia. Curiously, while Muhlenberg left a detailed account of his interview with Zinzendorf—an account which he also shared with the Halle authorities—there is no parallel account in Zinzendorf's diary or from Moravian sources. For Muhlenberg's account see *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, edited by Theodore G. Tappert and John Doberstein, Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1942, reprinted by Whipporwill Publications, Evansville, 1982 volume 1, pgs. 75-81. The encounter took place on December 29, 1742.

ecumenical Protestantism called “The Congregation of God in the Spirit,” a concern which gave birth to the Pennsylvania Synods at which many different traditions were represented. Muhlenberg felt that unless order could be introduced into the congregations, the members of those communities could be bereft of sound teaching, discipline, and worship. Each claimed the right to represent the Lutheran Church. That Muhlenberg was sent by Halle, now estranged from Zinzendorf, did not help. Personality characteristics undoubtedly played a role. Cast into a power struggle in which each perceived the other as denying the validity of his authority and jurisdiction, the men parted with reciprocal hostility.

In one sense the journey from Prague to Philadelphia might be said to have ended the creative and supportive relationships between Lutherans and Moravians in the United States. While there have been joint endeavors and warm relationships between many congregations in the respective churches, Lutherans have recalled the Muhlenberg-Zinzendorf encounter as defining church-dividing differences, but Lutherans have not themselves articulated what was at stake ecclesially or theologically. Another sense in which the journey ended at Philadelphia, at least symbolically, is that the Unity and the Lutherans went on to separate ecclesiastical lives. American denominationalism, not theology, was the chief factor that led them to form two different organizations.

But the journey with the Savior did not end in 1742. Chronologically long overdue, yet in a kairotic time, Lutherans and Moravians are able to see that we have come far together internationally. We are now ready to recognize that the Savior is calling his Moravian and Lutheran flocks to full communion and mission in the 21st century.

II. The Journey to Full Communion:

Perspectives on Theology, Affirmations, and Complementarities

As Christians listen to the voice of the Shepherd and seek to follow, we will leave some of our traditional securities, yet we will gain deepened identities as God’s people in mission. Perhaps we will understand more fully Jesus’ prayer, “I ask not only on behalf of these [disciples], but also on behalf of those who will believe in me through their word, that they may all be one” (John 17:20, NRSV). The Lutheran–Moravian Dialogue and our churches’ movement toward full communion are set in the contexts of dialogues and journeys toward unity in which Christians and their churches encounter each other anew. Today we have concluded that Christian unity need not mean corporate unification, but involves what we have previously called “full communion.”

At the same time, the twentieth century, for all its startling scientific and technological advances, has also witnessed the often lethal fragmentation of the human family along racial, ethnic, religious, gender, political and economic lines. The deconstruction of shared meanings between and within communities, together with rising levels of anxiety and violence, underscore the need and hunger for coherence without coercion and community with continuity. In this time Christians hear and seek to respond to God’s summons to recognize the unity which we already have and to manifest our confidence in the Lord who calls all persons to himself.

Part of the response to God and the Church’s mission to the world involves new approaches in ecumenical dialogues and actions. One such approach is indicated in *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (BEM)* developed by the World Council of Churches Faith and Order

Commission.¹⁴ The Commission invited the churches to consider how one church recognizes the apostolic faith in the life and thought of another church. At that level the respective communities are freed from insisting on verbal or conceptual exactitude or uniformity of practice in their formulations and actions. Here *BEM* foreshadowed what we term shortly “Mutual Affirmations.” Next, each church was asked to consider whether it could learn from others so as to gain a fuller understanding of and richer expression for its witness to and praise of God. At this level *BEM* foreshadowed what we call “Mutual Complementarities.”

The Moravian and Lutheran dialoguers recognized that our conversations were roughly analogous to the methods used in *BEM* and the bilateral dialogues in which Lutherans have engaged in recent decades. We encountered frequently the need to explain our perspectives on theology and theology’s roles in the spheres of personal, ecclesial, and social life. In effect, we realized the importance of the fourth goal of our original charge: “to test and articulate Moravian and Lutheran theology and theological methodologies.” Our attitudes toward, understandings of theology’s functions, and the means we employ to express ourselves emerged as vital to our self-understandings and our understandings of each other. The balance of this report follows the pattern Perspectives on Theology, Mutual Affirmations, Mutual Complementarities, and Concluding Statement.

A. Perspectives on Theology

Lutherans and Moravians have different yet complementary attitudes toward and experience with theological discourse and formulations. Lutherans expect their churches to engage in theological discussions, adhere to creedal-confessional formulations, and teach from doctrinal perspectives. The Lutheran movement originated in theological debate and coalesced about a series of confessional documents. Luther, his associates, and their successors in the sixteenth century developed and deepened their understandings of Law and Gospel, biblical interpretation, liturgical renewal, the sacraments, society, pastoral activity, and other major areas of Christian life and witness in the face of and in the heat of theological explorations and disputations with Roman Catholics, other Reformation movements and leaders, and among themselves. Since the sixteenth century Lutherans have retained the attitude that theological debate, clarity, and adherence are vital for the integrity and continuity of the Christian faith. They anticipate that theological discourse, personal piety and intellectual acuity will be balanced and mutually supportive one of the other.

Lutherans are convinced that such theological discourse is more than possible; it is necessary if the Church is to speak and act knowingly as well as feelingly, in seeking to be faithful to the Lord. While Lutherans recognize the importance of social and historical

¹⁴ *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Faith and Order Paper 114, Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982. The way that churches were asked to respond to *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* provides a meaningful paradigm for the way churches are called upon to respond to each other. This could be summarized as:

- a. the extent to which your church can recognize in these recommendations the faith of the Church through the ages and the church of which you are a member;
- b. the consequences your church may draw from these recommendations and our churches shared and contrasting understandings of the Christian faith; and
- c. the guidance your church can take from these recommendations for its worship, educational, ethical, and spiritual life and witness.

Several American church bodies of the Reformed tradition have been engaged in dialogue with Lutheran churches since 1962. In the wake of mergers and the formation of new ecclesiastical entities, those churches are now the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Reformed Church in America, and United Church of Christ, and the ELCA. The *Formula of Agreement* to establish full communion between the Reformed churches and the ELCA was presented to the respective church assemblies in 1997 and accepted by all bodies.

contingencies, they also insist that there are theological consistencies which are to be believed, taught, and confessed as essential for understanding, living and transmitting the faith. Christian theology involves disciplined reflection on the Triune God, the human condition, the Church, and the world. The roles of such disciplined reflection include the Church's stating to itself and for its own edification as well as correction what the Christian faith holds true, and how the Church is to be shaped and guided by that faith. Another dimension of theological reflection involves equipping believers for mission and witness in the world. Further, theology has an apologetic function through which Christians seek to make clear where they stand in relations with other religions and claimants for human devotion and allegiance.

While Lutheran theologians may use different methods to carry on the theological tasks, they do so in reference to a threefold authoritative basis. First, they agree that the basis, criteria, and guide for faith, doctrine, and practice is the Scripture of the Old and New Testaments. In traditional language; "We believe, teach and confess that the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments are the only rule and norm according to which all doctrines and teachers alike must be appraised and judged."¹⁵ Second and as a valid witness to the Scriptures, Lutherans receive, use, and pledge themselves to the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds as the "unanimous, catholic, Christian faith and confessions of the orthodox and true church."¹⁶ The place of the third component, a set of specific documents composed in the sixteenth century and compiled as the *Book of Concord*, is more complex.

The documents are the *Augsburg Confession*, *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, *Smalcald Articles* (with the Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope appended), *Large Catechism*, *Small Catechism*, and *Formula of Concord*. These are regarded as consonant with yet subordinate to the Scriptures. Within the circle of confessional literature, the "Unaltered" *Augsburg Confession* is regarded as having given Lutherans "a clear and unequivocal Christian witness, setting forth the faith and teaching of the Evangelical Christian churches concerning the chief articles, especially those which were in controversy between them and the popes adherents. . . . [W]e abide by the plain, clear, and pure meaning of its words. We consider this Confession a genuinely Christian symbol which all true Christians ought to accept next to the Word of God, just as in ancient times Christian symbols and confessions were formulated in the church of God."¹⁷ The first twenty-one articles of the *Augsburg Confession* deal with matters of faith and doctrine, while the remaining six articles concern issues related to human practices. While the other documents are regarded highly among Lutherans, the two Catechisms hold an especially cherished position.¹⁸ We observe

15 *Formula of Concord, Epitome, Part I, 1*. Note that all references to the documents contained in the Lutheran Confessions are from *The Book Of Concord. The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, translated and edited by Theodore G. Tappert, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, published originally in 1959.

16 *Formula of Concord, Epitome, Part I, 2*.

17 *Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration, Rule and Norm, 3 and 4*. Philipp Melancthon, author- compiler of the *Augsburg Confession*, re-edited and modified portions after 1530. While the original text and details about the presentation of the original Confession before Emperor Charles V at the Diet of Augsburg are uncertain, Lutherans have settled on a *textus receptus* in Latin and German which is termed the *Unaltered Augsburg Confession*.

18 See *Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration, Rule and Norm, 8*.

that the *Formula of Concord* and Lutheran practice also give the writings of Martin Luther a significant position as a model for stating the Christian faith.¹⁹

The constitutions of the ELCA, its synods, and congregations contain a section, "Chapter 2. Confession of Faith," which essentially repeats the positions cited from the *Formula of Concord* regarding the roles of the Scriptures, Creeds, and the Confessions. It concludes, "This church confesses the Gospel, recorded in the Holy Scriptures and confessed in the ecumenical creeds and Lutheran confessional writings, as the power of God to create and sustain the Church for God's mission in the world" (2.07.). At the ordination of a person to the office of the ministry of Word and Sacraments, the bishop states "The Church into which you are to be ordained confesses that the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God and are the norm of faith and life. We accept, teach, and confess the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian Creeds. We also acknowledge the Lutheran Confessions as true witnesses and faithful expositions of the Holy Scriptures. Will you therefore preach and teach in accordance with the Holy Scriptures and these creeds and confessions?" The candidate's expected response is, "I will, and I ask God to help me."²⁰ It is highly unlikely that Lutherans will add to the corpus of their Confessions. They do, however, develop and discuss theological statements and declarations, sometimes adopting them for guidance. Because of their historical conditioning and theological focus, Lutherans look askance at other faith communities which formulate or add confessions to their theological treasuries, especially when some of those confessions appear to contradict or replace or re-interpret the confessions Lutherans cherish.

Explicitly and implicitly, Lutheran methods appear to move from Scripture to Creeds and then to Confessions when Lutherans analyze, assess, express, and formulate positions, practices, liturgies, and actions. Actually, within the triad is an inner canon. In the realm of Scripture, Pauline positions on justification (as understood by Lutherans) have priority.²¹ The *Augsburg Confession* occupies first place among the Confessions.

Moravians, while influenced deeply and positively by Lutheran individuals and Lutheran theology, have also observed debilitating arguments and confusions created by those who thought they possessed God's truth to the exclusion of other insights. Moravians regard theological polemics as contrary to the Savior's will and love. Having been persecuted and vilified, they decline to use those tactics when dealing with others and when coping with problems within their own communion. A 1979 statement on theology by the Joint Theological Commission of the Northern and Southern Provinces, USA puts the Moravian understanding of theology's purpose and role clearly:

Theological reflection in the Moravian tradition is not to be understood as an attempt to arrive at final answers but is a way of thinking about God and His relationship to us so that He can, through His Spirit, draw us to Himself, and to His Son, and we can know Him as the Source of our living. Such reflection should lead to sharing of ideas and experiences, articulation of our faith, new levels of trust toward each other as persons through whom God partially discloses Himself in

¹⁹ See *Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration, Rule and Norm, 6 and 8.*

²⁰ *Occasional Services*, Minneapolis: Augsburg-Fortress, 1982, pg. 194 from the rite of ordination.

²¹ Especially Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians.

various ways, stimulation of the Christian life and our attentive waiting upon God for His clarification of our understanding.

If “confessional” describes Lutheran theological methods and purposes, “relational and devotional” fit Moravians. Certainly Moravians insist that theological tasks are to be pursued with intellectual rigor and the best means scholarship provides. Certainly Moravians recognize that a person and a community theologize within historical, social, and ecclesiastical contexts. Certainly Moravians are insightful about the degrees that their vibrant connections to Moravia, Saxony, and Pietism still invigorate the Unity. And certainly Moravians have doctrinal, liturgical, and institutional benchmarks to assess positions, proposals, and practices. But these are secondary.

Moravian perspectives on the Christian faith generally, and the Unity’s distinctive positions particularly, are formed by the affirmation that at heart Christianity is relational and devotional, not abstract or conceptual. The central goal of theology is to foster the Christian life. Theological inquiry is only partially planned and structured by humans; it is also an openness and discipleship to the Savior. For Moravians, prayer and worship are essential components in undertaking theological study and discourse. *The Ground of the Unity*, a deliberately revisable statement of principles used by the world-wide Moravian Church, opens with the following:²²

1. The Lord Jesus Christ calls His Church into being so that it may serve Him on earth until He comes. The *Unitas Fratrum* is, therefore, aware of its being called in faith to serve mankind by proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It recognizes this call to be the source of its being and the inspiration of its service. As is the source, so is the aim and end of its being based on the will of its Lord.
2. With the whole of Christendom we share faith in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. We believe and confess that God has revealed Himself once and for all in His Son Jesus Christ; that our Lord has redeemed us with the whole of mankind by His death and His resurrection; and that there is no salvation apart from Him. We believe that He is present with us in the Word and Sacrament; that He directs and unites us through His Spirit and thus forms us into a Church. We hear

22 The most recent text of the *Ground of the Unity* is that revised by the Unity Synod (the international assembly of the Unity) which was held in 1995 in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. The revision concerned Para. 4 “God’s Word and Doctrine.” The following note accompanied the revision: “The difficulty experienced with the formulation of 1957 was a wording adopted by the Synod which had never been used by the Moravian Church before. Moravians have always called Scripture ‘the only rule (norm, standard) of faith and doctrine.’ In the statement of 1957 it was for the first time also called ‘the only source’ which was interpreted by some Moravians as meaning ‘the only source of information about everything.’ Moravians have also always believed that God was the source of their life, not just the book, as important as it is, which bears witness about God. Jesus in John 5:39 says that people search Scriptures because they think to have eternal life in them, but rather do they bear witness to him, the One who is the source of life.” For further information concerning the *Ground* prior to the changes of 1995, see C. Daniel Crews, *Confessing Our Unity In Christ. Historical and Theological Background to “The Ground of the Unity,”* prepared for presentation to the Moravian Clergy Association (January 6, 1994) and published at the request of the Provincial Elders Conference, Southern Province. The changes in #4 were proposed by the Northern and Southern Provinces in their 1994 and 1995 meetings prior to the international Synod, further suggestions were proposed by the Theological College in Mbeya, Tanzania, and then Unity Synod modified the text in the process of accepting it. As a source of doctrine we also call attention to the Church Order of the *Unitas Fratrum* (Moravian Church), published by the Moravian Church, *Unitas Fratrum*,: Lansdowne, Republic of South Africa, 1988. The present version of this is as revised by the Unity Synod in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, in 1995. This document, which is foundational for the Church Orders of all the provinces, includes The Ground of the Unity, Essential Features of the Unity, Constitution of the *Unitas Fratrum*, Church Life in the *Unitas Fratrum*, and Mission Outreach. The section on Church Life includes subsections on the important areas of sacraments and ministry.

Besides these sources of doctrinal reflection and understanding, Moravians would call attention to the Book of Worship, especially the Easter Morning Liturgy which is primarily a confession of the faith of the Church. Moravian Churches around the world may use various catechisms and there is a history of various catechisms used in the North American Moravian Church, the last revision being: *Catechism of the Moravian Church, Published by Order of the Provincial Synod of 1956*. On the history of Catechisms in the Moravian Church see “Catechisms in the Moravian Church in America: A Brief Preliminary Report to the Interprovincial Faith and Order Commission” by C. Daniel Crews, November 1994 (unpublished).

There is also the *Moravian Covenant for Christian Living* (previously called the *Brotherly Agreement*) which is supposedly signed by members of Moravian congregations and over the years has undergone numerous changes. This has its origin in the manorial rules signed by the congregation in Herrnhut in 1727. Since the 1960s this has had a doctrinal section at the beginning partially based on the *Ground of the Unity*.”

Him summoning us to follow Him, and pray Him to use us in His service. He joins us together mutually, so that knowing ourselves to be members of His body we become willing to serve each other.

In the light of divine grace, we recognize ourselves to be a Church of sinners. We require forgiveness daily, and live only through the mercy of God in Christ Jesus our Lord. He redeems us from our isolation and unites us into a living Church of Jesus Christ.

3. The belief of the Church is effected and preserved through the testimony of Jesus Christ and through the work of the Holy Spirit. This testimony calls each individual personally, and leads him to the recognition of sin and to the acceptance of the redemption achieved by Christ. In fellowship with Him the love of Christ becomes more and more the power of the new life, power which penetrates and shapes the entire person. As God's Spirit so effects living belief in the hearts of individuals, He grants them the privilege to share in the fruits of Christ's salvation and membership in His body.

To balance what might be perceived as a tilt toward the "internal," or "subjective" or "heart theology," the *Ground* continues with "external," or "objective," or "mind" factors:

4. The Triune God as revealed in the Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testament is the only source of our life and salvation; and this Scripture is the sole standard of the doctrine and faith of the *Unitas Fratrum* and therefore shapes our life.

The *Unitas Fratrum* recognizes the Word of the Cross as the center of Holy Scripture and of all preaching of the Gospel and sees its primary mission, and its reason for being, to consist in bearing witness to this joyful message. We ask our Lord for power never to stray from this.

The *Unitas Fratrum* takes part in the continual search for sound doctrine. In interpreting the Scripture and in the communication of doctrine in the Church, we look to two millennia of ecumenical Christian tradition and the wisdom of our Moravian forebears in the faith to guide us as we pray for fuller understanding and ever clearer proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. But just as the Holy Scripture does not contain any doctrinal system, so the *Unitas Fratrum* also has not developed any of its own, because it knows that the mystery of Jesus Christ which is attested to in the Bible, cannot be comprehended completely by any human mind or expressed completely in any human statement. Also it is true that through the Holy Spirit the recognition of God's will for salvation in the Bible is revealed completely and clearly.

5. The *Unitas Fratrum* recognizes in the creeds of the Church the thankful acclaim of the Body of Christ. These creeds aid the Church in formulating a Scriptural confession, in marking the boundary of heresies, and in exhorting believers to an obedient and fearless testimony in every age. The *Unitas Fratrum* maintains that all creeds formulated by the Christian Church stand in need of constant testing in the light of the Holy Scriptures. It acknowledges as such true professions of faith the early Christian witness: "Jesus Christ is Lord!" and also especially the ancient Christian creeds and the fundamental creeds of the Reformation.*

*Note: In the various provinces of the Renewed *Unitas Fratrum* the following creeds in particular gained special importance, because in them the main doctrines of the Christian faith find clear and simple expression:

The Apostles' Creed
The Athanasian Creed

The Nicene Creed
The Confession of the Unity of the Bohemian Brethren of 1535
The Twenty-One Articles of the *Unaltered Augsburg Confession*
The Shorter Catechism of Martin Luther
The Synod of Berne of 1532
The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England
The Theological Declaration of Barmen of 1934
The Heidelberg Catechism

Moravians consider truth neither as a quantity to possess nor as able to be finalized in formulas. Truth involves a personal journey in the company of other believers toward the fulfillment God promises in the crucified and risen Lord who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. The Christian community is part and parcel of the Unity's theological method and purposes. That "company" is a "living Church" which witnesses for Christ to the world." Again from the *Ground*:

52. A church is and remains a living one when it: is attentive to God's Word, confesses its sins and accepts forgiveness for them, seeks and maintains fellowship with its Lord and Redeemer by means of the Sacraments, places its whole life under His rule and daily leading, ministers to its neighbour and seeks brotherhood with all who confess Christ, proclaims to the world the tidings concerning the Saviour, awaits whole-heartedly the coming of its Lord as King.

Moravians, wary of concretizing the Christian faith in humanly developed theological statements, encourage both structure and freedom in theological discourse. Their openness to the personal and devotional dimensions of theological methods is a reminder of the arid arguments of 16th-18th century successors to the Reformers, and places a lively emphasis on the Spirit's activity in theological methods and discussions. Recollection and narration of historical experience, both communal and personal, and worship shape theological method and expression. While worship reflects theology in most communions, the Moravian worship shapes and empowers theology as relational and devotional, and recalls significant events in the Unity's history. The Easter Liturgy, for example, is designed to be a confessional service. Citations from the *Small Catechism's* Explanations to the Apostles' Creed are prominent in the service. Perhaps we may draw a rough analogy between Lutherans and Moravians at this point: what the Confessions are to Lutherans, the Unity's history and worship are to Moravians.

In summary, Lutheran and Moravian theological methods differ from each other, yet we venture to conclude that the differences are mutually supportive and complementary. If Moravians counsel Lutherans about the divisive and self-defeating risks of doctrinal polemics, Lutherans counsel Moravians about the need to develop greater clarity and consistency in stating their interpretations of the faith. Both approaches need each other in order to undertake theological efforts which are carefully formulated and open to the power of God for the Church and the world. We turn now to some key Mutual Affirmations, and Complementarities.

B. Mutual Affirmations

The lines between Affirmations and Complementarities may be said to be more porous than they are either sharp or blurred. On the one hand, our backgrounds in the Reformation

and Pietism, refracted through our experience in North America, result in significantly large areas of agreement. After all, we affirm the Reformation's principles in virtually identical terms. We seek to apply the Bible to our faith, practice, and mission. Our churches profess and use the three historic creeds of western Christianity, the doctrinal articles of the *Augsburg Confession*, and the *Small Catechism*. On the other hand, our backgrounds, experiences, and present self-understandings lead us to express ourselves differently in doctrinal and liturgical methods and attitudes. The differences, however, prove to be mutually supportive and enriching—hence the porosity between Affirmations and Complementarities. Put simply, we are not clones one of the other, but sheep from the same fold called to journey more closely with one another as we follow our Shepherd.

Three interpenetrating and important areas fit the description “Mutual Affirmations,” and deserve particular comment. Our churches expect to recognize in each other substantial agreement on the nature of the Gospel and on the sacraments. The dialoguers also realized that the Biblical-Reformation principle of justification is essential to that agreement. In presentations and discussions we explored our historical and theological understandings of the Word of God as the traditional framework for the three areas. The dialogue showed that our respective communions have comparable spectrums of diverse attitudes toward and positions on the Word as Law and Gospel and as Scripture. We discerned no significant differences between our churches in content, our attitudes toward, and methods of understanding the Word of God. To aid our churches in the movement toward full communion, the dialoguers concluded that it would be helpful to discuss our mutual affirmations on the Gospel of God in Jesus Christ, Justification by Faith, and the Sacraments.

1. The Gospel

Moravians and Lutherans affirm the centrality, power, and authority of the Gospel in Jesus Christ. God's revelation in and through the Gospel may be expressed in conceptual terms, yet it is far more than doctrines and formulas. Indeed, the Gospel is not an “it;” the Gospel is a person, Jesus of Nazareth. He is the Word made human, alive and present in, with, and through our experiences, dilemmas, and hopes. He is God in person, that is, really present in every area and situation of life as well as by personally relating God's grace and acceptance to us.

To believe in the Gospel is to trust with our whole beings and to profess in our words and actions that Jesus is our Savior and Shepherd. Through his incarnation, death, resurrection, and exaltation, he seals God's promises to be with his people and to raise them to eternal life. The message of God's presence and assurance of everlasting fellowship is proclaimed as saving good news in the Scripture, heard in preaching and words of reconciliation spoken by believers, and made visible in the sacraments. This message is named Jesus; he is the divine Promise in fully human form.

Lutherans and Moravians affirm that all persons need the Gospel because we are sinners unable to merit God's favor. Left to ourselves, we are in bondage to evil and headed toward spiritual death. The good news in Christ, however, bestows forgiveness from and reconciliation with God. Jesus' death and resurrection break the power of sin and evil. Moreover, we agree that God's mercy is inseparable from our being renewed through the

Spirit to serve God and do God's will. To believe the Gospel, that is, to trust in Christ's gift of life through grace produces "good fruits and good works."²³

At the same time, Moravians and Lutherans agree that believers are far from being perfect. We experience the Word of God as Law as well as Gospel. The Law calls humans to account, accusing us of sin, and driving us to God's mercy in Christ. The Law of God continually sends us to the Gospel and to Jesus, for the Gospel gives us freely what the Law demands of us. Given the dialectic of Law and Gospel, Lutherans and Moravians agree that through the actions of Law and Gospel we are simultaneously sinners and justified. Further, we discuss within our communions the role of the Law in the life and conduct of believers. However we may debate that role of the Law within our churches, we are convinced that the Law is never a means to salvation; we rely fully on the Gospel, the grace of God in Jesus Christ. Concomitantly, our understanding of the persistence of sin leads us to the joint understanding that the realm of political, cultural, and organizational structures are to be ruled and judged by God's Law. Neither Moravians nor Lutherans are utopians who expect the Kingdom of God to come through human efforts and arrangements. At the same time, we understand ourselves to be called by God to participate in society as responsible citizens and to seek justice for all persons.

In order to communicate the Gospel faithfully, Lutherans and Moravians proclaim Christ according to the Holy Scriptures. As noted in the *Ground of the Unity* and the *Formula of Concord*, we understand Scripture to be our guide, norm, and source for teachings, practices, and conduct. Because Moravians and Lutherans understand the Scripture as the normative witness to Jesus Christ for the Church, we affirm scriptural authority without being biblical literalists. We employ historical and other analytical and scholarly means to understand biblical texts and meanings. When we affirm the Reformation principle *sola Scriptura*, "Scripture alone," we mean, at the very least, that no ecclesiastical authority or pious custom can impose doctrines, actions, and attitudes on persons as conditions for their reconciliation with and salvation by God which are not clearly enjoined in the Scripture.

In summary, Lutherans and Moravians understand the Gospel to be personal and relational, expressed in human form in Jesus. He engages persons and communities, challenging and encouraging them to see, hear, and follow him in discipleship. We understand that Gospel to give us freely what the Law demands of us by bringing us into fellowship with Jesus, our Savior-Shepherd. Moravians and Lutherans, then, agree with and affirm each other's understandings of the Gospel, the Scriptures, and the relationship of Law and Gospel.

23 *Augsburg Confession*, VI. Our liturgies reflect these views with remarkable similarities. The *Moravian Book of Worship* (Bethlehem and Winston-Salem: The Moravian Church in America, 1995) reflects phrasings which appear also in *Lutheran Book of Worship* (Minneapolis and Philadelphia: Augsburg Publishing House and Board of Publication, Lutheran Church in America, 1978). Our churches share the following almost *verbatim*: "Most merciful God, we confess that we have sinned against you in thought, word, and deed, by what we have done and by what we have left undone. We have not loved you with our whole heart; we have not loved our neighbors as ourselves. We are truly sorry, and we humbly repent. For the sake of your Son Jesus Christ, have mercy on us and forgive us, that we may delight in your will, and walk in your ways, to the glory of your name. Amen" (*Moravian Book of Worship*, General Liturgy 3, pg. 21). See *Lutheran Book of Worship*, "Most merciful God, we confess that we are in bondage to sin and cannot free ourselves. We have sinned against you in thought, word, and deed, by what we have done and by what we have left undone. We have not loved you with our whole heart; we have not loved our neighbors as ourselves. For the sake of your Son, Jesus Christ, have mercy on us. Forgive us, renew us, and lead us, so that we may delight in your will and walk in your ways, to the glory of your holy name. Amen" (pgs. 56, repeated on pgs. 77 and 98).

The dialoguers recognized that the biblical themes we used varied not in content but proportion. Moravians tend to look first to the life of Jesus as presented in the Gospel of John, and then they move toward the Pauline writings. Lutherans realized they usually began with Paul, especially the epistles to the Galatians, Romans, and Ephesians. Both Lutherans and Moravians rely substantially on the Fourth Gospel for understanding Jesus as the Word of God.

2. Justification

Lutherans and Moravians share the same emphases and understandings of the biblical and Reformation theme of justification by faith through grace without works of the Law.²⁴ This doctrine concerns Law and Gospel as well as the role of Jesus. In this area Moravians and Lutherans are in agreement and mutual affirmation on the Reformation principles *sola gratia* (by grace alone) and *sola fide* (by faith alone). There are numerous models which are used biblically and in the Church's history to express the content of justification, yet the point is that God forgives and is reconciled with sinners not by the merits or deeds or worthiness of the sinners but solely by divine free, gracious will and action in and through Jesus Christ. The divine gift is grasped by believers who are called, enlightened, and led to faith through the Holy Spirit.

Once more, our common grounding in the Reformation and the development of the Reformation through Pietism leads Moravians and Lutherans to express themselves clearly about the graciousness of God in justifying sinners and imparting to them the Spirit through Christ. Moravians will speak in terms of the Lamb who was slain and being clothed in his righteousness. One of Zinzendorf's hymns expresses the thought and devotion:

The Saviour's blood and righteousness
My beauty is, my glorious dress;
Thus well-arrayed, I need not fear,
When in his presence I appear.

The holy, spotless Lamb of God,
Who freely gave his life and blood
For all my numerous sins to atone,
I for my Lord and Saviour own.

Therefore my Saviour's blood and death
Are here the substance of my faith;
And shall remain, when I am called hence,
My only hope and confidence.

Lord Jesus Christ, all praise to thee,
That thou didst deign a man to be,
And for each soul which thou hast made
Hast an eternal ransom paid.

Thy incarnation, wounds and death
I will confess while I have breath,
Till I shall see thee face to face
Arrayed with thy righteousness.²⁵

Historically Lutherans have tended to use a forensic model of justification in which punishment and condemnation are juxtaposed against justification. A late sixteenth century Lutheran theologian wrote that Romans 8 clearly shows

24 A current theological discussion deals with the nuances of stating the principle as "justification by faith through grace" and "justification by grace through faith." The dialoguers did not enter discussions on that issue. For the sake of consistency and without making a commitment on either side of the question, this report uses "justification by faith through grace."

25 The hymn is 327 in the 1969 *Hymnal of the Moravian Church*. A modernized translation is in the new *Moravian Book of Worship* (Hymn 776) and a portion is used in one of the communion rituals (pg. 201). The "dress of righteousness" reflects Luther's view of the righteousness of God which is "alien" to humanity, see Luther's sermon on "The Two Kinds of Righteousness," (*Luther's Works* volume 31, pgs. 293-306). Note also in the Lutheran *Service Book and Hymnal*, 376 in which verses 2-4 are by Zinzendorf and express the same ideas.

...the proper and true meaning of the word “justify.”... It agrees entirely with the forensic meaning, that we are absolved before the judgment of God, for Christ’s sake, from the guilt of sin and from damnation, pronounced just, and received to eternal life...The Law accuses all of being under sin. Every mouth is stopped, and the whole world is made to stand guilty before God, because by the works of the Law no flesh is justified. But we are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption, etc.... [The] meaning of the word justify is judicial, namely that the sinner, accused by the Law of God, convicted, and subjected to the sentence of eternal damnation, fleeing in faith to the throne of grace, is absolved for Christ’s sake, reckoned and declared righteous, received into grace, and accepted to eternal life.”²⁶

Both churches teach that sinners are justified by Christ through grace and are called by the Spirit to newness of life. While believers still may sin and need the accusatory use of the Law to humble them, they are nevertheless still justified. Forgiveness and renewal, mercy and transformation are inseparable. That is, forgiveness is not the terminal point of justification. Forgiveness is reception into life with God in the Church, and so leads to discipleship. Justification leads to discipleship (a distinctive Moravian theme) and the new obedience (a Lutheran term rooted in the *Augsburg Confession*, Article VIII).

To summarize: Lutherans and Moravians agree with and affirm one another’s views of justification. This agreement and affirmation also includes our understanding of the Gospel.

3. The Sacraments

Explorations of our respective positions concerning the sacraments are both simple and complex. The simple or uncomplicated aspect is that we agree fully on there being two sacraments, baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and our theologies concerning those sacraments are in harmony, perhaps total agreement. This is not surprising since the *Small Catechism* has not only been used and cherished by Lutherans but has played a significant role historically in the Moravian Church. Both of us practice infant baptism and maintain the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Complexity enters through the emphases, explications, and expectations we have in these areas. Again, there is agreement and affirmation, but not uniformity. Again, we learned from one another.

A basic, far-reaching question is why we have sacraments at all? An obvious, profound answer is, “Because Christ commanded his followers to baptize and to share the Supper.” Probing the response raises several factors.

First, we are commanded to administer and participate in the sacraments because we are human beings, not disembodied spirits. We need the sacraments. They are physical means through which God addresses us with the divine message of salvation. The sacraments are the Word of God in visible, tangible, even tasteable form. That Word is so intimately conjoined to the earthly elements of water, bread, and wine that these elements are bearers of God’s revelation of grace to men and women. In, with, and under the physical materials is God’s Word—Christ—speaking, cleansing, nourishing, and renewing his people. Because we are bodily creatures, we need the Word in physical as well as spoken form.

26 Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent, Part 1*, translated by Fred Kramer, St. Louis: Concordia, 1971, pgs. 473-474. Melancthon also used the juridical or forensic model, *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, Article IV, section 304-305.

Second, we are commanded to administer and participate in the sacraments because we are anxious sinners. The sacraments are God's Word of reconciling assurance, mercy, and hope to persons who are in despair, have troubled consciences, and realize their unworthiness. Here the sacraments are active demonstrations of God's justifying grace. While we are yet sinners, helpless to merit divine favor, and alienated from God, God comes to us. The sacraments meet us in our futility and weakness to proclaim purpose and to offer us strength. The sacraments provide us with another means by which we can know of God's faithfulness, and they are an anchor for our faith.

Third, we are commanded to administer and participate in the sacraments because we need the external forms to structure our spiritual responses. The Reformation contained movements which advocated the jettisoning of physical forms in favor of direct or unmediated revelations through persons who claimed special inspirations and insights. The sacraments keep us earth-bound, furnish us with a framework which gives us a sense of order in order for the God who created the world to approach us with saving grace in the incarnate Lord.

Fourth, we are commanded to administer and participate in the sacraments because they offer us individual and communal identities. Both baptism and Eucharist name and designate us as members of the Body of Christ and heirs of the Kingdom through Jesus. The Lord who promises to be with us in all conditions knows us by name, by our unique beings, and so incorporates us into the death and resurrection of Jesus, cleanses us from sin, reveals Christ's presence, nourishes us, assures us of forgiveness, and empowers us to new life in the Spirit. While the Word of God in its other forms also testifies of these gifts, the sacraments convey these to us through creaturely means. A corollary of the same point is that the sacraments are means by which the Holy Spirit engages us as individuals and for mission in the world.

Behind the bare commandments to baptize and to share the supper is God's promise of grace. The sacraments are the Gospel in visible form. Through the Gospel, God evokes, sustains, and nourishes the faith by which we are united with Christ and receive his salvation. Another way to express the same idea is to say that through the Gospel, God enters into a personal relationship with us. The sacraments are visible means which form and express that relationship.

Since agreement concerning the sacraments is a major issue in ecumenical discussions, it is appropriate to continue our mutual affirmations further.

a. Sacrament of Baptism

Lutherans and Moravians agree with and affirm one another's positions that through baptism we are initiated into the Church, united to Christ by the Spirit, and enter into a covenantal relationship with God and our fellow Christians. Through baptism we undertake our life journeys in God's grace and to grow in faith through the Spirit. The covenantal dimensions of baptism are stated in our liturgies. At the beginning of the sacramental rite, a Moravian officiant says:

In grace God called and chose the people of Israel and established with them a covenant: I will be your God and you will be my people. In that relationship they were to be freed from sin and become a blessing to all. Then God came to us in Jesus Christ and fulfilled that covenant for all people. Through Christ's life, death, and resurrection, God made for us a new covenant of grace....

Our Lord Jesus Christ instituted baptism as the visible means of entry into the new covenant. Baptism is a gift of God. In this sacrament, through grace and the power of the Holy Spirit, we are united with Christ, are cleansed by his saving work, enter into the fellowship of the church, and are called to a life of faith and willing obedience.²⁷

The Lutheran officiant begins,

In Holy Baptism our gracious heavenly Father liberates us from sin and death by joining us to the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. We are born children of a fallen humanity: in the waters of Baptism we are reborn children of God and inheritors of eternal life. By water and the Holy Spirit we are made members of the Church which is the Body of Christ. As we live with him and with his people, we grow in faith, love, and obedience to the will of God.²⁸

We also share understanding baptism to involve on-going growth in the Spirit. The Lutheran minister charges the parents of infants and young children who are to be baptized:

In Christian love you have presented *these children* for Holy Baptism. You should, therefore, faithfully bring *them* to the services of God's house, and teach *them* the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments. As *they* grow in years, you should place in *their* hands the Holy Scriptures and provide for *their* instruction in the Christian faith, that, living in the covenant of *their* baptism and in communion with the Church, *they* may lead godly *lives* until the day of Jesus Christ.²⁹

The Moravian minister asks:

Relying on the power of the Holy Spirit, do you promise to lead your *children* by prayer, instruction, and example toward that time when *they* can by grace confirm *their* faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and commit *themselves* to the life and work of the church?³⁰

Both rites provide for the congregation to welcome the newly baptized into the whole Church through the acclamation of the congregation.³¹

We noted that Moravians and Lutherans consider the rite of confirmation to be an affirmation of baptism. The respective liturgies echo the promises made by parents and sponsors at the baptism of infants and children.³²

To summarize: Lutherans and Moravians agree with and affirm one another's views of the Sacrament of Baptism.

²⁷ *Moravian Book of Worship*, pg. 165.

²⁸ *Lutheran Book of Worship*, pg. 121.

²⁹ *Lutheran Book of Worship*, pg. 121.

³⁰ *Moravian Book of Worship*, pg. 166.

³¹ See *Lutheran Book of Worship*, pgs. 124f. and *Moravian Book of Worship*, pg. 169. In the Moravian liturgy the acclamation is through a hymn of welcome which also includes the motif of growth in grace and the congregation's pledge of love.

³² *Moravian Book of Worship*, pgs. 170-174 and *Lutheran Book of Worship*, pgs. 198-201.

b. Sacrament of Communion

Moravians and Lutherans agree that Jesus calls the community of believers to be a communion in the Spirit, united in love, and sent to serve. Further, we agree that the Sacrament celebrates this communion, strengthens the bonds of mutual relationships, and promises that God will be with us as we live in the world. Still further, we agree that the Eucharist is “for you and for the forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation are given to us in the sacrament, for where there is forgiveness of sins, there are also life and salvation.” (*Small Catechism, VI*).

From the 16th to the present century Lutherans have engaged in significant intra-church and ecumenical debates which have centered in the “Real Presence” of Christ in, with, and under the forms of bread and wine. The concerns expressed include whether or not there is a change of substance in the elements, the relation of ordained ministers to the Eucharist, the natures of the Christ who is present, whether the grace of God is diminished by stressing the recipients’ faith, and communing with and/or under the auspices of Christians who do not hold the same theological views. Moravians, wary of past polemics and aware of the need for humans to be humble when describing God’s ways, appreciate the concerns involved in discussing Christ’s presence. Lutherans and Moravians agreed that in the Lord’s Supper, Christ gives his body and blood according to his promise to all who partake of the elements. When we eat and drink the bread and the wine of the Supper with expectant faith, we thereby have communion with the body and blood of our Lord, and receive the forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. In this sense, the bread and wine are rightly said to be Christ’s body and blood which he gives to his disciples. We are united with Jesus in the Supper and with one another in the fellowship of his body, and we enjoy a foretaste of the great marriage feast of the Lamb. We joyfully confess the mystery of the Lord’s Supper in the faith that the love of Christ knows no limits, acknowledging that no human theory can fully or finally account for it.

As anticipated, Moravian liturgies indicate the breadth and depth of their understandings of communion. This may be seen in the Unity’s having not one general communion liturgy but four. Each of the four reflects distinct themes correlated to the Church Year.³³ As anticipated, congregational singing and an emphasis on the relationship of the worshipers to one another are prominent. The opening rubric of all the communion services is “The congregation gives the right hand of fellowship, signifying oneness in Christ and the desire to be at peace with one another.” The hymn which follows the handshake of peace in the communion liturgies for “Celebration of Christ’s Coming” and “Celebration of the Resurrection” illustrates well the twin themes of the unity of believers and the covenantal relationship with God in Christ:

We covenant with hand and heart to follow Christ our Lord;
with world, and sin, and self to part, and to obey his word;

33 The four themes are In Celebration of Christ’s Coming, of the Atonement, of the Resurrection, and of the Holy Spirit. There are seven “General Liturgies” (General, Reconciliation, Adoration, Creation, Grace, Discipleship, and Celebration). A series of other liturgies related to the liturgical calendar and a number of topical liturgies in addition to a cluster of occasional services complete the roster of liturgies. The Lutheran liturgical tradition reflected in the *Lutheran Book of Worship* has three different musical settings of what is basically the same service, Holy Communion, a number of formats tied to the times of worship (e.g., morning and evening prayer, compline), other types of services (e.g., Service of the Word, Responsive Prayer, etc.), and some occasional services.

to love each other heartily, in truth and with sincerity,
and under cross, reproach, and shame, to glorify his name.³⁴

The Moravian concern is not for the mode or extent of Christ's presence; they understand that Jesus is fully present with his promises and gifts in manners which God determines and actualizes through the Spirit. A distinctive Moravian contribution is the emphasis on the covenantal unity shared by God, the individual, the local fellowship of believers, and the whole Body of Christ. One hymn in the communion liturgy for atonement expresses it well for both Lutherans and Moravians:³⁵

Own your congregation, gracious Paschal Lamb;
we are here assembled in your holy name;
look upon your people whom you by your blood
have in love redeemed and brought nigh to God.
You have kindly led us through our joys and tears;
now accept our praises and remove our fears.
Grant us all with gladness to obey your voice;
let your will and pleasure be our only choice.
May your church arrayed in the glorious dress
of the Lord and Savior's spotless righteousness,
be both now and forever by your blood kept clean,
and in all its members may your grace be seen.

To summarize: Moravians and Lutherans agree with and affirm one another's understandings of the Sacrament of Communion.



The Mutual Affirmations indicate diversity within our agreements, yet the affirmations are extensive, profound, and unforced. Our summary of the summaries at this point is that Lutherans and Moravians agree with and affirm one another's understandings of the Gospel and Sacraments.

C. Mutual Complementarities

A complement is neither a compliment nor a supplement. The former praises while the latter appends something related but different to the original. A complement completes an idea or position, moves a discussion or practice toward consummation, expands on what is already present so that the original reaches toward wholeness. Throughout the dialogue,

³⁴ The hymn "In Celebration of the Atonement" is:

Come, then, come, O flock of Jesus, covenant with him anew; unto him, who conquered for us, pledge we love and service true; let our mutual love be glowing; thus will the world plainly see that we, as on one stem growing, living branches are in thee.

The hymn "In Celebration of the Holy Spirit" is:

I come with joy to meet my Lord, forgiven, loved, and free; in awe and wonder to recall his life hid down for me.
As Christ breaks bread and bids us share, each proud division ends; the love that made us, makes us one, and strangers now are friends.

³⁵ *Moravian Book of Worship*, pg. 205.

Lutherans and Moravians recognized and discovered complementarities. Sometimes those complementarities were related to our methods and forms of expressing our positions and perspectives. In those instances one partner discerned that what we said in our separate ways could be enriched by listening to the other's agreement with and expansion of the statement and practice. At other times the position of one illumined a theme which the other had de-emphasized over time, thereby encouraging both to recover and consider cultivating what was present. On still other occasions, we informed one another of problems which our respective traditions had encountered but which could be seen now, with the assistance and prodding of the other to be valued and helpful in our present contexts. Our reciprocal and mutual searching for and finding moved us to appreciate our respective teachings and practices while we deepened our progress toward recommending that our churches establish full communion with each other.

Three areas of complementarities are tightly linked to one another, our methods, and Affirmations. Moreover, each involves the Holy Spirit's involvement with the believer, the Church, and ministry. The three areas are: 1) the Holy Spirit, the Believer, and the Christian Life; 2) the Holy Spirit in the Church; and 3) Our Churches' Ministry and Polity. A preliminary comment is in order. While our respective bodies would benefit from thorough examinations and expositions of our understandings about and experiences of the Holy Spirit, this report is limited in scope and purpose. Our joint grounding in the Bible provides us with a wealth of images, ideas, learnings, and perspectives on the interactions of the Spirit within the Godhead, humanity, nature, history, the Church, believers, and the consummation of all existence. Moravians and Lutherans believe, teach, and confess faith in the Triune God in terms which are recognized and confirmed throughout the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. Because both churches have had to respond to significant challenges related to the Spirit, each is cautious, perhaps overly so, when discussing the Spirit's roles in revelation, the lives of individual believers, and the witness of the whole Church. In the present, however, Christians in many communions are overcoming their anxieties related to the Spirit, and are recognizing as well as recovering positive and creative emphases about the Spirit.

Among the texts Moravians and Lutherans share is the Explanation of the Third Article of the Apostles' Creed in Luther's *Small Catechism*.³⁶

I believe that by my own reason or strength I cannot believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to him. But the Holy Spirit has called me through the Gospel, enlightened me with his gifts, and sanctified and preserved me in true faith, just as he calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian church on earth and preserves it in union with Jesus Christ in the one true faith. In this Christian church he daily and abundantly forgives all my sins, and the sins of all believers, and on the last day he will raise me and all the dead and will grant eternal life to me and all who believe in Christ.

This is most certainly true.

Several articles of another commonly held document, the *Augsburg Confession*, express the same views.³⁷ The Catechism's statement presupposes the positions and ambiguities

³⁶ As noted previously, the Explanation of the Third Article is included in the Moravian liturgy for Easter morning and has the character of a statement of faith. The Explanations to the articles are widely known and cherished by Lutherans.

³⁷ See the *Augsburg Confession*, Articles II, III, V, XVIII and XX.

developed by the Church over the centuries concerning issues such as the substance, persons, begottenness of the Son, procession of the Spirit, and others related to the Godhead. These matters have never been at issue between Lutherans and Moravians. Likewise, the Explanation does not deal with a number of important areas involving the Spirit, e.g., creation, providence, and wisdom. These may be explored fruitfully in other and subsequent venues.

1. The Holy Spirit, the Believer, and the Christian Life

The Catechism's Explanations of the first and second articles of the Creed open with the believer's awareness of God's loving care for the person and conclude with the Christian's looking forward in trust and joy to serving the Creator and Redeemer. The central sections of the initial two Explanations present humans as totally helpless to undertake any actions which deserve or merit divine favor, while God is praised for the gifts and assurances which provide for temporal and eternal life.³⁸ Luther's Third Explanation, however, provides an energy and coherence for the article which can be seen retrospectively as crucial for the other two articles and which extends into the believer's faith, deeds, and relationships. That energy and coherence engage Lutherans and Moravians in agreeing and complementing one another's faith and practice. To illumine our complementarities in this area, we present three points concerning the Spirit's relationship with individual believers which grow out of the following: a) all persons need the Spirit in order to come to faith in Christ; b) Christians still need the Spirit to admonish and call them to repentance even though they are justified; and c) the Spirit is the source and power of sanctification in the life of the believer.

First, although language expressing justification by faith is not used directly, justification, as Moravians and Lutherans affirm it, suffuses and shapes the Explanation's views of humans and Jesus. Parenthetically, that a forensic or other mode of expressing justification is not used here points to the realization that justification is not and cannot be limited to one or another mode. Yet the Catechism takes us deeper. It insists that only through the Spirit can one believe in or come to Jesus as her or his Lord and Savior.

Here as elsewhere, Lutherans underscore justification through grace, whatever the mode or metaphor, deriving their understandings from Pauline, Augustinian, and Reformation sources. These sources stress the sovereignty of God's power to save, and that God's will to save through grace is mediated via the Spirit. Lutherans recognize that there is no other way for us to enter a saving relationship with God except through God's action. The Spirit is that Person of the Trinity through whom we know Christ and the Creator. Moreover, the Spirit generates in us the faith needed to grasp the grace offered so that we may come to Christ and the Maker of all. Lutherans regard justification as "the main doctrine of

³⁸ The Explanation to the First Article reads:

I believe that God has created me and all that exists; that he has given me and still sustains my body and soul, all my limbs and senses, my reason and all the faculties of my mind, together with food and clothing, house and home, family and property; that he provides me daily and abundantly with all the necessities of life, protects me from all danger, and preserves me from all evil. All this he does out of his pure, fatherly and divine goodness and mercy, without any merit or worthiness on my part. For all of this I am bound to thank, praise, serve, and obey him. This is most certainly true.

The Explanation to the Second Article is:

I believe that Jesus Christ, true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the virgin Mary, is my Lord, who has redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature, delivered me and freed me from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil, not with silver and gold but with his own holy and precious blood and with his innocent sufferings and death, in order that I may be his, live under him in his kingdom, and serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness, even as he is risen from the dead and lives and reigns to all eternity. This is most certainly true.

Christianity...[which] when properly understood, it illumines and magnifies the honor of Christ and brings to pious consciences the abundant consolation that they need.”³⁹ There can be no doubt or compromise, Lutherans claim, about the clarity and certainty that we are justified by faith alone without works of the Law as a gift of God’s grace in Christ.⁴⁰ Certainly, Lutherans understand justification to be on the basis of Christ’s sacrifice, so that through his death and resurrection we have both the promises and the reality of the forgiveness of sins and reconciliation with God. Indeed, the “Gospel is, strictly speaking, the promise of forgiveness of sins and justification because of Christ.”⁴¹ And all these “benefits” of Christ are given through the Spirit.

The Lutheran expression of the point that all persons need the Spirit in order to come to faith in Christ has a sonority and passionate logic borne of the heat of debates and controversies in the sixteenth and subsequent centuries-and which are still current today. While not losing sight of the incarnate Lord, Lutherans are determined to express their views of the Spirit, justification, and the Christian life in terms which deny any hint of works righteousness or human merit which might prompt God’s favor. Relying on Pauline terms and their Reformation heritage, Lutherans see and listen to contemporary society, including church life, as prone to both works righteousness and a careless sentimentality about God’s love. A Lutheran contribution and complement at this juncture is a staunch insistence on justification as an unmerited gift from God through the Spirit.

The Moravian perspective complements the Lutheran view. Moravians highlight justification as the believer entering a personal relationship with Jesus through the Spirit. The Unity agrees fully that justification is by faith, apart from works of the Law, and recognizes justification as a God-given assurance that the person belongs to and in Jesus. In other words, while recognizing justification as a core doctrine, Moravians express their understanding of it more naturally as God’s gracious invitation for a person to walk with the Savior. This fits with the Catechism Explanation’s consistent use of the personal pronouns “I, me, and mine.” The Spirit is the Person of the Trinity who sheds God’s grace abroad in the hearts of men and women so that they come to trust in, depend upon, and live in fellowship with one another as they follow Jesus. The *Ground of the Unity*, in a passage cited earlier, states that each individual is called personally and is led to a recognition of her or his sin, culminating in accepting the redemption achieved by Christ. The Spirit “effects living belief in the hearts of individuals.”⁴² There is no room here, either, for works righteousness or human pride. Again, a hymn expresses it well:

Faith is a living power from heaven
that grasps the promise that God has giv’n,
a trust that cannot be overthrown
fixed heartily on Christ alone.

Faith finds in Christ our every need
to save or strengthen us indeed;

³⁹ *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, Article IV, 2.

⁴⁰ See *Smalcald Articles* I, 1-5.

⁴¹ *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, Article IV, 43.

⁴² *Ground of the Unity*, #3.

we now receive that grace sent down,
which makes us share his cross and crown.

Faith in the conscience works for peace,
and bids the mourner's weeping cease,
by faith the children's place we claim,
and give all honor to one name.

We thank you, then, O God of heav'n,
that you to us this faith have given
In Jesus Christ your Son, who is
our only fount and source of bliss.⁴³

The Moravian experience of the Spirit in the life of the believer was not shaped by the polemics of the Reformation but by the Brethren's endurance in the Ancient Church, the "period of the hidden seed," its renewal in Continental Pietism, and its internal struggles to be faithful to the power of the Spirit and the need for witnessing to Christ as individuals and as a community. Especially under the influence of continental Pietism the *Unitas Fratrum* came to depict the Christian life as a pilgrimage with Jesus as the Leader and Companion through joys and sorrows. The journey's goal, whether called heaven or salvation, was undertaken humbly and gratefully with the Lord in the Spirit. Zinzendorf's hymn, also used by Lutherans, puts justification through grace in terms of that journey:

Jesus, still lead on till our rest be won;
and although the way be cheerless,
we will follow calm and fearless;
guide us by your hand to the promised land.

If the way be drear, if the foe be near,
let no faithless fears o'ertake us,
let not faith and hope forsake us;
safely past the foe to our home we go.

When we seek relief from a long-felt grief,
when temptations come alluring,
make us patient and enduring;
show us that bright shore where we weep no more.

Jesus, still lead on till our rest be won;
heav'nly leader still direct us,
still support, console, protect us,
still we safely stand in the promised land.⁴⁴

Moravians and Lutherans complement each other in agreeing on the point of the need for the Spirit in engendering faith through our central affirmation on justification through grace by means of the Spirit. Lutherans seek to maintain the grace of God bestowed through the Spirit against any shadow of human works and worth. The Unity endeavors to insure that the believer realizes that justification opens a gracious relationship with Jesus by means of the Spirit. Clearly we need both dimensions in understanding the wonder and grace of God.

⁴³ *Moravian Book of Worship*, 700. The words and tune date from 1556.

⁴⁴ *Moravian Book of Worship*, 799. The hymn also is in *Lutheran Book of Worship*, 341.

The second point is that it is impossible for anyone to claim that a person's faith, devotion, and experiences of God are due to human worthiness or effort in any measure at all. A believer becomes a believer only through the Spirit; and so a person is totally dependent upon God for belief, piety, and good works. The radical nature of human helplessness before God asserts divine sovereignty in salvation, but that sovereignty is recognized and realized through the Spirit who testifies to and applies the grace of Christ in and for humans. In and through the Spirit, a lost and condemned creature's heart and mind are strengthened and enlightened to recognize God's redemptive action in Jesus. Faith is the result of the Spirit's gracious action; without the Spirit, there can be no saving relationship with Jesus. The person who affirms, "This is most certainly true" can make that statement in faith because the Spirit has led and inspired the individual to confess the truth about the Truth, and then to walk on the Way through resurrection, and to abide with God just as Christ and the Father abide together.

Nevertheless, although declared righteous through Christ, the justified person is still a sinner. She or he cannot assume that now good works will earn further care or favor from God. The Spirit's dual function of accuser and comforter applies to the Christian. Through the Spirit, the believer becomes acutely conscious of both the depths of one's sin and the immensity of God's love bestowed through Christ. The Spirit both troubles and calms the believer's conscience. Christians are driven repeatedly to God's mercy in Jesus. They know that they have been redeemed not with silver or gold but with Jesus' innocent sufferings and death. Each day the believer realizes that the Spirit searches the depths of human hearts and each day forgives sins so that the person "may be Christ's and live under him" and "serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness."

The Moravian complement, as anticipated, looks toward Jesus. He is the suffering yet triumphant Lamb, the crucified and forgiving Lord. His sin-healing wounds and blood present the objective reality of God's reconciling love for humanity. Especially through the influence of Pietism as developed by Zinzendorf, the Renewed Unity affirms that centrality of the cross which eliminates any ground for human worthiness or pride. Paradoxically, the Savior's pain and death turn the believer not toward gloom and guilt but to an ever-fuller and more joyful dependence on God's grace and love. One of Christian Renatus Zinzendorf's hymns conveys the follower's heartfelt devotion to and hope in Jesus:

My Redeemer, overwhelmed with anguish, went to Olivet for me;
there he kneels, his heart does heave and languish in a bitter agony;
fear and horror seize his soul and senses,
for the hour of darkness now commences;
ah, how he does weep and groan our rebellion to atone.

Could our hearts and voices then join forces in exalted songs to raise;
yet, till joined to the celestial chorus, cold would prove our warmest praise;
Jesus' love exceeds all comprehension,
but our love to him we scarce dare mention;
we may weep beneath his cross, but he wept and bled for us.

Lamb of God, you shall remain forever of our songs the only theme;
for your boundless love, your grace and favor, we will praise your saving name;
that for our transgressions you were wounded

shall by us in nobler strains be sounded,
when we, perfected in love, once shall join the church above.⁴⁵

The Lutheran complement on the impossibility for humans to claim they are worthy of God's grace at any time may be seen clearly in terms of the Word of God as Law and Gospel. The Law continues to apply to the regenerate because of the persistence of the Old Adam even among those justified by faith. The condemnatory use of the Law drives the Christian away from any security based on human works or worthiness, and urges the believer to cling to God's grace in Christ more fervently. Christ is the "mirror of the Father's heart" apart from whom "we see nothing but an angry and terrible Judge." The Law is the mirror "in which the will of God and what is pleasing to him is correctly portrayed." The Spirit employs the Law to teach, admonish, warn, threaten, and punish Christians, "egging them on so that they may follow the Spirit of God." Lutherans are acutely aware that while the "perfect obedience of Christ covers" the sins of Christians" so that [those sins] are not reckoned to believers for damnation, and although the Holy Spirit has begun the mortification of the Old Adam and their renewal in the spirit of their minds, nevertheless the Old Adam still clings to their nature and to all its internal and external powers."⁴⁶

This point of complementarity may be summarized from the Moravian perspective as a concentration on Jesus' passion which binds believers to a personal engagement with the incarnate Word of God who truly suffered and died in giving himself for sinners. In this engagement, the Christian is drawn by the Spirit to follow the Lord humbly and thankfully. The Lutheran complement hews closely to the Law-Gospel construction which Lutherans hold is important in discerning God's will. The Lutheran contribution aids in avoiding a cloying attachment to a helpless Christ while presenting God's gracious action with intensity and clarity. Again, Lutherans and Moravians gain from one another.

The third point of complementarity under consideration deals with the continual presence and activity of the Spirit within the believer; justification is inseparable from sanctification, and sanctification leads the person into fuller awareness of God's justifying sinners by faith through grace, and calling them to live according to their calling to holiness and eternal life. A Christian is called, enlightened, sanctified, and preserved in the true faith. The person who is declared justified, who is dressed in the righteousness of Christ, is nevertheless still a sinner. The sanctifying task of the Spirit is to lead, guide, admonish, strengthen, and, when needed, expose the believer in the believer's growth in grace. Here the Catechism prepares for the Catechism's Explanation to the Lord's Prayer and foreshadows the *Augsburg Confession's* Article VI:

[In response to the Prayer's second petition] To be sure, the Kingdom of God comes of itself, without our prayer, but we pray in this petition that it may also come to us.... [T]he heavenly Father gives us his Holy Spirit so that by his grace we may believe his holy Word and live a godly life, both here in time and hereafter forever.

[Article 6's traditional title is "The New Obedience"] It is also taught among us that such faith should produce good fruits and good works and that we must do all such good works as God has commanded, but we should do them for God's sake and not place our trust in them as if thereby to merit favor before God. For we receive forgiveness of sin and righteousness through faith.

⁴⁵ *Moravian Book of Worship*, 346.

⁴⁶ For the quotations and paraphrases see *Formula of Concord*, Solid Declaration, Article VI, 7-9 and 21.

While faith may be construed as accepting right or orthodox doctrines, the Reformation meaning is far more powerful. In a passage cherished by Moravians and Lutherans alike, Luther wrote:

Faith, however, is a divine work in us which changes us and makes us to be born anew of God.... It kills the old Adam and makes us altogether different men, in heart and spirit and mind and powers; and it brings with it the Holy Spirit. O it is a living, busy, active, mighty thing, this faith. It is impossible for it not to be doing good works incessantly.... Faith is a living, daring confidence in God's grace, so sure and certain that the believer would stake his life on it a thousand times. This knowledge of and confidence in God's grace makes men glad and bold and happy in dealing with God and with all creatures. And this is the work which the Holy Spirit performs in faith.⁴⁷

The work of the Spirit may be quiet, steady, and gradual. And the Spirit may engender boldness, joy, and confidence. The Spirit's work in the believer's life may be seen in a person's works and words. It may also be felt in the Christian's heart as a warmth, openness, and acceptance generated by trusting that the Spirit seals what Christ has won for our salvation.

Lutherans and Moravians agree fully that the Spirit is active in the life of the believer in ways which lead to the individual's growth in grace. Growth in the Spirit is also growth in the grace which assures us of forgiveness, strengthens us to do God's will, emboldens us to witness to Christ, and draws us ever-closer to God and the members of the Body of Christ.

Lutherans, wary of any signs that justification by faith through grace might be compromised, are equally concerned that a legalistic view of human conduct will assert itself. Lutherans are aware that legalism leads to a tyranny over conscience and action, even when advocated for the sake of God's will. The Gospel offers freedom through which the Spirit moves Christians to just and compassionate decisions and deeds. Experience with distortions in pietism and orthodoxy as well as tendencies in North American society legitimate such concerns. In addition, Lutherans are still debating among themselves the role of the Law in the life of the believer. Nonetheless and by whatever means the Spirit may employ, Lutherans agree that we grow in grace through the Spirit. Luther wrote,

Neither you nor I could ever know anything of Christ, or believe in him and take him as our Lord, unless these were first offered to us and bestowed on our hearts through the preaching of the Gospel by the Holy Spirit. The work is finished and completed, Christ has acquired and won the treasure for us by his sufferings, death and resurrection, etc. But if the work remained hidden and no one knew of it, it would have been all in vain, all lost. In order that this treasure might not be buried but put to use and enjoyed, God has caused the Word to be published and proclaimed, in which he has given the Holy Spirit to offer and apply to us this treasure of salvation. Therefore to sanctify is nothing else than to bring us to the Lord Christ to receive this blessing, which we could not obtain by ourselves.⁴⁸

The Lutheran Order for Baptism reflects "By water and the Holy Spirit we are made members of the Church, which is the body of Christ. As we live with him and with his

⁴⁷ *Luther's Works*, volume 35, pp 370f, *Preface to Romans*.

⁴⁸ *Large Catechism*, Part II, 38.

people, we grow in faith, love, and obedience to the will of God.” Parents promise to provide the external means through which children are brought into regular contact with the Christian community and the means of grace, “that, living in the covenant of *their* baptism and in communion with the Church, *they* may *lead godly lives* until the day of Jesus Christ.”⁴⁹ In the Rite of Confirmation, a person affirms the promises made at baptism, and the whole assembly gives its “amen” to the prayer

Gracious Lord, through water and the Spirit you have made these *men and women* your own. You forgave them all their sins and brought them to newness of life. Continue to strengthen them with the Holy Spirit, and daily increase in them your gifts of grace: the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord, the spirit of joy in your presence; through Jesus Christ, your Son, our Lord.⁵⁰

Moravians recognize the risks of legalism and crypto-works righteousness. They, too, realize that humans have a knack for binding one another’s consciences in subtle as well as blatant ways. While acknowledging the need to be as clear as possible about the differences between Law and Gospel, the Unity construes sanctification in terms of the Holy Spirit’s leading the believer to a closer relationship with Jesus. Indeed, the motif of the Christian life as a journey with God in the Spirit is reflected in the Confirmation liturgy. The candidate who affirms her or his baptism is exhorted by the presiding minister, “By affirming your baptismal covenant in public worship today, you have taken another step in your journey with God. You have entered into a new relationship with God and this congregation. We charge you in God’s name always to remain faithful to Christ and the Church, and to be open to the leading of the Holy Spirit.”⁵¹

The *Unitas Fratrum*’s motto, “Our Lamb has conquered. Let us follow him,” is reflected in the Moravian willingness to share with others one’s *Lebenslauf*, that is, story of one’s life-faith journey. The *Lebenslauf* is a thoughtful, self-searching examination of events, and thoughts, influences and experiences in which the person humbly seeks to discern in his or her life the presence, guidance, admonition, and blessings of Christ through the Spirit.

The mutual complementarities in the field of sanctification are helpful to Moravians and Lutherans. Lutherans emphasize caution regarding legalism and works righteousness, yet they realize that Christians grow in trusting, understanding, and obeying God through the Spirit. Moravians offer the motif of the journey as a way of expressing that growth in grace and a personal engagement with God which also leads to fellowship with others.

We move now to our complementarities on the Holy Spirit and the believer in the Church.

2. The Holy Spirit and Believers in the Church

The Christian community, extended in space around the globe and throughout time from the New Testament times to the end of the age, is the normal and natural locus for the Spirit’s

49 Order for Baptism, *Lutheran Book of Worship*, pg. 121. The italics indicate optional wordings.

50 Affirmation of Baptism, *Lutheran Book of Worship*, pg. 201. The title “Affirmation of Baptism” is given to the rite traditionally called “Confirmation.”

51 The Rite of Confirmation, *Moravian Book of Worship*, pg. 173.

activity. Many biblical images are used to describe that community such as called-out assembly (*ekklesia*), disciples of the Lord, Body of Christ, new Israel, Bride of Christ, and household of faith. The “Followers of the Way” also understood themselves as the branches and Jesus the vine, as sheep who followed the Good Shepherd, friends of Jesus, brothers and sisters in the Lord, and saints-in spite of definitely unsaintly conduct. Often Christians applied to themselves descriptions of ancient Israel, such as royal priesthood, holy nation, faithful remnant, and covenant people. The richness and fluidity of terms indicates a wealth of concepts and self-understandings. Whatever expression or image Christians have used to describe themselves, they have understood themselves as united in Christ through the Holy Spirit, and they also understood that their God-created and led community was part of God’s plan for the salvation of all. We can expect these ideas and images to appear among Lutherans and Moravians. We consider several common and foundational agreements shared by Moravians and Lutherans.

Both agree with the *Augsburg Confession’s* understanding of the Church, Articles VII and VIII:

VII. It is taught among us that one holy Christian Church will be and remain forever. This is the assembly of all believers among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity and the sacraments are administered according to the Gospel. For it is sufficient for the true unity of the Christian church that the Gospel be preached in conformity with a pure understanding of it and that the sacraments be administered in accordance with the Divine Word. It is not necessary for the true unity of the Christian church that ceremonies, instituted by men, should be observed uniformly in all places....

VIII. Again, although the Christian Church, properly speaking, is nothing else than the assembly of all believers and saints, yet because in this life many false Christians, hypocrites, and even open sinners remain among the godly, the sacraments are efficacious even if the priests who administer them are wicked men....

When these positions are joined to the Explanation of the Third Article in the *Small Catechism*, Lutherans and Moravians realize that they have great freedom in structuring rites, church organization, and seeking fellowship with other believers whose positions and practices may differ in form. They also realize that it is the substance of the Gospel which is the center of faith, fellowship, and function. Further, the Explanation puts the whole Church and its specific manifestations under the guidance, enlightenment, and judgment of the Spirit. Here freedom is placed in the context of faithfulness to the Triune God. Our ways of expressing the Spirit’s presence and action in the Church both complement and encourage us to pursue further conversations and considerations.⁵²

Historical experiences move Moravians to consider carefully and boldly the nature of the Church universal and the Unity in particular. At the same time their historic commitments cause them to cultivate close harmony among their members as well as to be willing to engage in mission-oriented and ecumenical ventures. The dialoguers concluded that an exposition of some Moravian perspectives on the complement “The Holy Spirit and

52 This is particularly the case with Zinzendorf’s expression that the Spirit is the Mother of the Church and believers. He did not intend this to ascribe gender to the Spirit, but depicted in this way the Spirit’s care for the family of God and its members. Moravians today are largely unaware of Zinzendorf’s thinking on the matter. It may be a way for Lutherans and Moravians to engage in discussions about the relationship of the Spirit to the Church, believer, and Christ.

Believers in the Church” will be helpful for mutual understanding. The *Ground of the Unity* provides reference markers: a) the source, aim, and end of the Unity’s being; b) the *Unitas Fratrum* as a unity and the Church as a fellowship; and c) the Church as a community serving the neighbor and the world.

First and foremost, the opening of the *Ground*:

1. The Lord Jesus Christ calls His church into being so that it may serve Him on earth until He comes. The *Unitas Fratrum* is, therefore, aware of its being called in faith to serve mankind by proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It recognizes this call to be the source of its being and the inspiration of its service. As is the source, so is the aim and end of its being based on the will of its Lord.⁵³

By situating the Unity within the Church so as to hear Jesus continually call the whole Christian community into existence in order to serve him, Moravians retain the dynamic understanding of member communities sharing with one another a unity which transcends doctrinal and liturgical differences and which empowers those communities to join their distinctive witnesses in serving the Lord who serves all humankind. Given its self-understanding that it is among those ecclesial communities called especially to proclaim the Gospel, Moravians seek to listen to the Spirit’s urgings and leadings as to how the *Unitas Fratrum* is to answer the call addressed to it. Other communities may be led and equipped with the Spirit’s gifts to other forms of service and witness. Moravians hear the Spirit especially summoning them to present to the Church and the world the Gospel so as to engage children, men, and women in personal relationships with God, a faithful walk with the Savior, and a vibrant community in the Spirit. Augustus Gottlieb Spangenberg’s hymn expresses it well:

The church of Christ which he has hallowed here to be his house,
is scattered far and near, in north, and south, and east, and west abroad;
and yet in earth and heav’n, thro’ Christ her Lord, the church is one.

One member may not know another here, and yet their fellowship is true and near;
one is their Savior, and their Father one; one Spirit rules them,
and among them none lives to one’s self.

They live to him who bought them with his blood,
baptized them with his Spirit, pure and good; and in true faith and ever-burning love,
their hearts and hopes ascend to seek above th’ eternal good.

O Spirit of the Lord, all life is yours;
now on your church your pow’r and strength out-pour, that many children may be born
to you,
and through your knowledge may be brought anew to sing Christ’s praise.⁵⁴

For Moravians, the Church certainly has external marks such as the Word rightly preached and the sacraments properly administered. Still, the primary constitutive factor is the relationship which God establishes with the Church and its believers in Christ through the Spirit. As the Triune God is the only source of life and salvation, according to the *Ground*, section 4, so the source of the Church’s being and mission is the same Trinity. The Ancient

⁵³ *Ground of the Unity*, Paragraph 1.

⁵⁴ *Moravian Book of Worship*, 516.

Moravian Church described the relationship between the Church and God in terms of the triad faith, love, and hope.

Emphasis on relationship takes flesh and blood form. The faith-love-hope which exists between God and an individual creates a communal relationship among persons. As the crucified Lord gave his mother and his beloved disciple to each other (John 19:25-27), so God brings persons together that they may share life together in Christ's community. The Church, as Moravians describe it, is the fellowship of followers gathered around the cross. And as there can be no Christianity without the cross, there can be no Church without Christ at its center, and no Christianity without the community of believers called the Church. As Spangenberg put it, the Church is scattered but one, a fellowship because of what its members share: the Triune God. The special role of Jesus as Head or Chief Elder of the Church derives from this position, as will be indicated shortly. A distinctive Moravian complementarity in this instance is the Moravian conception of the Church as called into being by God, being given the broad mission to proclaim the Gospel in fellowship with communities within the Church, and linking the Church in its manifold forms in an intimate union with the Triune God so that the Church is a human community sharing Christ's Gospel with the whole of humanity.

The second reference marker develops the Church as a fellowship and the Moravian Church as a unity within that fellowship. Sections 6 and 7 of the *Ground of the Unity* provide the reference mark:

6. We believe in and confess the unity of the church given in the one Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. He died that He might unite the scattered children of God. As the living Lord and Shepherd, He is leading His flock toward such unity.

The *Unitas Fratrum* espoused such unity when it took over the name of the Old Bohemian Brethren's Church "*Unitas Fratrum*" (Unity of the Brethren). Nor can we ever forget the powerful unifying experience granted by the crucified and risen Lord to our fathers in Herrnhut on the occasion of the Holy Communion of August 13, 1727, in Berthelsdorf.

It is the Lord's will that Christendom should give evidence of and seek unity in Him with zeal and love. In our own midst we see how such unity has been promised us and laid upon us as a charge. We recognize that through the grace of Christ different churches have received many gifts. It is our desire that we may learn from each other and rejoice together in the riches of the love of Christ and the manifold wisdom of God.

We confess our share in the guilt which is manifest in the severed and divided state of Christendom. By means of such divisions we ourselves hinder the message and power of the Gospel. We recognize the danger of self-righteousness and judging others without love.

Since we together with all Christians are pilgrims on the way to meet our coming Lord, we welcome every step that brings us nearer the goal of unity in Him. He Himself invites us to communion in His supper. Through it He leads the Church toward that union which he has promised. By means of His presence in the Holy Communion He makes our unity with Him evident and certain even today.

7. The Church of Jesus Christ, despite all the distinctions between male and female, Jew and non-Jew, white and colored, poor and rich, is one in its Lord. The *Unitas Fratrum* recognizes no distinction between those who are one in the Lord Jesus Christ. We are called to testify that God in Jesus Christ brings His people out of “every race, kindred and tongue” into one body, pardons sinners beneath the Cross and brings them together. We oppose any discrimination in our midst because of race or standing, and we regard it as a commandment of the Lord to bear public witness to this and to demonstrate by word and deed that we are brothers and sisters in Christ.

The aim of the Church in proclaiming the Gospel is to unite all persons in Christ and with one another. The Moravian community within the Church is to strive for that unity in a three-fold manner: a) through mission endeavors directed toward those who are not yet believers; b) through ecumenical partnerships and sharing with other Christian communities; and c) through providing the world and the Church with a witness of Christian concord and fellowship manifested in the Unity itself. In concept and practice, the Unity’s testimony of the reality of oneness in Christ through its congregational and denominational life provides the energy for its ecumenical and missionary ministries. And a vibrant sense of God’s presence in Christ through the Spirit is the heart of the Moravian Church’s unity. Moravian commitments to the unity of the whole Church, then, are basic to Moravian self-understandings of their Unity and the Church universal.

The Unity knows that oneness in Christ and in their own ranks is neither to be taken for granted nor is it without cost. The *Ground’s* reference to the experience of August 13, 1727, is an admission to the world and subsequent generations in the Renewed Church that they have been tested with divisions and disagreements. In a time of crisis over leadership, direction, and the challenge of mission, and after considerable debate and prayer, and in the context of a Lutheran-led Eucharist, the fellowship was deeply moved by what has come to be called the Moravian Pentecost. The members experienced the reality of the Spirit working among them to unite them in spite of different opinions and reasonings. The oneness they shared in the Spirit, members realized, was to be expressed in harmonious love and peace as they lived as a community and as individuals to do God’s will. Ever since, August 13 is a cherished day among Moravians. It is a time to recall the events at Berthelsdorf with humility and joy, and to commit themselves anew to their mission to be involved in promoting the unity of the whole Church. A later hymn catches the experience and expresses the Unity’s dedication to oneness in Christ, the *Unitas Fratrum*, and the Church:

They walked with God in peace and love but failed with one another;
while sternly for the faith they strove, they fell out with each other.
But he in whom they put their trust, who knew their frames,
that they were dust, with pity healed their weakness.

He found them in his house of prayer with one accord assembled,
and so revealed his presence there, they wept for joy and trembled.
One cup they drank, one bread they broke, one baptism shared,
one language spoke, forgiving and forgiven.

Then forth they went, with tongues of flame in one blessed theme delighting;
the love of Jesus and his name, God’s children all uniting.

That love our theme and watch-word still; the law of love may we fulfill—
give love as love we're given.⁵⁵

The Moravian “Love Feast” is another means through which congregations enhance and witness to their fellowship. As indicated, poetry, hymnody, and music are used along with history to manifest the Unity’s thought, devotion, and practice. The Love Feast has developed into a distinctive form through which a congregation and groups of congregations come together. The forms of the service may differ, but the intent is the same. Although marriages, congregational celebrations, and traditional ways to mark the seasons of the Church Year may be the stipulated occasions, the members gather for singing hymns and listening to special presentations of choral music. The unity afforded through joint listening and common singing is increased through a simple sharing of a bun and a cup of coffee during the musical offering. While the Love Feast is not a sacrament *per se*, it has the character and climate of a fellowship meal in which the Spirit unites the hearts, minds, and voices of the community.

The third reference marker moves the *Unitas Fratrum* to understand the whole Church and itself as engaged in being a community of service to those near and far. The reference marker is the *Ground’s* sections 8, 9, and 10:

8. Jesus Christ came not to be served but to serve. From this, His Church receives its mission and power for its service, to which each of its members is called. We believe that the Lord has called us particularly to mission service among the peoples of the world. In this, and in all others forms of service both at home and abroad, to which the Lord commits us, He expects us to confess Him and witness to His love in unselfish service.

9. Our Lord Jesus entered this world’s misery in order to bear it and overcome it. We seek to follow Him in serving His brethren. Like the love of Jesus, this service knows no bounds. Therefore we pray the Lord ever anew to point out to us the way to reach our neighbor, opening our heart and hand to him in his need.

10. Jesus Christ maintains in love and faithfulness His commitment to this fallen world. Therefore we must remain concerned for this world. We may not withdraw from it through indifference, pride or fear. Together with the universal Christian Church, the *Unitas Fratrum* challenges mankind with the message of the love of God, striving to promote the peace of the world and seeking to attain what is best for all men. For the sake of this world, the *Unitas Fratrum* hopes for and looks to the day when the victory of Christ will be manifest over sin and death and the new world will appear.

As the Ancient Church was a fellowship of believers who were on the move because of persecution and often were in need, and as continental Pietism provided a missionary impulse to the Renewed Church, the *Unitas Fratrum* today sees itself as a community in mission. The forms of the mission may cover the spectrum from educational programs to preaching for conversion, from assisting poverty-stricken persons to achieve dignity through gaining skills and land to joining with other Christians in the struggle for justice, the Unity is a world-wide mission-service member of the Body of Christ. Perhaps because it never achieved the status of an “established” or national church, Moravians have an awareness of the needs and

⁵⁵ *Moravian Book of Worship*, 396.

conditions of the marginalized, the voiceless, and the refugees. Mission and service are manifestations of the Moravian response to Christ's call; mission and service are both special assignments and gifts which the members of the Unity feel are given them through the Spirit.

Lutherans are not strangers to the image of Jesus the Shepherd who leads his flock. Luther and the theologians who signed the *Smalcald Articles* held that the Church is "holy believers and sheep who hear the voice of their shepherd" and so, as do children, pray, "I believe in one holy Christian Church." As expected, Lutherans hold that the Church's holiness does not consist in human ceremonies or deeds, but "in the Word of God and true faith."⁵⁶ Lutherans provide three dimensions relevant here to complement our common understanding of the Church.

First, the Church has outward marks or signs. God comes to us concretely in the midst of our earthly lives. From the sixteenth to the present century, Lutherans have realized that freedom and order, external and internal elements are required to hold the community together:

The church is not merely an association of outward ties and rites like other civic governments, however, but it is mainly an association of faith and of the Holy Spirit in men's hearts. To make it recognizable, this association has outward marks, the pure teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments in harmony with the Gospel of Christ. This church alone is called the body of Christ, which Christ renews, consecrates, and governs by his Spirit...the "communion of saints" seems to have been added [to the Apostles' Creed] to explain what church means, namely the assembly of saints who share the association of the same Gospel or teaching and of the same Holy Spirit, who renews, consecrates and governs their hearts... We are not dreaming about some Platonic republic, as has been slanderously alleged, but we teach that this church actually exists, made up of true believers and righteous men scattered throughout the world. And we add its marks, the pure teaching of the Gospel and the sacraments.... Of course, there are also many weak people in it who build on this foundation perishing structures of stubble, that is, unprofitable opinions.... In accordance with the Scriptures, therefore, we maintain that the church in the proper sense, is the assembly of saints who truly believe the Gospel of Christ and who have the Holy Spirit.⁵⁷

On the one hand, Lutherans hold that the Spirit uses external means and forms, so that the Spirit's work can be distinguished from human passions and fads, enthusiasms and distortion. There are benchmarks or standards for doctrine and practice which can be used to protect the core interpretations and understandings, validate new insights, and serve as norms for theology and practice. On the other hand, the Lutheran position recognizes that mere conformity to rituals and structures is also dangerous. The Church is not utopia; its members are fallible sinners who need correcting, enlivening, inspiration by the Spirit. The Church has God's promise that it will always have the Spirit which will give the community of believers guidance, forgiveness, and hope.

The second dimension relevant at this juncture is the Lutheran view of the relationships of persons within this community to one another and the wider society. In the *Large*

⁵⁶ *Smalcald Articles*, XII, 2-3.

⁵⁷ *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, Articles VII-VIII, V, VIII, XX, and XXVIII.

Catechism, the Reformer taught that the sum and substance of “I believe in the holy Christian Church” is:

I believe that there is on earth a little holy flock or community of pure saints under one head, Christ. It is called together by the Holy Spirit in one faith, mind and understanding. It possesses a variety of gifts, yet is united in love without sect or schism. Of this community I also am a part and member, a participant and co-partner in all the blessings it possesses. I was brought into it by the Holy Spirit and incorporated into it through the fact that I have heard and still hear God’s Word.⁵⁸

The work of the Spirit in the Church is aimed at proclaiming and assuring members that they are forgiven by and reconciled to God through Christ, then to enlighten them about God’s will, to move them in the process of sanctification, and to preserve them in true faith. All baptized Christians are to engage in mutual prayer and concern, service and assistance for one another. The vocation or call to be a Christian is expressed through sharing the Word in worship, praise, and speaking mutual consolation and hope to one another. In other words, each Christian is a member of the priesthood of all believers. What was noted earlier about the relationship of the Spirit to the individual believer is lived out in the community of the faithful. Again, the Large Catechism noted that the Spirit “makes me holy...through the Christian church.” The Church is the Spirit’s unique community, “It is the mother that begets and bears every Christian through the Word of God. The Holy Spirit reveals and preaches that Word, and by it he illumines and kindles hearts so that they grasp and accept it, cling to it, and persevere in it. The Spirit can be said to place the believer upon the bosom of the Church.”⁵⁹

The Spirit through the Church is also active in the world to bring God’s Word—as Law and Gospel—to society and its power structures. As believers go into the world, they go in the power of the Spirit. The Spirit’s enlightening role involves guiding and aiding Christians in their daily lives in the world, at work and through their responsibilities as citizens: “All this then is the office and work of the Holy Spirit, to begin and daily increase holiness on earth through these two means, the Christian church and the forgiveness of sins.”⁶⁰

The third dimension concerns the ecumenical perspective on the whole Church. The Lutheran position holds that agreement on two factors is sufficient for believers to agree upon: the pure teaching of the Gospel and the proper administration of the sacraments in accordance with the Word. This position permits maximum discussion and room for exploration, arenas for the Spirit to lead Christ’s followers in discerning the unity they already have in Christ, and then moving toward fuller forms of fellowship. At the same time, agreement in the Gospel and on the sacraments are of such critical importance to Lutherans that they will expend significant time and effort to ask themselves and their partners about the essence of the Gospel and the nature of the sacraments. Lutherans are willing to learn from others and to share their views, to recognize that forms of worship and expression may

58 *Large Catechism*, Part II, 51.

59 *Large Catechism*, Part II, 41, 37.

60 *Large Catechism*, Part II, 59. We note that one of the areas which we have discussed but not included references about in this report is social-political attitudes. These were not seen as issues of disagreement or complementarities, but of general affirmation. Again, further explorations will be fruitful for our respective churches.

differ from one ecclesial communion to another and even within communions. Their fundamental concern runs straight to the heart of justification by faith through grace. From that point outward and inward, Lutherans engage in ecumenical relationships of different intensities and breadth. Lutherans are willing to say both “yes” to ecclesial ecumenical sharing at the deepest levels, and they are also willing to say “no” in love when they feel that such sharing is either not appropriate or not yet appropriate given current understandings.

Discussions of the Spirit in the lives of believers and in the Church lead to Moravian and Lutheran forms and views of the ministry.

3. Mutual Complementarities About Ministries

Probably no issue is more vexing and problematic in intra-church and ecumenical discussions than understandings of ministry. This is, however, not the case for Moravian and Lutheran relations. Within our own ranks there may be substantial reflection and debate, yet we have common understandings and positions, even common internal discussions. Lutherans and Moravians share a lively sense of the priesthood of all believers through our own historical developments, Reformation heritages, and backgrounds derived from continental Pietism. We agree that all baptized members of the Body of Christ are called to pray for one another and the world, proclaim through word and deed that Jesus is Lord, share the strengthening hope of forgiveness and reconciliation, and live so that we may bear the fruits of the Spirit.

At the same time, Moravians and Lutherans agree that the ministry of Word and sacraments requires a recognizable and authorized form. Within the community of the baptized and for the sake of due order, we understand the Spirit to lead the Church to authorize men and women publicly to represent within the whole Church and to the world the proclamation of the Word and the administration of the sacraments through what is called traditionally the pastoral office. The office authorizes a person to preach, teach, administer the sacraments, and provide spiritual leadership among us. Normally the rite of ordination authorizes persons who have been called by the Spirit and the Church to fulfill the office of the ministry of Word and sacraments. We do not understand ordination to be God’s granting a person spiritual superiority over others. The ministry of the ordained is a public office to which a person is called by the Spirit working within the heart of the believer and within the Christian community. While we recognize a variety of public offices in the Christian community which are filled by persons who are not ordained, and while we may use several titles for those who are ordained, Lutherans and Moravians understand the roles of the ordained in remarkably similar ways.⁶¹

Ordained ministers have a triple accountability. Chiefly, they are accountable to God for the stewardship of the ministry which has been entrusted to them. At times they may have to address the Word as Law to the believing community and the wider society in spite of opposition and risk which may result from the faithful proclamation of the will of God. Naturally, they are also called upon to test what they say and do by the Scriptures. In the same category, ordained ministers are to be accountable to the Shepherd, faithful to their responsibilities in caring for the flock of Christ, competent communicators of the doctrines of the Church, examples of Christian living, and advocates of God’s mercy and justice in

61 In the ELCA there are official, unordained lay rosters of deaconesses, diaconal ministers, and associates in ministry. There are a variety of functions which persons may fulfill, e.g., nurses, directors of religious education, musicians, parish workers, etc. There are requirements in these instances which involve theological study, requisite skills for the position, and certification by an appropriate body in the church. Included are requirements concerning continuing education. In order for a person to remain on the official roster of the church, the person is to have served under appointment or be designated as on leave from appointment for a designated period of time.

society. Above all, they are expected to be devout Christians, sinners who depend on the grace of God and who manifest their relationship to Christ through lives dedicated to his service in and through the Church. Second, they are accountable to the Church and their ecclesial body for exercise of their ministries among the people of God. In other words, they are subject to the discipline and afforded the counsel of the Church in matters of life, doctrine, and other appropriate support. Third, they are accountable to the congregation, agency or institution of the church which has called them to serve in their midst.

In terms of ordained ministry, Lutherans and Moravians emphasize the roles and responsibilities of congregational pastors. While Lutherans continue to consider the advisability of ordaining persons to an office titled “deacon,” Moravians have such an office as the entry point into pastoral ministry. Moravians and Lutherans are recognizing the historic office of the bishop as a pastoral figure who provides advice and guidance for the church and the church’s ordained and lay leadership. Both churches expect their ordained ministers normally to be educated in a theological seminary and to have demonstrated academic competence as well as ministerial skills in the context of spiritual commitment to the Gospel. From these common positions, each church complements the other’s understanding of the Church and ministry. At this juncture some brief descriptions of the ministry in our respective churches may be helpful in showing that while there are differences of form, there are complements and common grounds which encourage us to recommend full communion between our churches.

A Lutheran understanding of the ministry of the ordained in the context of the ministry of the whole people of God may be seen in terms of some of the Constitution of the ELCA’s statements about the Church, the specific Lutheran church and its leaders. In describing the Nature of the Church:

3.01. All power in the Church belongs to our Lord Jesus Christ, its head. All actions of this church are to be carried out under his rule and authority.

3.02. The Church exists both as a fellowship and as local congregations gathered for worship and Christian service. Congregations find their fulfillment in the universal community of the Church, and the universal Church exists in and through congregations. This church, therefore, derives its character and powers from both the sanction and representation of its congregations and from its inherent nature as an expression of the broader fellowship of the faithful. In length, it acknowledges itself to be in the historic continuity of the communion of saints; in breadth, it expresses the fellowship of believers and congregations in our day.

The ELCA is a member of the World Council of Churches, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, and the Lutheran World Federation. The latter is a body which describes itself as “a communion of Churches,” which has no jurisdictional authority over its member Churches. The ELCA’s Constitution⁶² is the church’s statement to itself and the whole Church that the ELCA will understand itself in the universal Church. Indeed, the Constitution makes commitments to seek wider unity among Lutherans and the Church ecumenically understood. The constitution for synods of the ELCA contains the same provisions regarding the unity of the Church and the ELCA’s commitments to such endeavors.⁶³ Seminaries of the ELCA are expected to provide candidates for ordination and other leadership positions as well as those serving in those capacities with educational opportunities to engage them in ecumenical thinking and action.

62 See the ELCA Constitution, 4.02.f., 4.03.d., and f. Please note *Ecumenism: Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America* is the official policy statement of the ELCA (adopted by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly).

63 See the *Constitution for Synods*, chapters 5 and 6.

While the ELCA continues to devote study to the nature of the ordained and other ministries, it does have succinct statements in its Constitutions for the national church, synods, and congregations concerning the responsibilities of ordained ministers. Among these are:

Consistent with the faith and practice of this church, every ordained minister shall preach the Word, administer the sacraments, conduct public worship, provide pastoral care, and, shall speak publicly to the world in solidarity with the poor and oppressed, calling for justice and proclaiming God's love for the world. Each ordained minister with a congregational call shall, within the congregation, offer instruction, confirm, marry, visit the sick and distressed, and bury the dead....⁶⁴

The office of bishop is part of the ministry in the ELCA. Considerations about the balance between pastoral and managerial aspects of a bishop's duties and responsibilities are on-going in the Church. According to the *Constitution for Synods* (§8.12.), the bishop as the synod's pastor is to:

...oversee and administer the work of this synod; preach, teach, and administer the sacraments in accord with the faith of this church; provide pastoral care and leadership for this synod, its congregations, its ordained ministers, and its associates in ministry, deaconesses, and diaconal ministers; advise and counsel its related institutions and organizations; and be the synod's chief ecumenical officer.

The synodical bishop, elected for a term by the synod assembly composed of congregational lay persons and ordained ministers, also ordains candidates for the ministry of Word and sacraments.

The Moravian understanding of ministry also may be seen as rooted in the Lordship of Jesus Christ over the Church. During 1741 the responsibilities of the far-flung enterprises of the Moravian Church weighed heavily on Leonard Dober, its Chief Elder. In a Synodal Conference held in London in September he declined to continue to serve in this position and no other was willing nor was the use of the lot supportive of selecting another.⁶⁵ The question was then put to the Savior by the use of the lot as to whether he desired this office for himself. For the first time the lot provided a positive answer, and so it was recognized that Jesus was Chief Elder of the church in jurisdictional and organizational matters. This was announced to the international Moravian church on November 13, 1741, and since then this stands as the day when Moravians celebrate this insight. Given the historical context of the church-state relations in Germany and the situation among the members of the Unity, the proclamation of Christ's Chief Eldership was a daring step. Zinzendorf's hymn provides us with some insight on the senses of reconciliation and mission which flowed from November 13 and which is still part of Moravian practice:

Heart with loving heart united, met to know God's holy will,
Let his love in us ignited more and more our spirits fill.
He the Head, we are his members; we reflect the light he is.
He the Master, we disciples, he is ours and we are his.
May we all so love each other and all selfish claims deny,
so that each one for the other will not hesitate to die.
Even so our Lord has loved us; for our lives he gave his life.
Still he grieves and still he suffers, for our selfishness and strife.

⁶⁴ *Constitution for Synods*, excerpted from §14.02.

⁶⁵ The use of the lot and similar methods were popular within Pietism to discern a right decision when sufficient information was not available otherwise to make a decision. Moravians used Scripture verses, one indicating a positive answer, another indicating a negative answer, and a third slip was blank. The slip drawn was used to indicate the Savior's guidance.

Since, O Lord, you have demanded that our lives your love should show
so we wait to be commanded forth into your world to go.
Kindle in us love's compassion so that ev'ry one may see
in our faith and hope the promise of a new humanity.⁶⁶

The provinces of the *Unitas Fratrum* are members of the World Council of Churches and the national or geographical councils where they exist. Thus it has an ecumenical and international commitment. However, the *Unitas Fratrum* in itself is an international church, uniquely ecumenical because of the special relationships which it cherishes with various Christian traditions in the countries where it has provinces. In its governmental structure, the Unity Synod is its highest deliberative and legislative body. The provinces, represented usually by three voting members, which make up the Unity Synod meet usually every seven years. It does not have a presiding bishop but an executive board composed of persons drawn from the provinces. The board elects its own chair for a maximum of two consecutive two-year terms. Proposals reflecting doctrine or the Unity's polity are referred to the Unity Synod. Each province may develop its own *Book of Order* which is to be in harmony with the *Church Order of the Unity*. The Northern and Southern Provinces of the Moravian Church in America have their respective Provincial Elders Conferences which serve as administrative bodies for the provinces. These also make the basic approvals for candidates for ordination and provide the calls to pastors to congregations on the basis of congregations approving such calls with the agreement of the person to be called. Each province may explore what ecumenical relations it deems advisable, yet it is customary for provinces to keep the Unity Board informed and to seek advice from the Board. A province meets in assembly (synods) every 2-3 years. The synods elect persons to be bishops from among the ordained elders, and may elect as many as seems appropriate to the synod.

A Moravian congregation typically has a Board of Elders and a Board of Trustees, and the pastor presides over the former. The Board of Elders is concerned with spiritual and educational life of the congregation, while the Board of Trustees deals with the "temporal" affairs.

The Moravian Church has a three-fold ordained ministry: deacons, presbyters (elders), and bishops. There is one ordination (to the office of deacon) and subsequent consecrations to the other offices.⁶⁷ The Moravian Church in America began to ordain women in 1975.⁶⁸ The *Church Order of the Unity*, as revised at Dar es Salaam in 1995, describes the office of the bishop as follows:

(687) The Renewed Unity received the episcopacy as an inheritance from the Ancient *Unitas Fratrum*.

Today we regard the episcopacy in the Renewed Unity in a different way from that of the Ancient *Unitas Fratrum*. Formerly, a Bishop had a Church-governmental

66 *Moravian Book of Worship*, 401.

67 Usually a Moravian deacon is consecrated as an elder after serving several years in a congregation. The process involves recommendation of the consecration and the commissioning of a bishop to do the consecration by the executive board of the Province, the Provincial Elders' Conference. There are no functional differences between a Moravian deacon and elder; both may preach, administer both sacraments, officiate at weddings, etc. Those deacons consecrated as Presbyters must be considered spiritually prepared for the office. Deacons who do not elect to proceed to consecration as Presbyters are not considered less mature spiritually than those who do take that step. Bishops are elected from the ranks of Presbyters.

68 The ELCA was formed in 1987. It continued the practice of its earliest predecessor bodies, The American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America. Those churches began to ordain women in 1970.

and administrative function. In our day, however, this function is not necessarily linked to the episcopal office. We hold to the understanding, common both to the Ancient and Renewed Unity, that only Christ is Head of the Church and pastoral oversight is exercised in responsibility to Him.

A Bishop of the Moravian Church is consecrated to a special priestly pastoral ministry in the name of and for the whole Unity.

The office of Bishop represents the vital unity of the Church and the continuity of the Church's ministry, although the Unity does not place emphasis on any mechanical transmission of the apostolic succession.

The office and function of a Bishop is valid throughout the Unity as a whole.

Duties of Bishop

(688) A Bishop as a Bishop has responsibility primarily for providing pastoral care to pastors and the Church, and assisting the Church in its faithfulness to Christ and the Gospel.

All Provincial and District Boards shall consult a Bishop or Bishops in all matters concerning the work in the Province or District which fall within his/her sphere of responsibility.

A Bishop has a special duty of intercession for the Unity, and also for the Church of Christ as a whole.

Bishops in active service should be enabled to visit congregations for the deepening of their spiritual life.

The opinion of a Bishop (Bishops) shall customarily be sought and given due consideration and weight in matters of doctrine and practice.

A Bishop represents the Church in the act of ordination.

Only bishops have the right to ordain or to consecrate to the various orders of the ministry, but only when they are commissioned to do so by a Provincial Board or Synod.

A Bishop, however, has the right to decline a commission to ordain, should he/she wish to do so.

In exceptional cases the ordination of a Deacon may be performed by a Presbyterian in the name of and by commission of a Bishop.

A Bishop (Bishops) should share in the decisions regarding the training of candidates for the ministry and should maintain a special pastoral relationship with such candidates throughout their training.

The Synod of the Bishop's Province may also add administrative responsibility by electing him/her a member of the Provincial Board.

A Bishop may be assigned by his/her Province to represent the Province in ecumenical gatherings and before governmental agencies.

Clearly, there are variations of practices and polity regarding the nature of the ministry, but there are no factors which raise theological issues or which might impede progress toward achieving full communion between our churches.



The Mutual Complementarities indicate diversity within the context of unity. Yet the nature of that diversity is seen as completing and enhancing what we already have. Our summary at this point is that Moravians and Lutherans agree with and complement each other's understandings of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Believer and in the Church, and we agree with and complement each other's positions on the Church's ministry.

III. Concluding Statement:

The Journey Continues

The members of the Lutheran-Moravian Bilateral Dialogue recommend to their respective churches that our churches move forward as expeditiously as possible to approve our churches entering full communion with each other, as indicated in the recommendations at the beginning of this report. We thank our churches for the opportunity to engage in this endeavor, and we thank God for helping us to grow in faith as we undertook this journey with our Savior.

We conclude by continuing the journey with our Shepherd:

I am the good shepherd. I know my own and my own know me, just as the Father knows me and I know the Father. And I lay down my life for the sheep. I have other sheep who do not belong to this fold. I must bring them also, and they will listen to my voice. So there will be one flock, one shepherd (John 10:14-16).

Response to the Action on Full Communion with the Moravian Church

Bishop Anderson said, "We will have an opportunity to hear from President Sawyer in just a moment. By approving 'Following our Shepherd to Full Communion,' we have fulfilled the goal—one of the steps that we asked in 1991 of ourselves—to reach out in several directions simultaneously to all those with whom we find agreement in the Gospel. I certainly rejoice in this vote. It is sort of a family reunion, and I thank God for those who have worked for it so long. I look forward to greatly strengthened relationships and I would like President Sawyer to come forward at this time. President Sawyer has asked the Rev. Burke Johnson to make the remarks."

Pastor Burke Johnson, president of the Northern Province of the Moravian Church, said, "I would like to share with you the Moravian daily text for today, the two scriptures. First, from Psalm 145:10: 'All your works shall give thanks to you, O Lord, and all your faithful shall bless you.' And from the 19th chapter of the book of Revelation: 'Then I heard what seemed to be the voice of a great multitude, like the sound of many waters and like the sound of mighty thunder peals, crying out "Hallelujah! For the Lord our God the Almighty reigns. Let us rejoice and exult and give him the glory...."'

"The Moravian Church in America is truly grateful for the vote of this churchwide assembly. We realize this has a further sign of our unity, and ask that God will lead us as we move forward in work and ministry and mission together. I believe that Michael Kinneman, theologian ecumenist, said it best this spring: 'We are all related by blood, but it is not our own.' Thanks be to God!" The assembly responded to this observation with rousing applause.

"I would like to conclude with the words of Zinzendorf in the first stanza of a mighty hymn in our tradition: 'Christian hearts, in love united, Seek alone in Jesus' rest; Has he not

your love excited, Then let love inspire each breast; Members on our head depending, Lights reflecting Him, our Sun; Brethren, His demands attending, We in Him, our Lord, are one.”

Bishop Anderson said, “I have said that we would sing ‘Beautiful Savior’ and I want to tell you why. This hymn connects us with the Moravians. As it turns out, many of you know that this hymn is often sung in other traditions with the words, ‘Fairest Lord Jesus.’ But we have always used ‘Beautiful Savior.’ The reason for that is that a former Moravian, Joseph August Seiss, translated that German hymn into English in 1873, and used the words, ‘Beautiful Savior.’ He was born in the German Moravian settlement at Grason in Frederick County, Maryland, studied with his Moravian pastor, and with the help of a few Lutheran clergymen, went to Gettysburg College, then called Pennsylvania College. He studied theology in private, was licensed to preach in 1842, and had a long and distinguished career as a Lutheran pastor and author. So let us stand and sing this gift from the Moravian Church to us: ‘Beautiful Savior.’”

After singing the hymn, the Rev. Constance Thomson Rehl [South-Central Synod of Wisconsin] requested information about obtaining copies of the Moravian daily readings. Bishop Anderson said that information would be provided.

Proposal on Full Communion: The Episcopal Church (continued)

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV: 10.1-10.4; continued on *Minutes*, pages 42, 157.

Beginning at 10:10 A.M., Bishop Anderson asked the assembly to turn to the text of the resolution regarding full communion with The Episcopal Church, saying, “it will come before you now for discussion and a vote as transmitted by the Church Council. The full text of ‘Called to Common Mission’ follows that resolution. Again, Section VI has relevant synod memorials on this topic.

“Now this is the way we will proceed through the document; it is a pattern we have used with other documents in the past. After the motion to get the document before us, and a second, I will ask on each page if there are amendments submitted by voting members. Some amendments have been distributed and I hope you will keep that sheet titled ‘Proposed Amendments to “Called to Common Mission”’ handy for reference. At the end of the process of going through page by page, when the whole statement has been refined, we will take up the resolution, however the document has been amended. Persons wishing to offer an amendment that was submitted before yesterday’s deadline can proceed to the microphone in the usual fashion, and make their motions when I move page by page through the document. When you move an amendment, you need clearly to say your name, the page that you are addressing, and the number assigned to the amendment—in this case, they are letters: A, B, C, and D.

“Now, I underscore that having an amendment printed on the sheet that was distributed does not necessarily mean that the mover will present it here to the assembly. The sheets are printed only to assist you to deliberate. The amendments have a status only when they are moved and seconded and are on the floor. The one exception to this is the amendment recommended by the Church Council. You will need to keep your finger in this tab. It is, again, in Section IV, on page 10.1. When we get to page five of the document, we will then consider this. It is a motion before the assembly already because it comes from the Church Council—we will address it on page five. Now I ask the secretary of the church to read the

'resolves' of the action before us under, again, the rules that you adopted. This resolution is amendable, substitutions are permitted, and a two-thirds majority is required for adoption."

Secretary Almen read aloud the action before the house:

MOVED;

SECONDED: RESOLVED, that this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America accepts "Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*" as set forth below as the basis for a relationship of full communion to be established between The Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America requests that Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America convey this action to Presiding Bishop Frank T. Griswold of The Episcopal Church.

Bishop Anderson opened the floor for discussion, saying, "Thank you. We are now open for amendments and I would call for any amendments to page four.

"Microphone 3, are you speaking to page four? It is the first paragraph of the document, yes. We are not quite there yet. Anyone on page four? Microphone 7, white card."

Ms. Stephanie A. Olson [East-Central Synod of Wisconsin] said, "I am not really making an amendment. I have a white card up because I have a question for clarification. Is that in order at this point?" Bishop Anderson said that it was in order. Ms. Olson continued, "I would just like to ask—it is kind of a procedural question—what would be the ramifications for future ELCA bishops and new seminary graduates if the current CCM is approved and he or she in good conscience cannot accept the historic episcopate?" Bishop Anderson responded, "I think that is a good question, but let us wait until the amendment process is through, and then we will ask some of our reference people to..." Ms. Olson interjected, "So will they answer that later then?" Bishop Anderson replied, "Yes. Stay around so I will remember that. All right, we are on page five then. We will take paragraph one. Microphone 3."

Bishop Steven L. Ullestad [Northeastern Iowa Synod] said, "I call your attention to amendment A—that is on the 'Proposed Amendments to "Called to Common Mission"'—the sheet distributed this morning. It is my understanding that if this comes from [the Committee of] Reference and Counsel that it has already been moved. Is that correct, Reverend Chair?" Bishop Anderson corrected, "No. To move it they [the Committee of Reference and Counsel] are simply recommending. Bishop Ullestad replied, "Okay. I would like to move by addition the sentence that is printed on that page: 'This agreement describes the relationship between our two church bodies. It does not define the Church, which is a gift of God's grace.'

MOVED;

SECONDED: To add the following sentence at the end of paragraph one:

This agreement describes the relationship between our two church bodies. It does not define the Church, which is a gift of God's grace.

Bishop Anderson said, "Thank you. Discussion on this amendment. Do you wish to speak to it?"

Bishop Ullestad said, "Yes. I met with a couple of our pastors who have opposed 'Called to Common Mission' a week or two before coming to this assembly. A sticking point for them was the need for greater clarity that our unity is a gift of grace that comes from God to us. Full communion is a human response to that gift. Therefore, I offer this amendment that will make a difference for those pastors and many others in our synod. This proposal does not define the Church for us Lutherans; that is defined in Augustana VII. Rather, this proposal is a response to the grace of God which has created the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. Full communion is subordinate to that gift of unity that comes in Jesus Christ, freely given by God. Full communion flows from that unity; it does not create it. Unity is the umbrella. Proposals for full communion are under that umbrella. That is why each one is so different from the other. That is why the Reformed is different from the Moravian and different from the Episcopalian, because they are all under the larger umbrella of the unity of Christ. I ask that you support this amendment to bring even greater clarity to the fact that this is a proposal about describing a relationship which grows from the unity of the Church that is given to us as a gracious gift from God."

Bishop Anderson asked if there were any others to speak on this amendment. Seeing no indication, he said, "All right. We will vote on it. Go to your voting pads. All favoring the addition of amendment A to paragraph one will vote 'yes,' all opposed will vote 'no.' Please vote now. Let us see the results. It has passed by 898 to 106, so it is part of the document."

MOVED;

SECONDED;

YES-898; NO-106

CARRIED: To add the following sentence at the end of paragraph one:

This agreement describes the relationship between our two church bodies. It does not define the Church, which is a gift of God's grace.

Bishop Anderson continued, "Now I think the next [amendment for consideration] will be the motion from the Church Council. I ask Secretary Almen to read that. You will find this on page 10.1, just behind the document."

Church Council Recommendation to Amend "Called to Common Mission"

BACKGROUND

The Church Council voted (CC99.04.25) at its April 10-12, 1999, meeting to receive the action of the Conference of Bishops and to transmit that resolution of understanding and expectation to the members of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly as information concerning "Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*."

This text was first developed in the Western Iowa Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to inform the conversation related to "Called to Common Mission" at that synod's 1999 Synod Assembly. The Rev. Curtis H. Miller, bishop of the Western Iowa Synod, submitted the text to staff members in the Department for Ecumenical Affairs of this

church to confirm the accuracy of the statements made in the text. Similarly, consultation was conducted with staff members in the Office for Ecumenical Affairs of The Episcopal Church who likewise affirmed that the text which follows is an accurate reflection of the text of "Called to Common Mission."

Bishop Miller presented the document to the members of the Conference of Bishops at the March 3-9, 1999, meeting. The Conference of Bishops voted (CB99.03.06), without audible dissent, to affirm the contents of the text. The action of the Conference of Bishops was provided as an exhibit for the report of the Conference of Bishops to the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at its April 10-12, 1999, meeting.

In its continuing discussion of "Called to Common Mission," a subsequent action of the Church Council sought to insure that the action of the Conference of Bishops be acknowledged as an official and accurate interpretation of the document. The Church Council voted (CC99.04.41) to recommend that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly take the following action:

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE
CHURCH COUNCIL**

To add the following sentence at the end of paragraph three of "Called to Common Mission":

In adopting this document the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church specifically acknowledge and declare that it has been correctly interpreted by the resolution of the Conference of Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, adopted at Tucson, Arizona, March 8, 1999.¹

Secretary Almen read the recommendation of the Church Council:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To add the following sentence at the end of paragraph three of "Called to Common Mission":

In adopting this document the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church specifically acknowledge and declare that it has been correctly interpreted by the resolution of the Conference of Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, adopted at Tucson, Arizona, March 8, 1999.

Bishop Anderson responded, "Thank you, and that does not need a second from the floor, I believe, since it comes from the Church Council's motion. Okay. We are ready to discuss that. Microphone 9."

Bishop Curtis H. Miller [Western Iowa Synod] said, "I am the primary author of the Bishops' Resolution on pages 10.1 and 10.2 of Section IV. There has been a lot of speculation about the purpose of this statement and I would like to share the two purposes I had in mind as I prepared this document. First, I sought to clarify the content. Personally, I find 'Called to Common Mission' to be quite clear. Yet, there continued to be a lot of

¹ The full text of the "Tucson Resolution" of the Conference of Bishops has been included in these minutes for ease of reference as Exhibit E.

misinformation and a lot of misunderstanding about how 'Called to Common Mission' is different from the *Concordat*. And so I sought to use straightforward language in outline form to bring these issues into clear focus. Second, I have heard some who oppose 'Called to Common Mission' express concern about how this document might be used in the future to force additional changes on this church. My second purpose in preparing this document was to create an additional documentary record, affirming that the ELCA is making no commitments in regard to bishops beyond those clearly outlined in 'Called to Common Mission.' I now encourage your support because this document both addresses many of the matters where there have been questions or misinformation, and it establishes a documentary record of how this church expects 'Called to Common Mission' to be implemented and administered."

Mr. Dale V. Sandstrom [member of the Church Council] said, "I made the motion at the Church Council meeting that brought this before the Churchwide Assembly. The intention of the action of the Church Council is to make the interpretation of the Conference of Bishops binding and incorporate it by reference, and thereby binding by the action of both this church and The Episcopal Church if this language is added as recommended by the Church Council."

Bishop Anderson continued, "Thank you. Further speaking? Ready to vote on the amendment? I think you are. All right. All favoring the addition of the amendment from the Church Council as it is written on page 10.1, will vote 'yes,' all opposed to that addition will vote 'no.' Please vote now. Voting is closed. Let us see the results. It is accepted by a vote of 903 to 101, so it is incorporated."

MOVED;

SECONDED;

YES-903; NO-101

CARRIED: To add the following sentence at the end of paragraph three of "Called to Common Mission":

In adopting this document the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church specifically acknowledge and declare that it has been correctly interpreted by the resolution of the Conference of Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, adopted at Tucson, Arizona, March 8, 1999.

Bishop Anderson asked if there were any further amendments for page five. Seeing none, he continued, "The next amendment printed is paragraph number 12, which is on page seven, so we will move to that if there are no others. Microphone 12."

Secretary Almen read the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel to substitute language for the amendments submitted by the Rev. John H. P. Reumann [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod].

MOVED;

SECONDED: To amend the fourth sentence of paragraph 12 to read:

Both churches value and maintain a ministry of *episkope* as one of the ways, in the context of ordained ministers and of the whole people of God, in which the apostolic succession of the church is visibly expressed and personally symbolized in fidelity to the Gospel through the ages.

Pastor Reumann said, "I assume that I must move this, even though it has come to you through [the Committee of] Reference and Counsel. Since I am responsible for items B, C, and D, [I offer] these words of explanation. During the last two years, I have bent most of my efforts toward improving the present draft. These are attempts..." Bishop Anderson interrupted to say, "Let us just get a second, okay? Is there a second to the amendment? You are moving the—you are moving the bold-face, by the way, are you?" Pastor Reumann indicated, "No, I thought you called for just the—I thought I could give us some time by giving the rationale for all three items, and then proceed seriatim. Whatever you wish, though."

Bishop Anderson said, "Oh, you are going to do all three of your proposals." Pastor Reumann responded, "As they come up, yes." Bishop Anderson asked, "Are you going to move the bold-face or do you wish to go back to your own?" Pastor Reumann replied, "Well, that is an interesting option. Could I comment on the background, the purpose of it, and the background that this material has gone through since the house has several versions?"

Bishop Anderson clarified, "Actually—let me apologize. I think that since [the Committee of] Reference and Counsel is not just recommending 'yes' or 'no' but comes with a recommended motion, it would be their motion, rather than as [I indicated] earlier. But, let us hear your general rationale and we will have the motion made.

Pastor Reumann stated, "I will be happy to make general comments and then it is in the hands of [the Committee of] Reference and Counsel.

"My efforts have been to improve the draft, particularly to our Lutheran constituency reflecting our confessional heritage. The three items pick up possible places in the text where the Lutheran confessional view is not clearly stated. The material that I submitted, which is printed before you, went with my own rationale to an *ad hoc* committee from the drafters. They presented, I understand, an oral report to [the Committee of] Reference and Counsel. You have what [the Committee of] Reference and Counsel has presented. While I am willing to speak on any one of these items as to purpose and intent, I assume that you are now ruling it is in the hands of [the Committee of] Reference and Counsel. Well and good."

Bishop Anderson said, "Yes, Dr. Reumann. They have presented this motion. It does not need a second, it comes from them, but you, obviously, can amend their recommendation or change it if you wish, but the motion before us is the bold-face material on the top of the second column on page 10.3. White card at Microphone 3."

Mr. John Prabhakar [Northern Illinois Synod] asked, "Have these amendments been discussed with our partners in The Episcopal Church who are part of the drafting team? Do you think it is relevant?"

Bishop Anderson responded, "I think I can answer that. The Reference and Counsel Committee did work with the drafting team members and the Episcopal representatives of that drafting team. Is that okay? All right. We are back on discussion of the recommendation. Microphone 11."

Pastor Reumann suggested, "These comments may be helpful. Where the draft spoke of *episkopé* as one of the ways in which the apostolic succession of the Church is visibly expressed and personally symbolized, one immediately wonders what are some of the other ways, a question I asked in plenary the other day. Now, some of the other ways are listed at the end of a previous paragraph, involving such things as holy scripture, creeds, and the sacraments. But for Lutherans, the personal symbolization of these things come not only through bishops, but also pastors, priests. I simply picked up the language of paragraph seven: 'and the whole people of God'—the theme of paragraph six. In discussion reflecting

Episcopal concerns, they did not want to imply that their deacons were left out. That is the reason for going to the phrase ‘ordained ministries’ rather than simply pastors and priests. You will have to decide whether there is any great difference between ‘along with’ and ‘in the context of.’ The purpose is to reflect, though, the ecumenical approach in the [WCC] Faith and Order paper—*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*—which regularly puts ordained ministries in the context of the whole people of God.”

Bishop Anderson continued, “Thank you. I see no speakers, so I think we are ready to vote on this proposed amendment. All favoring the inclusion of that amendment will vote ‘yes;’ opposed will vote ‘no.’ Please vote now. Voting is closed. Let us see the results. The amendment is approved by 908 to 98.”

MOVED;

SECONDED;

YES-908; NO-98

CARRIED: To amend the fourth sentence of paragraph 12 to read:

Both churches value and maintain a ministry of *episkope* as one of the ways, in the context of ordained ministers and of the whole people of God, in which the apostolic succession of the church is visibly expressed and personally symbolized in fidelity to the Gospel through the ages.

Secretary Almen read the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To amend the third sentence of paragraph 18 to read:

Any subsequent installation of a bishop so installed ~~should not repeat the~~ includes a prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit ~~and~~ without the laying-on-of-hands.

Pastor Reumann said, “A highly technical area. In the intervention that I submitted, illustrating cases of instances were spelled out. The proposal from [the Committee of] Reference and Counsel deletes those and I agree with that. What we are all agreed on is that further laying on of hands should not be involved, but there is an affirmation of what Lutherans might well expect on all such occasions—a prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit.”

Bishop Anderson asked if the assembly was ready to vote on this proposed amendment. Seeing no indication of further discussion, he said, “All favoring the amendment to paragraph 18 please vote ‘yes;’ all opposed ‘no.’ Please vote now. Voting is closed. Let us see the results. By a vote of 900 to 104, the amendment is approved and included in the document.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

YES-900; NO-104

CARRIED: To amend the third sentence of paragraph 18 to read:

Any subsequent installation of a bishop so installed ~~should not repeat the~~ includes a prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit ~~and~~ without the laying-on-of-hands.

Secretary Almen read the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel to substitute language for the combined amendments submitted by the Rev. John H. P. Reumann and Bishop Andrea F. DeGroot-Nesdahl [South Dakota Synod]:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To amend the first sentence of paragraph 20 to read:

In accord with the historic practice whereby the bishop is representative of the wider church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America agrees to make constitutional and liturgical provision that a bishop~~s~~ shall regularly preside and participate in the laying-on-of-hands at the ordination of all clergy.

The report of the Committee of Reference and Counsel indicated:

The use of “regularly” establishes the ELCA’s intent to adhere to the same standard of ordination by a bishop as practiced by The Episcopal Church. “Regularly” does not imply the possibility of planned exceptions but allows for pastoral discretion in emergencies. The use of singular “bishop” clarifies that only one bishop is required to ordain.

Bishop Anderson explained, “That comes from Reference and Counsel, so it is before you for action. Speaking? Microphone 2.”

The Rev. Stephanie K. Frey [Southwestern Minnesota Synod] indicated that she wished to ask a question related to this amendment. “I would like to direct it to the Rev. David Perry, if he is available.” Bishop Anderson said he could see him present in the plenary hall. “It is a rather dark corner down here where we have all our resource people. He is there, so he is listening.” Pastor Frey continued with her question. “The question I would like to pose, related to this amendment, is this: Under what circumstances would a pastor’s ordination without a bishop in the historic episcopate be acceptable to members of The Episcopal Church?”

Father Perry responded, “I think perhaps the best answer that I could offer, in taking counsel with the others from our Episcopal church, is to look at Line 27 in the proposed amendments, the rationale of the Reference and Counsel Committee: ‘The use of “regularly” establishes the ELCA’s intent to adhere to the same standard of ordination by a bishop as practiced by The Episcopal Church. “Regularly” does not imply the possibility of planned exceptions but allows for pastoral discretion in emergencies....’”

Bishop Andrea F. DeGroot-Nesdahl [South Dakota Synod] said, “I had held on to the hope over the last months that one word could be added to the ‘Called to Common Mission’ document that would open the door, that would widen the space on which we could all stand together. We have spoken of this in many different settings and groups made up of many different individuals in the church, going as far back as the drafting meeting prior to this most recent issue that we are dealing with today; I am suggesting that maybe that one word could be ‘normally,’ as you see in the proposed amendment here that was deferred rather to the word ‘regularly.’ And so, the old adage comes to mind: ‘Watch what you pray for because you might get it.’ Now the word ‘regularly’ is before us, and as I made this amendment yesterday prior to the deadline, I wondered if one word really could bear the weight of

intention and inference that it had come to mean to me—that it really meant a place to stand together.

“In my work as a synod bishop, my staff and I make every effort, when we deal with congregations who are of opposing views, to find common ground, to help them speak as one again in order to begin feeling and work together for mission. The prospect yesterday that there were no amendments coming on this document meant that that spirit, it seemed to me, was lacking in our assembly, and I very much wanted to be a leader who was part of an effort to bring us together on this, the ‘Called to Common Mission’ document, that has come through a joint process and an acceptable process to our partners in The Episcopal Church.” Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and asked the next speaker to begin.

The Rev. Daniel M. Hoeger [Rocky Mountain Synod] asked a question for clarification. “Is my interpretation of this that a former bishop would not be allowed to do an ordination, and that for purposes of this document, it is the office of bishop that has the authority, not an individual? Is that correct?”

Bishop Anderson said, “Let us ask the drafting committee or someone. I think that Secretary Almen is prepared to respond.”

Secretary Almen responded to the question, saying, “The constitutional provision that has been in place from the beginning of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has indicated that the synodical bishop is to exercise solely—I am quoting the language here from the [constitutional] document—exercise solely this church’s power to ordain or provide for the ordination of approved candidates. In the 1997 edition of the *Concordat of Agreement*, there was language in there that would have indicated that someone who had previously held the office of bishop could be designated to preside for an ordination. In the revisions that have been undertaken, on the basis of responses to the 1997 document, that possibility has been eliminated. So the language before us now means that present for regular ordinations would be someone who currently holds the office of synodical bishop, be that the bishop of territory—that is, the territory where the ordination is taking place—or another synodical bishop who is serving in that capacity as the one present with other pastors on the occasion of an ordination.”

Bishop Robert D. Berg [Northwest Synod of Wisconsin] said, “Bishop Anderson, I would ask that my two minutes be given to Bishop DeGroot-Nesdahl.” Bishop Anderson observed, “You are speaking in favor, she was speaking opposed. I do not think we can play that game. Microphone 2.”

Bishop Richard J. Foss [Eastern North Dakota Synod] asserted, “We are both here for the same reason. I wish to speak against [the Committee of Reference and Counsel’s interpretation of the word] ‘regularly’ and I wish to yield my time to Bishop DeGroot-Nesdahl so that we can hear whatever it was that she was going to say.” Bishop Anderson responded, “Bishop DeGroot-Nesdahl, you have the floor for two minutes.”

Bishop DeGroot-Nesdahl concluded, “The last thing I wanted to say was that the interpretation now given by the Reference and Counsel Committee to this possible amendment to the word ‘regularly’ does narrow the ground that I was hoping to establish with the one-word inclusion in this document. It clearly states that ‘regularly’ does not imply the possibility of planned exceptions, but allows for pastoral discretion in emergencies. That is not completely the spirit in which I had hoped the one-word theory of amendment would help us to move together to common ground, but given the written rationale here, the one

word is not as sufficient as I would have hoped for and supported when I originally made the amendment. Thank you.”

The Rev. Diane E. Wheatley [Upstate New York Synod], indicating her hope for clarification, asked a process question. “There seem to be two different versions of this. If we vote ‘no’ on the recommendation of Reference and Counsel, does that automatically bring up the original proposal, or does that have to be re-proposed?” Bishop Anderson asked if by “the original proposal,” she meant the text of “Called to Common Mission” or one of the amendments. Pastor Wheatley indicated that she was referring to the amendments. Bishop Anderson responded, “The way to do that would be for an individual to move to substitute his or her amendment for the recommendation from Reference and Counsel.”

The Rev. Gregory E. Isaacson [Northwestern Minnesota Synod] said, “I speak in opposition to this amendment. I am one of those people who was not ordained by a bishop; I was ordained by a pastor who was authorized [to do so]. And I see some incongruencies here, especially if we look at paragraph 16, when I ask the question, ‘What does it mean to be temporarily suspending the restriction of accepting those pastors who are not in the historic episcopate? In my own experience, at my ordination it was such a remote location that a bishop wasn’t able to come, and as a result, in the laying on of hands, my parents and my baptismal sponsors were a part of that service. And that was a very powerful moment for me. And as I was on my knees and about to receive my ordination stole, I took a peek and I saw the four hands of these very precious people who have nurtured me in the faith. In many ways, I did not need a bishop in a historic succession to validate the ministry and calls of a number of people. And as I turned to face the congregation, I saw out there people who were Sunday School teachers, people who shared with me in the entire process of my call. So I speak in opposition to this because I feel it does not address the immediacy of what is going to happen to someone like me. At what point will I be fully recognized in this ‘Called to Common Mission?’ So I speak in opposition to this amendment.”

Bishop William B. Trexler [Florida-Bahamas Synod] said, “I would like to speak in favor of the recommendation of [the Committee of] Reference and Counsel on the insertion of the word ‘regularly,’ and also stand with my sister bishop from the ‘Class of ‘95’ in her [interpretation of] ‘normally.’ I feel like we are often called on to interpret items that are in our documents. I think there is enough room in the use of the word ‘regularly’ and that the intent and the spirit is there that would allow for that wiggle room that some have been looking for. I would like to stand with Reference and Counsel because this particular rationale does include the consent of our Episcopal brothers and sisters who are with us.”

The Rev. William L. Hurst Jr. [Metropolitan New York Synod] said, “Bishop, my understanding would be that a ‘yes’ vote on this amendment would not be an acceptance of the commentary that is in the rationale by Reference and Counsel. Is that correct?” Bishop Anderson said that he presumed that the interpretation of “regularly” would be governed by the actions which had brought it to the document. Pastor Hurst asserted, “So the rationale would act as a commentary on the meaning of our vote?” Bishop Anderson concluded, “That would be my understanding, that the assembly understands what it was voting on in that way. Microphone 3.”

The Rev. Michael D. Wilker [Sierra Pacific Synod] said, “I want to say I was not ordained by a bishop either, but our church documents, our constitution and the Augsburg Confession do give me confidence that I am in apostolic succession, and it does not matter if a bishop was there or not. But I do speak in favor of this amendment because I think that having a bishop at regular ordinations is a good thing, and I interpret the term ‘regularly’ to

mean that the bishops and the pastors and the candidates for ordination will work to try and have the bishop at the ordination. But in some cases, it will not be possible. And yet, that pastor who is also ordained without a bishop present will also continue to be in apostolic succession just like I am and just like all of the other pastors are already. I urge you to vote for the amendment.”

Ms. Stephanie A. Olson [East-Central Synod of Wisconsin] asked if this would be an appropriate point at which to return to her earlier observation. Bishop Anderson said that it was. Ms. Olson responded, “What would the ramifications be for future ELCA bishops and new-current-seminary students and graduates if the current CCM is approved, and he or she in good conscience cannot accept the historic episcopate? Would they have another option?”

Secretary Almen responded, “The first part of the answer really is in the existing constitution of our church; namely, that as the synod’s pastor, the bishop is to exercise solely this church’s power to ordain. As indicated, then, in the preface to the proposed amendment that is now before us, the word ‘regularly’ establishes the ELCA’s intent—that is, the norm—to adhere to the same standard to the ordination with a bishop present—[that is,] a bishop currently holding office. ‘Regularly’ does not imply the possibility of planned exceptions but allows for pastoral discretion in emergencies. The use of the singular ‘bishop’ clarifies that only one synodical bishop is required to be present for ordination. Ordained ministers, or candidates for ordination, in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, are approved according to churchwide standards exercised by synodical candidacy committees. The basic principle is that persons ordained into the ministry of Word and Sacrament in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America are ordained for service throughout this entire church, and, therefore, the basic standards that are outlined in the churchwide constitution and in related policies would apply to all such ordinations. The effect of this action would be that for fulfillment of the constitutional provision, the language that one finds in Section IV on page 116, would apply; namely, that as the synod’s bishop, ‘the bishop shall:...exercise solely this church’s power to ordain (or provide for the ordination of)...’, and then the insertion of the language would be ‘by another synodical bishop of) approved candidates.’”

Bishop Anderson stated, “I realize there are some white cards. I am not just going to call on white cards. I want to try to get people who also want to speak on one side or the other to have the chance directly. Microphone 7.”

Bishop Theodore F. Schneider [Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod] said, “Reverend Bishop, I rise to speak in support of Reference and Counsel’s motion. With the word ‘regularly,’ it sounds highly technical, but it is significant. One cannot finally do ecumenical work unilaterally, and the proposal of the Reference and Counsel Committee, as I understand it, has had the advice and counsel of our Episcopal brothers and sisters who serve as counselors to us in these things. And we finally need to be reminded that in the end, it is not only we who must approve it, but also The Episcopal Church. I speak for the adoption of the present motion.”

Mr. Michael Franklin [Indiana-Kentucky Synod] moved to end debate on this matter.

Bishop Anderson said, “The previous question is moved. It requires a two-thirds vote to close debate. All those favoring the closure of debate on this amendment will vote ‘yes;’ those opposing closing debate will vote ‘no.’ Please vote now. Voting is closed. Let us see the results. The debate is closed by a vote of 878 to 124.”

MOVED;

TWO-THIRDS VOTE REQUIRED

SECONDED;

YES-878; NO-124

CARRIED: To move the previous question.

Bishop Anderson continued, "We now proceed directly to voting on the amendment from Reference and Counsel. This would amend the first sentence of paragraph 20 by adding the word 'a,' striking the plural in 'bishops,' and adding the word 'regularly.' So it would read, '...that a bishop shall regularly preside....' All favoring the inclusion of that amendment, please vote 'yes;' opposed vote 'no.' Vote now. All right, let us see the results. The amendment is accepted by a vote of 81.6 percent for; 18.4 percent against; 809 for; 183 against."

Moved;

Seconded;

YES-809; NO-183

CARRIED: To amend the first sentence of paragraph 20 to read:

In accord with the historic practice whereby the bishop is representative of the wider church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America agrees to make constitutional and liturgical provision that a bishops shall regularly preside and participate in the laying-on-of-hands at the ordination of all clergy.

Bishop Anderson then said, "Now, I believe we are ready to go to the document as a whole as amended. Again, I will call on speakers alternately as best I can. You wondered why we had a traffic light put up here; now you know! Well, as you can imagine, it is going to be difficult for me to tell who got to a microphone first. So, I am going to do my best to go through in rotation, so you might go to a microphone with less people, favoring your side of it, so we can be balanced out. I will start with Microphone 1."

Bishop Paull E. Spring [Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod] said, "Bishop, let me say a personal word. I have only two minutes, but I want to say that just before I spoke, before I got here, that Bishop Foss and I shook hands, and I said, 'Wherever this goes, we are still in Christ,' and we both agreed. That needs to be said.

"I speak in strong support of 'Called to Common Mission.' In so doing, I speak in favor of balance, portion, and wholeness in our ecumenical endeavors. Two years ago we approved relationships with the Reformed churches. For me and for many others, our support for full communion with the Reformed community was predicated on approval of full communion with The Episcopal Church. I call for balance in our ecumenical mission. Much has been said about our church as a 'bridge' church within the larger Christian context. To approve full communion with the Reformed community and not with The Episcopal Church makes that image impossible to sustain. Full communion with The Episcopal Church speaks to our self-understanding that we are a church, but less church and more a reformed movement within the entire Church catholic. If we are truly a bridge, then the bridge has to go somewhere. 'Called to Common Mission' provides a way for us to enact what we truly are—a movement for renewal and reform within the whole Church."

The Rev. Wesley L. Hamlin Jr. [Upstate New York Synod] said, "I serve as a parish pastor in the Upstate New York Synod. At a recent synod assembly, I served on a committee appointed by a bishop to facilitate a fair discussion of this topic—CCM—and both on the floor and other places—cafeteria lines, dorm rooms, etc.—there was a lot of discussion and I felt that I heard in that position a great deal of pain, but also a great deal of passion. People who were opposed to this on both sides of the argument struggled with this issue and have continued

to struggle, and I know that I have prayed about this and people who disagree with me also prayed fervently. So, I hope that in the process that we can not only hear one another and disagree, but that we understand where we are coming from, and in the spirit of Luther's teaching, or his admonition in his explanation of the Eighth Commandment, I would like to try to speak the truth as I understand it, in love.

"I saw, serving that position, some problems with the 'Called to Common Mission' document. I would call the whole issue of our identity, and much of that document deals with identity and matters of structure, and not mission. That is what it seems we need to be all about. For us who are opposed to CCM, we do so—at least I do—with sadness and with regret, but I need to stand here and say I think this is the wrong thing for us to do at this time. It strikes at the heart of our evangelical understanding of the Church. The 'E' in the ELCA, the word 'evangelical' is important to us. This is part of our name; for us, the Word, the Gospel, is primary. Bishops and pastors and the people of God are in ministry together for the sake of the Gospel...." Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker's time had lapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

The Rev. Ruth M. Peterson [Sierra Pacific Synod] said, "I am here to speak in favor of CCM. I am what some have called a 'genetic Lutheran.' My family roots reach deep into the farmland of South Dakota. However, I have lived my life west of the Rockies, which is a different culture than most of you here face. I am privileged to serve as a pastor in Reno, Nevada, where over 85 percent of the population is unchurched. They are not Lutheran, they are not Episcopal, they are not Christian, and in that context, as well as after listening to the words of Pastor Weissenbuehler yesterday, what kind of a witness we will present to the world, I must ask what witness this will give. A 'yes' vote will speak clearly to those who are non-Christian, who see our arguments as confusing. A 'no' vote will speak just as clearly to their worst fears of Christians. Our 'yes' vote would give our voice to the oneness of mission and purpose. I am not urging a vote just to be nice, but the real benefits that would come, that would express this unity, would far outweigh the potential and possible problems that might exist if we pass it."

The Rev. Raymond L. Mehl [Saint Paul Area Synod] said, "Two points. The first may be stating the obvious. Just because we voted in favor of one or more amendments does not necessarily mean we need to vote in favor of the main resolution or recommendation. The second point is that during the entire period we have been talking about this recommendation, we have heard the phrase 'unity with diversity,' and I believe that we can move into unity in the Gospel and the Word and Sacraments, doctrine, but need not necessarily have unity or, rather, can have diversity in terms of polity. I think the resolution that was just passed regarding the unity with the Moravian Church states it very well: 'that both churches recognize each other's polity and ministries of oversight, including the interpretation of church doctrines, discipline of members, authorization of persons for ordained and lay ministries, and provision for administrative functions.' I would hope that we can defeat the main motion and move toward a statement such as was approved in the case of the Moravian Church."

Mr. Thomas Koch [New England Synod] said, "Reverend Bishop, I have been disturbed this week about how I believe some of the wrong questions are being asked. The question of the historic episcopate; it has taken on a life of its own. But I submit that it is not the main issue; the main issue is full communion. We made a commitment in 1991 that we will pursue the goal of full communion, and will rejoice in all movement toward that goal. The Reformed resolutions and the Moravian resolution were easy because they did not ask

anything of us. Now, in the Episcopal proposal, we are being asked to do something; we are being asked to make some changes. And do we balk as soon as we are asked to change? Sometimes there is a cost to discipleship. As a lawyer, having done a good deal of negotiating, I know that if one party has a point on which that party is legitimately and irretrievably stuck—as I believe The Episcopal Church is on this issue—and the other party could go either way on it—it is optional, or in church language, *adiaphora*—then if you want to make the deal, the party who can go either way gives in on that point. And the deal here is full communion. Two days ago, I heard the question raised in the hearings about balance—who is giving more? That question is so far from being the right question that it is sad that it is even whispered in these halls. Jesus gave his life for us....” Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

The Rev. Mark M. Rydberg [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] said, “Thank you, Reverend Chair. I would like to just comment on the previous speaker that for many of us who are opposed to CCM, the issue is not simply the historic episcopate. The Lord bless all of our Lutheran communion partners and in The Episcopal Church and the Moravian Church. With the historic episcopate, the issue is still the necessity of adopting the historic episcopate—a certain form of ministry, as a condition for the unity of Christ’s Church. I think that the amendments and the clarifications, or changes of [the] Reference and Counsel [Committee] to the amendments, only serve to heighten and sharpen the differences that we have in that perspective. Several times over the last few days, I have heard conversations that we who oppose CCM do so out of fear. Part of the gift that my seminary professors gave to me is that we can look at one event in the life of Jesus in the Gospels, and we have four different perspectives—from Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—the same event, four different perspectives. We who oppose this document look at this single document and oppose it not out of fear, but we come with honest differences in perspective, and that is the necessity. The issue is not unity, the issue is uniformity. The issue is not bishops, the issue is a necessity of a certain form of bishops in certain practices of our church.”

Ms. Carol LaHurd [North Carolina Synod] said, “Reverend Bishop, I rise to urge adoption of ‘Called to Common Mission.’ Full communion with The Episcopal Church is one small step, not toward merger or sameness, but toward authentic unity in Jesus, the Christ. I have had the privilege of ten years of study and discussion of this full communion proposal, first in the Minneapolis Area Synod, and now in North Carolina. I have respected friends and theological colleagues on all sides of the issue. I have also heard folks at this assembly express fear about how we at the ELCA will be able to heal, to come together, should ‘Called to Common Mission’ be adopted. My vocation is the study and teaching of the New Testament, and I am struck by the number of times the people of God, by the grace of God, have lived through times of divisiveness and discord. Think of the children of Israel, struggling in the Sinai. Or, since this is the year of Matthew in our Lectionary, think of Matthew’s Christian community, likely made up of rich and poor, Jew and non-Jew, Aramaic-speaking and Greek-speaking persons, all struggling both to be faithful to the Jewish law and to proclaim Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior. Even this young church, the ELCA, has already come through the birth pangs of merger and the crisis of conflict over a social statement on sexuality. In the case of ‘Called to Common Mission,’ a very positive sign is that five-eighths, or five out of eight, of our seminary faculties have voted to urge approval, and none of the seminaries, as a voting body, have opposed CCM or endorsed alternative proposals. By the grace of God, we will come through this debate and be able to re-unite with each other even as we embrace our Episcopal brothers and sisters in full communion.”

The Rev. Gregory E. Isaacson [Northwestern Minnesota Synod] said, "A couple of items in the document—paragraph 16 again. I have a question as to why it is not clear how long this temporary restriction will be to accept pastors who are not in the historic episcopate." Bishop Anderson asked, "Are you asking that as a question? Do you want an answer?" Pastor Isaacson responded, "Rhetorically. Sorry. And also, in paragraph 26, where the churches agree to take this document into account at every stage of their dialogues with other faith traditions. What I am afraid of is that the historic episcopate implies a separation between pastor, priest, and bishop from the laity. And my fear is that the historic episcopate may limit our freedom to practice, to order our ministries in a way that enables the laity to be a part of the process, to have an equal say in what is taking place. I know that is referred to in paragraph 20, but I am afraid the implication is still strongly there. The historic episcopate limits our ecumenical dialogues because we are not in full communion with other denominations who do not accept the historic episcopate. It becomes a stumbling block. And if we are currently under an interim agreement that is working, why would we want to go to a document that still has an unclear boundary by having a temporary suspension, where there is no deadline, where there is no end-time resolution for some of these things that are an issue for pastors and congregations."

Mr. Paul E. Lumpkin [Metropolitan New York Synod] said, "I rise to support 'Called to Common Mission.' Seeking full communion with the Episcopalians would not only allow Lutherans and Episcopalians to exchange pulpits, it will also allow us to continue God's work toward unity. 'Called to Common Mission' allows us the freedom to disagree and yet to share the ministry between two churches. All of us are God's children, and we have been baptized with the Holy Spirit of God. Full communion to the altar, which is God's altar, should be as one. The 'Called to Common Mission' document recognizes that Christians who worship God in our congregations are united in a common mission. This unity can only make our local witness stronger, reminding us that we are by no means alone, but rather, strengthened by the Holy Spirit who binds all people of God together. My prayer is that as we, the church, face new opportunities and challenges of the next century, our Lord will help us to become all that he wants us to be; that is, making Christ known to all. May God's blessing be with us as we go out and share our ministry to others in the world."

Mr. David E. Morken [Northwestern Minnesota Synod] said, "I am sorry to say that I will not be able to vote 'yes' for this, and the reason is that it has too many 'have to's' in it. We have to be in the historic episcopate, we have to stay in the historic episcopate, we cannot get out. To me the essence of the Gospel is freedom. Galatians says indeed that 'it was for freedom that we were set free.' To me, this is a step backward from freedom. When you take a step backward from freedom, that is not progress. The Moravian document was in the spirit of the Gospel. This document is in the spirit of the law. I am sorry. I cannot vote for it."

The Rev. Samuel D. Zumwalt [Southwestern Texas Synod] said, "I speak first of all, dear bishop, to say that we need to remember it is not against one another, against flesh and blood, that we are contending, but it is against the powers and the principalities that would push our buttons and turn us against each other. That is not the nature of the Gospel. We have an amazing freedom in Jesus Christ, and that freedom is a terrifying thing. It is a terrifying thing. We heard about that two Sundays ago, with Peter stepping out on the water. You know, I have heard as if there was some sort of lay versus clergy thing. In Holy Baptism, the Lord Jesus said we are more lovable, more precious, and more valuable than God's own life. And so that is not at stake. We are precious to the Lord Jesus, all and everyone. And so it is not about whether or not in the evangelical freedom we can have

bishops; Lutherans do. We have just never done that in the United States. But it is an important reminder to all of us that the Church does not belong to the laity, and the Church does not belong to professional Church workers, and the Church does not belong to pastors, and I do not know a single bishop who believes the Church belongs to bishops. The Church belongs to the Lord Jesus Christ, and Paul has told us, ‘Have this mind among yourselves, that Christ Jesus, though he was in the form of God, thought not equality with God a thing to be grasped, but he emptied himself—he emptied himself—and being found in human form, he was obedient—obedient—even unto death on a cross. Therefore God hath highly exalted him, and bestowed upon him the name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.’ Jesus is here today.”

Ms. Carol K. Matevia [Indiana-Kentucky Synod] said, “Thank you, Bishop Anderson. I rise in strong opposition to CCM. I am not a theologian, nor am I a Bible scholar. Others in this place have expressed themselves more eloquently than I could ever hope to, and I thank them for that. It seems to me that it has been suggested that to pass ‘Called to Common Mission’ is to do the will of God. However subtly, I have heard that message in sermons, prayers, and in our discussions, and I have trouble with that. If, as we believe, the Holy Spirit dwells within each one of us and works and speaks through us all, how do we account for the dissension that has been expressed? Has God removed the Holy Spirit from those of us who disagree and allow that space to be filled with fear and doubt and faithlessness? Can it be, or can it not be, that the same Spirit that encourages us to work and walk with our brothers and sisters in the faith is saying to us, ‘Not this way, not now?’ Bishop, and people of God, I believe there are prophets in this place and I believe that we should be listening to them.”

Ms. Susan A. Stewart [Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod] said, “Good morning. I am a lay person speaking in favor of CCM. One thing I have learned, as the mother of four young children, is that when the bickering is loudest, there is truth on both sides. So it is with the issue of the necessity of the historic episcopate. Yes, Article VII of the Augsburg Confession states that such traditions are not necessary for true unity of the Church and, yes, Article XV of the Apology states that traditions have an appearance of wisdom. I quote, ‘This good order is very becoming in the Church and is, therefore, necessary.’ These two statements may appear contradictory, but, in fact, are not mutually exclusive. This can be demonstrated by way of analogy. When my husband injured his left ring finger, he was faced with the choice of saving his finger or saving his wedding ring. I have to admit he saved his finger. The ring was cut off. I do not think that made us any less married. The ring itself does not constitute marriage; it has no magical power. Clearly, it is not necessary to the unity of our marriage. However, the minute the swelling went down and his finger was intact, we put the ring back on. First, because in our marriage, it symbolizes our unity, and second, because when some gorgeous single female looks at my husband’s ring finger, I want to know that she knows that he is married. I believe it is for the good order of the marriage and very becoming. And so it is with the historic episcopate. It is both not necessary for true unity of the Church, and simultaneously, necessary for the good order of the Church, as stated in our confessional documents. Our Lutheran forefathers wore the ring of historic episcopacy, and we are clearly reluctant to cut it off. It has been 500 years.” Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

The Rev. Raymond C. Siegle [Eastern North Dakota Synod] said, “I believe there is a consensus in this room—it is my belief certainly—that we desire full communion with The Episcopal Church. And I believe that the regulations for how we vote—the numbers are there

that we have a consensus. What is not clear to many of us in the room—and there are differences, the lines [at the microphones] indicate that, the discussion which we just had, discussion earlier—there is not a consensus as to how that takes place. Until we can find a consensus in this room and, therefore, also find a consensus across the church for a way to do this full communion, the desire to do it is there, our support for doing it is there, but until we can find a consensus, why, I believe I would need to vote ‘no.’”

Mr. Mark A. Betley [Rocky Mountain Synod] said, “Bishop Anderson, I need to preface my remarks by identifying a Lutheran heresy I think I found swirling in our midst. It goes like this: ‘God loves us just the way we are.’ Now that is not the heresy. The heresy is that we put a period at the end of that sentence. I think the faithful full sentence goes like this: ‘God loves us just the way we are and loves us so much that God will not leave us there.’ In this context, I believe God loves The Episcopal Church just the way it is and loves the ELCA just the way it is, but we can be for one another agents of God’s ongoing sanctification. Our Episcopal brothers and sisters can be those flames of the Holy Spirit that fire us, that help us to become hard of character and pure. I invite you to think seriously about inflating that Spirit to be the one that purifies us through the agency of our Episcopal brothers and sisters. I think this is too big a chance to miss. Purification of the spirit is painful, but it is necessary to be the fullness of the Church. We must walk up to the precipice of the historic episcopate and remain people who live primarily by the Word.”

Mr. Patrick Mansfield [Southeastern Minnesota Synod], rising for a point of order, said, “I refer to the previous question.” Bishop Anderson explained, “I am sorry, you need to be recognized [at a microphone] in order to move the previous question. Microphone 4.”

The Rev. John Hanson [Northwest Synod of Wisconsin] said, “I speak in opposition to this proposal. I have served in Lutheran ministries in New York, Nebraska, Montana, and Wisconsin. Oh, I found good and gracious Christians in each of these regions. In none of these regions have I only been in fellowship with Lutherans, but all community members. We are one huge and varied church, and each of us have many family ties to other faith bodies. I do not believe this proposal was brought forward in good conscience—or, I do believe this was brought forward in good conscience—but I believe it is not good for the whole ELCA. As was noted in the last month’s *Lutheran* [magazine], synods across our country found difficulty with this motion, making this not a geographical issue. This is not an issue of fear. What frightens me is these four pictures of myself staring back at me, and I am afraid. It is not an issue of fear, but it is an issue of a belief that people have that this is not for our church body. It is not an issue of disrespect for our Episcopal brothers and sisters, for time and again, we return to wanting fellowship. I pray we will be an understanding body that we are many and varied, that we are not of one mind on this. Let us return to a duty we should have completed prior to this assembly in setting our single ecclesiology as one church. Thank you. I speak against the proposal.”

The Rev. John K. Stendahl [New England Synod] said, “I rise not for exhortation, but with a request. The action we are considering has implications for world Anglicanism and the whole Lutheran communion. It is an ecumenical decision and, therefore, for the whole *oikoumene*. I understand that Ishmael Noko, general secretary of the Lutheran World Federation, is here with us, and I would ask that if he is willing, that he be invited to make some comment for our help, and if so, that that time not be taken out of the rest of our debate.”

MOVED;

SECONDED: To allow General Secretary Ishmael Noko to address the assembly without subtracting his time from the time available for debate.

Bishop Anderson responded, "Thank you. First of all, we will need the permission of the assembly to do that. Is there objection? All favoring permission of Ishmael Noko, general secretary of the Lutheran World Federation, to comment on this issue, please say 'yes;' opposed will say 'no.' The 'ayes' have it." An unidentified speaker challenged the ruling of the chair. Bishop Anderson continued, "You want a division? All right. The question is whether we allow the general secretary of the Lutheran World Federation to comment on this issue. All favoring that will press 1, all opposed will press 2. Yes, we have given permission. There is a white card at microphone 5. Yes, sir."

MOVED;

TWO-THIRDS VOTE REQUIRED

SECONDED;

YES-659; NO-249

CARRIED: **To allow General Secretary Ishmael Noko to address the assembly without subtracting his time from the time available for debate.**

The Rev. Peter A. Pettit [Pacifica Synod] asked, "Regarding our rules—will Reverend Noko's time be limited to the two minutes of our current rules, and if so, I would move that we extend the time for him to address us to five minutes."

MOVED;

SECONDED: To allow General Secretary Ishmael Noko to speak for five minutes.

Bishop Anderson responded, "Thank you. The motion is to allow General Secretary Noko five minutes to address the assembly. All favoring that extension of time will say 'yes;' opposed 'no.'"

MOVED;

TWO-THIRDS VOTE REQUIRED

SECONDED;

VOICE VOTE

CARRIED: **To allow General Secretary Ishmael Noko to speak for five minutes.**

Bishop Anderson continued, "Very well. I would like to invite General Secretary Noko to speak. General Secretary."

General Secretary Ishmael Noko said, "Bishop Anderson, dear friends, delegates, ecumenical guests, ladies and gentlemen. A few things only to add to what has been said, hopefully, during the hearings what you heard. When you speak about the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, we are speaking about the second largest single Lutheran national church within the Lutheran communion worldwide. Second to the Church of Sweden, you are the second largest of the members of the Lutheran World Federation; a federation that consists of 58 million people around the face of the earth. The second thing to bear in mind when you speak about the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is that there are 65 synods here, and those 65 synods have established partnerships around the face of the globe. Therefore, it is true to say that whatever decisions are taken here and now are your decisions. But they are also decisions on behalf of your sister churches around the face of the earth.

“There are approximately over 15 million members around the world that have incorporated the tradition of the historic episcopate. I come from such a church myself, and my own church is also in partnership with one of the synods of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Three months ago I was not going to be here. I was going to send a representative. I was going to send a message through a video; I was going to write you a letter of greetings. But because of the pressure of our member constituents, I had to come in person. It is caution that is taking place here and, therefore, of tremendous interest throughout the membership of the Lutheran World Federation, namely, your own sister churches that you have had partnership with through the partnering of the synods, but also through the many missionaries that have been sent from this church, the Lutheran churches in America, prior to 1808. I remind myself, and I want to remind also you, that today, it is not possible to take decision without mutual accountability to one another. It is important for us to hear that.

“I was in South Africa on Tuesday in the city of Pietermaritzburg on a consultation with the leading bishop of our member churches in South Africa. Without planning it, we spent half a day on two things: One on the theme of the Evangelical Lutheran Church [in America] Churchwide Assembly. Your theme observes and puts us on the stage on the threshold of a new millennium, and it carries a sense of hope in it. The second decision was the decision that you will be making with regard to Moravians—which I want to congratulate you for—and secondly, with the Episcopalians. The prayers were said because they thought since the African churches within five years will establish full communion between themselves and the Anglican churches on a pan-African level. And those churches in Africa—all of them, all of them—in one form or another are related to you. Therefore, the prayers were said, and they feel also that they are accountable to you, inasmuch as you are [to them]. Thank you so much.”

Bishop Anderson said, “Thank you so much. We will now move to Microphone 6.”

The Rev. Rebecca P. Wegner [New England Synod] said, “I rise to speak in opposition to this and it is very hard to do after that moving and meaningful word from our Lutheran World Federation. But words matter; words are important, and the words that we have before us are words I cannot agree with. I, along with being a pastor, teach English as a second language. I am very careful in what things say and how we use them. I became a Lutheran as an adult because I believe the words that I had to say to join this church, and the promise that I had to make was that I would agree to all of Scripture, the creeds of the Church, and the complete and *Unaltered Augsburg Confession*. I took it seriously enough to read it at 20, and I continue to read it, and I do not see how I can in honesty accept the position before us as being in line with that document. I pray that we may move to some solution that will allow the intent that we want—that is, full communion. But it is not in the words that we have. Thank you for your prayerful consideration and for being honest about what is actually on the table.”

The Rev. Joel A. Bacon [La Crosse Area Synod] said, “Bishop Chair, rising in favor of the proposal. I went to the second Mahtomedi Conference as an undecided voter, hoping to be led in my decision. After processing the conference, and after balancing it with our 1991 ecumenism statement and the bishops’ resolution and the Apology to the Augsburg Confession, I find myself in favor. We are being watched. We are on the front of today’s *Denver Post*. The lost sheep are watching. I believe we have a history of the lost sheep looking in and seeing the 99 sheep arguing over seating arrangements and color schemes. I believe the passage of this would be the 99 sheep turning toward that lost sheep and saying that we want you in here. As a baptized child of God, and as a called and ordained minister

of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, I can be in favor of this. And I recall the apostles; they went through the inconvenience of shedding their blood for the lost sheep. It may be inconvenient, but I do not think I will shed my blood and I will do it for the lost sheep.”

The Rev. Walter F. Taylor Jr. [North/West Lower Michigan Synod] said, “I am a pastor, and also a professor at Trinity Lutheran Seminary. I am in many ways a reluctant opponent of CCM, although an opponent nevertheless. I have family members who are Episcopalian. I have taken part in three Episcopal ordinations, and if CCM were to pass, we might finally have tea available at the Churchwide Assembly, rather than coffee only.

“While many issues in CCM disturb me, there are three particular sources of confusion. First, why the historic episcopate now? The lack of theological, biblical, and missional argument in CCM for adopting the Episcopal version of the historic episcopate is to me striking. To my knowledge, Lutherans in this country have never had the historic episcopate; indeed, my home branch of Lutheranism specifically rejected the historic episcopate even when it was repeatedly offered. I can only conclude that we are being asked to adopt the historic episcopate solely to enable this particular full communion proposal. Is that enough to overturn 350 years of Lutheran experience in this country? For me the answer is ‘no,’ the cost of the proposal is too high.

“Second, I still struggle with the question, ‘Why does not Lutheran ministry quite count?’ Proponents keep pointing to immediate recognition of Lutheran ministry by The Episcopal Church and I appreciate the move that the Episcopal representatives have made at that point. But I do want to remind us that that recognition comes only with a temporary suspension of Episcopal rules on ministry—temporary until we conform to an Episcopal understanding of the historic episcopate (paragraphs 16 and 14). I therefore suggest that CCM does not meet the criteria of our own ecumenism statement which calls for mutual recognition of ordained ministers. And finally, where the cost for me is too high is saying that we are ordaining bishops in the ceremony with placing two hands on the head of the pastor, it will indicate that.” Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

Bishop Stephen P. Boumann [Metropolitan New York Synod] said, “I have a fear that we are directing our comments to folks who have already got their minds made up. But I want to speak directly from the heart to those who oppose ‘Called to Common Mission.’ It is about mission. Ministry, where we are, we need partners. We need partners who are across the street from each other in places like the South Bronx and Long Island. We minister in a part of the world that is like Mars Hill, when Paul went and saw all the different gods and all the different faces, and respected the spiritual depth of each of them. You can help us shine the face of Jesus more clearly with partners that we need. I also want to link what I am saying to what we said yesterday about women and children in poverty. Where we do ministry, we need your help. Give us our partners.”

Ms. Linda Danielson [Southeastern Iowa Synod] said, “Bishop, I continue to stand opposed to this document, and I want to clarify that I am not afraid of change. I know that I am in need of change every day of my life, and I hope and I pray for that daily as I repent that God will change me and that I will become a better Christian in my walk. But I am concerned of us going into a full communion agreement with which we are divided. I believe that God has another way for us, and that is why we are struggling with this document. CCM is the wrong way to do the right thing. I want us to find another way. I would like us to find a document that we can all stand on in unity like we did with the previous full communion [agreement] with the Moravian Church.”

Bishop Marcus J. Miller [Northeastern Ohio Synod] said, “Bishop Anderson, when we face difficult challenges in Northeastern Ohio, at least in some areas, we have come to adopt an axiom that says, ‘More often than not, in Jesus’ Church we act our way into new ways of thinking much more readily than we think our way into new ways of acting.’ Two years ago, I went to Philadelphia fully committed to the Concordat and with some grave questions about the *Formula of Agreement*. I talked. I listened. We prayed together. I heard my partners throughout the Church tell me that they needed the *Formula of Agreement* to expand and continue and to move on in ministry in Jesus’ name. Right when we got to the vote, I still did not know how I was going to vote, but I voted for the *Formula of Agreement* and I am glad I did. I voted for it because our ecumenical reach needs to be broad, it needs to be to the right and to the left. Our ecumenical posture needs to be one that provides opportunity for mission, and finally for me, I voted for it because I knew we would have to act our way into new ways of thinking with our partners in the *Formula of Agreement*. That has begun to happen in Northeastern Ohio, sometimes haltingly, but it has been a blessing for us, and I am grateful we approved that document. I want to speak to the few left who maybe have not made up their minds yet. We need ‘Called to Common Mission’ to further our mission. We have an opportunity to act our way into new ways of thinking for the sake of Jesus Christ.”

Ms. Cynthia A. Jurisson [Metropolitan Chicago Synod] said, “I am a professor at the Lutheran seminary in Chicago. I have not had much sleep this week. Like you, I am guessing, I go to bed late and I wake up early thinking about what is going on here. One particular conversation or theme has been running through my thoughts this week, and that is that we have had this talk about a sign of Christian unity—what is an appropriate sign of Christian unity. Finally, it seems to me, after everything is said and done, after we have talked about this sign and that sign and another sign, it is clear to me that there is only one true and authentic, and, therefore, useful sign of Christian unity, and that is the cross of Jesus Christ. It is not that the body of Christ is divided—and we need to find a good sign to unite us—the truth is that the body of Christ is already united under the most powerful sign of all—the cross. But every time Christians try to add other signs to the sign of the cross, we divide ourselves from one another. All over the world, Christians etch the sign of the cross on our foreheads, we trace it over our hearts, we put it around our necks on chains, we put it in our homes and in our churches. It is the cross which unites Christians around the world, not any certain form of government. Lutheran churches around the world, some of whom have the historic episcopate and some of whom do not, are united not because of these different forms of church government, but because of the cross of Jesus Christ. The cross of Jesus Christ, I think, is the only sign truly capable of uniting us. It is the only sign that we ought to put before us as we seek ways to cooperate fully with other Christians. I believe that the Moravian agreement works because we follow the cross of Christ and did not add another request for unity. The Episcopalian agreement, as it is presently configured, is not quite there yet, but I think we can get there.” Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

Bishop David A. Donges [South Carolina Synod] said, “I have been asked two interesting questions about what we are doing this morning. The first is whether or not I thought our decision was a defining moment for the ELCA, for this church. Well, I said I wasn’t sure, defining moments are usually determined by historical [perspective]—by looking back in retrospect. However, I suspect it is a defining moment for us. The second question is what did I think is the faithful thing for us to do. Lutherans are people of great faithfulness. Those who favor CCM would frame their decision in terms of faithfulness. Those who oppose it would also frame their decision in terms of faithfulness. So I am not

sure that is the most helpful way to frame it. I would rather like to suggest to all of us, those for, those against, those who are undecided, to frame it in terms of our faith, not just our faith in Jesus, which we share, and not just what we believe Jesus would have us do, but rather, our faith in this church. How much faith do we really have in the leadership of this church? How much do we trust the legacy of ecumenical commitment, of being brought to this place, of being a unique bridge-building church? How much do we have faith in the dialogue of the last 30 years and in those who have dialogued with our ecumenical partners on our behalf? How much do we trust the process we followed, the drafting team who have done what we have asked them to do? How much do we trust those who follow, who will receive our legacy? I think it is a defining moment for our church and I pray that the vote will be 'yes,' and that we will enter the future with a bold sense of faith."

Bishop Richard J. Foss [Eastern North Dakota Synod] said, "I rise to speak against 'Called to Common Mission,' the document proposed in front of us. The arguments have been made very well repeatedly on both sides. The sticking point of the required historic episcopate is still a sticking point. The amendments were good this morning. It reminded me of my scraggly little dog, Trixie. I took her to get groomed last week. She came home clean, smelled good, had a little blue bow on her collar. It did not take long after getting home to realize she was the same dang dog. The amendments cleaned it up a little. I believe we need a new dog. I have worked hard for more than two years up until last night with some of my colleagues to try to find another way, to try to find a compromise, to try to find some way not to come to this up or down vote. That is not possible, I guess, and so I am at least comforted by what I saw on a church on the way down here—a little sign outside: 'When God closes the door, God opens a window.' I think God is closing the door on the document called 'Called to Common Mission.' I think God opened a window with a fresh breeze with the marvelous partnership document we passed with the Moravians, and I trust that that will also be a foretaste of a window and a door that God can open to us if we simply go and start and do something that will bring us together. I vote against CCM."

Ms. Rita J. Dudley [Northeastern Iowa Synod] said, "Reverend Chair, I did not become a Lutheran until 24 years ago when I married my husband. It has been important to me over those 24 years to understand my adopted church, and so I take classes on what it means to be a Lutheran any time the opportunity presents itself. In the past 24 years of learning about this church, with the help of seven different pastors, two congregations, and numerous interns from a nearby seminary, I have learned a great deal about what it means to be a Lutheran. I have intellectualized, rationalized, and emotionally embraced Lutheranism, and have come to love this church deeply. Yet in all of those years of study and discussion, not once has the Lutheran church's historic episcopate been taught as an integral part of what it means to be a Lutheran. Not once has any class or discussion group even brought up the role of the historic episcopate in the formation and understanding of Lutheranism today. While I now know the significance of the historic episcopate, my identity as Lutheran does not hinge on the acceptance or rejection of it. My Lutheran identity comes from my understanding of Word and Sacrament, from my belief in justification by faith—Christ alone, faith alone, grace alone—and from my love for the work this church does all over the world. The historic episcopate is but a small fraction of my identity as a Lutheran. It is certainly not any good reason to block any opportunities for strengthening mission, and 'strengthening' is the key word with The Episcopal Church. I want to do more with my Episcopal brothers and sisters than share service projects, building facilities, and ecumenical services. I want to share my faith, my love of God, my bread and my ministry with them. I urge you to approve CCM so that the resources and energies of our church can..." Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker's time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

Mr. Jared Ratzloff [Southwestern Minnesota Synod] said, “Reverend Chair, I am a lay voting member. I would like to say, though, I do feel that I am in representation of the people in my conference. I come from a Norwegian Lutheran church that believes in Word and Sacrament. Word and Sacrament—the wonderful thing there is the clarity. We call ourselves Lutherans because in Luther’s doctrine, he proclaims the simpleness of it. Why are we going to change a doctrine? To me, it is an identity situation, it is a structural situation, because it is in their name: Episcopal. And let me preface this: we are not against the Episcopalians. I know, I know that the Holy Spirit is here, I know it. We want fervently to work with them and have a full communion agreement with them. In the hearing that I was in, right at the end, there were some questions and heated argument. An Episcopal historian stood up and said, ‘We hold Scripture number one,’ and I said, ‘Then, if this is so, why are you asking us to change our identity?’ To me, it does not make sense. The people at home are confused, they do not understand, and I just want to let everybody here know that the Word and Sacraments are what we hold dear as Lutherans; the Word is where the Holy Spirit comes from, the Holy Spirit comes through us and ecumenical movements come by the Holy Spirit, not a man-made mathematical movement.”

Bishop Robert L. Isaksen [New England Synod] said, “Reverend Bishop. The first presiding bishop of this church, Bishop Chilstrom, gave us a vision of this church which I think was helpful—it still sticks with me—when he talked about a church that was deeply and confidently rooted in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Today we have the opportunity to declare and display some of that confidence. I am from New England, where Lutherans have no idea what it means to be the largest church, the oldest church, the richest church, or the strongest church, and that is why it is so important for us to be here with the rest of you. But we have discovered what it means to be ecumenical leaders. We are not followers in New England, we are sought out for what we can bring to the table, for what we stand for, for our clear emphasis on the Gospel, for our doctrine, for our commitment to mission, and that is a great identity for us to have. Lutherans are uniquely positioned at this point to break an old logjam in the ecumenical movement. If we can be a church that is deeply and confidently rooted in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, we can choose to receive the historic episcopate without becoming the Church of Sweden, without becoming the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Jordan, or El Salvador, or Tanzania, or Zimbabwe, or without becoming The Episcopal Church. We will still govern our own affairs by our own constitution. We will still be able to interpret the historic episcopate according to our own evangelical principles. We will still be in full communion with the Reformed churches and with the Moravian Church, and with other Lutheran churches around the world that do not have it.”

Mr. James Sulerud [Minneapolis Area Synod] said, “I am not a pastor, I am not a bishop, I am not a synod staff, nor am I from one of the church schools. I am a lay delegate like most of us here, and like most of the folks in our 11,000 congregations. I do not think we should adopt CCM today or tomorrow and I will tell you why. The 1997 Churchwide Assembly strongly voted in favor of a process that would lead to a future document that would have widespread, wholehearted, and unambiguous approval at this assembly. While many good and talented folks have worked diligently toward that end, this product, a dividing ‘Called to Common Mission,’ does not reflect the support that was asked for. In my discussions here and at home, support for mutual mission with The Episcopal Church is overwhelming, but support for CCM does not come close. This document does not respond in faithfulness to many of those at home. This dividing document is not nearly our best work. We have got further to go on this issue. The Holy Spirit will not vanish at the end of the millennium, the wind of the last week and this week will be here blowing tomorrow.”

Bishop April Ulring Larson [La Crosse Area Synod] said, “Bishop Anderson, I want to thank all of the voting members of this assembly for this fine discussion and debate. I am proud to be a part of this church. Most of my family, friends, teachers, and mentors—not all, but most of them—are opponents of CCM. That is my heritage. But I have to say that I was a supporter of the Concordat, I am a supporter of ‘Called to Common Mission.’ I believe this is the time and the day and the moment to walk across this bridge, to reach our hands out in stronger fellowship and commitment and unity with our sisters and brothers in The Episcopal Church. We have, I believe, the finest structure in the United States in a denomination. I am so excited about this church—60 percent lay participation at this assembly, our deep commitment to the ministry of the whole people of God. I believe we have the finest clergy—I want to apologize to my Episcopal brothers and sisters when I say that—but I believe we have the finest clergy in the Church and we should bring these wonderful clergy and lay people into this deepening unity, bring our gifts, our rootedness in the Lutheran Confessions. We know who we are, we know what we bring. Each time in my personal life, as I have gained a sister-in-law or a brother-in-law or a cousin-in-law, I have realized that although we have made some adjustments—and I do not like the historic episcopate, I must speak truthfully there—even though we have made some adjustments, everybody...” Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

Mr. Gary Jerke [South Dakota Synod] said, “Thank you, Bishop Anderson. For those of you who may somehow still be undecided, a paragraph that speaks loudly to me is number 13. It says as follows: ‘The Episcopal Church is free to maintain that sharing in the historic catholic episcopate...is nonetheless necessary when Anglicans enter the relationship of full communion....’ Further on down, ‘The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is free to maintain that this same episcopate...is nonetheless not necessary for the relationship of full communion.....’ As I thought about that paragraph there was something that bothered me greatly about it. To me, it was no different than when I proposed to my wife and she said that she would marry me, she would come to me and say, ‘In this marriage I come because I love you,’ and I would go to her and I would say, ‘Well, that might not necessarily be the way I feel, but I will join you in the marriage.’ I feel that we are setting a precedent here that is rather scary for both our church and our society, where we are telling people it is okay to do something, but you do not have to believe in it. And I cannot accept that. And it is for that reason that I vote against the CCM document.”

The Rev. Reinold Schlak Jr. [West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod] said, “When I go home on Monday, Bob Schwartz from the Charleston newspapers is going to call me and ask me my opinions on our vote, whichever way the vote goes. I know Bob Schwartz will call me because two years ago he called me the day after Churchwide Assembly and wanted to know my opinions. So we talked about the historic episcopate and we talked about the Lutheran apprehension. We had a wonderful talk—Bob is very educated and he knows a lot about Lutherans and Episcopalians, but Bob is not Christian—and when it was all over, Bob wanted to know why we really did not love each other enough to put down some differences. The world looks at us and the world does not want to know the finer points of our theologies, but the world does want to know how much we are willing to love. I was a student at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis when that was the focal point of Christendom 25 years ago and the world looked at us to see what we were doing. We knew the finer points of theology and I think I convinced many Lutherans of what some of those finer points could be, but as soon as I took my finer points and tried to explain them to people who were not in the Church—people who were unchristian—they had no idea what I was talking about and they scratched their heads and wondered where the love was. I was moved by the example of

Moravians a hundred years ago, or several hundred years ago, when they were willing to sell themselves into slavery so other people could hear the Gospel. That so moved the slave owners that shortly those conditions were changed, people not only heard the Gospel, but they were freed.”

The Rev. James H. Hanson [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod] said, “Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak against bishops because I am a son of a bishop. My dad was a bishop in Northern Minnesota in one of our predecessor bodies—A. E. Hanson. I cannot speak against ecumenism or full communion because I think we had it in a little town in Hardin, Montana, in 1957. We were the two littlest churches in town and it was Easter time. We did not have enough of a choir for either one of us do a decent job, so we decided to come together, and decided as long as we were coming together, we might as well share Word and Sacrament, and we did. I do not think we had any permission from anybody, and I do not think anybody there, excepting possibly me, had any connection with historic episcopacy because my father happened to be of the old Norwegian Lutheran Synod, and there might be a connection at that point. The point I am making is this. Ecumenism is the work of the Holy Spirit; it is the movement of the people of God toward each other, as inspired by the Holy Spirit and in obedience to the command of our Lord Jesus Christ, ‘By this all men will know you are my disciples, and that you have love for one another.’ I do not think we need all of the words, all of the confusion; we need to keep the conversation so we can be united. I vote against CCM.”

Ms. Linda C. Kempke [Northeastern Ohio Synod] said, “I would respectfully call the assembly, and especially those who are undecided at this point, to our 1991 document of vision for ecumenism [“Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America”]. The last page, Section IV, regarding full communion, has words in there like ‘variety,’ ‘flexibility,’ and one sentence that I think is especially telling, ‘These characteristics stress that the church acts ecumenically for the sake of the world, not for itself alone.’”

Ms. Velma Larson [Northwest Synod of Wisconsin] said, “I come before you today to speak from the perspective of an unemployed college student who sometimes sits in the pew and sometimes stands behind the pulpit. As I was sitting in the pew not long ago, and the offering plate was passed, I was reminded of how sacrificially some of our people give that others may hear about Jesus. I am here today because the church budget allows for my expenses to be paid and I thank you for that. What about the needs that we have been talking about, the people who need to be enabled to have a decent living? What about the perspective of teaching others about Jesus? Our call is to go and to teach, and to provide a mission. I cannot believe that the funds that are sacrificially given to our church should be spent on hierarchy or on travel expenses or on meeting the standards; I believe instead we should focus on teaching others about Jesus, and so I stand against CCM because I believe our money would best be spent elsewhere.”

Bishop Anderson said, “Thank you. I have twenty [minutes] after eleven now, and I am going to suggest that at twenty of twelve, by my watch, we would conclude debate and take the vote. When we get to that point, I will propose that, and it would be possible to extend debate at that time if you wish. But, just to give you some framework. Now let us go to microphone 1.”

Mr. Rocky E. Piro [Northwest Washington Synod] said, “As I have heard the speakers and voting members, I have become more convinced that Jesus is indeed calling us to move forward together with our brothers and sisters in The Episcopal Church in mission and

witness to the world. I do not see where the discussion or debate we have had this week is Church-dividing or something to fear. On the contrary, I found our discussions to be very stimulating, informative, and, in my estimation, begin to set the context for how we move forward with implementing 'Called to Common Mission' in our common life together in a manner that is faithful to our Lord and to our Lutheran Confessions. How far we have come since Philadelphia. Those who drafted CCM have indeed met the challenge of addressing the several somewhat ambiguous and unclear messages in the previous Concordat acted upon in Philadelphia, and I believe today's amendments are icing on the cake. As a result, we have a much stronger document, one that is very much grounded in Scripture, the life of the Church throughout time, and the Lutheran Confessions. I have to also say that at the same time, I delight in hearing at this assembly many of the opponents of the Philadelphia full communion agreement, that they have come to express their commitment to some form of formal communion with Episcopalians. In my opinion, to leave Denver without an agreement for full communion would simply be cruel, cruel for this church body, cruel for our mission in the world, and cruel for the whole people of God. But to support this agreement as amended and commit together to make it work, let us vote 'yes.'"

Mr. Luther D. Peterson [Upstate New York Synod] said, "Bishop Anderson, I deeply regret having to stand in the 'opposed' line, for no one in this auditorium appreciates more than I the rich history of the Anglican communion and its witness to our common Christian message. At issue in our deliberation is our understanding of what Lutheran bishops are. In particular, proponents of CCM have claimed an identity between the bishops of the Church of Sweden and those of the Anglican community. This simply is not true. Thus we need to go back to the 16th century, to its understanding of bishops. Philipp Melancthon is quoted in favor of the historic episcopate, but that is not what he was willing to accept in accepting the office of bishop. He was not willing to accept any role of human institutions in the validation of the Christian message, as is involved in the idea of the historic episcopate. In fact, the Wittenberg theologians went off to Merseberg to celebrate the installation of Georg von Anhalt as bishop—this happened in 1545. Did this mean they accepted the historic episcopate? No. They were willing and found useful to have bishops for the human needs of administration of the Church. But for them, the sole source and validity was God's Word—Scripture and Sacraments. I suggest that there is a fundamental difference in understanding that will be confused and perhaps lost in accepting this document. Let me make a suggestion instead that I understand would not be acceptable." Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker's time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

Bishop Gary M. Wollersheim [Northern Illinois Synod] said, "Bishop Anderson. I wish to speak about mission. I have spent my entire ministry working in the areas of evangelism and outreach. I have been a pastor developer, a re-developer, an evangelist for the ELCA, and a mission director. I have had a chance to work in the city and suburbs, in small towns, and in rural areas. I have participated in planting many, many churches. I rise to say that 'Called to Common Mission' will be of great help to us as we reach out with the Gospel of Jesus Christ. What we can do together is greater than what we do separately. We need these partners; the harvest is plentiful. 'Called to Common Mission' is about mission. 'Called to Common Mission' is witness. 'Called to Common Mission' is about planting the Church. 'Called to Common Mission' is about making Christ known. I urge its approval for the sake of Christ's mission."

Mr. Daniel Eisch [East-Central Synod of Wisconsin] said, "Reverend Chair, I would like to be voting for the CCM, but I am not able to do so. I would strongly endorse the CCM if it were written in the spirit of the Moravian statement. I would hope and pray that upon

defeat of the CCM we can write a statement that will endorse and support our Lutheran heritage and a common mission with our Episcopalian brothers and sisters. With a name like Eisch, I think I can make this observation: I think at times we are—we take our Norwegian heritage too much to heart and we look at ourselves and find something wrong and feel guilty about it. I think this is the time to stand up for who we are, who we have been, and move on with being Lutheran.”

The Rev. Michael F. Keys [Oregon Synod] said, “Reverend Chair, I speak in favor of ‘Called to Common Mission.’ I would like to read from the document that we have just accepted with the Moravians—Section IV, page 16. ‘...thus beginning a position which had episcopal authority and evolved into episcopal office though, it was also understood that there was no fundamental difference between a priest and a bishop. The episcopal office among Moravians is, therefore, of long standing and is intended for the preservation of the apostolic mission of the Church and the administration of its faith, life, and mission....’ I think we have something to learn from the Moravians. I encourage this assembly to re-read the amendment to CCM, Section IV, page 10.1, the resolution from the bishops. We are not voting on a Moravian, Episcopalian, or Swedish Lutheran understanding of the role of the bishop. We are voting on an American Lutheran understanding and ELCA understanding. As this understanding unfolds, it will be nurtured and directed by the Holy Spirit. This vote is about trust, not just trust in our church structures or our bishops, but trusting the Holy Spirit. This vote is about committing to a living relationship in Christ’s Church. I ask this assembly to vote ‘yes’ for unity.”

The Rev. Richard P. Jebsen [Arkansas-Oklahoma Synod] said, “Reverend Chair, I ask you please to permit me an analogy and I assure you that I am speaking to the issue. A bride stood at the end of the aisle just before her wedding and she said to her mother, ‘I do not know if I can do this, I am too nervous.’ Her mother said, ‘Just think of three things: look up that aisle and know that you have walked that aisle many times before, look at that altar and remember that God is here to bless your marriage, and then look at your husband-to-be. Watch him as you go down the aisle.’ And as she went down the aisle, the people on the sides heard her saying, ‘aisle, altar, him, aisle, altar, him.’ I feel like the Lutheran bridegroom standing at the altar and I feel my Episcopal bride saying, ‘aisle, altar, him’ as she comes down the aisle. I love my Episcopal bride very much, but I wish that we could start our marriage on a much more positive basis than ‘aisle, altar, him.’”

The Rev. Muriel N. Heichler [Delaware-Maryland Synod] said, “I speak in favor of ‘Called to Common Mission,’ and make no mistake, the issue is mission, however much the tail may wish to wag the dog. I have seen in Africa the confusion among native people and therefore the destructive sense of Christian witness occasioned by competing denominational mission. During a long life in American foreign service, we often served in countries where there was no Lutheran church or not enough Lutherans to form a church, although we did organize one in Berlin. And so we have worshiped wherever we could, sometimes in churches of the Reformed tradition, and then many Sundays I spent the time driving home from church correcting what my children had heard from the pulpit. In some postings, we were blessed to find Anglican and Episcopal churches. How blessed it was to settle in where we could celebrate our shared theology, our shared understanding of ministry of Word and Sacrament. Our experiences in those churches was that the emphasis came from the laity, the ministry of all the baptized. Nor was my experience with Episcopal bishops anything like what is painted in some of the mailings we received. I sat chatting in my kitchen, while scrambling the breakfast eggs, with Bishop Browning who had confirmed my daughter in

Switzerland. And I appreciated his pastoral concern for my then rebellious teenage son. When I have experienced these bishops in their official capacities, they have uniformly given me a sense—a sign, if you will—of the connectedness of the whole communion of saints of every time and place, and of my connection with...” Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

The Rev. Lee E. Snook [Minneapolis Area Synod] said, “I am a pensioner, and a teacher at a Lutheran seminary. This has seemed like a very long seminar on theology. It has been a good one, and I conclude, as a professor of theology, it has been a draw. I think from here on in, it is going to be a matter of perceptions. I stand here, Bishop Anderson, at the red microphone a bit uneasily, but I do wish to speak critically of CCM. I am uneasy because red can mean anger, and I am not angry. It can mean danger, I do not intend to hurt anybody with my words, but my words are critical of the CCM because I think there are reasons for us to be careful. Eventually when we vote, I think we will be voting largely on perceptions of what is going on. I happen to be one who wishes visible unity with The Episcopal Church, but we know what we disagree about, and that is using language of last year—does this rise to the level of a necessary expression of our unity? I care about perception. I have been wearing a bow tie these last years. After many years, I am not doing so because I got tired of people confusing me with Billy Graham. I am not a Baptist, although some of my friends from the east might think I have become one. Many years ago I learned two things from a Quaker professor at the law school of Cornell: the joys of sailing on the windy waters of Lake Cayuga and the perils of trying to write a legal agreement for partners. He always knew when a partnership would end or fail because the partners tried to cover every detail.” Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

Bishop E. Roy Riley Jr. [New Jersey Synod] said, “I want to speak to this issue again from the point of the interdependence of this church. A few years ago, floods in the upper Midwest crippled the church and its mission in the Eastern Dakotas area. And when pastors and congregations in New Jersey heard about that, they were brokenhearted, especially when I told them how Bishop Foss had said that the pastors in some cases could not find their congregations because they had been separated by the floods. So we gathered offerings and we partnered churches between New Jersey and Eastern North Dakota. And some of the people even went and scraped the mud out of the houses because we understand that as the interdependence of the church. And now in New Jersey we have been inundated. We are inundated by Moslem people who have filled our communities from New York City to Philadelphia. Two Hindu temples have been built in the last ten years in our state, and when they were built, 5,000 people came so that they could watch the holy man invest those marble images as gods to which the people, the children, pray. We are only 82,000 Lutherans in a state of eight million people. We need partners. Episcopalians are wonderful partners for us on our territory. For the sake and out of the interdependence of this church, I urge you to give us these partners in full communion.”

The Rev. Wallace S. Kemp [Florida-Bahamas Synod] said, “The lineups at the microphones are an indication that we need to set this document aside in favor of one that is clearer and simpler. I hope that we will set this aside with a positive ‘no’ for a better ‘yes’ later on.”

The Rev. James T. Swanson [Indiana-Kentucky Synod] said, “Thirty-four ago I was a Lutheran groom standing at the altar—34 years ago today. And the lady who came down the aisle then had certain things that she was expecting of me, and I of her. I do not know

whether they have all been fulfilled on her end; I probably would have to say not all on mine. Nevertheless, as I stood there and as I think back on that, she was not a member of my family when she came down the aisle. The Moravians, as Bishop Anderson has already said, was almost like a family reunion—it felt like that to me as I read the documents. This is not a family reunion as such because we have never been together with the Episcopalians or the Anglican tradition heretofore. This is an opportunity for us, however, to do something as a witness for Jesus Christ and also to show the rest of the world that we are serious about our ecumenical commitments that we have made in the past. It also means, I think, that as we take a look, the call has often been that we need more time. Well, I assure you that as I stood 34 years ago today at an altar, I had some fear and trepidation. I can assure you the lady coming down the aisle did because she had told a friend, ‘I am never going out with that man again, he is a seminarian, you know.’ The fact of the matter is that here we are, and we have been together 34 years. It would be my hope and prayer that it would be much longer than that, led by the Spirit, with the Episcopalians. Nevertheless, we have been with them talking for over 30 years, and we have had a communion interim sharing for 17 years. In 1991, we did more. Now we come to the time. I think it is time for us to say ‘I do.’”

At 11:40 A.M. Mountain Daylight Time, Bishop Anderson said, “Thank you. By my watch, we have come to the end of the time, and I am going to suggest that we now vote unless there is a motion to extend the time.

“Very well. Let us proceed to the vote. Now, this is an inter-church vote; therefore, two-thirds of the votes cast are required for adoption. I am going to ask the secretary of the church to read the motion before you, then I am going to ask him to lead us in prayer. After the vote has been taken, whatever the outcome, I am asking Pastor Almen once again to lead us in prayer, and then I am going to ask that we sing together Hymn 45, which is, ‘If You But Trust In God To Guide You.’ Secretary Almen.”

Secretary Almen said, “The motion is printed on page three of Section IV. The words ‘amended and’ will be inserted in the motion as follows:”

Moved;

Seconded: RESOLVED, that this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America accepts “Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*,” as amended and set forth below, as the basis for a relationship of full communion to be established between The Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America requests that Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America convey this action to Presiding Bishop Frank T. Griswold of The Episcopal Church.

Bishop Anderson said, “Would you lead us in prayer?”

Secretary Almen said, “The Lord be with you. [Response: And also with you.] Let us pray. Eternal God, by your gracious Spirit, grant us to know what we ought to know, to love what we ought to love, to praise what delights you most, and to value what is precious in your sight. Above all, enable us to seek in all things what is the good pleasure of your will, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen”

Bishop Anderson said, "All right. All favoring the proposal which you have just heard will vote 'yes' by pressing 1; if you wish to vote 'no,' press 2. Please vote now. The voting is closed. Let us see the results. By a vote of 716 to 317, the resolution is passed."

ASSEMBLY

Two-Thirds Vote Required

ACTION

Yes-716; No-317

CA99.04.12 **RESOLVED, that this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America accepts "Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the Concordat of Agreement," as amended and set forth below, as the basis for a relationship of full communion to be established between The Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and be it further**

RESOLVED, that this Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America requests that Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America convey this action to Presiding Bishop Frank T. Griswold of The Episcopal Church.

CALLED TO COMMON MISSION:

A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*

Introduction

Our churches have discovered afresh our unity in the Gospel and our commitment to the mission to which God calls the church of Jesus Christ in every generation. Unity and mission are organically linked in the Body of Christ, the church. All baptized people are called to lives of faithful witness and service in the name of Jesus. Indeed, the baptized are nourished and sustained by Christ as encountered in Word and Sacrament. Our search for a fuller expression of visible unity is for the sake of living and sharing the Gospel. Unity and mission are at the heart of the church's life, reflecting thereby an obedient response to the call of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Many years of thorough and conscientious dialogue have brought our churches to this moment. The history of how far our churches have already traveled together is significant. It guides us on a common path toward the unity for which Christ prayed.

The purpose of this *Concordat of Agreement* is to achieve full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church. Our churches have set this goal in response to our Lord's Prayer that all may be one. Our growing unity is urgently required so that our churches will be empowered to engage more fully and more faithfully the mission of God in the world.

I ask not only on behalf of these, but also on behalf of those who will believe in me through their word, that they may all be one. As you, Father, are in me and I am in you, may they also be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me (John 17:20-21).

The Concordat is the latest stage in a long history of ecumenical dialogue between the two churches. Although the issues that gave rise to the Protestant Reformation in England and on the European continent were dissimilar in some respects, Anglicans and Lutherans have long recognized something of themselves in each other, and our churches have never issued condemnations against one another. Liturgical and sacramental worship has always figured largely in the identity and character of each tradition. Moreover, the architects of reformation, both in England and on the continent, were concerned to uphold the catholic faith. Thus it is no surprise that official ecumenical conversations between Lutherans and Anglicans date back to the late nineteenth century.

The first official conversation in this century involving Anglicans and Lutherans in the U.S.A. took place in December 1935, between The Episcopal Church and The Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church, a church with roots in Sweden. In 1969, the first of three rounds of Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue began. Periodic reports were submitted to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and its predecessor bodies and to The Episcopal Church. Two final reports, *Implications of the Gospel* and “*Toward Full Communion*” and “*Concordat of Agreement*,” were submitted in 1988 and 1991 respectively.

Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue was coordinated through the Lutheran World Federation and the Anglican Consultative Council with the Anglican-Lutheran International Conversations, the European Regional Commission, and the other national and local dialogues. Consultations were held as well with other churches and traditions in dialogue with Lutherans and Anglicans.

In 1996, the Nordic and Baltic Lutheran and the British and Irish Anglican churches entered communion on the basis of agreement in The Porvoo Common Statement. Earlier, in 1988, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany and the Church of England agreed on steps to closer relations on the basis of The Meissen Declaration. Anglican and Lutheran churches in Canada, in Southern and Eastern Africa, and in Asia have initiated dialogue and begun to share in mission. These actions, and those that follow, help to prepare us and, indeed, other churches committed to the ecumenical movement, to move from our present separation into a relationship of full communion.

Official Text

CALLED TO COMMON MISSION:

A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*

1. The Lutheran-Episcopal Agreement of 1982 identified as its goal the establishment of “full communion (*communio in sacris*/altar and pulpit fellowship)” between The Episcopal Church and the churches that united to form the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. As the meaning of full communion for purposes of this *Concordat of Agreement*, both churches endorse in principle the definitions agreed to by the (international) Anglican-Lutheran Joint Working Group at Cold Ash, Berkshire, England, in 1983, which they deem

to be in full accord with their own definitions given in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America's policy statement "Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America" (1991), and in the "Declaration on Unity" of The Episcopal Church (1979). This agreement describes the relationship between our two church bodies. It does not define the church, which is a gift of God's grace.

2. We therefore understand full communion to be a relation between distinct churches in which each recognizes the other as a catholic and apostolic church holding the essentials of the Christian faith. Within this new relation, churches become interdependent while remaining autonomous. Full communion includes the establishment locally and nationally of recognized organs of regular consultation and communication, including episcopal collegiality, to express and strengthen the fellowship and enable common witness, life, and service. Diversity is preserved, but this diversity is not static. Neither church seeks to remake the other in its own image, but each is open to the gifts of the other as it seeks to be faithful to Christ and his mission. They are together committed to a visible unity in the church's mission to proclaim the Word and administer the Sacraments.

3. The Episcopal Church agrees that in its General Convention, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America agrees that in its Churchwide Assembly, there shall be one vote to accept or reject, as a matter of verbal content as well as in principle, the full set of agreements to follow. If they are adopted by both churches, each church agrees to make those legislative, canonical, constitutional, and liturgical changes that are needed and appropriate for the full communion between the churches. In adopting this document, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church specifically acknowledge and declare that it has been correctly interpreted by the resolution of the Conference of Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, adopted at Tucson, Arizona, March 8, 1999.¹

A. Agreements

Agreement in the Doctrine of the Faith

4. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church recognize in each other the essentials of the one catholic and apostolic faith as it is witnessed in the unaltered *Augsburg Confession*, the *Small Catechism*, and *The Book of Common Prayer* of 1979 (including "Ordination Rites" and "An Outline of the Faith"), and also as it is summarized in part in *Implications of the Gospel* and "*Toward Full Communion*" and "*Concordat of Agreement*," (containing the reports of Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue III), the papers and official conversations of Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue III, and the statements formulated by Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogues I and II. Each church also promises to encourage its people to study each other's basic documents.

5. We endorse the international Anglican-Lutheran doctrinal consensus which was summarized in *The Niagara Report* (1989) as follows:

"We accept the authority of the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. We read the Scriptures liturgically in the course of the church's year.

"We accept the Niceno-Constantinopolitan and Apostles' Creeds and confess the basic Trinitarian and Christological Dogmas to which these creeds testify. That is, we believe that Jesus of Nazareth is true God and true Man, and that God is authentically identified as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

¹ The full text of the "Tucson Resolution" of the Conference of Bishops has been included in these minutes for ease of reference as Exhibit E.

“Anglicans and Lutherans use very similar orders of service for the Eucharist, for the Prayer Offices, for the administration of Baptism, for the rites of Marriage, Burial, and Confession and Absolution. We acknowledge in the liturgy both a celebration of salvation through Christ and a significant factor in forming the *consensus fidelium* [the consensus of the faithful]. We have many hymns, canticles, and collects in common.

“We believe that baptism with water in the name of the Triune God unites the one baptized with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, initiates into the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church, and confers the gracious gift of new life.

“We believe that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, distributed, and received under the forms of bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper. We also believe that the grace of divine forgiveness offered in the sacrament is received with the thankful offering of ourselves for God’s service.

“We believe and proclaim the Gospel, that in Jesus Christ God loves and redeems the world. We share a common understanding of God’s justifying grace, i.e. that we are accounted righteous and are made righteous before God only by grace through faith because of the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not on account of our works or merit. Both our traditions affirm that justification leads and must lead to ‘good works’; authentic faith issues in love.

“Anglicans and Lutherans believe that the church is not the creation of individual believers, but that it is constituted and sustained by the Triune God through God’s saving action in Word and Sacraments. We believe that the church is sent into the world as sign, instrument, and foretaste of the kingdom of God. But we also recognize that the church stands in constant need of reform and renewal.

“We believe that all members of the church are called to participate in its apostolic mission. They are therefore given various ministries by the Holy Spirit. Within the community of the church the ordained ministry exists to serve the ministry of the whole people of God. We hold the ordained ministry of Word and Sacrament to be a gift of God to his church and therefore an office of divine institution.

“We believe that a ministry of pastoral oversight (*episkope*), exercised in personal, collegial, and communal ways, is necessary to witness to and safeguard the unity and apostolicity of the church.

“We share a common hope in the final consummation of the kingdom of God and believe that we are compelled to work for the establishment of justice and peace. The obligations of the kingdom are to govern our life in the church and our concern for the world. The Christian faith is that God has made peace through Jesus ‘by the blood of his cross’ (Colossians 1:20) so establishing the one valid center for the unity of the whole human family.”

Agreement in Ministry

6. The ministry of the whole people of God forms the context for what is said here about all forms of ministry. We together affirm that all members of Christ’s church are commissioned for ministry through baptism. All are called to represent Christ and his church; to bear witness to him wherever they may be; to carry on Christ’s work of reconciliation in the world; and to participate in the life, worship, and governance of the church. We give thanks for a renewed discovery of the centrality of the ministry of all the

baptized in both our churches. Our witness to the Gospel and pursuit of peace, justice, and reconciliation in the world have been immeasurably strengthened. Because both our churches affirm this ministry which has already been treated in our previous dialogues, it is not here extensively addressed. Both churches need more adequately to realize the ministry of the baptized through discernment of gifts, education, equipping the saints for ministry, and seeking and serving Christ in all persons.

7. We acknowledge that one another's ordained ministries are and have been given by God to be instruments of God's grace in the service of God's people, and possess not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also Christ's commission through his body, the church. We acknowledge that personal, collegial, and communal oversight is embodied and exercised in both our churches in a diversity of forms, in fidelity to the teaching and mission of the apostles. We agree that ordained ministers are called and set apart for the one ministry of Word and Sacrament, and that they do not cease thereby to share in the priesthood of all believers. They fulfill their particular ministries within the community of the faithful and not apart from it. The concept of the priesthood of all believers affirms the need for ordained ministry, while at the same time setting ministry in proper relationship to the laity. The Anglican tradition uses the terms "presbyter" and "priest" and the Lutheran tradition in America characteristically uses the term "pastor" for the same ordained ministry.

8. In order to give witness to the faith we share (see paragraphs 4 and 5 above), we agree that the one ordained ministry will be shared between the two churches in a common pattern for the sake of common mission. In the past, each church has sought and found ways to exercise the ordained ministry in faithfulness to the apostolic message and mission. Each has developed structures of oversight that serve the continuity of this ministry under God's Word. Within the future common pattern, the ministry of pastors/priests will be shared from the outset (see paragraph 16 below). Some functions of ordained deacons in The Episcopal Church and consecrated diaconal ministers and deaconesses in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America can be shared insofar as they are called to be agents of the church in meeting needs, hopes, and concerns within church and society. The churches will over time come to share in the ministry of bishops in an evangelical, historic succession (see paragraph 19 below). This succession also is manifest in the churches' use of the apostolic scriptures, the confession of the ancient creeds, and the celebration of the sacraments instituted by our Lord. As our churches live in full communion, our ordained ministries will still be regulated by the constitutional framework of each church.

9. Important expectations of each church for a shared ordained ministry will be realized at the beginning of our new relation: an immediate recognition by The Episcopal Church of presently existing ordained ministers within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and a commitment by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to receive and adapt an episcopate that will be shared. Both churches acknowledge that the diaconate, including its place within the threefold ministerial office and its relationship with all other ministries, is in need of continuing exploration, renewal, and reform, which they pledge themselves to undertake in consultation with one another. The ordination of deacons, deaconesses, or diaconal ministers by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is not required by this Concordat.

10. The New Testament describes a laying-on-of-hands to set persons apart for a variety of ministries. In the history of the church, many and various terms have been used to describe the rite by which a person becomes a bishop. In the English language these terms include: confecting, consecrating, constituting, installing, making, ordaining, ordering. Both

our traditions have used the term “consecration of bishops” for this same rite at some times. Today the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America uses the term “installation” while The Episcopal Church uses the word “ordination” for the rite by which a person becomes a bishop. What is involved in each case is the setting apart within the one ministry of Word and Sacrament of a person elected and called for the exercise of oversight (*episkope*) wider than the local congregation in the service of the Gospel.

11. “Historic succession” refers to a tradition which goes back to the ancient church, in which bishops already in the succession install newly elected bishops with prayer and the laying-on-of-hands. At present The Episcopal Church has bishops in this historic succession, as do all the churches of the Anglican Communion, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at present does not, although some member churches of the Lutheran World Federation do. The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1886/1888, the ecumenical policy of The Episcopal Church, refers to this tradition as “the historic episcopate.” In the Lutheran Confessions, Article 14 of the *Apology* refers to this episcopal pattern by the phrase, “the ecclesiastical and canonical polity” which it is “our deep desire to maintain.”

12. **Commitment and Definition.** As a result of their agreement in faith and in testimony of their full communion with one another, both churches now make the following commitment to share an episcopal succession that is both evangelical and historic. They promise to include regularly one or more bishops of the other church to participate in the laying-on-of-hands at the ordinations/installations of their own bishops as a sign, though not a guarantee, of the unity and apostolic continuity of the whole church. With the laying-on-of-hands by other bishops, such ordinations/installations will involve prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit. Both churches value and maintain a ministry of *episkope* as one of the ways, in the context of ordained ministries and of the whole people of God, in which the apostolic succession of the church is visibly expressed and personally symbolized in fidelity to the Gospel through the ages. By such a liturgical statement the churches recognize that the bishop serves the diocese or synod through ties of collegiality and consultation that strengthen its links with the universal church. It is also a liturgical expression of the full communion initiated by this Concordat, calling for mutual planning and common mission in each place. We agree that when persons duly called and elected are ordained/installed in this way, they are understood to join bishops already in this succession and thus to enter the historic episcopate.

13. While our two churches will come to share in the historic institution of the episcopate in the church (as defined in paragraph 12 above), each remains free to explore its particular interpretations of the ministry of bishops in evangelical and historic succession. Whenever possible, this should be done in consultation with one another. The Episcopal Church is free to maintain that sharing in the historic catholic episcopate, while not necessary for salvation or for recognition of another church as a church, is nonetheless necessary when Anglicans enter the relationship of full communion in order to link the local churches for mutual responsibility in the communion of the larger church. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is free to maintain that this same episcopate, although pastorally desirable when exercised in personal, collegial, and communal ways, is nonetheless not necessary for the relationship of full communion. Such freedom is evidenced by its communion with such non-episcopal churches as the Reformed churches of *A Formula of Agreement* and most churches within the Lutheran World Federation.

14. The two churches will acknowledge immediately the full authenticity of each other’s ordained ministries (bishops, priests, and deacons in The Episcopal Church and pastors in

the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America). The creation of a common and fully interchangeable ministry of bishops in full communion will occur with the incorporation of all active bishops in the historic episcopal succession and the continuing process of collegial consultation in matters of Christian faith and life. For both churches, the relationship of full communion begins when both churches adopt this Concordat. For the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the characteristics of the goal of full communion—defined in its 1991 policy statement, “Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America”—will be realized at this time. For The Episcopal Church, full communion, although begun at the same time, will not be fully realized until both churches determine that in the context of a common life and mission there is a shared ministry of bishops in the historic episcopate. For both churches, life in full communion entails more than legislative decisions and shared ministries. The people of both churches have to receive and share this relationship as they grow together in full communion.

B. Actions of The Episcopal Church

15. The Episcopal Church by this Concordat recognizes the ministers ordained in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America or its predecessor bodies as fully authentic. The Episcopal Church acknowledges that the pastors and bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America minister as pastors/priests within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and that the bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America are pastors/priests exercising a ministry of oversight (*episkope*) within its synods. Further, The Episcopal Church agrees that all bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America who are chosen after both churches pass this Concordat and installed within the ministry of the historic episcopate will be understood by The Episcopal Church as having been ordained into this ministry (see paragraph 18 below).

16. To enable the full communion that is coming into being by means of this Concordat, The Episcopal Church pledges to continue the process for enacting a temporary suspension, in this case only, of the seventeenth-century restriction that “no persons are allowed to exercise the offices of bishop, priest, or deacon in this Church unless they are so ordained, or have already received such ordination with the laying-on-of-hands by bishops who are themselves duly qualified to confer Holy Orders” (“Preface to the Ordination Rites,” *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 510). The purpose of this action, to declare this restriction inapplicable to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, will be to permit the full interchangeability and reciprocity of all its pastors as priests or presbyters within The Episcopal Church, without any further ordination or re-ordination or supplemental ordination whatsoever, subject always to canonically or constitutionally approved invitation. The purpose of temporarily suspending this restriction, which has been a constant requirement in Anglican polity since the Ordinal of 1662, is precisely in order to secure the future implementation of the ordinals’ same principle in the sharing of ordained ministries. It is for this reason that The Episcopal Church can feel confident in taking this unprecedented step with regard to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

17. The Episcopal Church acknowledges and seeks to receive the gifts of the Lutheran tradition which has consistently emphasized the primacy of the Word. The Episcopal Church therefore endorses the Lutheran affirmation that the historic catholic episcopate under the Word of God must always serve the Gospel, and that the ultimate authority under which bishops preach and teach is the Gospel itself (see *Augsburg Confession* 28. 21-23). In testimony and implementation thereof, The Episcopal Church agrees to establish and

welcome, either by itself or jointly with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, structures for collegial and periodic review of the ministry exercised by bishops with a view to evaluation, adaptation, improvement, and continual reform in the service of the Gospel.

C. Actions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

18. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America agrees that all its bishops chosen after both churches pass this Concordat will be installed for pastoral service of the Gospel with this church's intention to enter the ministry of the historic episcopate. They will be understood by The Episcopal Church as having been ordained into this ministry, even though tenure in office of the Presiding Bishop and synodical bishops may be terminated by retirement, resignation, disciplinary action, or conclusion of term. Any subsequent installation of a bishop so installed includes a prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit without the laying-on-of-hands. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America further agrees to revise its rite for the "Installation of a Bishop" to reflect this understanding. A distinction between episcopal and pastoral ministries within the one office of Word and Sacrament is neither commanded nor forbidden by divine law (see *Apology of the Augsburg Confession* 14.1 and the *Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope* 63). By thus freely accepting the historic episcopate, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America does not thereby affirm that it is necessary for the unity of the church (*Augsburg Confession* 7.3).

19. In order to receive the historic episcopate, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America pledges that, following the adoption of this Concordat and in keeping with the collegiality and continuity of ordained ministry attested as early as Canon 4 of the First Ecumenical Council (Nicaea I, A.D. 325), at least three bishops already sharing in the sign of the episcopal succession will be invited to participate in the installation of its next Presiding Bishop through prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit and with the laying-on-of-hands. These participating bishops will be invited from churches of the Lutheran communion which share in the historic episcopate. In addition, a bishop or bishops will be invited from The Episcopal Church to participate in the same way as a symbol of the full communion now shared. Synodical bishops elected and awaiting installation may be similarly installed at the same service, if they wish. Further, all other installations of bishops in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will be through prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit and with the laying-on-of-hands by other bishops, at least three of whom are to be in the historic succession (see paragraph 12 above). Its liturgical rites will reflect these provisions.

20. In accord with the historic practice whereby the bishop is representative of the wider church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America agrees to make constitutional and liturgical provision that a bishop shall regularly preside and participate in the laying-on-of-hands at the ordination of all clergy. Pastors shall continue to participate with the bishop in the laying-on-of-hands at all ordinations of pastors. Such offices are to be exercised as servant ministry, and not for domination or arbitrary control. All the people of God have a true equality, dignity, and authority for building up the body of Christ.

21. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America by this Concordat recognizes the bishops, priests, and deacons ordained in The Episcopal Church as fully authentic ministers in their respective orders within The Episcopal Church and the bishops of The Episcopal Church as chief pastors in the historic succession exercising a ministry of oversight (*episkope*) within its dioceses.

D. Actions of Both Churches

Interchangeability of Clergy: Occasional Ministry, Extended Service, Transfer

22. In this Concordat, the two churches declare that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith, although this does not require from either church acceptance of all doctrinal formulations of the other. Ordained ministers serving occasionally or for an extended period in the ministry of the other church will be expected to undergo the appropriate acceptance procedures of that church respecting always the internal discipline of each church. For the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, such ministers will be expected to preach, teach, and administer the sacraments in a manner that is consistent with its "Confession of Faith" as written in chapter two of the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*. For The Episcopal Church, such ministers will be expected to teach and act in a manner that is consistent with the doctrine, discipline, and worship of The Episcopal Church. Ordained ministers from either church seeking long-term ministry with primary responsibility in the other will be expected to apply for clergy transfer and to agree to the installation vow or declaration of conformity in the church to which she or he is applying to minister permanently.

Joint Commission

23. To assist in joint planning for mission, both churches authorize the establishment of a joint commission, fully accountable to the decision-making bodies of the two churches. Its purpose will be consultative, to facilitate mutual support and advice as well as common decision making through appropriate channels in fundamental matters that the churches may face together in the future. The joint commission will work with the appropriate boards, committees, commissions, and staff of the two churches concerning such ecumenical, doctrinal, pastoral, and liturgical matters as may arise, always subject to approval by the appropriate decision-making bodies of the two churches.

Wider Context

24. In thus moving to establish, in geographically overlapping episcopates in collegial consultation, one ordained ministry open to women as well as to men, to married persons as well as to single persons, both churches agree that the historic catholic episcopate can be locally adapted and reformed in the service of the Gospel. In this spirit they offer this Concordat and growth toward full communion for serious consideration among the churches of the Reformation as well as among the Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches. They pledge widespread consultation during the process at all stages. Each church promises to issue no official commentary on this text that has not been accepted by the joint commission as a legitimate interpretation thereof.

Existing Relationships

25. Each church agrees that the other church will continue to live in communion with all the churches with whom the latter is now in communion. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America continues to be in full communion (pulpit and altar fellowship) with all member churches of the Lutheran World Federation and with three of the Reformed family of churches (Presbyterian Church [U.S.A.], Reformed Church in America, and United Church of Christ). This Concordat does not imply or inaugurate any automatic communion between The Episcopal Church and those churches with whom the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is in full communion. The Episcopal Church continues to be in full communion

with all the Provinces of the Anglican Communion, with the Old Catholic Churches of Europe, with the united churches of the Indian subcontinent, with the Mar Thoma Church, and with the Philippine Independent Church. This Concordat does not imply or inaugurate any automatic communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and those churches with whom The Episcopal Church is in full communion.

Other Dialogues

26. Both churches agree that each will continue to engage in dialogue with other churches and traditions. Both churches agree to take each other and this Concordat into account at every stage in their dialogues with other churches and traditions. Where appropriate, both churches will seek to engage in joint dialogues. On the basis of this Concordat, both churches pledge that they will not enter into formal agreements with other churches and traditions without prior consultation with each other. At the same time both churches pledge that they will not impede the development of relationships and agreements with other churches and traditions with whom they have been in dialogue.

E. Conclusion

27. Recognizing each other as churches in which the Gospel is truly preached and the holy sacraments duly administered, we receive with thanksgiving the gift of unity which is already given in Christ.

He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in him all things in heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or powers—all things have been created through him and for him. He himself is before all things, and in him all things hold together. He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, so that he might come to have first place in everything. For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him God was pleased to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, by making peace through the blood of his cross (Colossians 1:15-20).

28. Repeatedly Christians have echoed the scriptural confession that the unity of the church is both Christ's own work and his call to us. It is therefore our task as well as his gift. We must "make every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Ephesians 4:3). We pray that we may rely upon, and willingly receive from one another, the gifts Christ gives through his Spirit "for building up the body of Christ" in love (Ephesians 4:16).

29. We do not know to what new, recovered, or continuing tasks of mission this Concordat will lead our churches, but we give thanks to God for leading us to this point. We entrust ourselves to that leading in the future, confident that our full communion will be a witness to the gift and goal already present in Christ, "so that God may be all in all" (1 Corinthians 15:28). Entering full communion and thus removing limitations through mutual recognition of faith, sacraments, and ministries will bring new opportunities and levels of shared evangelism, witness, and service. It is the gift of Christ that we are sent as he has been sent (John 17:17-26), that our unity will be received and perceived as we participate together in the mission of the Son in obedience to the Father through the power and presence of the Holy Spirit.

Now to him who by the power at work within us is able to accomplish abundantly far more than all we can ask or imagine, to him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus to all generations, forever and ever. Amen (Ephesians 3:20-21).

Response to the Action on Full Communion with The Episcopal Church

Bishop Anderson said, “And I would now—friends, we will have a chance to—we will have a chance to think about this. Let us just wait in the moment and ask God’s guidance as we move forward. Secretary Almen.”

Secretary Almen said, “Let us pray. O God of peace, who through your Son Jesus Christ set forth one faith for the salvation of humanity: Send your grace and heavenly blessing upon all Christian people who are striving to draw nearer to you and to each other, in the unity of the Spirit and in the bond of peace. Give us penitence for our divisions, wisdom always to seek your truth, courage to do your will, and unswerving loyalty to your holy name; that together we may seek your glory and the advancement of your rule in our lives and in our world; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.”

Bishop Anderson then invited the assembly to stand and sing the hymn, “If You But Trust in God to Guide You.” Following the hymn, he said, “Today we have made history in these two remarkable ecumenical relationships.”

Then Bishop Anderson addressed the assembly, saying: “Brothers and sisters in Christ. Thank you. I am hoping that these agreements will be an opportunity to show the world a new way to be one in Christ. In the case of ‘Called to Common Mission,’ we need to remember that at this point, it is only a Lutheran proposal to The Episcopal Church. None of these proposals will go into effect until after The Episcopal Church acts on it next summer. And in the meantime, I hope that you will join with me in addressing the questions and concerns of congregations that still have doubts about the wisdom of this move. We owe them the opportunity to hear clearly what we have heard and to share what we have learned here, and to hear what we can do to help them understand and fully participate in this new relationship.

“I do want to seriously thank all of those who took part in the discussion. I think you did an excellent job of talking to each other, and I particularly appreciate the few of you who had some humor to help us through the difficult moments. I think particularly of those who labored in the dialogues, sometimes for many years, more recently with the Moravians. I want to thank these ecumenical partners in dialogues who are now closer to us as sisters and brothers in Christ. And a special thanks to the drafting team that has worked over the past two years, and to those of you who raised important concerns and challenged us to find the best possible way we could go forward. You have all contributed to a better document. I celebrate these votes and these agreements. I think we are given now a task by God that we need to carry through faithfully. Let us keep the mission of Christ always before us as we work out our new life together.”

Secretary Almen observed that there was a speaker standing at a microphone. Bishop Anderson recognized him.

The Rev. Phillip E. Olson [Northeastern Iowa Synod] said, “Thank you. Just a question. Will the full text of the revised CCM be a part of the *Preliminary Minutes* that we will get tomorrow?” Bishop Anderson asked Secretary Almen to respond to the question, who said, “Yes, we will seek to ensure that.”

Bishop Anderson then recognized Bishop C. Christopher Epting [the Episcopal Diocese of Iowa] to greet the assembly.

Bishop Epting said, “Thank you. I would like our ecumenical officer, David Perry, to have a word first, please.”

Father Perry observed, "What hope for a new century! I know we are not supposed to have cell phones or use them any way in this room. I cannot wait to get off the platform. In Philadelphia, I think I told those of you who were there that I had some phone calls to make in what I wanted to say. The first phone call I will have to make is to our presiding bishop, Frank Griswold, who has been praying all day long in New Hampshire under a tree somewhere, I know. I know he rejoices with us. I want to say thank you to you all—if I can speak for two-and-a-half million faithful Episcopalians who rejoice—and I believe truly the Spirit will lead us in this very room probably next year in July in 2000 to confirm the action you have taken this day. I also want to thank you for 70 million Anglicans around the world. This is an incredible step you have taken this day. And, my own mother-in-law—my 90-year-old mother-in-law, the Norwegian South Dakota Lutheran from Dell Rapids; I think I better call my wife before I call her—but we have been praying and in constant contact for two years, and she sends her love. I was in her parish in Dell Rapids in June when I went to speak to the South Dakota Synod, and I actually went into the church building that her father and grandfather had built. They are going to celebrate a 125-years anniversary. I gave thanks for them and the church they had built, but I also prayed for all of us that we would continue to build that church faithfully. Thank you."

Bishop Epting said, "I did not sleep very well last night—maybe I could say I slept intermittently last night. Finally I gave up and decided it was time to say my morning prayers a bit earlier than I normally do, and as I turned to the psalms appointed for this morning in our Lectionary, and prayed the psalms, the first one was Psalm 131. It says, 'Oh Lord, my heart is not lifted up, my eyes are not raised too high, I do not occupy myself with things too great or too marvelous for me, but I have calmed and quieted my soul like a weaned child with its mother. My soul is like a weaned child that is with me. O Israel, hope in the Lord from this time forth forevermore.' And that helped, that psalm, to quiet me and to focus and center me again on the God who leads us. In Psalm 132 and Psalm 133: 'How very good and pleasant it is when kindred live together in unity. It is like precious oil on the head running down upon the beard, upon the beard of Aaron, running down over the collar of his robes. It is like the dew of Hermon which falls on the mountains of Zion, for there the Lord has ordained His blessing, life forevermore.' And that psalm helped even more. I pray that unity for you now and pledge you our partnership and support to work for that, and I pledge you that unity between our two communions. God bless you and thank you."

Bishop Anderson said, "Thank you. I think we are ready now for announcements. We will postpone the further legislative action. Microphone 5."

The Rev. John K. Stendahl [New England Synod] said, "Before we move on, I would request one additional rising act of appreciation from this assembly for the leadership, the grace, and the fortitude of our presiding bishop through this debate." The assembly responded with applause.

Recess

Secretary Almen encouraged voting members to refer to the capsule agenda for the times of upcoming deadlines, then offered several announcements about the Holy Communion and Compline services scheduled later in the day, and gave instructions for those who had signed up for the city tours.

Bishop Anderson invited the Rev. Larry V. Smoose, a member of the Church Council, to lead the assembly in prayer and a hymn, "In Christ There Is No East or West." Following the hymn, at 12:02 P.M., Bishop Anderson declared the assembly in recess until 8:30 A.M. on Friday, August 20, 1999.

Plenary Session Seven

Friday, August 20, 1999

8:30 A.M.–12:00 NOON

The Rev. H. George Anderson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, called Plenary Session Seven to order at 8:35 A.M. Mountain Daylight Time on Friday, August 20, 1999.

Bishop Anderson invited to the podium Mr. D. Mark Klever, a member of the Church Council, to lead the assembly in morning prayer. Worship opened with the hymn, “Whatever God Ordains is Right,” and the service was accompanied by instrumentalists from the Lutheran Music Program, who also played for the assembly before the plenary session opened.

Following worship, Bishop Anderson reviewed the upcoming events of the day and thanked the voting members for their graciousness toward one another demonstrated during discussion and debate thus far. Bishop Anderson then shared with the assembly that he had been thinking about some of the consequences of the ecumenical decisions of August 19, 1999. He said he wanted to take seriously the concerns that were raised during those discussions, and had been trying to decide how to respond most helpfully to those concerns while sharing his conviction that this church can maintain its Lutheran identity along with its ecumenical relationships. Bishop Anderson stated that this topic would be discussed among the members of the Church Council and the Conference of Bishops at lunch this day, and invited anyone with ideas about how the issues raised might be addressed to speak with a bishop or council member.

Mr. Michael E. Niebauer [Southwestern Washington Synod] rose on a point of personal privilege and asked for prayers for the Rev. Paul R. Wuest, who was having kidney surgery this morning. Bishop Anderson led a moment of prayer, asking for God’s strength for and blessing on Pastor Wuest and his family.

Bishop Anderson informed the assembly of the abundant news coverage of the ecumenical decisions and of the record number of visits to this church’s Web site. He also said that he hoped that the “depth of conversation, gracious hospitality, listening to one another, and prayerful hopefulness” that marked the ecumenical discussions would continue as we “journey together with our ecumenical partners.” Bishop Anderson then reviewed the agenda for Plenary Session Seven, announcing minor changes.

Mr. Marc S. Williams [La Crosse Area Synod] rose on a point of clarification, asking whether the previous day’s two-minute limitation on speeches was still in effect. Upon hearing Bishop Anderson say it was no longer in effect, Mr. Williams moved that speeches this day also be limited to two minutes.

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes–749, No–180

CARRIED: To limit speeches to two minutes during this day’s plenary session.

Bible Study III

Bishop Anderson called upon the Rev. Wayne E. Weissenbuehler to continue his “superb” Bible study of Acts.

Pastor Weissenbuehler spoke of God’s signs and wonders. He presented the miracle of healing described in Acts 3:1-21 and spoke of that miracle as a sign of the new age breaking into the status quo. He asked the assembly to memorize the phrase, “in the name of Jesus Christ” from today’s study, and proclaimed that Jesus’ name has the power to heal. “What has happened? True faith in Jesus’ name is all that has happened,” Pastor Weissenbuehler said. He described faith as the relationship between God and God’s people, a relationship that is inherent to healing. He called the assembly to consider again the power of Jesus’ name to create and make faith happen. But “be thou careful,” he warned, citing the unhappy ending of the Acts 19:11-16 story, in which itinerant Jewish exorcists tried to use the name of Jesus over those who had evil spirits.

“What is the purpose of these signs and wonders?” he asked the assembly. God’s signs and wonders cause us to contrast our actions and God’s. Peter named this contrast in Acts 3:14-15 (NRSV): “[You] asked to have a murderer given to you, and you killed the Author of Life.” God’s signs and wonders lead us to repentance so that forgiveness can happen, he said. Repentance is related to the past but oriented to the future.

As he concluded his Bible study, Pastor Weissenbuehler asked the assembly, “Are signs and wonders in the name of Jesus being done among us today? If not, why not? We have our work cut out for us, so let us get at it!”

At the completion of this day’s Bible study, Bishop Anderson thanked Pastor Weissenbuehler for his thought-provoking study in Acts.

Theme Focus: Signs of Hope

Bishop Anderson called upon Ms. Addie J. Butler, vice president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to present another “Sign of Hope,” this one highlighting the many ways in which this church is a *responsive* church.

Vice President Butler provided examples of the way this church responds to disasters, both natural and human, and to many other people in need. She characterized this church as the hands of Christ and then showed those hands at work through a video about Lutheran Disaster Response. She cited the hundreds of thousands of dollars in emergency aid and the hundreds of volunteers as evidence of this church’s care. Vice President Butler concluded her presentation by saying, “Together we extend the hand of our Lord in mercy providing aid, caring for all of God’s children, and giving hope to those who are hopeless.”

Quasi-Committee of the Whole for General Discussion: Social Statement on Economic Life

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 45-54 (Section I, page 14); continued on *Minutes*, pages 116, 416.

Bishop Anderson introduced the proposed social statement on economic life for discussion by recalling that it had been first introduced Tuesday morning [during Plenary Session Two] and noted that assembly members had the opportunity to participate in hearings. “For our discussion of this statement, I want to make clear that you can amend both

the recommendation of the Church Council, which is on page 45 of Section IV, and the text of the statement itself on the pages that follow. So we will be using pages 44 and following under Section IV. This may cause some confusion, so we will try to be clear about what we are amending at which time when we get to that point.

“As I indicated earlier, I propose that we divide our time into two sections: 30 minutes on the quasi-committee of the whole process—opportunities for general comments, specific amendments. Sometimes parliamentary procedure in working amendments and other things get so confusing that it is hard to get the big picture. Some people may have comments on the statement generally. So unless there is objection, we will use the first 30 minutes of our debate for general comments, and then we will proceed with our plenary discussion of the Churchwide Assembly. As we go through that plenary discussion, I will ask if there are amendments on each page. We will do that same page-by-page process. Some of the amendments have been reviewed by the *ad hoc* committee and have been distributed to you. When we have completed the page-by-page process, the whole statement has been refined, and you have taken action on it, then we will go back to the resolution on page 45 to adopt the statement as amended. As I said, we have got time today and tomorrow for thorough consideration.

“I now call on Secretary Almen to present the motion to move into quasi-committee of the whole.”

Secretary Almen said, “Bishop Anderson, as a point of clarification before making the motion, I note that the pagination on the report of the *ad hoc* committee on amendments to the social statement, ‘Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All,’ should be corrected from pages 55 and 56 of Section IV to pages 54a and page 54b for the sequence of the report, so that pagination does not affect in any way the content of the report.”

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Voice Vote

CARRIED: **To proceed as a quasi-committee of the whole for the purpose of general discussion of the proposed social statement on economic life.**

Bishop Anderson then indicated that the Rev. Charles S. Miller, executive director of the Division for Church in Society; the Rev. Karen L. Bloomquist, director for studies in the division; Ms. Ingrid Christiansen, chair of the board; and Ms. Annette Citzler, chair of the task force that developed the statement; and the Rev. Winston D. Persaud, a member of the task force, were present on the platform to serve as resource persons during the discussion.

Bishop Anderson announced that the assembly was now a quasi-committee of the whole, and he reminded the assembly of the rules for discussion: no applause, two-minute limit on speeches, and alternating speakers having opposing viewpoints.

The Rev. Terri K. Stagner-Collier [Southeastern Synod] said “I would like to commend the committee who developed this document. It is excellent. In my preparations for this assembly, I taught a Sunday school class for adults where we discussed all the issues coming before the assembly. This was the one, in my suburban, affluent congregation, that hit them the most. It hit them right between the eyes. They struggled, like I do as I read them. I especially appreciate the ongoing tensions that are listed there. So I speak in favor of this document, and also request that Division for Congregational Ministries establish stewardship materials, using some of these statements.”

The Rev. Robert D. Johnson [Minneapolis Area Synod] stated, “I do not know how many of you have read the [*New York Times*]’ special report on corporate welfare in America. If you have, you will believe that our statement, while it is quite fine, does not go nearly far enough. Let me read you from the report—and I encourage you all to get it. It appeared within this last year. It says, ‘During one of the most robust economic periods of our nation’s history, the federal government has shelled out \$125 billion in corporate welfare, equivalent to all the income tax paid by 60 million individuals and families. During that same period, the corporate welfare has allowed our corporations to earn \$4.3 trillion in profits, and this means that a sum equal to the cumulative paycheck of 50 million working Americans who earn less than \$25,000 a year for the same period.’ My suggestion to you is that we need to be a lot more specific and a whole lot more direct. Perhaps we stand like David and Goliath, but I believe we had better speak a lot more clearly to corporate America about what it is doing with its profits because this has a lot to do with how our nation is treating those who are less fortunate.”

Ms. Louise P. Shoemaker [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod] rose to support the motion. “I agree with the previous speaker that we need to be much more bold, but a vote for this is like yesterday’s vote—no matter which way we vote, we have tremendous work ahead, largely among ourselves. After 50 years of work in secular institutions, walking with the poor in this country, even in the women’s reformatory in Shakopee, Minnesota, in post-war Europe, or recently in Africa, and now in West Philadelphia. I do not speak ‘churchy language.’ I do not use Greek or Latin or whatever. The challenge to us, though, in the ELCA is to move more boldly into city halls, state capitols, and the U.S. Congress to bring the Gospel to Wall Street, to Silicon Valley, as well as to the Horn of Africa and Bangladesh, to challenge our own young people who are going to be lawyers, politicians, business people, teachers, [to work] for equal justice and distributive justice wherever they are. Bishop Anderson quoted UNICEF statistics, I think, in saying 31,000 children die daily. Well, in two decades, that has come down from 40,000 children daily, but even that reality we cannot grasp. We need to exploit the technology which hurtles us into galaxies of outer space and into the black hole of the human mind for this endless and astonishing creativity, to understand that poverty and hunger are political issues which we must work on as hard as we do on collecting funds. Ours is a society which is more and more one of socialism for the rich.”

Ms. Greta G. Heinemeier [Sierra Pacific Synod] spoke about her involvement with HUD housing in the Santa Clara Valley, which is otherwise known as Silicon Valley. “There are those who think that HUD housing in Silicon Valley is an oxymoron, but it is not. What I would like to see come from this is for the dean of my conference to be able to go to the Santa Clara housing authority and say, ‘On behalf of the 22 Lutheran churches in the South Bay [Area], I would like to request that you think seriously about affordable housing.’ You have no idea the cost of housing in Silicon Valley. And we need to speak about that because housing is one of those essentials that we need to make sure that everyone has. And so I speak strongly in favor of this. It will give our people the ability to stand up and say, ‘We Lutherans feel strongly about this, government. We Lutherans feel strongly about this, local government, and listen to us.’”

Mr. Jay Johnson [Minneapolis Area Synod] said, “Maybe I am taking a little different look at this statement, but I understand that the intent of the statement is to influence the business world today and to make a credible argument to them about our beliefs about economic policy. Although I see that the intent of the document is honorable, I think we are

going to have a credibility problem with the business world in that they are going to look at [whether or not it makes] economic sense. Before you vote 'yes' on this [statement], I would invite you to read it putting yourselves in the shoes of businessmen and women. As I see it, there is conflicting economic theory in it. There is a reliance on government influence to make our economic goals work. It disregards market efficiency and consumer practices. There is a blanket statement in [the document] about salary disparity. And so you are slapping in the face some of the same CEOs who may have a modest income in relation to their position, and these are the same people that you are trying to sell on this economic statement. So I guess the intent of the statement is good, but before you vote 'yes,' before you contemplate amendments, look at it from the point of a businessman."

Ms. Mary Lu Bowen [Upstate New York Synod] rose in support of the economic life document. "New York has the largest gap between rich and poor of any state in the country. We see economic justice [issues] all around us. Upstate communities vie with each other in unhealthy ways to attract jobs. You heard Bishop Miller talk about the problems of the farmers and Bishop Bouman speak of the situations in New York City. When we see this, we feel compelled to carry the church's message into the public arena. We need a document like this when we talk to decision makers. I urge a 'yes' vote; it will make a difference."

Mr. Jeff L. Burrell [Minneapolis Area Synod] said, "I find I must also rise in opposition to this document. One of the problems I find with it is that it is confrontational, and it seems to imply that business by its very nature attempts to push people down, attempts to take more than it should from society. What it fails to understand, or what it fails to elucidate, is that profit is not necessarily bad. Profit is what pays most of our salaries. Businessmen are not necessarily evil. Businessmen—CEOs—are required by law to take into account the shareholders' value in a company. If they do not, they can be sued. Who are these shareholders? Most often than not, they are us in this audience through pension funds or through mutual funds.

"I find the document also tends to be a slap in the face of the whole idea of the free market. Again, there is a reliance, as the previous speaker said, on legislative reforms to the economy. We can look at any number of governments over the past 70 or 80 years that have tried to do that, most notably the Soviet Union. It no longer exists. I find this document to be objectionable in several ways, but I do find, as the previous speaker said, that its intent is noble. We should re-examine this in the light of the Gospel. And we should examine that, and, again, think in terms of the businessman, what options he truly has open."

Mr. Robert Drakeford [Southeastern Synod] said, "As a professor who served over 20 years in various low-income communities, this statement says a lot of good things about the ELCA. The fact that we are discussing it in a very impartial and impassioned way is a very good thing. The topic talks about things that we need to be doing, reaching out to the least of us. Remember, we are only as strong as the least of us. Any chain is only as strong as its weakest link. I urge adoption of this, and I think it says a lot of good things about the people sitting here, and the ELCA."

The Rev. Steven C. Berntson [Eastern North Dakota Synod] said, "I am one who is glad that the document is sufficiently vague because I am quite certain that it will pass. What I am concerned about is the use that is made of this document in the church. I think that as a church we need to recognize that people of good will and people who care about justice and the poor and all people, exist on both sides of the political spectrum in our country. So often, political and social statements come down from the church which mirror one political party and not the other, and as one who is a member of the other political party—I have strong

convictions that way—I often feel estranged by those social statements and political statements and the bias that is always reflected. And I think that many people tend to feel alienated by this church when it is always reflecting one political view and not the other. And so, if we can voice a concern for justice and for the poor without promoting just one political and economic ideology, that is my concern.”

Mr. Joseph R. Thom [Minneapolis Area Synod] observed, “I probably should be standing between the green and the red. I stand here, though, at the green because even though we have experienced the longest peace time economic expansion in this country’s history, I am reminded that many people have not shared in this economic expansion. Yesterday again reminded me. I ran ten miles in the city of Denver. As I passed through each and every park, there were many homeless people sleeping on every bench. It reminds me that I think it is important that we address economic injustices within our country and within our economy. However, there are many areas, as I read this document, that resonate with me and, that is, actions speak much louder than words. We put a lot of words on a piece of paper, and we call others to do things, but I look at ourselves as the church and say to myself, ‘We do not do many of these things well ourselves.’

“We call for employers to end discrimination in employment practices, when, in fact, most large corporations are far ahead of the church in any discrimination [policies] and being inclusive. We ask ourselves [and] companies to be more involved in their communities. I am from Minneapolis, Minnesota. My observation is corporate America has been much more active in our community than our synod has. For instance, Lutheran Brotherhood has actively worked with congregations to help them build their vision and their mission, helped them with resources to achieve it within their communities. Honeywell is building housing in the neighborhood in which their corporate office is headquartered.”

Mr. James D. Reyner [Sierra Pacific Synod] said, “I oppose the current draft that we have. The apparent purpose of an economic statement is to put in place a statement for ELCA since our predecessor bodies had economic statements. I share the concerns of the previous people that believe that it is too detailed. You cannot make a road map in such a complicated area. I think the statement goes one level too far. I think it should stop with identifying the areas for concern and study, and refrain from trying to become a cookbook.”

Ms. Dawn Webb [Indiana-Kentucky Synod] stated that she worked as a rural home health therapist in Appalachia, Kentucky, for several years. “I want to share with you a story about Nell and Joe. They lived on the side of a hill. They lived in a two-room home that did not have running water—and this was less than five years ago—they did have electricity. They were the most loving people I have ever met. Joe had a stroke and every time we came, Nell had homemade fudge for us, and if she was not able to give us homemade fudge because of their finances, she made sure her granddaughters were there to sing for us to give us something back. And I met many people like Nell and Joe in my work. In all of those people, I started to really have a lot of problems with the disparity of income I was seeing between mine and the people that I was working with. And not only that, but the contentment that they had with what they had was just amazing to me. And there was not contentment in my life and a lot of the people that I was around in the Lexington area.

“And so I started on a journey and did a lot of soul searching and a lot of research. And about two years ago, my husband and I made a decision that I would be at home. And now I want to be home with my daughter, but I would be doing community service in the community. And I want you to know it is one of the best decisions we have ever made, and I feel like I am making a difference. And I hope that if we adopt this, that people will take

this back to their congregations, to themselves, and to their synods and conferences, and really do this and not put it on the shelf. I think this says a lot about the ELCA.”

Ms. Nancy C. Fricke [Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod] said, “I reluctantly have to agree with the previous speaker who opposed the statement because I think it goes one level too far. I think that the statements on ‘we commit ourselves,’ and ‘the church confesses’ are very good and very helpful for us, but I think probably 99 percent of the people here already know where the situations are that the church needs to help people. We do not have to have it spelled out for us in a statement. For example, the conference dean in the Silicon Valley [mentioned by an earlier speaker] could today speak to government authorities in support of housing; he does not need the statement for that. He can speak in the name of Jesus. We heard that this morning in the Bible study. We have Jesus. We have to look at each issue. We have to look at the ramifications of all the details that led up to the situation that we are addressing, and then pray and come up with what we think is the best solution. This statement is not going to help us do that. I went to the hearings and I heard the people who worked on the statement say that they spent hours discussing particular issues, and condensed hours of dialogue into one statement. So they know what they mean by these ‘we call for’ statements, but we do not know when we take this to our local areas. And so I would oppose it for that reason.”

The Rev. Susan E. Nagle [New Jersey Synod] rose to speak in favor of the statement and to thank the task force for their responsiveness to those who have studied and worked with this statement. “I told my husband one time that when I preach a sermon, I like to be able to sum up the point that I am trying to make, at least in my own head, in one sentence. And he said, ‘If you can, why don’t you?’ And so as I have worked with this statement, I have tried to come to one statement that tries to sum this up for me so that it is, in fact, talking about the Christian’s response to the tensions of economic life. And what is that sentence, and how can we be Christians? And so I think that what I see through this whole statement, as we work out all the details of what it means elsewhere, is that Christians give primary attention to the least among us, rather than to the greatest—first attention. And so I would urge the passage of this, but I would, more importantly, urge the use of this document.

“I have chosen not to try to amend the document or try to amend the implementing resolution. But in the implementing resolution, we call upon bishops, pastors, and other rostered leaders to give attention to Scripture, liturgy, preaching, hymnody, and the like, and I would urge that in resolution [paragraph] seven, we also call upon the Division for Church in Society to help us do that and get this into a sentence or an idea that we can use.”

Mr. Kevin Boatright [South-Central Synod of Wisconsin] said, “I really have only one quarrel with the statement that I think in almost every respect is an excellent piece of work. I wish that it said a great deal more about the value and the importance of charitable giving. I think that is a challenge to us as a church, as individuals, that really is not reflected adequately in this report. There is a statement, for example, that says, ‘Paying taxes to enable government to carry out these purposes is an appropriate expression of our stewardship in society rather than something to be avoided.’ It should be pointed out that legal avoidance of taxation is different than the illegal evasion of taxation, and sometimes legal avoidance through various kinds of charitable giving can be a very worthwhile activity and a good thing ultimately for the church and for other nonprofit organizations. That is really my sole concern about this. It does not say enough; it does not challenge us enough to give of our own wealth charitably even if that includes the avoidance of some taxation.”

The Rev. Natanael F. Lizarazo [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] said, “I stand before this assembly, thanks to the grace of God and the advocacy of what is today the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. I speak with a deep sense of gratitude for the work that we do through Lutheran World Relief, through the Lutheran World Federation, and through many other church-related institutions. I had the privilege in Colombia to direct community development projects with and among the poor, and I think, personally, what we can do and what we are called to do as this church. Dr. [Ishmael] Noko yesterday reminded us in an ecumenical context that the decisions that we take in one place of this world affect all other places in this world. That is also true economically speaking. I want to make the case of our companion synod for Southeastern Minnesota Synod in Colombia. Colombia is now the third country in this world that receives the most military aid from the United States. We are facing a civil war and we are facing a 22 percent unemployment rate. I strongly urge all of us to advocate, and more importantly, to do the work at all levels of the church. The part of the world in whom we see Jesus’ face will thank us and will have reasons to give glory in thanksgiving to God.”

The Rev. Kimberly M. Sterner [Grand Canyon Synod] stated, “I want to just make a couple points. I might be stating the obvious, but I am a pastor and I do that a lot when I preach. We had some discussion in one of the hearings on this document that it did not go far enough, that it did not tell us what to do. And I wanted to just say, in case there is confusion for any here that need to know that this is a statement, a social statement, that calls us to listen and then respond, but certainly does not tell us exactly what to do or how to do it. And maybe that is because Lutherans do not like to be told what to do and how to do it all the time.

“We are very blessed in the Grand Canyon Synod to have a Lutheran Advocacy Ministry of Arizona, an office with a staff person that goes to congregations and reminds us of our call to statements such as this, helps us with implementation plans, helps us access information, who to write to, what to say, and I am sure you in other synods, you have the same resources available. This is the statement to call us to awareness and then after prayerful consideration, call us to action in your churches and in your synods. So, please, do not just think this is not going far enough. You can take it as far as you want.”

Bishop Anderson indicated that there was time for one more speaker, and then the assembly would move out of quasi-committee and into the regular plenary session. He asked the speakers who were at microphones to please reserve their comments, saying there would be time during the plenary to offer them.

The Rev. R. Mark Swanson [Southwestern Minnesota Synod] said, “The root reason that I rise to support this document is because we pray every day, ‘Give us this day our daily bread.’ And as you remember from Luther’s *Small Catechism* how comprehensive daily bread is, it is everything we need to live. We are not owners, we are not stockholders, we are stewards. We hold everything we have as a gift from God. We do not own. And when we have the ability to give to give something that will help someone else, we are called upon to give it.”

Resumption of Plenary Session Seven Debate of the Social Statement on Economic Life

Bishop Anderson thanked the assembly for its general discussion, saying, “That concludes our quasi-committee of the whole. We now proceed to plenary session, and it is

at this point that the document will be presented in terms of a motion to adopt. I ask Secretary Almen to read the 'Resolves' of the recommendation."

Secretary Almen said, "The recommendation of the Church Council is as follows:"

MOVED;

SECONDED: 1. To adopt "Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All" as a social statement of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in accordance with "Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns" (1997);

2. To call upon members of this church to pray, work, and advocate that all might have a sufficient, sustainable livelihood, and to draw upon this statement in forming their own judgments and actions in their ministries in daily life;

3. To call upon our bishops, pastors, and other rostered leaders to give renewed attention to how Scripture, liturgy, preaching, hymnody, and prayers may express God's will for economic life and empower a faith active for justice, and to provide leadership in seeking economic justice in their communities;

4. To challenge all congregations, synods, and churchwide units to carry out the substance and spirit of this statement and intensify their work with various ecumenical, interfaith, and secular groups in pursuit of its commitments;

5. To encourage the education, service, and outreach ministries of this church in their work for economic justice;

6. To urge churchwide units and affiliated organizations (social ministry organizations, schools, colleges and universities, and seminaries) to review and adjust their programs and practices in light of this social statement;

7. To direct the Division for Church in Society, in cooperation with other churchwide units, to provide leadership, consultation, and educational and worship resources on the basis of this statement, particularly through the development of resources that interpret this statement and develop its implications for different arenas of responsibility;

8. To direct the Division for Church in Society to expand its work in advocating for corporate social responsibility, in assisting with community economic development, and in public policy advocacy that furthers the various commitments made in this statement;

9. To call upon the members of this church to give generously to the World Hunger Appeal of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, so that the Lutheran World Federation, Lutheran World Relief, domestic hunger grants, and our partner ecumenical agencies might do more in helping to alleviate the causes and consequences of hunger, poverty, and injustice; and to

call upon the members of this church to participate actively in supporting these and similar ministries; and

10. To call upon the educational institutions of this church—schools, colleges and universities, seminaries, continuing education centers, camps, and retreat centers—to develop programs and educational resources in light of this statement so people can be better prepared to respond to the challenges of economic life.

Bishop Anderson explained that as the assembly moved into consideration of the document, they would deal first with amendments, so that when discussion continued on the document in its totality, it would be the amended document before the house. “A reminder about these amendments. If you made your amendment before the deadline, just be ready when the committee comes to your particular proposal, and then you will make the motion as we go through. If the committee has an amendment, it will make it, but if you have one, you will need to do that separately. You need to make sure we know which page you are on, and which numbered amendment you are dealing with. Now remember, if there is an amendment on the sheet—and I hope you have this page 54a, Section IV, which has the amendments—and if no one makes the motion indicated, it will simply mean that the person has decided not to proceed.”

Mr. Karl Gingrich [Northwestern Ohio Synod] asked for a point of order, wondering if the assembly would be considering amendments to the recommendation or the statement itself. Bishop Anderson indicated that amendments to the statement would be considered. He then asked the *ad hoc* committee to make its report and to lead the assembly through the amendments that were submitted.

The Rev. Charles S. Miller, executive director of the Division for Church in Society, directed the assembly to the report of the *ad hoc* committee, distributed as Section IV, pages 54a and 54b. “We are grateful for the interest of the assembly in this proposed social statement. As information to you, 11 proposed amendments were submitted by the stated deadline for the committee’s consideration. Most of the persons submitting amendments met with the *ad hoc* committee on Wednesday evening. In light of that conversation, three of those offering amendments have subsequently chosen to address their concerns in relationship to the implementing resolutions, and two have decided to withdraw their amendments, meaning that the committee is reporting on six amendments.

“I would call your attention to an error in the exhibit that you have. If you would turn to Section IV, page 54b—the back side of the report of the *ad hoc* committee—you will note on line 42 that amendment is labeled number four. It should be labeled number five. And then on line 53, number five should be labeled number six.”

After a brief discussion with Bishop Anderson about how best to proceed, Pastor Miller read the rationale for the *ad hoc* committee’s recommendation on amendment number one. “The rationale of the committee, in relation to the amendments to be inserted between paragraphs one and two, is that the first proposed paragraph in the amendment reiterates what is already developed in the statement, especially in lines 86 to 101, and the second paragraph, slightly amended, could more appropriately be inserted at another point in the text. Therefore, the recommendation of the committee to the assembly is not to approve the first paragraph, and in place of the second paragraph to substitute the following, inserting it after

the sentence ending on the middle of line 192, which is at the bottom of the right-hand column on page 47. This substitute would read: 'At the heart of Jesus' ministry and central to the message of the Old Testament prophets was partiality toward the poor and powerless.'"

**RECOMMENDATION
OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE:**

To decline the first paragraph; and

To substitute the following for the second paragraph, inserting it after the sentence ending on the middle of line 192:

At the heart of Jesus' ministry and central to the message of the Old Testament prophets was God's partiality toward the poor and powerless.

For purposes of clarity, Bishop Anderson suggested that the assembly divide the question and consider first the rejection of paragraph one.

Mr. Gerhard H. Fisher [Greater Milwaukee Synod] agreed that the document did mention some of what is in that paragraph, "but I feel it should be emphasized that in an abundant life, it is not just material things that we consider an abundant life. And I think it should be stressed that the spiritual life and closeness to God is also part of an abundant life, and I would like to keep some of those words in the document. As far as the second paragraph, I am perfectly happy with what they have done to revise it."

Mr. Thomas Koch [New England Synod] asked for a point of order. "If it is the recommendation of the committee that is before us, and the recommendation is not to approve the motion as submitted by the member, then how should we vote? Yes or no?" Bishop Anderson responded, "Technically, the first paragraph was not before the house for consideration, and he would need to move that first paragraph, and then we would vote on that. If Gerhard Fischer wishes to do that, he may."

Mr. Fisher returned to the microphone to move his amendment, including the first paragraph.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes-410; No-492

DEFEATED: To insert between the first and second paragraphs (after line 14):

It should be noted at the outset that the economy and economic life of a people in a Christian sense must serve the whole of the human spirit and of human life. Economic goals are not ends in themselves but must serve to enrich the spiritual life of humans in a just and caring way. The ends of human existence should not be directed to material and power enrichment but to spiritual growth and blessings. However, the material needs of the poor and disenfranchised must not be overlooked; rather they must be emphasized.

God's undeserved partiality to all who are poor and powerless was a major part of the earthly ministry of Jesus as well as the great concern of the prophets of the Old Testament.

Bishop Anderson indicated that the assembly would next consider the second portion of the committee's recommendation, saying, "This is before us from the committee and has been moved and seconded.

The Rev. Scott W. Lingenfelter [Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod] said, "As the second paragraph of the original amendment proposed by two individuals in the Greater Milwaukee Synod read, partiality for the poor is significant and a major part of Jesus' ministry—the structuring of Israel's society through Old Testament Law and social criticism levied by Old Testament prophets. However, in speaking against the recommendation of the *ad hoc* committee, partiality for the poor is not the heart of Jesus' ministry. At the heart of Jesus' ministry is the good news of a new relationship between God and all people, created by the death and resurrection of Jesus, and realized for believers through faith. It would be right and good to order their lives in society by showing a preferential option or partiality for the poor as a response to the Gospel, but in our public statement, let us be sure to proclaim the Gospel as the heart of Jesus' ministry, and not our response to that Gospel."

Bishop Anderson asked if there were further discussion. He reiterated that the motion from the committee is to insert: "At the heart of Jesus' ministry and central to the message of the Old Testament prophets was God's partiality toward the poor and powerless." This would occur on line 192, following "...throughout the Bible."

Moved;

Seconded;

Yes-631; No-306

Carried: To substitute the following for the second paragraph, inserting it after the sentence ending on the middle of line 192:

At the heart of Jesus' ministry and central to the message of the Old Testament prophets was God's partiality toward the poor and powerless.

Pastor Miller then directed the assembly to the next two amendments—amendments two and three—which were treated together by the committee because they address the same text. "The text is line 470 through 474 on page 50. The rationale from the committee in response to amendments two and three is that throughout the statement we, as a church, commit ourselves to certain principles before we ask the wider society to do similarly. What is stated in this section is consistent with what has been the position of the ELCA since 1991, and addresses important matters of worker justice, based on the ethical grounding developed in this section."

***RECOMMENDATION
OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE:***

To substitute the following for what is proposed in number two, replacing lines 470-474, as follows:

- cultivate workplaces of participatory decision-making;
- honor the right of employees to organize for the sake of better working conditions and to engage in collective bargaining, and refrain from intentionally undercutting union organizing activities, or from permanently replacing striking workers; and

To recommend that proposed amendment number three not be approved.

Bishop Donald J. McCoid [Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod], the author of amendment two, moved the following amendment:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To strike the remainder of the paragraph after “honor the right of employees to organize for the sake of better working conditions” and to insert:

...and for workers to make free and informed decisions; encourage those who engage in collective bargaining to commit themselves to negotiated settlements, especially when participatory attempts at just working conditions fail; and discourage the permanent replacement of striking workers.

Bishop McCoid asserted, “I appreciate the committee’s attempt to separate the bullets as requested, but out of concern and appreciation for the workers and management who daily carry out the social ministry of this church, and out of concern for recognizing the needs and roles of each contributing entity in all church-related institutions, it is important that we commit ourselves as a church to assuring workers and management engaged in mutual decision making about work, working conditions, and compensation. We need to recognize that we have a variety of relationships within the church, related agencies, institutions, and organizations, some with unions, some without unions.

“However, we need to emphasize that in all situations, there should be an expectation that there be dialogue about work, working conditions, and compensation. It is more clearly stated and supported if there is the expectation that there be the cultivation of participatory workplaces in all situations, union and non-union workers to organize, but also to encourage those who engage in collective bargaining will be committed to negotiated settlements. When there is a union involved, and in order to assure that there be a right climate for collective bargaining, we need to discourage the permanent replacement of striking workers. The wording change recognizes both management and workers’ rights and needs, and offers the church a challenge of both parties to be committed to negotiated settlements, and the best working environment. As a person who spoke in 1991 in favor of the labor-management policies, we need to remember that workers who daily are not in unions also need to be emphasized. My wording tries to recognize workers’ union and non-union, and also to provide a positive approach to labor and management.”

Bishop Anderson asked for clarification, confirming that Bishop McCoid was suggesting that the assembly delete from the committee’s recommendation everything after the words “better working conditions?” Bishop McCoid said that this was correct. Bishop Anderson then asked if the additional amendment was to follow immediately. Bishop McCoid said that was correct. To be certain of the reading, Bishop Anderson read the proposed amendment aloud: “...honor the right of employees to organize for the sake of better working conditions, for workers to make free and informed decisions; encourage those who engage in collective bargaining to commit themselves to negotiated settlements, especially when participatory attempts at just working conditions fail; and discourage the permanent replacement of striking workers.” Bishop McCoid said, “That is correct.”

The Rev. Leonard R. Klein [Lower Susquehanna Synod] rose to speak in favor of Bishop McCoid's amendment, saying, "The concern that we have is that the language is such that any effort whatsoever, any resistance whatsoever, on the part of a social ministry organization to union activity or unionization might be seen as undercutting, thus putting the social ministry organization at odds with the statement of its church. The effort here is not in any sense to deny the rights of labor or the dignity of unions, but to moderate the language just enough to afford some reasonable protections to our SMOs [social ministry organizations] and their management."

The Rev. Michael D. Wilker [Sierra Pacific Synod] moved to amend Bishop McCoid's original amendment.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To insert after "fail" and before "discourage" the following words:
...to refrain from intentionally undercutting union organizing activities...

Bishop Anderson responded, "All right. The amendment is that after Bishop McCoid's proposed amendment, where it says '...participatory attempts at just working conditions fail...' could we have that on the screen so people at least follow that much? And then, following that would be added, 'to refrain from intentionally undercutting union organizing activities....' There it is."

Pastor Wilker said, "I come from a farm town in California called Watsonville, and when the folks giving the Women and Children in Poverty report the other day asked me, 'What is the one thing that would benefit women and children in poverty in your community?' I immediately said, 'To increase the wages of farm workers.' And farm workers in my community have been trying to organize and to come together to do just such a thing, especially in the strawberry industry, in which my community of 33,000 people has a revenue of a quarter of a billion dollars a year in the strawberry industry. And yet, the majority of workers only earn \$7 an hour for backbreaking, stooping-over-all-day-long labor, and they are trying to organize. However, the owners and farmers are intentionally undercutting their organizing activities. We have to pass this so that we speak and act in solidarity with the poorest of our community, with the poorest of the state of California. Please vote in support of my amendment."

Bishop Anderson asked Pastor Wilker if his amendment was dealing with what he wished this church to do, "or is this calling for others to do it?" Pastor Wilker responded, "The way that I read the document is that this section calls upon the church to refrain from intentionally undercutting union organizing activities, but the reason it is important here is because we should not ask other people to do what we will not do ourselves. So we also must pledge not to undercut union organizing activities."

Mr. Thomas Koch [New England Synod] rose for a point of order, asking, "Is this not an amendment of the third degree and, therefore, out of order at this time?" Bishop Anderson reviewed the development of the proposed amendment, and ruled Mr. Koch to be correct, that Pastor Wilker's amendment was in fact out of order. "We are back on Bishop McCoid's amendment."

Pastor Wilker urged the assembly to vote against this amendment so that the words "to refrain from intentionally undercutting union organizing activities" could later be included in another amendment.

Mr. Monroe Herring [Southeastern Synod] said, "I represent the ELCA on the Commission for Religion in Appalachia. Appalachia is a very depressed area, particularly in the coal and steel industry areas. The depression is caused mainly by employers subjecting their employees to unconditional work, unhealthy working conditions, and they replace them if [the employees] object or try to organize. I think it would be well for this church to recognize that, throughout the Scriptures, the prophets spoke against the CEOs of their day, and Jesus did not hesitate to speak against the leaders of the day when they were oppressing or cheating the workers out of their sustainable lives. I speak in favor of this amendment."

The Rev. Ruth M. Peterson [Sierra Pacific Synod] asked for a point of clarification. "The amendment we currently are debating is Bishop McCoid's amendment. If that were to pass, would we then be able to amend it? Bishop Anderson responded, "You can come back then to whatever text we have; you can make an amendment on that text." Pastor Peterson continued, "Could the amendment we are currently debating be put back on the screen for a longer period of time so that it can be studied better?" Bishop Anderson explained that they were trying to find a balance between showing the speakers and the text, but assured her, "we certainly could look at it a little more fully."

The Rev. Douglas J. Mork [Saint Paul Area Synod] said "I would agree wholeheartedly with the speaker from Appalachia, and I guess, though I am at a different colored microphone, for that reason I would oppose the amendment. I do think it weakens the language that we have. I do think it is often easier for us to speak and critique society, and then to act ourselves as the church in accord with our own preaching. And I think we should preserve the strong language in support of the rights of workers to organize and of our opposition to any sort of undercutting of their rights or replacement both within church institutions and in the broader society. So I would urge opposition to this amendment."

The Rev. Walter R. Riedel [Florida-Bahamas Synod] encouraged the assembly to vote for this amendment, asserting that the wording needed a little bit of weakening. "Let us face it," he said, "We are not always on the side of organized labor. Not all of us would be enthusiastic about the umpire's strike or the baseball players' strike. In not every situation is the union on the side of the angels. Sometimes even big business does something right. If we were to make a blanket statement that we will always in all situations support organized labor, we would find ourselves in contradictory situations not only when labor is not really doing what we would believe in, but in situations where, as Pastor Klein mentioned, our own organizations would be put in a situation where nothing they could do would be right."

Bishop Anderson warned that the assembly was nearing the Order of the Day, at which point debate would be suspended.

The Rev. Diane E. Wheatley [Upstate New York Synod] asked for a point of information. "I have lost track of where the amendment we are discussing goes in what I have on my piece of paper before me. Is it possible to put it on the screen and show where in that bullet, lines 11 to 18, it replaces the words, so we know how much of the original suggestion is left?" The complete text of how the amendment would affect the document was displayed on the large screen, and Bishop Anderson worked through it, line by line, to identify the changes.

Bishop Anderson then said, "It is my proposal to ask microphone 11 to speak. I will then suggest that we vote on this [amendment]. If you do not want to vote on it yet, you should then be ready to object when I ask for that move. Microphone 11."

The Rev. Elizabeth J. Toler [North Carolina Synod] said, "I am speaking in favor of this amendment as a person who grew up in the heart of the West Virginia coal fields and the

chemical industry. My father worked in both of those areas. He was paid very little in proportion especially to the number of children he had to raise. I ask that everyone consider the safety of those who work in these areas and the proportionate amount of pay they receive to the families they have to care for and raise. My father negotiated a contract—helped negotiate one. He worked during a seven-month strike at any kind of job he could get that was honest, used all of his savings to provide a roof over our heads and food for us. Please remember the suffering that some people have had to go through over the years when you are considering this statement and especially this amendment.”

Bishop Anderson, hearing no objection, terminated debate, called for the text of the amendment to be projected once again on the screen, reviewing it line by line, and then called for the vote. The motion was carried.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—706; No—200

CARRIED: **To strike the remainder of the paragraph after “honor the right of employees to organize for the sake of better working conditions” and to insert:**

...and for workers to make free and informed decisions; encourage those who engage in collective bargaining to commit themselves to negotiated settlements, especially when participatory attempts at just working conditions; and discourage the permanent replacement of striking workers.

Bishop Anderson announced that the assembly had arrived at the Order of the Day, and would return to the recommendations of the *ad hoc* committee regarding amendments at the next plenary session. He thanked the members of this committee and the voting members of the assembly for their discussion, then invited the assembly to stand and sing Hymn 50, “Let Us Talents and Tongues Employ.”

Election: Editor of *The Lutheran*

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 119-120 (Section I, pages 11-13).

Bishop Anderson announced that the assembly would move into an important decision in the life of this church: the election of a new editor for *The Lutheran* magazine. He informed the assembly that *The Lutheran* is the largest denominational periodical in the United States, read by 1.3 million people—about one fourth of this church’s 5.2 million members. Bishop Anderson then told the assembly a brief anecdote about the significance of members’ receiving *The Lutheran*: “A man recently told me that his mail carrier said, ‘I would never have known that you were a Lutheran until I started delivering that magazine.’”

Bishop Anderson then called to the podium the Rev. Edgar R. Trexler to thank him for his 34 years of service in editing *The Lutheran*. Bishop Anderson noted that during Pastor Trexler’s tenure, he had covered thousands of stories in addition to bringing the magazine into the computer age and overseeing significant changes in design and structure. Bishop

Anderson presented Pastor Trexler with a gift of a replica of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America's rondel that carried the following citation:

**WITH GRATITUDE:
THE REVEREND DR. EDGAR R. TREXLER**

"Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are varieties of services, but the same Lord; and there are varieties of activities, but it is the same God who activates all of them in everyone. To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good..." (1 Corinthians 12:4-7).

This is presented to you, the Reverend Dr. Edgar R. Trexler, with heartfelt appreciation for your conscientious, distinguished, thoughtful, able, wise, and dedicated service as the first editor of *The Lutheran* magazine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (October 1, 1987-October 31, 1999).

On behalf of a grateful church, we thank you and commend you for your abiding partnership in the Gospel. We cherish you as a gracious brother in Christ and as an able servant of the Church of Jesus Christ.

With superb dedication, you brought the gifts of pastoral vision, care, and compassion. Along with journalistic expertise and quality, you served your tasks of leadership and service as editor. Moreover, your broad experience nationally and internationally fostered awareness of and perspective on issues within the life of this church and the whole Church.

Commitment to clear and effective communication within the life of this church and its predecessor bodies, especially the Lutheran Church in America, has been nearly a life-long endeavor for you.

For your 22 years of service on the editorial staff of *The Lutheran* magazine of the former Lutheran Church in America and your 12 years of service as editor of *The Lutheran* magazine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, we commend you and express to you abiding gratitude. God bless you in the continuing journey of our life in Christ as "we walk by faith, not by sight" (2 Corinthians 5:7).

Pastor Trexler responded to the gift by saying that he was deeply touched by those words. He said that he was fortunate that this church had asked him to do the one thing he had always wanted to do: be a pastor and a journalist with *The Lutheran* magazine. Pastor Trexler reviewed some of the many issues he had covered and said that he had always tried to lift up three things: the marvelous corporate nature of this church, the global nature of the Church, and the ecumenical scene. Pastor Trexler said also that he had tried to bring the standards and ideals of journalism into this church: straight-forward reporting, fair-mindedness, accuracy. In closing, Pastor Trexler thanked his staff, his wife, and "the large cloud of witnesses, the readers of *The Lutheran*. I thank you for asking me to do the only thing I ever wanted to do."

Bishop Anderson thanked Pastor Trexler once again and then moved to the business of electing a new editor. He explained to the assembly that according to the governing documents of this church, the advisory committee of *The Lutheran*, in consultation with the presiding bishop and the Church Council, nominates one person to be the editor of *The Lutheran*. Bishop Anderson then called to the podium Ms. Hazel Reinhardt, the chair of the advisory committee for *The Lutheran*, to join him and Secretary Almen on the stage to place the nomination before the assembly.

Ms. Reinhardt reviewed in detail the process by which the nominee for the editor of *The Lutheran* had been chosen. Following Ms. Reinhardt's remarks, Bishop Anderson told the assembly that the advisory committee's recommendation of the Rev. David L. Miller was affirmed by him and by the Church Council. Bishop Anderson called Pastor Miller to the podium to address the assembly.

Pastor Miller told the assembly that working at *The Lutheran* had made him a privileged person, privileged to witness and write about the ministries of this church. He shared with the voting members his nick name of "Disaster David," referring to the fact that he keeps a pair of waders under his desk that are perfect for covering floods, tornadoes, and other disasters. While covering these stories, Pastor Miller said that each time he is moved to tears not simply by suffering but from seeing the goodness of God flowing through the people of this church. He also saluted the many people who shared their stories in the pages of *The Lutheran*, thereby touching the lives of people they would never meet. He pledged to make *The Lutheran* both a telescope in order to help this church see further and a microscope to help it see in detail.

Bishop Anderson then asked Secretary Almen to read the recommendation for action from the Church Council.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes—900, No—34

CA99.04.13 To elect the Rev. David L. Miller to a four-year term as editor of *The Lutheran* magazine, effective November 1, 1999.

Bishop Anderson declared the Rev. David L. Miller elected to a four-year term as editor of *The Lutheran* magazine.

Greetings: World Council of Churches

Bishop Anderson then turned the assembly's attention to greetings from "a strong ecumenical partner, the World Council of Churches." He stated that the World Council of Churches (WCC) is this church's partner, along with the Lutheran World Federation (LWF), in carrying out God's mission in places throughout the world where the needs and the opportunities are great. Bishop Anderson then invited Ms. Kathy J. Magnus, a member of the central committee of the World Council of Churches and former vice president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to introduce a video greeting from the Rev. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches.

Ms. Magnus introduced the assembly to a new acronym: WYP, meaning “We’re your partner.” Ms. Magnus reviewed the many ways that the World Council of Churches is in partnership with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America around the world. She said that the WCC celebrates the strong ecumenical relationships this church now models. Ms. Magnus went on to say that she and Mr. Arthur Norman, who had been elected representatives to the WCC central committee, were leaving next week for Switzerland for the first meeting and asked the assembly to keep the World Council of Churches in their prayers. She also encouraged the assembly to keep abreast of WCC developments on its Web site, closing with the reminder, “We are your partners.”

During his video greeting, Pastor Raiser called on the Church to “boldly leave the past behind and venture into the future. Trusting in the promise that God’s Spirit will guide our churches into the future.” He also expressed gratitude for this church’s steady and faithful support. He concluded by asking for this church’s prayers and offering his own for this church, saying, “May God guide and bless you in your deliberations.”

Introduction: Former Presiding Bishops

Bishop Anderson announced that before the assembly moved into the next report, he wanted to recognize the bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America’s predecessor church bodies and the former bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. He asked to come to the stage the Rev. William L. Herzfeld, who served as bishop of the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches. Bishop Anderson welcomed also the Rev. Herbert W. Chilstrom, the first presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. He also announced to the assembly greetings from one bishop not present at this assembly, the Rev. James R. Crumley Jr., who served as bishop of the Lutheran Church in America, and from the Rev. David W. Preus, the presiding bishop emeritus of The American Lutheran Church, who had been present for the first few days of this assembly but had to leave prior to this plenary session. Bishop Anderson presented bishops emeriti Herzfeld and Chilstrom with gifts.

The Rev. Robert J. Marshall, who served as bishop of the Lutheran Church in America from 1968 to 1978, had left the Churchwide Assembly early and thus could not be recognized, Bishop Anderson later explained in answer to a query from a voting member.

Greetings: National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Staccato Powell, the deputy secretary for national ministries, who brought greetings from the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., which provides an essential forum for various Protestant denominations to work together to find new ways to carry out God’s mission. Pastor Powell said that this church took a bold step in making Christ known by ratifying the full communion agreements with The Episcopal Church and the two provinces of the Moravian Church. He called upon others to follow the example of this church. He invited everyone to the November 1999 celebration of the National Council of Church’s 50th anniversary.

Report of the Elections Committee First Common Ballot Distributed

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, pages 9-12; continued on *Minutes*, pages 491, 516, 622, 651, and Exhibit B.

Bishop Anderson turned the attention of the voting members to the first ballot for Church Council and for boards and committees related to churchwide units. He informed the voting members that they would need three things:

1. The several-page nominee list that showed the names of the nominees on the various tickets for election;
2. The computer ballot form, distributed by synodical bishops, on which they would mark their choices; and
3. The # 2 pencil that was distributed for voting.

Bishop Anderson referred the assembly to the appropriate section of the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, which contained biographical descriptions of the nominees, and to the biographical data of candidates nominated from the floor, which had been distributed with the nominee list.

Bishop Anderson subsequently called upon Mr. Scott S. Fintzen, chair of the Elections Committee, who explained the use of tickets in the voting process.

Bishop Anderson suggested to the assembly members that they take about a half an hour to fill out the form and that they would have until 2:00 P.M. this day to return them at one of the three ballot stations located at the main doors to the plenary hall.

Report: Conversations Related to Gay and Lesbian Persons

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section V, pages 15-25; continued on *Minutes*, pages 509, 537, 534.

Bishop Anderson called the voting members' attention to a report based on the actions of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly. He explained that, in response to that assembly's action, the Church Council requested that five churchwide units work together to prepare a "bundled" report on issues related to gay and lesbian persons. That report would demonstrate to this assembly activities taking place in the Division for Ministry, the Division for Church in Society, the Division for Outreach, the Division for Congregational Ministries, and the Commission for Women concerning this issue. He directed the assembly's attention to Section V of the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, where a common introduction and separate reports from the five different churchwide units were printed.

Bishop Anderson informed the voting members that following a brief presentation, they would have an opportunity to discuss the report. He reminded the voting members that the report was before them at this time only for information and discussion.

Bishop Anderson called the assembly's attention to the memorials on this topic printed in Section VI, pages 61-63, of the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*. He said that since the memorials in Category 20, pages 61-62, relate to the subject of this report and have been removed from the *en bloc* resolution, substitute motions or amendments would be in order when the Memorials Committee presented the memorials on this topic for action following discussion of the report. He explained that the memorial in Category 21, pages 62-63, was not removed from *en bloc* and consequently would not be considered individually.

Bishop Anderson introduced those seated on the platform: from the Division for Ministry, the Rev. Joseph M. Wagner, executive director; the Rev. A. Craig Settlage, associate director; and Mr. Nelvin Vos, board chair; from the Division for Church in Society, the Rev. Charles S. Miller, executive director; the Rev. Leslie F. Weber Jr., associate executive director; and Ms. Ingrid Christiansen, board chair; from the Division for Outreach, the Rev. Richard A. Magnus, executive director; Ms. Susan A. Thompson, executive for newly organized congregations; and the Rev. Julius Carroll IV, board chair; from the Division for Congregational Ministries, the Rev. Kelly Chatman, director for youth ministries—Lutheran Youth Organization; and Ms. Meredith Lovell, Region 8 board member of the Lutheran Youth Organization; and from the Commission for Women, Ms. Joanne Chadwick, executive director; and the Rev. Ann M. Tiemeyer, steering committee chair.

Bishop Anderson called upon Mr. Vos to provide an overview of the report. Mr. Nelvin Vos said, “Bishop Anderson and members of the assembly. The report is found on Section V, page 15. The 1997 Churchwide Assembly requested that a status report be brought to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly regarding this church’s ongoing dialogue relating to homosexuality. The assembly action in 1997 particularly called for the development and use of models for conversation, and continuing moral deliberation on this sensitive and important subject. Five churchwide units have been working collaboratively on this assignment: the Division for Ministry, the Division for Church in Society, the Division for Outreach, the Division for Congregational Ministries, and the Commission for Women. Each unit prepared its own response as part of this bundled report.

“A common introduction was prepared by an interunit staff team. The common introduction includes five points, each of which is developed more fully in the report, as important considerations that this church should keep in mind as it continues conversation on the place of homosexual persons in the life of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. These five considerations are that, first, this church’s engagement in the matter of homosexuality is not about insiders and outsiders. The baptized members of this church include both homosexual and heterosexual persons. Second, the task of engagement touches core matters of personal identity and, therefore, affects each of us. Third, the task of engagement is multi-faceted and has several dimensions. It has the dimension of the educational task of examining what the Bible and our theology say. It has the missional commitment to welcome gay and lesbian people to full participation in the life of this church. It has the pastoral and moral issues involved, and it has the institutional question concerning the possible ordination of gay and lesbian people to live in a committed same sex relationship. Fourth, there is no arbitrarily set timetable for concluding this discussion. And, finally, this church needs to continue to engage in the matter—engage the matter of homosexuality in deliberate, thoughtful and prayerful ways.

“The report contains a number of initiatives in the development of models for conversation and moral deliberation. Two of these models will be helpful as educational resources for the church.

“The first is ‘Talking Together as Christians about Homosexuality, a Guide for Congregations,’ from the Division for Church in Society; a leader guide, participant book, and a videotape are included in this packet of materials. The guide covers the following: How to Organize Discussions; Guidelines for Talking about Homosexuality; Discrimination; History of ELCA Actions; and Stories of People’s Experiences. The participant book has five essays: The Bible and Homosexuality; Scientific Perspectives; Two Ethical Perspectives; Marriage and Committed Relationships; and The Ordination of Non-Celibate Gay and

Lesbian People. The packet video offers contrasting presentations by two Lutheran ethicists, and the entire presentation is one of balance of the entire spectrum of the viewpoints in this church.

“The second is ‘Congregational Hospitality to Gays and Lesbians’ from the Division for Outreach. This publication is built upon the ELCA Churchwide Assembly actions in 1991, which declared that ‘gay and lesbian people, as individuals created by God, are welcome to participate fully in the life of the congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,’ as well as an open letter from the Conference of Bishops in 1996, which said, ‘We call upon all our pastors, as they exercise pastoral care, to be sensitive to the gifts and needs of gay and lesbian members. We urge our congregations to reach out to all God’s people with the Gospel of Jesus Christ.’ This publication was based on visits to 16 congregations hospitable to gay and lesbian persons. The resource assists congregations to be welcoming to gay and lesbian persons.

“So both of these resources, as well as the other initiatives by all five of these units, fulfill the mandate of the previous assembly. What are needed are vehicles for us to talk with and listen to one another as we continue to engage in moral deliberation and conversation on this sensitive and important subject.”

Bishop Anderson responded, “Thank you. The persons you see on the podium are persons who have worked with this process, this report. We are now open for discussion, questions—although I would suggest that actions requiring voting be deferred until we come to the report of the Memorials Committee and get into a more parliamentary mode. But this is your opportunity to comment on the report, if you wish, to ask questions about it. Microphone 7.”

Bishop Mark B. Herbener [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod] said, “While I really want to thank for the work of the Division for Outreach in developing a program for welcoming gays and lesbians, I would hope that a similar program is also done for the poor of the earth. Our congregations do not really do well in welcoming and inviting the poor, the homeless, the outcast, into our congregations. We are often willing to do charity to give them something ‘over there.’ If we are going to be all-inclusive, we need to be inclusive in that direction as well.”

Bishop Richard N. Jessen [Nebraska Synod] said, “I, too, want to thank the churchwide expression for the resources that are being made available. When we get back on Monday, we will have the meeting of the Cabinet of Deans in the Nebraska Synod, and we will be using the resource, ‘Talking Together about Homosexuality.’ We are not comfortable at all with that in Nebraska, and it is not easy for us to do, but we are grateful for the fine resources.”

The Rev. Darlene B. Muschett [Upstate New York Synod] said, “I would simply like to comment briefly on the fifth line of the last paragraph on page 15: ‘Examining what the Bible and our theology say....’ I want to note that the understanding of Scripture as being inerrant and infallible, I give thanks that is not what our constitution says is the way that we approach Scripture. As many of you well know, our constitution in the second chapter refers to Old and New Testaments as the ‘inspired Word of God and authoritative source and norm of its proclamation, faith and life.’ To me, this difference is significant. I see here and sense here an opening of the Spirit to help us look at the reality that there is more than one model for Scriptural authority. When I see the statement, ‘Examining what the Bible....’ etc., that, in my hearing, brings to mind the inerrant, infallible interpretation. It may not bring it to your

minds. But I simply want to lift up in this very significant issue that what our model or models of authority for Scripture are, are very relevant to this discussion.”

The Rev. Roger D. Hardy [Minneapolis Area Synod] said, “I thank the churchwide [units] for this document and for the models of conversation. We need to discuss this in our parish. What I want to know is, however, are there Bible study materials available for us? Some of our people, and maybe many others, will want to go to the Scriptures, and ask very pointed questions. Is that kind of material available for us to use in the parish?”

The Rev. Charles S. Miller, executive director of the Division for Church in Society, responded, “For the resource developed by the Division for Church in Society, there indeed is a portion of material that provides a biblical overview of texts that address this topic, and discussion questions for those using this resource, so that the Bible study is encompassed within the larger resource on moral deliberation.”

The Rev. G. Scott Cady [New England Synod] said, “I am also very grateful for this and urge the continued discussion. I am struck by an irony here. I was at the luncheon in the Division of Ministry and heard about the many synods who are looking for first-time pastors to fill vacant parishes. There is not the word “crisis” perhaps, but certainly a lacking there, and we need some people to fill those spots. We are also talking about being a church in mission. We want to start new parishes, and we are going to need pastoral leadership. And then we have a whole cadre of people who are pleading with us to be allowed to do that, who say they feel the gifts of the Spirit, whose colleagues recognize in them the gifts of the Spirit, who have been trained theologically, and who are being denied the opportunity to do that by our present visions and expectations. So I hope that this continued study will allow us to move ahead so that we can take these people who are well gifted and these congregations and mission fields in deep need and bring them together, so that we can continue to fulfill our wider vision and mission as a church.”

Ms. Valerie Sites [Nebraska Synod] requested that the Rev. Kelly Chatman “give us a summary of what actions the Lutheran Youth Organization [LYO] has taken on this issue.”

Pastor Chatman responded by inviting Ms. Meredith Lovell, Region 8 representative to the board of the Lutheran Youth Organization, to address the question.

Ms. Lovell stated, “At our 1997 convention in New Orleans, the delegation gave us a resolution that stated that we were to explore and look into holding a pre-Gathering event for gay, lesbian, and bi-sexual youth before the Triennial Assembly. The board, at its fall meeting, took this prayerfully into consideration and divided that, along with the other resolutions that we received, into task forces. That task force then met, and it was decided at our fall meeting that we would enter into a nine-month period of prayerful deliberation before we would take any action on that. We asked for resources, we talked with various people in the churchwide office and with different mentors in the church, and we hosted a day of prayer and fasting, where we invited the entire church body to join with the youth to discern where God was calling us to go.

“From that, we had a discussion on the Internet, and taking all of that into consideration, the board then, at their spring meeting, decided that it was not possible at this time for us to hold a pre-Gathering event, but that we would continue into ministry and pursue ministry with the gay, lesbian, and bi-sexual community.”

Pastor Chatman then said, “I would just like to add to that report that the resolution that came forward came out of Lutheran Youth Organization convention in New Orleans. And from my experience as the advisor to the Lutheran Youth Organization board, it was a

wonderful experience for youth, who lifted up a litany of their experiences of how in their congregations, and their pastors and in their families, there is ministry going on, modeling how ministry does exist and does happen within congregations and within families within the ELCA.”

Mr. Daniel Eisch [East-Central Synod of Wisconsin] said, “I would like to make a statement in support of the discussion that is going on and in the activities, hopefully, that will follow. I would like to say that when I was a child, my father was denied membership of Grace Lutheran Church because he worked in a brewery. Today, pastors of the Lutheran Church drink beer. When I was a child, a divorced person was ostracized within the church. Today, both lay and clergy who are divorced are participating fully in the Lutheran Church. When I was a child, at least in our area, it was believed that a Catholic, and maybe not even an Episcopalian, would ever make it to heaven. Today, we have some different feelings. So today we need to look back, but we need to move forward in the love of Christ as brought to us through the Gospel. Might we, as a church, be reconciled in Christ? We, as a church of change, a church growing in its expression of love, may the Spirit direct us for change and growth.”

Ms. Rosanna N. Abanonu [Saint Paul Area Synod] said, “Thank you, Bishop Anderson. I approve that the gays and lesbians in our community be welcomed in our churches. Let them be lay members. Through our discussions with them, prayers, and the power of the Holy Spirit, they might on the way change. I do not agree that they should be priests of our Lord Jesus Christ. America is looked upon all over the world as a leader, and it will not sound right, and will not be good, if they lead on this making gays and lesbians priests. St. Paul, in his letter the Corinthians, told them that if their action will lead fellow members into sin, they should resist from that. I believe that this, if approved, will lead many Christians astray, so I am asking that they should be welcomed in our churches, and not be made priests. Another thing is in Revelations, we are not to add or subtract from the Word of God. It is written in the Bible that gays and lesbians should not be made priests. It looks odd if this time in the altar and offer the Holy Communion, the bread and the wine, to people...” Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

Mr. Paul Hinderlie [Northwest Synod of Wisconsin] said, “I rise in favor of the report, which was wonderful. Mr. Eisch’s story reflects something that happened to me. I bought a restaurant in Pepin, Wisconsin, in 1980. I found that when I tried to join Immanuel Lutheran congregation, that I owned a bar. So, at first I was refused entry. However, I have a question about the—our reception as a church of gays and lesbians in the early 1990s. A member of the clergy in the La Crosse Area Synod was publicly ‘out-ed’ by his bishop in the press, and, speaking as an employer, if I had done that, I would have lost my restaurant in a lawsuit. What is our legal response these days? Is someone there who can answer that for me?”

Secretary Almen responded, “I am not a lawyer. Lawyers can forgive me for that, I hope. But we do have lawyers who work on our behalf in the churchwide office. A basic principle to keep in mind in the context of this response is that the church has the responsibility for establishing its standards for ordained ministry and has the freedom and obligation to apply those standards in terms of those who are ordained to teach on behalf of the church. But our general counsel, Mr. Phillip H. Harris, is also available, Bishop Anderson, for comment on this.”

Mr. Harris said, "Pastor Almen says that he is not an attorney, but he has faithfully stated the way the civil law views this issue. As any issue related to the church's decision with regard to selection, training, and ordination of clergy, it is the church's decision; civil law will respect the church's decision because the church does enjoy the protection of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Part of being able to enjoy the protection of religious freedom in this country carries with it the responsibility to exercise that freedom faithfully and responsibly, and it is this body's responsibility to do that with regard to the decisions that are made in this church on selection and ordination of clergy. So, we do enjoy a freedom from the civil law on this issue. If there are any other questions in this area, I would be glad to respond, Bishop Anderson."

Bishop Anderson said, "Microphone 9, you have taken quite a bit of time. We have some other speakers [waiting at microphones] and we are going to close [discussion] in about four minutes. Do you want to continue for whatever remains of your time?" Mr. Hinderlie deferred the remainder of his time to other speakers.

Bishop Juan Cobrda [Slovak Zion Synod] said, "I am very pleased that our church has destined to welcome lesbians and gays. Through my 41 years of ministry, I have made also an evolution in this subject. I have considered that there are three categories: one, who are born to it; second, who are turned to it through wrong social and family education; and third, who have done their choice to have this way of life. With this first two categories I have very much sympathy. I have seen many good things, and especially in the life of the church here in United States and Argentina. We have ordained a gay pastor and at that time, we did not have in Argentina complicated problems as we have here, so we did not ask questions. He is very committed to the church and for the sake of the church, and he is now internationally recognized as the one who is working for those who are affected by the AIDS. I have a question. Do we have in our constitution a norm that those who are ordained as single who are straight must be also committed to celibacy?"

The Rev. A. Craig Settlage responded, "The 'Vision and Expectations' document that has been referred to several times does, in fact, speak to the issue of single ordained ministers, and if I may, Bishop Anderson, I will just read that:

"Single ordained ministers are expected to live a chaste life. Married ordained ministers are expected to live in fidelity to their spouses, giving expression to sexual intimacy within a marriage relationship that is mutual, chaste and faithful."

"So, for both single and married ordained ministers of this church, the expectation is that they live a chaste life."

The Rev. William E. Saunders [Southern Ohio Synod] said, "Building upon the comments of the last speaker and the person from the chair, that seems to be the issue involved here, and perhaps the issue the church needs to revisit is the union or marriage of same sex couples. That puts everybody on the same playing field. It also then keeps intact the documents and directions that we have for the sake of good order within the clergy and order and structure of the church."

The Rev. Bruce H. Davidson [New Jersey Synod] said, "Discussions have been held in other denominations in the United States on this issue, particularly as it relates to the ordination of gay and lesbian people who are in committed relations. Those discussions have sometimes been difficult for those churches. I think of the Presbyterian Church [(U.S.A.)], the [United] Methodist Church, The Episcopal Church. Could someone comment on any discussions that were held with our ecumenical partners on this issue, and any possibility that might exist of trying to work together on a common solution to this issue?"

Pastor Wagner responded, “The Division for Ministry is in conversation with our full communion partners around this issue. We have conversations scheduled in a meeting with Episcopal counterparts next month; that will be a part of those conversations. We have had conversations with our full communion partners in the Reformed churches last year and again this year—those issues are raised. We have a representative from the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) meeting with our board at its meeting this fall to share just those kinds of findings. We see this as a way of benefitting from the experiences of the other churches, and we very much are involved in those conversation.”

Bishop Anderson explained, “Now, I have time for one more, and I would ask that if anyone has a question, there will be discussion time later as we discuss the general matter. If anyone has a question of the panel specifically, this is the time to give that. Microphone 1.”

Ms. Betsy D. Liljeberg [Upstate New York Synod] said, “Bishop Anderson. I, too, am thankful for the resources that have been created. I do have a problem with the various divisions calling for congregations to welcome homosexuals and to allow full participation of these people. What definition of ‘full’ are you using? When you require chastity for ordained homosexuals, it is the equivalent of saying overweight people may be ordained, but may not eat. I believe the word ‘fully’ should not be used in these cases.” Bishop Anderson asked if someone from the panel wished to respond? Panel members indicated that they considered this a statement rather than a question, and chose not to respond.

Bishop Anderson announced the end of the time allotted for discussion. He called on Secretary Almen for announcements.

Recess

Secretary Almen spoke about newspaper accounts describing as “merger” the previous day’s action to adopt “Called to Common Mission.” He noted that this church had no control over inaccurate representations of its actions. He also indicated that staff members of the Department for Communication have worked hard to help ensure accurate reporting, although newspaper editors and headline writers as well as radio and TV reporters make their own decisions.

He reminded voting members that the deadline for budget amendments and for the first common ballot would be 2:00 P.M. on August 20, 1999.

Secretary Almen announced that take-home videos could still be arranged by signing up in the area in front of the ballroom of the convention center and that the Division for Church in Society would make available at its display lists of those in the United States Congress.

Secretary Almen was pleased to announce that this day was the 45th wedding anniversary of voting member Mr. Kenneth D. Blockhus and his wife, Harriet, a visitor at this assembly.

Bishop Anderson called upon Mr. Carlos Peña, a member of the Church Council, for the closing hymn and prayer. After devotions, Bishop Anderson announced at 11:58 A.M. that the assembly would be in recess until 2:00 P.M.

Plenary Session Eight

Friday, August 20, 1999

2:00 P.M.—5:00 P.M.

Theme Focus: Signs of Hope

The Rev. H. George Anderson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, called Plenary Session Eight to order at 2:07 P.M. Mountain Daylight Time. He called upon Ms. Addie J. Butler, vice president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to present another “Sign of Hope” video, this one showing ways in which this church is a “connected” church. She concluded by inviting the assembly to sing “Cantad al Señor.”

Social Statement on Economic Life (continued)

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, pages 45-54 (Section I, page 14); continued on Minutes, pages 116, 391.

Bishop Anderson said, “We had just finished dealing with an amendment and I think we were looking for the possibility of a further amendment. Microphone 3.

The Rev. Michael D. Wilker [Sierra Pacific Synod] moved to amend the amendment.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To add the following phrase after the word “fail” and before “discourage:”
...to refrain from intentionally undercutting union organizing activities....

The Rev. Leonard R. Klein [Lower Susquehanna Synod] said “Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment rather undoes the point of the original amendment. Part of the problem that led to the offering of that amendment was that the language of ‘undercutting’ is so broad and so uncertain that it could condemn the most moderate effort to persuade people that maybe a union wasn’t a good idea at that time and that place. The amended statement, as it stands, already includes language in favor of collective bargaining and organizations. I think that is all we need to do.”

The Rev. William E. Saunders [Southern Ohio Synod] said, “Reverend Chair, labor unions are not always right and just, and there may be a time when it is necessary to undercut some of their work.”

The Rev. Darlene B. Muschett [Upstate New York Synod] rose to speak in favor of the amendment because “it is my understanding that in that way, we could give support to the poorest of the poor, most in need of a voice and most in need of the opportunity to organize on behalf of a better livelihood.”

Bishop Anderson instructed, “I think we are ready to vote, so get your keypads ready. Now let us look at the amendment again. We can have it on the screen. Now, you understand this is part of the proposal to replace lines 470-474. It is that bullet with the bold print. All right. All favoring the inclusion of this amendment, please vote ‘yes;’ all opposing vote ‘no.’ Vote now. We close voting. Let us see the results. It fails by 446 to 404.”

Moved;

Seconded;

Yes-404; No-446

Defeated: To add the following phrase after the word “fail” and before “discourage:”
...to refrain from intentionally undercutting union organizing activities....

Bishop Anderson continued, “Now, there was amendment number three, or do we go on then to amendment number four? Seeing no one at the microphones, we will move to amendment four. Pastor Miller.”

The Rev. Charles S. Miller said, “Bishop Anderson, I call the assembly’s attention to the material in the statement, lines 515 and 516, and we will be looking at an amendment proposed by Mr. Kevin Boatright. The sentence, as it currently reads, is ‘Paying taxes to enable government to carry out these and other purposes is an appropriate expression of our stewardship in society, rather than something to be avoided.’ And the proposed amendment is to change the end of that sentence to read, ‘...rather than something to be maligned or illegally avoided.’ The rationale of the committee is that to add modifiers to the word ‘avoided’ can create possible misinterpretation; that is, for example, it would suggest that the corollary to something being illegally avoided would be to encourage something that is legally avoided that is not necessary—necessarily a salutary result, that there are ways to legally avoid paying taxes that may not at all meet the ends of the totality of this statement. Rather, then, the rationale of the committee is the simplicity and directness of the original text, is preferable, and it recommends that the assembly not to approve this change.”

Bishop Anderson said, “First, we would need the maker of the amendment to make that amendment. Microphone 3.”

An unidentified asked if final action to adopt amendment two, as amended, had been taken. A review of the record showed that the speaker was correct. Bishop Anderson thanked the speaker for this observation, and instructed the assembly that consideration was now on the final version of amendment two rather than continuing with consideration of amendment four.

The Rev. Douglas J. Mork [Saint Paul Area Synod] said, “I would like to speak against the recommendation of the committee as it currently stands in its amended form. I believe the language is too weak and, in fact, less clear, and more convoluted than the original statement, and I think we are best off speaking and living with the language in the original statements. So I would urge opposition of this amendment, or this recommendation.

Bishop George P. Mocko [Delaware-Maryland Synod] said, “I, too, would speak in opposition to it. When labor and management contend with each other and discuss with each other, management is inherently and by nature organized. Workers, labor, is not organized. And I think we should, as a church, both model and press for that organization of labor.

Bishop Anderson said, “Thank you. Are you ready to vote now on the bold-faced material presented by the committee to replace lines 470-474 as it has been amended? I think we can put up the amended part on the screen. It reads, first ‘cultivate workplaces of participatory decision-making;’ and then, ‘honor the right of employees to organize for the sake of better working conditions and for workers to make free and informed decisions; encourage those who engage in collective bargaining to commit themselves to negotiated settlements, especially when participatory attempts at just working conditions fail; and

discourage the permanent replacement of striking workers.’ [We are] voting on that package. Microphone 5.”

Bishop Donald J. McCoid [Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod] said, “Speaking in favor of the recommendation that we have before us as amended. I want us to remember also that we are not talking just about unions, but we are also talking about individuals who are not unionized, and we need to raise up a voice for those people who could be also considered the poorest of the poor. We also need to make sure that as we look at this proposal that we have before us, that we are looking and trying to emphasize a participatory workplace where employers and employees are working together. This tries to emphasize the importance of all workers, unionized and not, and managers working together to try to extend the best for those church-related agencies, institutions, and organizations.”

Ms. Sonja Lindquist [South-Central Synod of Wisconsin] rose to a point of clarification, asking, “I just want to make sure I understand what we are doing. If we vote ‘no’ to the amendment we are currently voting on, do we then adopt the text in the original statement?” Bishop Anderson responded, “The text in the original statement would stand, that is lines 470-474, and then if we adopt the whole statement, we would adopt that. Yes, all right. I think we are ready to vote on the amendment; it has just been read to you a moment ago. All favoring the inclusion of the amendment for lines 470-474, please vote ‘yes;’ those opposed will vote ‘no.’ Vote now. Okay, let us close the vote and see the result. It is adopted by 640 to 280.”

Moved;

Seconded;

Yes—640; No—280

Carried: To replace lines 470-474 with the following:

- **cultivate workplaces of participatory decision-making;**
- **honor the right of employees to organize for the sake of better working conditions and for workers to make free and informed decisions; encourage those who engage in collective bargaining to commit themselves to negotiated settlements, especially when participatory attempts at just working conditions fail; and discourage the permanent replacement of striking workers.**

Bishop Anderson continued, “Now, I think we are able to move to number four. Does the mover of that amendment wish to make that amendment? Microphone 3.”

Mr. Kevin Boatright [South-Central Synod of Wisconsin] said, “I am the maker of this motion, and I think my intention at this point is to not move it. As I said earlier this morning, I think it is important to draw a distinction between the lawful avoidance of taxes through tax-exempt securities, charitable giving, other kinds of activities, that is legal tax avoidance versus illegal tax evasion. The Committee of Reference and Counsel does not seem to recognize that distinction which I was trying to draw, and so I am actually acquiescing in their view that we should leave it as it is, unless someone else wants to take up this issue. I just wish to make a point that this institution as a church depends very heavily on charitable giving, which is, in fact, one of its attributes—tax avoidance for those of us who itemize.”

Bishop Anderson then stated, “Now we go to amendment number five. And I think before hearing from the committee, we will have to see if it is moved by the author. Microphone 9.”

The Rev. Michael R. Stadie [Western Iowa Synod] said, "I would move a substitute for the proposed amendment." Bishop Anderson interrupted to say, "I am sorry, let us wait. The other amendment is not on the floor yet. Just hang in there a minute. We will see what happens. Okay. I do not see the—All right, here we go. Microphone 9."

Mr. Leroy L. Simonson [Western Iowa Synod] identified himself as the author of the proposed amendment. He reported that, after continued discussion of the intent of his amendment with Pastor Stadie, "we have better words." Bishop Anderson explained that the printed motion had not been formally made; therefore the preferred amendment could be presented.

Pastor Stadie continued, "Thank you. The amendment would be to modify the sentence beginning in line 682, to read: 'Individuals and families should not borrow irresponsibly, and delete the rest of the line.'

Bishop Anderson responded, "Now that I have heard the amendment, I think it is a somewhat different direction, and the body would have to suspend the rules in order to consider this amendment. You understand what is happening here? That would require two-thirds vote by the assembly, because it did not go through the regular process and it leads us in a slightly different direction from what the committee had worked on."

Pastor Stadie asserted, "My understanding is because the word 'responsibly' is used in this amendment submitted by Mr. Simonson, that I would be able to substitute it." Bishop Anderson pointed out that Mr. Simonson had not moved the amendment. Pastor Stadie asked, "If he would move it, would that make a difference?" Bishop Anderson invited Mr. Simonson to speak to this issue. Mr. Simonson replied, "Okay. I move we use only the word 'responsibly.' I move my amendment. I am sorry. What am I supposed to do?" Bishop Anderson stated, "You did the right thing the first time. Thank you. The problem is that Pastor Stadie's maneuver is not appropriate at this time, unless the assembly will suspend the rules. Is that correct, Mr. Parliamentarian? Or overrule the chair. So I think we will simply ask the assembly if they would be willing to consider this amendment at this time."

Pastor Stadie said, "To make it official, I ask to suspend the rules to consider this."

Bishop Anderson, looking for direction for the parliamentarian, said, "That is right. Okay. A two-thirds vote is required. You have heard what he is proposing to do. If you wish to allow him to present that and consider it, you will vote 'yes.' If you do not wish him to bring that forward at this time, you will vote 'no.' It would require two-thirds vote. Please vote now. Okay. Voting is closed. And let us see the results. It fails the two-thirds by a considerable margin."

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—451; No—480

DEFEATED: To suspend the rules for consideration of an amendment from the floor.

Bishop Anderson continued, "We will move, then, on to number six. And here again, I think, at this point, the committee has a recommendation, so we will be voting this time on the committee's recommendation rather than the original amendment."

Pastor Miller said, "I call the assembly's attention to page 53, Section IV, where you will find on line 767 the end of a series of 'call for' to which Pastor Doyle Karst has requested

an additional 'calling of society.' Our rationale, from the committee, is that the proposed addition by Pastor Karst would be improved if it included more than congregations and the phrase 'next generation' instead of 'young farmers,' and, therefore, we recommend as a substitute an additional bullet after line 767, which would read, 'greater entry-level opportunities for the next generation of farmers.'"

Bishop Anderson said, "Very well. Now that recommendation is before you. It needs a second."

MOVED;

SECONDED: To insert the following after line 767:

- greater entry-level opportunities for the next generation of farmers.

Bishop Anderson continued, "Now we are on the recommendation. It can be amended, substituted, or whatever. Microphone 3."

The Rev. Doyle G. Karst [Nebraska Synod] said, "As the writer, the intent of this was to encourage that congregations would be a sparkplug to help our young farmers as they begin to take their family and, so to speak, go forth. It is definitely an intent for family farming to move forward, and I am very comfortable with the way they have this bullet here, and if we cannot amend it, that is fine." Bishop Anderson said that amending the text would be permissible. Pastor Karst said, "I would like to add one word before 'farmers.' I would like to add 'family.' So it would read, 'greater entry-level opportunities for the next generation of family farmers.'" After consulting with Pastor Miller, Bishop Anderson said, "The [*ad hoc*] committee considers it a friendly amendment, so [by unanimous consent] we will just consider it a part of their recommendation. Further speaking on the proposed amendment? Microphone 9."

Mr. Simonson [Western Iowa Synod] said, "I would speak in favor of this. The average age of farmers, they tell me, is in the 50s, and so it would be good, and an ideal place would be for congregations, and then there are various ways that congregations can help out for this. So I would adhere that you vote in favor of it."

Pastor Stadie [Western Iowa Synod] moved to suspend the rules to consider an amendment. Bishop Anderson ruled this motion out of order and, seeing no indication of further discussion, said, "What is before you, then, is the bold print at the bottom of the column: 'greater entry-level opportunities for the next generation of'—add the word 'family'—'farmers.' All favoring that amendment, after line 767, will vote 'yes;' all opposed will vote 'no.' Please vote now. All right, let us see the results. It is approved by 877 to 70."

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—877; No—70

CARRIED: To insert the following after line 767:

- **greater entry-level opportunities for the next generation of family farmers.**

Bishop Anderson addressed Pastor Stadie, saying, "Now, sir, you are in order."

Pastor Stadie said, "I move to suspend the rules for an amendment to line 748—to remove the first 'and,' and to insert the words at the end: 'and, therefore, debt reduction.'"

MOVED;

SECONDED: To suspend the rules for consideration of an amendment from the floor.

Bishop Anderson, after assuring that the assembly understood the nature of Pastor Stadie's amendment, said, "The motion is to suspend the rules to consider this amendment. If you wish to suspend the rules to allow us to consider at this time the amendment, you will press 1—'yes;' if you wish not to do that, you will press 2—'no.' Please vote now. Two-thirds required. Let us see the results."

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—550; No—390

DEFEATED: To suspend the rules for consideration of an amendment from the floor.

Bishop Anderson continued, "It did not get the two-thirds, so the rules are not suspended. And that will complete, I believe, our series of amendments [from the *ad hoc* committee]. So, now we are ready to open discussion on the document as a whole. No, I think the best thing to do at this point would be to move to the recommendation of the committee. We now have an amended document."

Mr. Eric Bjorlin [Northwestern Ohio Synod] rose to a point of order, saying "I do not think we voted on the last amendment, did we? Number six? The whole thing? We just added 'farmers' or 'family.?' We did not vote on the whole thing, did we?" Bishop Anderson explained, "The 'family' phrase was added by friendly amendment. It was accepted by the [*ad hoc*] committee, so as I read it, the final amendment did include 'family.' The vote on that amendment was 877 to 70."

Bishop Anderson continued, "Now, we need to have the recommendation of the committee moved so that you will be voting—discussing and voting on—the entire document. Secretary Almen, if you would be kind enough to read the text of the resolution." Secretary Almen said he was willing to spare the assembly this rather lengthy reading.

The Rev James W. Addy [South Carolina Synod] rose to a point of order, asking, "Is this the time to propose an amendment to one of these amendments, or do we take it as we progress through the entire document?" Bishop Anderson explained, "The entire document now has been gone through. Some persons have tried to make amendments from the floor without having gone through the process of the *ad hoc* committee. The assembly, however, has generally not accepted that effort to suspend the rules." Pastor Addy asserted, "What I propose is an amendment to an amendment that we considered earlier this morning, but did not have time to get that to the Secretary and so forth before we moved on to the next amendment." Bishop Anderson responded, "You—help me understand. You have an amendment to material that did not—that we were past and you did not get it up here on time?" Pastor Addy said this was correct.

Bishop Anderson ruled, "Well, we will just have to see what the judges say in that regard. You are in the same situation as one of the previous speakers at the present time. It

does not make any difference that it was for an amendment earlier. So, in other words, if you want to move to suspend the rules, you may do so. I just would note that has not gone too well lately.”

Pastor Addy replied, “I understand. All right. I move to suspend the rules so that we might consider an amendment to the first amendment proposed by the *ad hoc* committee, so as to change the words ‘partiality toward’ the poor, to ‘concern for’ the poor...” Bishop Anderson interrupted, saying, “The parliamentarian [Mr. David J. Hardy] says that is action on something that we have acted upon, and so it does not look like you even get the chance [to move the suspension of the rules].”

Returning to the recommendation of the Church Council, Bishop Anderson said, “All right. I think we are ready now for action on the recommendation itself, and I want to ask again, ‘Do you want the recommendation read to you again?’ This is the bold print on pages 45 and 46. If I do not hear objection, we will proceed to consideration of that. Hearing no objection, it is formally before us. I think we need a—no, it comes from the Church Council; therefore it is moved and seconded. Microphone 3.”

Bishop Mark S. Hanson [Saint Paul Area Synod] said, “Although too muted for many, this document, I believe, echoes the prophets who with courage and with boldness suggested that when God looks upon the faith of God’s people, God does so not finally by listening to the joyfulness of our songs or the eloquence of our prayers, but God looks upon the condition of the poor of the land. Think what this will mean for a culture that looks to Wall Street daily for its economic indicators to measure the quality of our life, rather than looking to the poor. This document calls us to repentance, to be turned from living, as Walter Brueggemann says, ‘in the myth of scarcity which is the fear that there may not be enough for my retirement, for my children, which breeds unneighborliness and greed and turns us towards stewards of the generosity of God’s goodness and grace.’ This document calls us to stand with the poor, believing that the Spirit is upon us to preach Good News to the poor and to hear from the poor the Good News of the Gospel. This document calls us to work with the poor to bring about the end of poverty and, I believe, that when we move from repentance to proclamation to working to eradicate poverty, then this will no longer be a social statement of the church; it will be public witness to the world. I urge its adoption.”

Mr. Jay Johnson [Minneapolis Area Synod] rose to ask a question of the panel. “On lines 292 and 293 that address shifting our resources for military expenditures to those of low income people, I would like to understand the intent of the writing committee in relation to U.S. forces, and specifically those involved with liberation operations or peacekeeping operations in foreign countries the last several years.”

The Rev. Karen L. Bloomquist responded to the question, saying, “First of all, it is important to say that particular matter is addressed more explicitly in ‘For Peace in God’s World,’ the social statement adopted in 1995. This general principle here does apply globally, which, obviously, does include the U.S., and so what is the intent here is to articulate a basic principle that resonates with some of the testimony that has already been brought forth in the course of this assembly—where massive amounts of military expenditures mean that the people in those countries do not have what they need to live. So, it is that basic principle that is articulated here especially.”

Mr. John D. Litke [Metropolitan New York Synod] rose to move an amendment to the council’s conveyance by adding paragraph 11. “If it is seconded, I would like to speak to it. I believe the Secretary has a copy of it already.”

MOVED;

SECONDED: To add as paragraph 11:

To direct the Church Council to report to the 2001 Churchwide Assembly any changes in policies or procedures and their intended effects taken by the Church Council or churchwide unites in response to the social statement, "Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All."

Mr. Litke explained, "My motive for this is the statement primarily encourages for goals we wish to achieve, and there are some recommendations for a potential action, but I would hope, if we take it seriously, our churchwide units will, in fact, take some action. And the other piece of the recommendation is I am aware that almost anything we do in this regard is sort of a double-edged sword. You intend to benefit, and you may well incur, or anticipate incurring, some loss in some other area. And so, I would like to understand what the churchwide units may have understood in this regard, as well as the actions they may have taken in respect to the social statement."

Bishop Anderson said, "Now we are considering that amendment. If you wish to speak on the addition of that, pro or con, please move right up to the microphones. Otherwise, thank you for moving back so I will not—I see no speakers, is that correct? Ready to vote on this addition for reporting changes in policies or procedures? All right. All favoring—put it up again, please, so we are all sure what we are doing. Okay. If you favor adding this amendment to the bold print series on page 46, you will press 1—'yes;' if you disapprove it, you will press 2—'no.' Okay. Voting is closed. Let us see the results. It is approved by 809 to 149."

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—809; No—149

CARRIED: To add as paragraph 11:

To direct the Church Council to report to the 2001 Churchwide Assembly any changes in policies or procedures and their intended effects taken by the Church Council or churchwide unites in response to the social statement, "Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All."

Ms. Susan A. Stewart [Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod] said, "I would like to move we refer this matter back to the drafting team."

Bishop Anderson said, "All right. A motion to refer is debatable, and it requires a second. Seconded. Anyone wish to refer it? I do not hear a second. I hear a second. Okay."

MOVED;

SECONDED: To refer the recommendation of the Church Council and the proposed social statement back to the task force for continued review and revision.

Bishop Anderson continued, "Please give us the argument for referral."

Ms. Stewart responded, "It seems to me that we have been making amendment after amendment after amendment after amendment, and that the specifics of the document

perhaps go a little further than they need to, although the intention is certainly valid. I suggest that it go back to committee and some of the specifics that we are hassling over could perhaps be eliminated.”

Bishop Anderson said, “So you are moving to refer the document and the enabling resolution back to the Church Council or to the Division for Church in Society?” Ms. Stewart indicated whichever was appropriate. Bishop Anderson said, “I think probably back to the task force.” Then directed to Pastor Miller, “Is that what it is called? Drafting team? The task force, yes. All right, the effect of this would be to stop debate on this and simply refer it back. Is there anyone else speaking on the proposal to refer? Microphone 12.”

Mr. Marc S. Williams [La Crosse Area Synod] said, “I rise strongly opposed to the motion to refer. The amendments that we have been discussing today have been relatively minor, although substantive. There has been a tremendous amount of effort, and I think the strong argument could be made that there are many that are looking forward to results of this statement that probably do not have another two years to wait. I think we should act on it and go forward, so I, again, rise to oppose referral.”

Ms. Judy Wagner St. Pierre [Virginia Synod] said, “Our congregation spent six weeks going over the proposal before it was presented in its current format. We had a lot of discussion. We are very involved in social ministry and many of the things this addresses. We will continue to do that, as I am sure all the entities of the ELCA will. But I think maybe we need to follow the example of Lutheran World Relief with its little symbol and mascot of the turtle: Slow and steady does the job. I do not think that by reconsidering and looking again at some of the wording, that we are hurting ourselves. And I know sometimes we think, ‘Oh, here is another committee; here is another way of looking at this.’ And there is humor in there, too. For instance, ‘How many Lutherans does it take to change a light bulb?’ ‘Five, one to change the light bulb, four to write the social statement.’ But we need to pause and reconsider this. I know many people who feel we have many more things to consider, and I do feel it is better to refer it to the task force.”

The Rev. Douglas J. Mork [Saint Paul Area Synod] said, “I rise in opposition to referring the statement. I think, in fact, it is a testimony to the strength of this statement and the basic principles of it to provide some guidelines that are broadly applicable without being too detailed; that, in fact, the number of relative amendments and changes have been minor, although we have spent some time on it. It is a strong statement. I could wish in many areas that it were still stronger and had more teeth, and yet, I think it is a nice move for us as a church and allows us to move forward on speaking to the critical matters of economic justice.”

Mr. James D. Reyner [Sierra Pacific Synod] said, “I believe you have heard ample proof by the confusing flurry of amendments to a rather lengthy document. That is proof that our economic statement is not user friendly and thus not ready for adoption by this assembly. I urge you to vote for this amendment so that it can be revised. I would suggest maximum four pages for an economic statement if you want it read and used, and should emphasize a Christian’s duties, and not to dictate his responses. I ask you to vote for this action.”

Bishop Robert L. Isaksen [New England Synod] moved to end debate.

Moved;

Seconded: To move the previous question.

Bishop Anderson said, "You move the previous question? All right. If you wish to close debate on referral, just on whether we should refer, you need to go to 'yes,' on closing the previous question. If you would like to continue the discussion on referral, you will vote 'no.' It requires two-thirds to close debate. All favoring closing debate on referral will vote 'yes;' 'no' if you oppose. Vote now, please. Voting is closed. Let us see the results: 887 for closing debate; 100 for continuing. Debate is closed."

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes-887; No-100

CARRIED: To move the previous question.

Bishop Anderson then continued, "We now proceed to the motion on referral. All favoring the referral of this document at this time back to the task force will vote 'yes;' opposed will vote 'no.' It requires a majority. Please vote now. Voting is closed. Let us see the results: 795 against referral; 201 favoring."

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes-201; No-795

DEFEATED: To refer the recommendation of the Church Council and the proposed social statement back to the task force for continued review and revision.

Mr. Richard Nehring [Rocky Mountain Synod] moved to amend by substituting the following for paragraph eight:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To delete paragraph eight and replace it with the following:

Affirming that Christian love both permits and encourages many diverse ways to serve our neighbors in our economic lives, acknowledging that Christians may legitimately differ about which economic policies and institutions best serve society, and cautioning that human sinfulness infects all economic policies and institutions, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America does not commit itself to any economic policy proposals within this statement. Neither does it authorize the Division for Church in Society to advocate the economic policy proposals within this statement as the official positions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Bishop Anderson ruled the motion out of order saying, "It would be something that would be in the social statement. Perhaps we could take it up as a germane motion later on, but it does not seem to me to relate to the [other conveyance] recommendations of the Church Council, which have to do with how one proceeds with this statement. Well, in my view, it is not germane to the topic we are dealing with, which is these paragraphs of direction. It, rather, is a general statement about the policy of the church."

Mr. Nehring asserted that the matter was very germane in that it says we are not in this case offering an official direction, but honoring the different political commitments of our membership. He then moved to appeal the ruling of the chair.

Bishop Anderson said, "An appeal of the ruling of the chair requires a majority vote. My ruling is that it is not in order at this time. Now the problem is—have they seen it? Well, we should put it on the screen in fairness to the assembly, so they know what we are considering." After some effort, the text of the proposed amendment was displayed on the screen before the assembly.

"That is the substance of his motion, and we are now going to ask you if you believe that the chair has ruled correctly, or that we should consider that as an amendment at this point. All upholding the decision of the chair will vote 'yes;' all opposing will vote 'no.' It requires a majority vote. Please vote now. All right. The chair is upheld, Mr. Nehring. We will not be considering it as an amendment to this document."

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—739; No—220

DEFEATED: To appeal the ruling of the chair.

Bishop Robert A. Rimbo [Southeast Michigan Synod] moved the previous question on all matters before the house.

Bishop Anderson said, "All matters before the house. Is there a second? All right. This means that we will vote without further debate, if it passes, on the recommendations of the Church Council, and if that passes, that means that the statement, as amended, is adopted. So this would essentially complete our discussion on this social statement. All those in favor of closing debate and now dealing with all matters before the house will please vote 'yes;' if you oppose it, you will vote 'no.' Please vote now. That is two-thirds. All right, let us see the results. You are ready to vote. All right. By a vote of 871 to something else, which has disappeared—105. I am not a speed reader either, as you have just discovered."

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes—871; No—105

CARRIED: To move the previous question on all matters before the house.

Ms. Marie K. Darby [Northern Illinois Synod] asked if the amendment to add paragraph 11 had been voted upon. Bishop Anderson said that motion to amend had been adopted.

Bishop Anderson then continued, "All favoring the adoption of the recommendations of the Church Council, as listed on pages 45 and 46. Microphone 3."

Ms. Sonja Lindquist [South-Central Synod of Wisconsin], unclear about Bishop Anderson's answer to Ms. Darby, asked again if paragraph 11 was or was not included in the action to adopt the social statement. Bishop Anderson repeated that the assembly had voted to include paragraph 11.

Bishop Anderson then asked the assembly "Ready to vote? All favoring will vote 'yes;' all opposed will vote 'no.' Please vote now. Voting is closed. It is passed by 872 to 124."

ASSEMBLY

Two-Thirds Vote Required

ACTION

Yes-872; No-124

CA99.05.14

1. To adopt "Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All" as a social statement of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in accordance with "Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns" (1997);

2. To call upon members of this church to pray, work, and advocate that all might have a sufficient, sustainable livelihood, and to draw upon this statement in forming their own judgments and actions in their ministries in daily life;

3. To call upon our bishops, pastors, and other rostered leaders to give renewed attention to how Scripture, liturgy, preaching, hymnody, and prayers may express God's will for economic life and empower a faith active for justice, and to provide leadership in seeking economic justice in their communities;

4. To challenge all congregations, synods, and churchwide units to carry out the substance and spirit of this statement and intensify their work with various ecumenical, interfaith, and secular groups in pursuit of its commitments;

5. To encourage the education, service, and outreach ministries of this church in their work for economic justice;

6. To urge churchwide units and affiliated organizations (social ministry organizations, schools, colleges and universities, and seminaries) to review and adjust their programs and practices in light of this social statement;

7. To direct the Division for Church in Society, in cooperation with other churchwide units, to provide leadership, consultation, and educational and worship resources on the basis of this statement, particularly through the development of resources that interpret this statement and develop its implications for different arenas of responsibility;

8. To direct the Division for Church in Society to expand its work in advocating for corporate social responsibility, in assisting with community economic development, and in public policy advocacy that furthers the various commitments made in this statement;

9. To call upon the members of this church to give generously to the World Hunger Appeal of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, so that the Lutheran World Federation, Lutheran World Relief, domestic hunger grants, and our partner ecumenical agencies might do more in helping to alleviate the causes and consequences of hunger, poverty, and injustice; and to call upon the members of this church to participate actively in supporting these and similar ministries;

10. To call upon the educational institutions of this church—schools, colleges and universities, seminaries, continuing education centers, camps, and retreat centers—to develop programs and educational resources in light of this statement so people can be better prepared to respond to the challenges of economic life.

11. To direct the Church Council to report to the 2001 Churchwide Assembly any changes in policies or procedures and their intended effects taken by the Church Council or churchwide units in response to the social statement, “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All.”

“Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All”

A Social Statement on Economic Life

Economic life pervades our lives—the work we do, the income we receive, how much we consume and save, what we value, and how we view one another. An economy (*oikonomia* or “management of the household”) is meant to meet people’s material needs. The current market-based economy does that to an amazing degree; many are prospering as never before. At the same time, others continue to lack what they need for basic subsistence. Out of deep concern for those affected adversely, we of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America here assess economic life today in light of the moral imperative to seek *sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all*.*

To an unprecedented degree, today’s market economy has become global in scope, intensity, and impact. Common brand names appear throughout the world. Many companies based in the United States generate most of their revenues and profits abroad. Daily foreign exchange trading has increased a hundredfold over the past quarter century. Billions of dollars of capital can flow out of one country and into another with a few computer keystrokes. This economic globalization has brought new kinds of businesses, opportunities, and a better life for many. It also has resulted in increasing misery for others. Intensive global competition can force a company to relocate if it is to survive—generating jobs elsewhere, while leaving behind many workers who lose their jobs. Sudden shifts in globalized capital and financial markets can dramatically affect the economic well-being of millions of people, for good or for ill.

Human beings are responsible and accountable for economic life, but people often feel powerless in the face of what occurs. Market-based thought and practices dominate our

world today in ways that seem to eclipse other economic, social, political, and religious perspectives. To many people, the global market economy feels like a free-running system that is reordering the world with few external checks or little accountability to values other than profit. Economic mandates often demand sacrifices from those least able to afford them. When any economic system and its effects are accepted without question—when it becomes a “god-like” power reigning over people, communities, and creation—then we face a central issue of faith.

The Church confesses

If the economic arena becomes a reigning power for us, the question arises: in what or whom shall we place our trust and hope? The First Commandment is clear: “You shall have no other gods before me” (Exodus 20:3). Or as Jesus said, “You cannot serve God and wealth” (Matthew 6:24c; Luke 16:13). To place our trust in something other than God is the essence of sin. It disrupts our relationships with God, one another, and the rest of creation, resulting in injustices and exploitation: “For from the least to the greatest of them, everyone is greedy for unjust gain” (Jeremiah 6:13).

As a church we confess that we are in bondage to sin and submit too readily to the idols and injustices of economic life. We often rely on wealth and material goods more than God and close ourselves off from the needs of others. Too uncritically we accept assumptions, policies, and practices that do not serve the good of all.

Our primary and lasting identity, trust, and hope are rooted in the God we know in Jesus Christ. Baptized into Christ’s life, death, and resurrection, we receive a new identity and freedom, rather than being defined and held captive by economic success or failure. In the gathered community of Christ’s Body, the Church, we hear the Word and partake of the Supper, a foretaste of the fullness of life promised by Jesus, “the bread of life” (John 6:35). Through the cross of Christ, God forgives our sin and frees us from bondage to false gods. Faith in Christ fulfills the First Commandment. We are called to love the neighbor and be stewards in economic life, which, distorted by sin, is still God’s good creation. God who “executes justice for the oppressed, who gives food to the hungry” (Psalm 146:7) is revealed in Jesus, whose mission was “to bring good news to the poor...release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor” (Luke 4: 18-19). The kingdom of God he proclaimed became real through concrete acts of justice: feeding people, freeing them from various forms of bondage, embracing those excluded by the systems of his day, and calling his followers to a life of faithfulness to God.

God’s reign is not a new system, a set of prescriptive laws, or a plan of action that depends on what we do. Nor is it a spiritual realm removed from this world. In Jesus Christ, God’s reign intersects earthly life, transforming us and how we view the systems of this world. Our faith in God provides a vantage point for critiquing any and every system of this world, all of which fall short of what God intends. Human impoverishment, excessive accumulation and consumerism driven by greed, gross economic disparities, and the degradation of nature are incompatible with this reign of God.

Through human decisions and actions, God is at work in economic life. Economic life is intended to be a means through which God’s purposes for humankind and creation are to be served. When this does not occur, as a church we cannot remain silent because of who and whose we are.

Our obligation and ongoing tensions

Based on this vantage point of faith, “*sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all*” is a benchmark for affirming, opposing, and seeking changes in economic life. Because of sin we fall short of these obligations in this world, but we live in light of God’s promised future that ultimately there will be no hunger and injustice. This promise makes us restless with less than what God intends for the world. In economic matters, this draws attention to:

- the scope of God’s concern—“**for all**,”
- the means by which life is sustained—“**livelihood**,”
- what is needed—“**sufficiency**,” and
- a long-term perspective—“**sustainability**.”

These criteria often are in tension with one another. What benefits people in one area, sector, or country may harm those elsewhere. What is sufficient in one context is not in another. What is economically sufficient is not necessarily sustainable. There are difficult and complex trade-offs and ambiguities in the dynamic processes of economic life. As believers, we are both impelled by God’s promises and confronted with the practical realities of economic life. We often must choose among competing claims, conscious of our incomplete knowledge, of the sin that clouds all human judgments and actions, *and* of the grace and forgiveness given by Christ.

Economic assumptions can conflict with what we as a church confess. Who we are in Christ places us in tension with priorities given to money, consumption, competition, and profit in our economic system. While autonomy and self-sufficiency are highly valued in our society, as people of faith we confess that we depend on God and are interdependent with one another. Through these relationships we are nurtured, sustained, and held accountable.

- While succeeding or making something of themselves is what matters to many in economic life, we confess that in Christ we are freely justified by grace through faith rather than by what we do.
- While a market economy emphasizes what individuals want and are willing and able to buy, as people of faith we realize that what human beings want is not necessarily what they *need* for the sake of life.
- While a market economy assumes people will act to maximize their own interests, we acknowledge that what is in our interest must be placed in the context of what is good for the neighbor.
- While competitiveness is key to economic success, we recognize that intense competitiveness can destroy relationships and work against the reconciliation and cooperation God desires among people.
- While economic reasoning assumes that resources are scarce relative to people’s wants, we affirm that God promises a world where there is enough for everyone, if only we would learn how to use and share what God has given for the sake of all.
- While economic growth often is considered an unconditional good, we insist that such growth must be evaluated by its direct, indirect, short-term, and long-term effects on the well-being of all creation and people, especially those who are poor.

When we pray in the Lord’s Prayer, “*Give us this day our daily bread*,” we place ourselves in tension with economic assumptions of our society. Rather than being self-sufficient, we need and depend on what God gives or provides through people, practices,

and systems. “*Daily bread*” is not earned by efforts of individuals alone, but is made possible through a variety of relationships and institutions.¹ God gives in ways that expand our notions of who “*us*” includes, from people close at hand to those around the globe. In stark contrast to those who seek unchecked accumulation and profit, our attention is drawn to those who are desperate for what will sustain their lives for just *this day*.

For all: especially those living in poverty

“For all” refers to the whole household of God—all people and creation throughout the world. We should assess economic activities in terms of how they affect “all,” especially people living in poverty.

We tend to view economic life by how it affects us personally. The cross of Christ challenges Christians to view this arena through the experience of those of us who are impoverished, suffering, broken, betrayed, left out, without hope. Through those who are “despised” and “held of no account” (Isaiah 53:3) we see the crucified Christ (Matthew 25:31-46), through whom God’s righteousness and justice are revealed. The power of God’s suffering, self-giving love transforms and challenges the Church to stand with all who are overlooked for the sake of economic progress or greed. Confession of faith ought to flow into acts of justice for the sake of the most vulnerable.

Outrage over the plight of people living in poverty is a theme throughout the Bible. At the heart of Jesus’ ministry and central to the message of the Old Testament prophets was God’s partiality toward the poor and powerless. The poor are those who live precariously between subsistence and utter deprivation. It is not poor people themselves who are the problem, but their lack of access to the basic necessities of life. Without such, they cannot maintain their human dignity. Strong themes in Scripture indicate that people are poor because of circumstances that have afflicted them (such as “aliens, orphans, widows”), or because of the greed and unjust practices of those who “trample on the poor” (Amos 5:11). The basic contrast is between the weak and the greedy. The psalmist decries that “the wicked draw the sword and bend their bows to bring down the poor and needy” (Psalm 37:14). The prophet rails against those “who write oppressive statutes to turn aside the needy from justice” (Isaiah 10:1-2). Their moral problem is that they have followed greed rather than God. As a result, the poor lose their basic productive resource (their land), and fall into cycles of indebtedness. Poverty is a problem of the whole human community, not only of those who are poor or vulnerable.

In relation to those who are poor, Martin Luther’s insights into the meaning of the commandments against killing, stealing, and coveting are sobering. We violate “you shall not kill” when we do not help and support others to meet their basic needs. As Luther explained, “If you see anyone suffer hunger and do not feed [them], you have let [them] starve.”² “To steal” can include “taking advantage of our neighbor in any sort of dealing that results in loss to him [or her]—wherever business is transacted and money is exchanged for goods or labor.”³ “You shall not covet” means “God does not wish you to deprive your neighbor of anything that is [theirs], letting [them] suffer loss while you gratify your greed.”⁴ Related Hebraic laws called for leaving produce in the fields for the poor (Deuteronomy 24:21), a periodic cancellation of debts (Deuteronomy 15:1), and a jubilee year in which property was to be redistributed or restored to those who had lost it, so that they might again have a means of livelihood (Leviticus 25).

Today, well over a billion people in the world are deprived of what they need to meet their basic needs. Far more lack clean water, adequate sanitation, housing, or health services.

They use whatever limited options are available to them in their daily struggle to survive. Thousands die daily. Millions pursue economic activities that are part of the underground or informal economy, and are not counted in economic statistics. Children often have no option but to labor under unjust conditions to provide for themselves and their families. Political struggles, militarism, and warfare add to this travesty, displacing masses of people from their homes.⁵ In many of the poorest countries, incomes continue to decline, and people subsist on less and less. Although most of the impoverished live in developing countries, where their numbers continue to grow at alarming rates, many millions are in the industrialized countries. Millions of poor people live in communities in the United States and the Caribbean where the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is present.

Developing countries that have opened their economies to global markets have generally reduced poverty over time more than those that have not, but the terms of trade often work to the disadvantage of developing countries. Seeking more just exchanges “for all” through investment and trade is a significant challenge. The danger is that less developed parts of the world, or less powerful groups within a country, will be exploited or excluded from participation in global markets.

When a developing country becomes heavily indebted, the poorest are usually the most adversely affected. A huge share of a country’s income must be used to pay off debt, which may have been incurred unjustly or under corrupt rulers. Structural adjustment programs to pay off debt typically divert funds from much needed educational, health, and environmental efforts, and from infrastructures for economic development.

God stands in judgment of those in authority who fall short of their responsibility, and is moved with compassion to deliver the impoverished from all that oppresses them: “Give justice to the weak and the orphan; maintain the right of the lowly and the destitute” (Psalm 82:3). The rich are expected to use wealth to benefit their neighbors who live in poverty here and throughout the world.

In light of these realities, *we commit ourselves as a church*⁶ and urge members to:

- address creatively and courageously the complex causes of poverty;
- provide opportunities for dialogue, learning, and strategizing among people of different economic situations and from different regions who are harmed by global economic changes;
- give more to relieve conditions of poverty, and invest more in initiatives to reduce poverty.

We call for:

- scrutiny of how specific policies and practices affect people and nations that are the poorest, and changes to make policies of economic growth, trade, and investment more beneficial to those who are poor;
- efforts to increase the participation of low-income people in political and civic life, and citizen vigilance and action that challenges governments and other sectors when they become captive to narrow economic interests that do not represent the good of all;
- shifts throughout the world from military expenditures to purposes that serve the needs of low-income people;
- support for family planning and enhanced opportunities for women so that population pressures might be eased;⁷

- reduction of overwhelming international debt burdens in ways that do not impose further deprivations on the poor, and cancellation of some or all debt where severe indebtedness immobilizes a country's economy;
- investments, loan funds, hiring practices, skill training, and funding of micro-enterprises and other community development projects that can empower low-income people economically.

Livelihood: vocation, work, and human dignity

Vocation: Our calling from God begins in the waters of Baptism and is lived out in a wide array of settings and relationships. Freed through the Gospel, we are to serve others through arenas of responsibility such as family, work, and community life. Although we continue to be ensnared in the ambiguities and sin of this world, our vocation is to seek what is good for people and the rest of creation in ways that glorify God and anticipate God's promised future.

"Livelihood" designates our means of subsistence or how we are supported economically. This occurs through paid jobs, self-employment, business ownership, and accumulated wealth, as well as through support of family, community networks, and government assistance.

Strong families, neighborhoods, and schools should support and help prepare persons for livelihood. Churches, businesses, financial institutions, government, and civil society also play key roles. Through these relationships people can be enabled and obligated to pursue their livelihoods as they are able. When these infrastructures for livelihood are absent, weak, or threatened (as they are for many today), people are more likely to be impoverished materially, emotionally, or spiritually.

Through these relationships and structures, individuals can learn important virtues, such as:

- trust, accountability, and fidelity in relationships;
- discipline, honesty, diligence, and responsibility in work;
- frugality, prudence, and temperance in the use of resources;
- compassion and justice toward other people and the rest of creation. These virtues, along with perspectives and skills acquired through education and training, make it more likely that individuals will be able to flourish in their livelihood.

We commit ourselves as a church and urge members to:

- develop God-given capacities and provide stable, holistic, loving development of children and youth through families, neighborhoods, congregations, and other institutions;
- support and encourage one another as we live out our vocation in ways that serve the neighbor and contribute to family and community vitality;
- pray and act to provide livelihood for ourselves and others through the institutions of our day, trusting in God's providential care for all.

We call for:

- policies that promote stable families, strong schools, and safe neighborhoods;
- addressing the barriers individuals face in preparing for and sustaining a livelihood (such as lack of education, transportation, child care, and health care).

Work: In Genesis, work is to be a means through which basic needs might be met, as human beings “till and keep” the garden in which God has placed them (Genesis 2:15). Work is seen not as an end in itself, but as a means for sustaining humans and the rest of creation. Due to sin, the work God gives to humans also becomes toil and anguish (Genesis 3:17,19). Injustice often deprives people of the fruits of their work (Proverbs 13:23), which benefits others instead.

God calls people to use their freedom and responsibility, their capacities and know-how to participate productively in God’s world. As stewards of what God has entrusted to us, we should use available resources to generate jobs for the livelihood of more people, as well as to create capital for the growth needed to meet basic needs. Wealth should serve or benefit others so that they also might live productively.

What matters in many jobs today, rather than a sense of vocation, is the satisfaction of wants or desires that the pay from work makes possible. Work becomes a means toward increased consumerism. Many also feel a constant sense of being judged, having to measure up according to an unrelenting bottom line of productivity or profit. We are freed from such economic captivity by the forgiveness, new life, and dignity that is ours in Christ.

Competitive economic forces, as well as changing technologies and consumer demands, significantly affect the kinds of jobs available and the nature of work. Increased productivity and technological innovation continue to make some jobs obsolete, while creating others. A growing proportion of jobs are part-time, temporary, or contractual, without the longevity and security assumed in the past. Workers in the United States increasingly produce services rather than tangible goods. Many people choose to be self-employed. A large number lose their jobs when companies merge, downsize, or move to areas with lower labor costs.

Job transitions can be enriching, but also painful. Feeling invested in one’s job as a calling or being able to count on a future livelihood can be difficult when work is continually in flux. Many workers feel treated as if they are dispensable. Amid these changes, our faith reminds us that our security and livelihood rest ultimately on God. Our hope is grounded in God’s promise—that people “shall long enjoy the work of their hands” (Isaiah 65:21). This gives us courage to ask why changes are occurring, to challenge forces of greed and injustice when they deny some people what they need to live, and, when necessary, to seek new possibilities for livelihood.

Therefore, ***we commit ourselves*** as a church and urge members to:

- deliberate together about the challenges people face in their work;
- counsel and support those who are unemployed, underemployed, and undergoing job transitions;
- provide skill and language enhancement training that will enable the most vulnerable (including new immigrants) to become better prepared for jobs.

We call for:

- public and private sector partnerships to create jobs and job retention programs;
- national economic policies that support and advance the goal of low unemployment.

Human dignity: Human beings are created “in God’s image” (Genesis 1:27) as social beings whose dignity, worth, and value are conferred by God. Although our identity does not depend on what we do, through our work we should be able to express this God-given

dignity as persons of integrity, worth, and meaning. Yet work does not constitute the whole of our life. When we are viewed and treated only as workers, we tend to be exploited.

Employers have a responsibility to treat employees with dignity and respect. This should be reflected in employees' remuneration, benefits, work conditions, job security, and ongoing job training. Employees have a responsibility to work to the best of their potential in a reliable and responsible manner. This includes work habits, attitudes toward employers and co-workers, and a willingness to adapt and prepare for new work situations. No one should be coerced to work under conditions that violate their dignity or freedom, jeopardize their health or safety, result in neglect of their family's well-being, or provide unjust compensation for their labor.

Our God-given dignity in community means that we are to participate actively in decisions that impact our lives, rather than only passively accept decisions others make for us. People should be involved in decision making that directly affects their work. They should also be free to determine their lives independent of particular jobs. Public policy can provide economic and other conditions that protect human freedom and dignity in relation to work.

Power disparities and competing interests are present in most employment situations. Employers need competent, committed workers, but this does not necessarily presume respect for the personal lives and needs of individual workers. Individual workers depend on the organization for employment as their means of livelihood, but this does not necessarily presume respect for the organization's interest and goals. Management and employees move toward justice as they seek cooperative ways of negotiating these interests when they conflict. Because employees often are vulnerable and lack power in such negotiations, they may need to organize in their quest for human dignity and justice. When this occurs, accurate information and fair tactics are expected of all parties involved.

We commit ourselves as a church to:

- hire without discriminating on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, age, disabilities, sexual orientation, or genetic factors;
- compensate all people we call or employ at an amount sufficient for them to live in dignity;
- provide adequate pension and health benefits, safe and healthy work conditions, sufficient periods of rest, vacation, and sabbatical, and family-friendly work schedules;
- cultivate workplaces of participatory decision-making;
- honor the right of employees to organize for the sake of better working conditions and for workers to make free and informed decisions; encourage those who engage in collective bargaining to commit themselves to negotiated settlements, especially when participatory attempts at just working conditions fail;** and discourage the permanent replacement of striking workers.

We call for:

- other employers to engage in similar practices;
- government enforcement of regulations against discrimination, exploitative work conditions and labor practices (including child labor), and for the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively;

- public policies that ensure adequate social security, unemployment insurance, and health care coverage;
- a minimum wage level that balances employees' need for sufficient income with what would be significant negative effects on overall employment;
- tax credits and other means of supplementing the insufficient income of low-paid workers in order to move them out of poverty.

Sufficiency: enough, but not too much

“Sufficiency” means adequate access to income and other resources that enable people to meet their basic needs, including nutrition, clothing, housing, health care, personal development, and participation in community with dignity. God has created a world of sufficiency for all, providing us daily and abundantly with all the necessities of life.⁸ In many countries, the problem is not the lack of resources, but how they are shared, distributed, and made accessible within society. Justice seeks fairness in how goods, services, income, and wealth are allocated among people so that they can acquire what they need to live.

Human need and the right to ownership often are in tension with each other. The biblical understanding of stewardship is that what we have does not ultimately belong to us. We are called to be stewards of what God has given for the sake of all. This stewardship includes holding economic, political, and social processes and institutions responsible for producing and distributing what is needed for sufficiency for all. Private property is affirmed insofar as it serves as a useful, yet imperfect means to meet the basic needs of individuals, households, and communities.

Government is intended to serve God's purposes by limiting or countering narrow economic interests and promoting the common good. Paying taxes to enable government to carry out these and other purposes is an appropriate expression of our stewardship in society, rather than something to be avoided. Government often falls short of these responsibilities. Its policies can harm the common good and especially the most vulnerable in society. Governing leaders are to be held accountable to God's purposes: “May [they] judge your people with righteousness, and your poor with justice.... May [they] defend the cause of the poor of the people” (Psalm 72:2).

The lack of material sufficiency for some within the human community is itself a spiritual problem. “How does God's love abide in anyone who has the world's goods and sees a brother or sister in need and yet refuses to help?” (1 John. 3:17). Sin disrupts our bonds with and our sense of responsibility for one another. We live separated from others on the basis of income and wealth, and resent what others have. Huge disparities in income and wealth, such as those we face in this country, threaten the integrity of the human community.

Those who are rich and those who are poor are called into relationships of generosity from which each can benefit. Within the Church, those in need and those with abundance are brought together in Christ. On this basis and in the face of disparities in the church of his day, Paul calls for “a fair balance between your present abundance and their need, so that their abundance may be for your need.” In so doing, “the one who had much did not have too much, and the one who had little did not have too little.” (2 Corinthians 8:9, 13-15).

God's mandate is clear. “Is not this the fast that I choose: to loose the bonds of injustice...and to break every yoke? Is it not to share your bread with the hungry, and bring

the homeless poor into your house; when you see the naked to cover them, and not to hide yourself from your own kin?" (Isaiah 58:6-7). God's lavish, justifying grace frees us from self-serving preoccupations and calls us to a life of mutual generosity as we relate to all who are our neighbors. Faith becomes active through personal relationships, direct assistance, and wider policy changes in society.

Not enough: In the United States, tens of millions of people live in poverty, although many refuse to think of themselves as "poor." Some make daily choices as to which necessities they will have to live without. Many work part- or full-time, but on that basis, are still unable to lift their families out of poverty. Others are physically or mentally unable to work. Many lack the family, educational, and community support important for making good choices in their lives. Although those living in poverty are particularly visible in cities, their more hidden reality in suburban, small town, and rural areas can be just as painful. A greater proportion of people of color live in conditions of poverty. The poor are disproportionately women with their children.⁹ Systemic racism and sexism continue to be evident in the incidence of poverty.

In light of these realities, ***we commit ourselves*** as a church and urge members to:

- provide counsel, food, clothing, shelter, and money for people in need, in ways that respect their dignity;
- develop mutual, face-to-face, empowering relationships between people who have enough and people living in poverty, especially through congregational and synodical partnerships;
- advocate for public and private policies that effectively address the causes of poverty;
- generously support organizations and community-based efforts that enable low-income people to obtain more sufficient, sustainable livelihoods;
- continue working to eradicate racism and sexism.

We call for:

- government to provide adequate income assistance and related services for citizens, documented immigrants, and refugees who are unable to provide for their livelihood through employment;
- adequate, consistent public funding for the various low-income services non-profit organizations provide for the common good of all;
- scrutiny to ensure that new ways of providing low-income people with assistance and services (such as through the private sector) do not sacrifice the most vulnerable for the sake of economic efficiency and profit;
- correction of regressive tax systems, so that people are taxed progressively in relation to their ability to pay;
- opposition to lotteries and other state-sponsored gambling because of how these regressive means of raising state revenues adversely affect those who are poor.¹⁰

Too much: Because most of us in the United States have far more than we need, we can easily fall into bondage to what we have. We then become like the young man Jesus

encountered, whose bondage to his possessions kept him from following Jesus (Matthew 19:16-22; Mark 10:17-22; Luke 18:18-25).

We consume goods and use services to meet our needs. To increase consumption and expand sales, businesses stimulate ever new *wants*. Rather than human *need* shaping consumption, advertising and media promotion both shape and expand *wants*. Our very being becomes expressed through what we have or desire to possess. When consuming to meet basic needs turns into consumerism as an end in itself, we face a serious crisis of faith.

Endless accumulation of possessions and pursuit of wealth can become our god as we yearn for a life without limits. “Ah, you who join house to house, who add field to field, until there is room for no one but you” (Isaiah 5:8). Many look to material possessions and money as the means for participating in the “fullness of life,” and thus become ever more dependent on economic transactions. But Jesus asks, “What does it profit them if they gain the whole world, but lose or forfeit themselves?” (Luke 9:25).

In the United States, people’s worth and value tend to be measured by the size of their income and wealth. If judged by their multimillion dollar compensations, top corporate officers and sports superstars would seem to be the most highly valued in our society. Enormous disparities between their compensations and the average wages of workers are scandalous.

The economic power of large transnational corporations continues to grow, making some of them larger than many national economies. Along with this financial strength comes an inordinate potential to influence political decisions, local and regional economies, and democratic processes in society. The power they wield, enhanced through mergers and buyouts, can have positive effects, but it can also hold others captive to transnational corporate interests. The global community must continue to seek effective ways to hold these and other powerful economic actors more accountable for the sake of sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all.

In light of these realities, *we commit ourselves* as a church and urge members to:

- examine how we are in bondage to our possessions and can be freed to be faithful stewards of them;
- serious and ongoing consideration in our families and congregations of how to resist the allure of consumerism and live lives less oriented toward the accumulation of goods and financial assets;
- educate one another, beginning with the young, on how to deal responsibly with money, credit, and spending within one’s means;
- give generously of our wealth (for example, through tithing and planned giving), especially for purposes that serve the needs of others.

We call for:

- corporate policies that lessen the disparities between compensations of top corporate executives and that of the workers throughout an organization;
- corporate governance that is accountable for the effects of a company’s practices on workers, communities, and the environment here and throughout the world;
- scrutiny of the tax breaks, subsidies, and incentives many companies receive, to assure that they serve the common good;
- enforcement of laws to prevent the exercise of inordinate market power by large corporations;

- appropriate government regulatory reform so that governments can monitor private sector practices more effectively and efficiently in an ever-changing global economy.

Sustainability: of the environment, agriculture, and low-income communities

“Sustainability” is the capacity of natural and social systems to survive and thrive together over the long term. What is sufficient in providing for people’s wants often is in tension with what can be sustained over time. Sustainability has implications for how we evaluate economic activity in terms of its ongoing effects on the well-being of both nature and human communities. Economic life should help sustain humans and the rest of creation—now and in the future.

Efforts to provide a sufficient livelihood must be sustainable economically. Individuals and families should not borrow*** more than they are able to pay back and still meet their future needs. Governments should not finance their spending by excessive borrowing or money creation that reduces national income and production, and threatens the livelihood of future generations. Tax rates and government regulations must not be so burdensome as to stifle the production of the very goods and services people need to live.

“The earth is the Lord’s and all that is in it, the world, and those who live in it” (Psalm 24:1). As God created, so God also sustains: “When you send forth your spirit...you renew the face of the ground” (Psalm 104:30). God makes a covenant with Noah, his descendants, and every living creature that they will not be destroyed (Genesis 9:8-17). In God’s promise of “new heavens and a new earth...they shall build houses and inhabit them; they shall plant vineyards and eat their fruit” (Isaiah 65:17, 21). The vantage point of the kingdom of God motivates us to focus on more than short-term gains. Humans, called to be stewards of God’s creation, are to respect the integrity and limits of the earth and its resources.

Sustaining the environment: The growth of economic activity during the twentieth century, and the industrialization and consumerism that fueled it, radically changed the relationship between humans and the earth. Too often the earth has been treated as a waste receptacle and a limitless storehouse of raw materials to be used up for the sake of economic growth, rather than as a finite, fragile ecological system upon which human and all other life depends.

Instead of being stewards who care for the long-term well-being of creation, we confess that we have depleted non-renewable resources, eroded topsoil, and polluted the air, ground, and water. Without appropriate environmental care, economic growth cannot be sustained. Caring for creation means that economic processes should respect environmental limits. “When we act interdependently and in solidarity with creation, we *do* justice. We serve and keep the earth, trusting its bounty can be sufficient for all, and sustainable.”¹¹

We commit ourselves as a church and urge members to:

- use less, re-use, recycle, and restore natural resources;
- plan for careful land use of church property, and receive and manage gifts of land and real estate in sustainable ways.

We call for:

- appropriate policies and regulations that help reverse environmental destruction;

- planning that accounts for the impact of regional growth on communities and ecosystems;
- ending subsidies for economic activities that use up non-renewable natural resources;
- companies to pay more fully for the wider social and environmental costs of what they produce;
- the development and use of more energy-efficient technologies.

Sustaining agriculture: Agriculture is basic to the survival and security of people throughout the world. Through the calling of agriculture, farmers produce the grain for our daily bread and the rest of our food supply. Without a bountiful and low-cost food supply, most Americans would not enjoy the livelihood they do. Farmers face the challenge of producing this food in ways that contribute to the regeneration of the land and the vitality of rural communities. At the same time, society as a whole must address the high levels of risk farmers face and the low prices they often receive. Changing agricultural policies and the growing power of large agribusiness corporations make this even more challenging.

We commit ourselves as a church and urge members to:

- pray for and support those who farm the land;
- pursue new ways for consumers to partner with small farmers in sharing the risks and yields of farming.

We call for:

- changes to assure that farmers will receive a greater proportion of the retail food dollar;
- adequate prices for agricultural products so that farmers can be compensated fairly for their labor and production costs;
- sustainable agricultural practices that protect and restore the regenerative capacities of the land, rather than practices that deplete the land (for example, by measuring productivity only by short-term agricultural yields);
- more just work conditions for farm workers, especially immigrants, and opportunities for them to acquire their own land;
- greater entry-level opportunities for the next generation of family farmers.

Sustainable development of low-income communities: In many low-income communities, disinvestment and neglect have taken their toll. In contrast to this are examples of sustainable community economic development that take into account the overall health and welfare of people, the environment, and the local economy. Such an approach creates jobs, prepares people for work, generates income that is re-circulated several times in the community, and sustains and renews environmental resources, all for the sake of a community's long-term viability.

Instead of a top-down approach focused on a community's deprivation and its lack of economic growth, effective community development draws upon its assets and emphasizes quality and diverse production. Effective policies build and enhance a community's social relationships, values, and institutions, which together can further economic development.

Local residents determine the future of their community by initiating, supporting, and sustaining new projects. Their capacities, skills, and assets help shape the vision and plan for the community.

Through broad-based community organizing people can be mobilized to address economic and other issues that directly impact them. Government and the private sector also must invest in health, education, and infrastructures necessary for sustainable development. When people and resources are connected in ways that multiply their power and effectiveness, this will help bring about productive results and meaningful participation in community and economic life.

Therefore, *we commit ourselves* as a church and urge members to:

- learn about, participate in, and provide financial support for community economic development and organizing strategies that enhance the current and future well-being of communities and the environment;
- support community development corporations and locally-owned or producer-owned cooperatives;
- integrate social values into our investment decisions, and invest more in socially responsible companies and funds that sustain businesses as well as workers, consumers, the environment, and low-income communities.

We call for:

- support of the above strategies by governments, financial institutions, and the wider society;
- alternatives to gambling as a means of community economic development;
- grants and low-interest loans that enable small companies and farms to get started, develop, and expand in order to provide livelihood for more people in low-income communities.

In conclusion, a vision renewed

Pursuing policies and practices that will lead to “sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all” is such a formidable challenge that to many it seems unrealistic or not worth the effort. The Church as an employer, property owner, consumer, investor, and community of believers can be as caught up in the reigning economic assumptions as the rest of society. But despite the Church’s failings, through the Word and the sacraments, we are forgiven, renewed, and nourished. At the Table, we together receive the same bread and drink of the same cup. What we receive is sufficient; it *does* sustain us. We are strengthened to persist in the struggle for justice as we look forward to the coming of God’s kingdom in all its fullness.

We are sent forth *into the world* to bear witness to God’s promised reign. The world is the whole household of God that economic life is intended to serve. The Spirit of God expands our vision and transforms our priorities. We realize that we do not eat alone; everyone needs to eat. The multitudes present around God’s global table become our neighbors rather than competitors or strangers. Empowered by God, we continue to act, pray, and hope that through economic life there truly will be *sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all*.

Implementing Resolutions Enacted by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly

1. To adopt “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All” as a social statement of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in accordance with “Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns” (1997);
2. To call upon members of this church to pray, work, and advocate that all might have a sufficient, sustainable livelihood, and to draw upon this statement in forming their own judgments and actions in their ministries in daily life;
3. To call upon our bishops, pastors, and other rostered leaders to give renewed attention to how Scripture, liturgy, preaching, hymnody, and prayers may express God’s will for economic life and empower a faith active for justice, and to provide leadership in seeking economic justice in their communities;
4. To challenge all congregations, synods, and churchwide units to carry out the substance and spirit of this statement and intensify their work with various ecumenical, interfaith, and secular groups in pursuit of its commitments;
5. To encourage the education, service, and outreach ministries of this church in their work for economic justice;
6. To urge churchwide units and affiliated organizations (social ministry organizations, schools, colleges and universities, and seminaries) to review and adjust their programs and practices in light of this social statement;
7. To direct the Division for Church in Society, in cooperation with other churchwide units, to provide leadership, consultation, and educational and worship resources on the basis of this statement, particularly through the development of resources that interpret this statement and develop its implications for different arenas of responsibility;
8. To direct the Division for Church in Society to expand its work in advocating for corporate social responsibility, in assisting with community economic development, and in public policy advocacy that furthers the various commitments made in this statement;
9. To call upon the members of this church to give generously to the World Hunger Appeal of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, so that the Lutheran World Federation, Lutheran World Relief, domestic hunger grants, and our partner ecumenical agencies might do more in helping to alleviate the causes and consequences of hunger, poverty, and injustice; and to call upon the members of this church to participate actively in supporting these and similar ministries;
10. To call upon the educational institutions of this church—schools, colleges and universities, seminaries, continuing education centers, camps, and retreat centers—to develop programs and educational resources in light of this statement so people can be better prepared to respond to the challenges of economic life.
11. To direct the Church Council to report to the 2001 Churchwide Assembly any changes in policies or procedures and their intended effects taken by the Church Council or churchwide units in response to the social statement, “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All.”

End Notes

1. See Martin Luther's discussion of this in "The Large Catechism," *The Book of Concord*, Theodore G. Tappert, transl. and ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), 430-431.
2. The Fifth Commandment as discussed in "The Large Catechism," BC, 391.
3. The Seventh Commandment as discussed in "The Large Catechism," BC, 395.
4. The Ninth and Tenth commandments, "The Large Catechism," BC, 406.
5. See the ELCA Message, "Immigration" (1998) and the ELCA Social Statement, "For Peace in God's World" (1995), available from the Division for Church in Society (Call 800-638-3522, extension 2718, for this and other ELCA statements and studies).
6. In this and subsequent "we commit" sections, "church" includes congregations, synods, the churchwide organization, and where relevant, this calls upon affiliated organizations such as seminaries, schools, colleges and universities, and social ministry organizations to adjust their policies and practices accordingly.
7. "Global population growth, for example, relates to the lack of access by women to family planning and health care, quality education, fulfilling employment, and equal rights." ELCA Social Statement, "Caring for Creation: Vision, Hope, and Justice" (1993), 3-4.
8. See how Luther explains the First Article of the Creed in the Small Catechism.
9. See the Women and Children Living in Poverty Strategy of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (800-NET-ELCA extension 2863).
10. See "Gambling: A Study for Congregations" (Division for Church in Society, 1998), 20-22.
11. "Caring for Creation..." (1993).

Addendum

This social statement has been adopted in accordance with "Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns" (1997), which calls for an addendum to be added to indicate amendments that received significant support but not enough for adoption (see the asterisks in the text).

* It should be noted at the outset that the economy and economic life of a people in a Christian sense must serve the whole of the human spirit and of human life. Economic goals are not ends in themselves but must serve to enrich the spiritual life of humans in a just and caring way. The ends of human existence should not be directed to material and power enrichment but to spiritual growth and blessings. However, the material needs of the poor and disenfranchised must not be overlooked; rather they must be emphasized.

** to refrain from intentionally undercutting union organizing activities.

*** should not borrow irresponsibly [with the remainder of this sentence deleted].

**Response to the Action on
“Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All”**

Bishop Anderson said, “Thank you, task force. Thanks not only to the folks who are on the podium here, but to the entire task force which worked very carefully and faithfully on this. Microphone 9.”

The Rev. Roger W. Spencer [New Jersey Synod] asked if this church’s ecumenical partners had been consulted during the development process. Pastor Bloomquist responded that there had been many conversations during the past five years with ecumenical partners, both in the United States and around the world.

Ms. Fran Koenig [North/West Lower Michigan Synod] asked if a corrected copy of the adopted document could be distributed to voting members before the assembly adjourned so that it could be taken home and shared. Bishop Anderson assured her that it would be.

Greetings: The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod

Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Alvin L. Barry, president of The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod (LCMS), stating that it was good to have him here representing the LCMS, and that he looked forward to the continuation of official conversations between the two church bodies, which began several months ago. Joining President Barry on the stage was the Rev. Robert T. Kuhn, first vice-president of The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod.

President Barry brought greetings from LCMS members and said that “our two church bodies have been blessed in knowing and holding two basic truths of Scripture: First, that all are sinners and deserve wrath and damnation. But thanks be to God, through the working of God’s Spirit through Baptism and the Word, we also know a second great truth, the fantastic forgiveness that is ours through the death and resurrection of Jesus.”

He went on to say that it was no secret that there are very serious theological and doctrinal differences that divide the two church bodies, but insisted that it is good that representatives are meeting to candidly discuss these differences.

He concluded by saying that “our church bodies can and must do this: thank God for those two great truths and ask God to bless our churches as we hold forth these two great truths before the eyes of all as we move into a new millennium so that God’s kingdom might truly come and his will be done among us.” He wished God’s blessings on these days spent together in this Churchwide Assembly.

Bishop Anderson thanked President Barry and presented him with a gift.

Greetings: Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada

Bishop Anderson then welcomed the Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran in Canada (ELCIC), the Rev. Telmor G. Sartison. Mentioning how much he had enjoyed his attendance at the ELCIC convention in July, Bishop Anderson invited Bishop Sartison to bring greetings to the assembly. He was welcomed by assembly members with applause and a standing ovation.

Bishop Sartison began by expressing appreciation for the willingness of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to enter into relationship with other churches in the Body of Christ, especially this church’s openness to meet others at the Lord’s Table before all the problems are solved, adding that he thought “that is the way it is meant to be.” He noted also that the ELCIC is involved in some of the same endeavors in which this church has been engaged ecumenically.

He said he gives thanks to God for the long standing partnership between the two church bodies, the cross-border sharing of information and resources, the participation of ELCIC bishops in the ELCA Academy for Bishops, the renewed interest in cooperative work and mission, and the newly established North American Desk of the Lutheran World Federation.

Finally, stating that “you are a very wealthy people among the churches of the world” possessing the potential to live in isolation or to be involved in the whole Body of Christ and the world, he said, “You have chosen the latter; for that I give thanks.”

He concluded by praying for the encouragement of God’s Holy Spirit and that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America may be a sign of hope churchwide and worldwide for a new century.

Bishop Anderson thanked Bishop Sartison and presented him with a gift.

Bishop Anderson called the assembly’s attention to another dignitary, Wilbur the pig. He said that 158 people had participated in the Board of Pension’s “Run, Walk, ’n’ Roll,” and that cumulatively they had run almost half the distance across the United States.

Proposed Amendments to Constitutions and Bylaws

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 109-119; continued on *Minutes*, pages 459, 461, 617, 625.

Bishop Anderson referred the assembly to the proposed amendments to the *Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America* recommended by the Church Council. He said that the assembly would now deal with the amendments detailed on pages 109-116, with the exception of column two on page 116 and amendments that were removed from *en bloc*.

He asked Secretary Lowell G. Almen, Church Council members Mr. Dale V. Sandstrom, chair of the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee, and Ms. Linda J. Brown, chair of the Committee of Reference and Counsel, to comment on the amendments and to report which provisions voting members had requested be removed from the *en bloc* resolution, namely, proposed bylaws 8.72.14. and 8.72.15.b., and †S14.13.d. and *C9.05.d. These will receive separate consideration. The remainder of the proposed amendments were approved in an *en bloc* action of the assembly.

ASSEMBLY

Two-Thirds Vote Required

ACTION

Yes–886; No–31

CA99.05.15 **To adopt *en bloc* the following amendments to the *Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*:**

To amend churchwide constitutional provision 4.03.c. to provide a more accurate description of the responsibility indicated therein:

4.03.c. Call forth, equip, certify, set apart, ~~supervise~~, and support oversee an ordained ministry... [*with the remainder of the provision unchanged*].

To delete churchwide bylaw 7.11.01. as being no longer necessary:

- ~~7.11.01. The roster of ordained ministers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America shall be composed of:~~
- ~~1) those persons on the Clergy Roster of The American Lutheran Church, the Clergy Roster of The Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, and the Roll of Ordained Ministers of the Lutheran Church in America as of December 31, 1987; and~~
 - ~~2) those persons who are added to the roster of ordained ministers following that date pursuant to section 7.20. et seq. of the Constitution of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;~~

To amend churchwide bylaw 7.31.11.d. and e. and 7.52.11.a.4) and 5) as follows:

- 7.31.11.d. academic and practical qualifications for ministry, including leadership abilities and competence in interpersonal relationships;
- e. commitment to lead a life consistent with worthy of the Gospel of Christ and personal qualifications including leadership abilities and competence in interpersonal relationships in so doing to be an example in faithful service and holy living; . . . [with the remainder of the bylaw unchanged].
- 7.52.11.a. 4) academic and practical qualifications for the position, including leadership abilities and competence in interpersonal relationships;
- 5) commitment to lead a life consistent with worthy of the Gospel of Christ and personal qualifications including leadership abilities and competence in interpersonal relationships in so doing to be an example in faithful service and holy living; . . . [with the remainder of the bylaw unchanged].

To amend churchwide bylaw 7.31.15. in accord with 7.42.h. and i., 7.42.01., 7.42.02., and 7.43.03. as follows:

- 7.31.15. Reinstatement. Persons A person seeking reinstatement to the ordained ministry as pastors a pastor, whether having served previously in this

church or in one of its predecessor bodies, shall be registered ~~with the candidacy committee~~ by the pastor and council of the congregation of which such a person is a member and with the candidacy committee of the synod in which the person was last rostered or, upon mutual agreement of the synodical bishops involved, after consultation with and approval by the secretary of this church, with the candidacy committee of the synod of current residence. The person then shall be interviewed, examined, and approved by the appropriate committee under criteria, policies, and procedures recommended by the Division for Ministry, reviewed by the Conference of Bishops, and adopted by the Church Council. In this process, the committee shall review the circumstances related to the termination of earlier service together with subsequent developments. The person is reinstated after receiving and accepting a letter of call to serve as a pastor in this church.

To amend churchwide bylaw 7.52.13. for clarity and consistency with other applicable bylaws related to candidacy:

7.52.13. Reinstatement. Persons A person seeking reinstatement as an associates in ministry, whether having previously served in this church or in one of its predecessor bodies, a deaconess of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, or a diaconal minister of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America shall be registered by the pastor and council of the congregation of this church of which such a person is a member and interviewed, examined, and approved for reinstatement by the appropriate committee under criteria and procedures recommended by the Division for Ministry, reviewed by the Conference of Bishops, and adopted by the Church Council. In this process, the committee shall review the circumstances related to the termination of earlier service together with subsequent developments. The person is reinstated after receiving and accepting a letter of call in this church... *[with the remainder of the bylaw unchanged].*

To amend churchwide constitutional provision 8.71. in a manner consistent with the process for adoption of constitutional provisions and bylaws, as provided in 22.11. and 22.21.:

8.71. This church may establish official church-to-church relationships and agreements. Establishment of such official relationships and agreements shall require a two-thirds vote of the voting members of the present and voting in a Churchwide Assembly.

To amend constitutional provision 8.72. to provide for the ongoing implementation of agreements of full communion in accord with the actions of Churchwide Assemblies and the governing documents of this church:

8.72. ~~If official church-to-church relationships and agreements are approved at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly under bylaw 8.71., as adopted by the 1995 Churchwide Assembly, interim p~~ Policies and procedures to implement such approval(s) church-to-church relationships of full communion established by action of a Churchwide Assembly may be recommended by the appropriate officer or the board of ~~the an~~ appropriate division, reviewed by the Conference of Bishops, and adopted by the Church Council, ~~notwithstanding any other provisions of the constitutions and bylaws of this church to the contrary. This provision 8.72. shall expire at the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.~~

To renumber previously adopted continuing resolutions as bylaws related to the implementation of established Lutheran-Reformed relationship of full communion and other possible church-to-church relationships of full communion:

8.72.10.Ecumenical Availability of Ordained Ministers

8.72.A9811. An ordained minister of this church, serving temporarily in a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been declared and established by a Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, may be retained on the roster of ordained ministers—upon endorsement by the synodical bishop and by action of the Synod Council in the synod in which the ordained minister is listed on the roster—under policy developed by the Division for Ministry,

reviewed by the Conference of Bishops, and adopted by the Church Council.

- a. A Letter of Call may be issued to an ordained minister of this church, serving temporarily in such a church body, by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America or a Synod Council, in accord with the Table of Sources of Calls (ELCA churchwide continuing resolution 7.44.A96.b.).
- b. A Letter of Call may be issued to an associate in ministry, deaconess, or diaconal minister of this church, serving temporarily in such a church body, by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America or a Synod Council, in accord with the Table of Sources of Calls (ELCA churchwide continuing resolution 7.52.A95.b.).
- c. A Letter of Call issued by the Church Council or a Synod Council for service in a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been established by the Churchwide Assembly shall be governed by churchwide constitutional provision 7.43. and churchwide bylaw 7.43.01.
- d. A Letter of Call to an ordained minister of this church or to an associate in ministry, deaconess, or diaconal minister who serves in a congregation of another church body, under a relationship of full communion, or an institution of such a church body on the territory of the synod, may be issued by the Synod Council. A Letter of Call to an ordained minister of this church or to an associate in ministry, deaconess, or diaconal minister who serves in a national or international agency or institution of another church body, under a relationship of full communion, may be issued by the Church Council.

8.72.B9812. An ordained minister of a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been declared and established by a Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America may be

authorized by the synodical bishop to serve in a congregation or employing entity of this church. Such service shall be rendered under a contract between the congregation or employing entity and the ordained minister in a form proposed by the synodical bishop and approved by the congregation or employing entity. Any such service shall be in accord with churchwide policies developed by the Division for Ministry, reviewed by the Conference of Bishops, and adopted by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

8.72.~~E98~~13. Whenever an ordained minister of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is to serve or is serving in a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been declared and established by the Churchwide Assembly, or whenever an ordained minister of a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been so declared and established is to serve or is serving in this church, a full sharing of relevant information concerning such ordained minister's experience and fitness for ministry is expected between the synodical bishop (or other appropriate office or entity) of this church and the appropriate person, office, or entity in the other church. Relevant information related to fitness for ministry shall include, but is not limited to, any information concerning disciplinary proceedings or allegations that could result, or could have resulted, in disciplinary proceedings.

8.72.F~~98~~16. An ordained minister of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, while serving in an ecumenical setting, remains subject to the standards, policies, and discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. An ordained minister of a church body with which a relationship of full communion exists is understood by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as subject to the standards, policies, and discipline of the church body in which the ordained minister is rostered or holds ministerial membership. Such an ordained minister, while serving in an ELCA congregation or other ministry, is expected to abide by the

standards and policies of this church related to ordained ministers.

To adopt a new churchwide bylaw 9.21.02. to provide for pastoral service under special circumstances in accord with agreements of full communion:

9.21.02. Under special circumstances, subject to the approval of the synodical bishop and the concurrence of the congregation, an ordained minister of a church body with which the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America officially has established a relationship of full communion by action of a Churchwide Assembly may serve temporarily under contract as pastor of a congregation of this church.

To amend the Model Constitution for Congregations by the addition of a section on ecumenical pastoral ministry:

C9.20. Ecumenical pastoral ministry

C9.21. Under special circumstances, subject to the approval of the synodical bishop and the concurrence of this congregation, an ordained minister of a church body with which the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America officially has established a relationship of full communion may serve temporarily under contract as pastor of this congregation.

To adopt a new churchwide constitutional and bylaw section, 9.90. and following, to provide for unusual mission situations in the formation and operation of federated or union congregations:

9.90. FEDERATED OR UNION CONGREGATIONS

9.91. A synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America may authorize a particular congregation or recognized ministry related to the synod to form a federated congregation or union congregation with a congregation or recognized ministry of a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been established by a Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, or a synod may organize a federated congregation or union congregation, with the synod acting in concert with a comparable ecclesiastical

entity of another church body or church bodies with which a relationship of full communion has been established by a Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

9.91.01. A federated congregation is one congregation that is formed and maintained with the approval of both the synod in which the congregation is located and the comparable ecclesiastical entity of one or more church bodies with which a relationship of full communion has been established. A federated congregation shall conduct its life and work under a plan of agreement adopted by the federated congregation in accord with policy of the synod in which the federated congregation is located and the comparable entity or entities of a church body or church bodies with which a relationship of full communion has been declared by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in accord with 8.71. and 9.91.

a. The plan of agreement shall follow, as clearly as is practicable, the model provisions developed by the secretary of this church, in consultation with the Division for Outreach and Conference of Bishops, and approved by the Church Council and such a plan of agreement shall be subject to the constitutions of each church body involved.

1) Whenever the constitutions of the respective church bodies differ, the mandatory provisions of one shall apply in all cases when the others are permissive.

2) Whenever conflicting mandatory provisions or conflicting permissive provisions exist, petition shall be made to the appropriate governing bodies of the church bodies involved to resolve the conflict under the internal procedures of the respective church bodies.

b. The plan of agreement of a federated congregation shall be consistent with the commitments made by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in church-to-

church resolutions and documents for the continuing relationship of full communion.

- c. The plan of agreement of each federated congregation shall be subject to review and ratification by the Synod Council of the synod in which the federated congregation is located.
- d. Implementation of the plan of agreement of a federated congregation shall be guided by policies and procedures developed by the Division for Outreach, reviewed by the Conference of Bishops, and approved by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.
- e. A federated congregation shall be incorporated when legally possible, under the laws of the state of location. A federated congregation shall take the necessary steps to protect its members and the related church bodies from liability.

9.91.02. A union congregation may be formed by two separate congregations that shall continue to exist as separate but cooperating entities. The separate congregations in a union congregation shall be related to their respective church bodies that have established a relationship of full communion in accord with 8.71. and 9.91. A union congregation shall conduct its life and work under a plan of agreement approved by the two separate congregations upon recommendation of the synod in which the congregation is located, with the synod acting in concert with the comparable ecclesiastical entity of a church body with which a relationship of full communion exists.

- a. The plan of agreement of a union congregation shall follow, as clearly as is practicable, the model provisions of such a plan of agreement developed by the secretary of this church, in consultation with the Division for Outreach and Conference of Bishops, and approved by the Church Council and such a plan of agreement for a union congregation shall be subject to the constitutions of each church body involved.

- b. The plan of agreement of a union congregation shall be consistent with the commitments made by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in church-to-church resolutions and documents for the continuing relationship of full communion.**
- c. The plan of agreement of a union congregation shall be subject to review and ratification by the Synod Council of the synod in which the union congregation is located.**
- d. Implementation of the plan of agreement of a union congregation shall be guided by policies and procedures developed by the Division for Outreach, reviewed by the Conference of Bishops, and approved by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.**

- e. Each congregation in a union congregation shall take the necessary steps to protect its members and the related church body from liability.**

To adopt a new sub-section, 13.70., and a new provision as 13.71. to provide for the handling of certain legal matters and other issues related to inactive corporate entities:

13.70. Officers of Predecessor Continuing Corporations

13.71. Whenever an existing but inactive corporate entity that previously functioned as a predecessor or more remote predecessor of this church or as an incorporated board, agency, or synod related to such predecessors, and such entity is otherwise without officers or directors, the officers of this church shall constitute the directors of such entity and shall hold the same office as they hold in this church.

To amend churchwide constitutional provision 17.31. to reflect more clearly the scope of responsibilities and services of the ELCA Foundation and its operation:

17.31. This church shall have a foundation to provide major gift and planned giving programs for individual donors, pooled investment services for endowment funds of this church and its

congregations, synods, agencies, and institutions, and educational and support services in major gift and deferred giving programs to congregations, synods, agencies, and institutions of this church. ~~This foundation shall operate under~~ Upon authorization of the Church Council, portions or all of one or more of these activities may be conducted through a separate corporation known as the Endowment Fund of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. ~~The Endowment Fund shall be incorporated. Its~~ The foundation executive director shall be president of the corporation and shall serve as its chief executive officer, unless the Church Council determines that the treasurer of this church shall be the president of this corporation.

To amend churchwide bylaw 17.31.01. by the following addition at the end of the bylaw to clarify the role of the board of trustees of the Endowment Fund in relation to the ELCA Foundation:

- 17.31.01. The Endowment Fund of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, operating as the ELCA Foundation, shall have a board of trustees of at least nine and not more than 13 members, elected by the Church Council from a slate of nominees submitted by the council's nomination process.**
- a. Board members shall be elected for one six-year term with no consecutive reelection and with approximately one-third elected every two years. The presiding bishop of this church or the presiding bishop's designated representative, a representative with stewardship responsibilities in the Division for Congregational Ministries, the treasurer of this church, and a synodical bishop elected by the Conference of Bishops shall serve as advisory members of the board with voice but not vote.**
 - b. The board shall function as an advisory committee of the ELCA Foundation with respect to those activities of the ELCA Foundation not conducted through the Endowment Fund.**

To amend churchwide bylaw 17.61.04. in recognition of the fact that the board of trustees of the Board of Pensions operates with several committees and that the designation of such committees is not needed in the bylaws:

17.61.04. The board shall organize itself as it deems necessary, ~~except that it shall have the following committees:~~

a. Benefits Committee, including a subcommittee on appeals; and

b. Investment Committee.

To amend †S8.32.a. to clarify the responsibilities of the synodical secretary:

†S8.32. The secretary shall:

a. Keep the minutes of all meetings of the Synod Assembly and Synod Council, be responsible for the printing and distribution of such minutes, and perform such other duties as this synod may from time to time direct... [with the remainder of the provision unchanged].

*To amend S14.03. in a manner consistent with *C9.12.:*

S14.03. The pastor **(a)** shall keep accurate parochial records of all baptisms, confirmations, marriages, burials, communicants, members received, members dismissed, or members excluded from the congregation, **and (b)** shall submit a summary of such statistics annually to this synod., **and (c) The pastor shall become a member of the congregation that has extended upon receipt and acceptance of the letter of call. In a parish of multiple congregations, the pastor shall hold membership in one of the congregations.**

To amend existing bylaw 20.21.07. to clarify responsibility in the process specified within it:

20.21.07. When charges are brought by a synodical bishop or the presiding bishop of this church, or when charges are brought other than by a synodical bishop and have not been withdrawn or dismissed or otherwise disposed of as provided in 20.21.06., **the synodical bishop or the presiding bishop, as appropriate, shall deliver a copy of the charges to the accused and the secretary of this church.**

*To amend *C6.05.g. and *C6.05.h. in the Model Constitution for Congregations to clarify the application of these provisions in accord with churchwide constitutional provisions 9.62.g. and 9.62.h.:*

***C6.05.g.¹ If Since this congregation was a member of the Lutheran Church in America, it shall be required, in addition to the foregoing provisions in *C6.05., to receive synodical approval before terminating its membership in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.**

¹This provision is to be used in the constitutions of all congregations that formerly were a part of the Lutheran Church in America, in accord with provision 9.62.g. in the Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

***C6.05.h.² If Since this congregation was established by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, it shall be required, in addition to the foregoing provisions in *C6.05., to receive synodical approval before terminating its membership in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.**

²This provision is to be used in the constitutions of all congregations that have been established by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in accord with provision 9.62.h. in the Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

To amend †S11.02. in the Constitution for Synods to provide flexibility to synods in the size of the elected Consultation Committee:

†S11.02. The Consultation Committee of this synod shall consist of at least six persons and not more than 12 persons, of whom five half shall be ordained ministers and seven half shall be laypersons, who shall each be elected by the Synod Assembly for a term of six years without consecutive reelection. The functions of the Consultation Committee are set forth in Chapter 20 of the Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and in Chapter 17 of this constitution. The size of the Consultation Committee, in accord with this provision, shall be defined in this synod's bylaw.

To amend †S11.03. in the Constitution for Synods to provide for vacancies on a discipline hearing panel and to amend churchwide bylaws 20.21.08. and 20.21.12. accordingly:

†S11.03. The Committee on Discipline of this synod shall consist of six 12 persons of whom three six shall be

ordained ministers and ~~three~~ six shall be laypersons, who shall each be elected by the Synod Assembly for a term of six years without consecutive reelection.

a. The functions of the Committee on Discipline of this synod are set forth in Chapter 20 of the Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

b. The terms of committee members shall be staggered so that the terms of four committee members (two clergy and two lay) expire every two years.

c. The Synod Council shall fill vacancies on the Committee on Discipline for any unexpired term. (During the 1999-2001 biennium, in order to implement such staggered terms for a 12-member committee, the Synod Council may designate terms and may transfer members from the Consultation Committee to the Committee on Discipline consistent with models prepared by the secretary of this church. This parenthetical implementation sentence shall expire at the conclusion of the 2001 Churchwide Assembly.)

20.21.08. A discipline hearing committee shall be convened to conduct a hearing. The voting members of this committee shall be composed of 12 persons of whom six shall be ~~the members of~~ selected by the Synod Council's Executive Committee from the Committee on Discipline of the synod and six shall be selected from the churchwide Committee on Discipline under the process described in 20.21.12. The rules authorized in 20.21.16. shall establish the method, based upon the remainder of the term, for determining which members of the synodical committee shall serve as the voting members and which shall serve as alternates. A hearing officer selected from the churchwide Committee of Hearing Officers under the process described in 20.21.14. shall preside as the non-voting chair of the discipline hearing committee.

20.21.12. The accused shall have the privilege of selecting two persons (one clergy and one lay) and their alternates of the six persons from the churchwide Committee on Discipline to serve on a discipline hearing committee. The remaining four persons (two clergy and two lay) and their alternates, or six, if the accused does not exercise the privilege, and their alternates shall be selected by the Executive Committee of the Church Council.

*To amend *C20.02. to conform to *C9.02. in the Model Constitution for Congregations and churchwide constitutional provision 9.21.d. and churchwide bylaw 9.21.01. to read:*

***C20.02.** Whenever a letter of call is being recommended for extension to an ordained minister of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America or a candidate for the roster of ordained ministers who has been recommended to the congregation by the synodical bishop to serve the congregations of a parish... *[with the remainder unchanged]*.

Amendments to Constitutions and Bylaws Related to Full Communion with The Episcopal Church

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV.D., pages 116; continued on *Minutes*, pages 445, 461, 617, 625.

Bishop Anderson indicated the assembly now would move to consideration of amendments to the churchwide *Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions* which would implement the full communion agreement with The Episcopal Church.

The Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, directed voting members to page 116 in Section IV, section D, and explained, "These four amendments were not removed from *en bloc*. The difference here between what we just adopted and this action is that this action was submitted by the Church Council, contingent upon both our approval of 'Called to Common Mission' as of yesterday, and then, also, action of The Episcopal Church in July of 2000 on that matter. So, the effective date of the amendments that you see in column two on page 116 would be contingent upon completion by The Episcopal Church of action in response to our action on 'Called to Common Mission.'"

MOVED;

SECONDED: *To recommend the following amendments to the Churchwide Assembly, contingent on prior approval of the proposed Lutheran-Episcopal relationship of full communion:*

To amend churchwide provision 10.31.a.9) by addition of the underlined text:

10.31.a.9) As the synod's pastor, the bishop shall: ...Exercise solely this church's power to ordain (or provide for the ordination by another synodical bishop of) approved candidates... *[with the remainder of the provision unchanged].*

To amend †S8.12.c. in the Constitution for Synods by addition of the underlined text:

†S8.12.c. As the synod's pastor, the bishop shall...:...Exercise solely this church's power to ordain (or provide for the ordination by another synodical bishop of) approved candidates... *[with the remainder of the provision unchanged].*

To amend churchwide bylaw 10.81.01. by deletion and addition:

10.81.01. The presiding bishop of this church, or a ~~member of the Conference of Bishops~~ bishop appointed by the presiding bishop of this church, shall preside for the installation into office, in accord with the policy and approved rite of this church, of each newly elected synodical bishop.

To amend †S8.15. in the Constitution for Synods by addition of the underlined text:

†S8.15. The presiding bishop of this church, or the appointee of the presiding bishop, shall install into office, in accord with the policy and approved rite of this church, each newly elected synodical bishop.

Bishop Anderson thanked Secretary Almen for introducing the amendment, and asked if voting members were ready to vote.

The Rev. Steven C. Berntson [Eastern North Dakota Synod] recalled that on Thursday, August 19, Bishop Andrea F. DeGroot-Nesdahl [South Dakota Synod] proposed an amendment to insert the word "regularly" into "Called to Common Mission." This amendment subsequently was adopted by the assembly. Pastor Berntson stated that this amendment would seem to have implications for this document, asserting that "it seemed to allow, in the case of an emergency, a pastor to ordain another pastor, filling in for the bishop. I think that this bylaw should then be brought into accord with that."

Bishop Anderson asked Secretary Almen to respond, who reported that existing constitutional provisions established the norm that was reflected in "Called to Common Mission," as indicated in the rationale provided by the Committee of Reference and Counsel. "The language [of the proposed constitutional amendments] is consistent with the action of the assembly and the adoption of the amended language of 'Called to Common Mission.'"

Bishop Anderson, seeing no indication of further discussion, invited the assembly to vote on the proposed constitutional amendments.

ASSEMBLY

Two-Thirds Vote Required

ACTION

Yes-802; No-152

CA99.05.16

To adopt the following amendments contingent on approval of the proposed Lutheran-Episcopal relationship of full communion:

To amend churchwide provision 10.31.a.9) by addition of the underlined text:

10.31.a.9) As the synod's pastor, the bishop shall: ...Exercise solely this church's power to ordain (or provide for the ordination by another synodical bishop of) approved candidates... *[with the remainder of the provision unchanged].*

To amend †S8.12.c. in the Constitution for Synods by addition of the underlined text:

†S8.12.c. As the synod's pastor, the bishop shall... : ...Exercise solely this church's power to ordain (or provide for the ordination by another synodical bishop of) approved candidates... *[with the remainder of the provision unchanged].*

To amend churchwide bylaw 10.81.01. by deletion and addition:

10.81.01. The presiding bishop of this church, or a ~~member of the Conference of Bishops~~ bishop appointed by the presiding bishop of this church, shall preside for the installation into office, in accord with the policy and approved rite of this church, of each newly elected synodical bishop.

To amend †S8.15. in the Constitution for Synods by deletion and addition:

†S8.15. The presiding bishop of this church, or the appointee of the presiding bishop, shall install into office, in accord with the policy and approved rite of this church, each newly elected synodical bishop.

Amendments to Constitutions and Bylaws Removed from the *En Bloc* Resolution

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 109-119; continued on *Minutes*, pages 445, 459, 617, 625.

Bishop Anderson then indicated that the assembly would move sequentially through the amendments which were removed from the *en bloc* resolution. He said that he would

announce the provisions by number, and invited the persons who removed them from *en bloc* consideration and who wished to make a comment or an amendment, to proceed immediately to a microphone. He stated that a separate vote would be taken on each of these removed provisions, and that he would announce prior to the vote which required a two-thirds majority vote.

Secretary Almen asked, before proceeding, if he might introduce the chair of the Church Council's Legal and Constitutional Review Committee to outline the varied processes for amendments to churchwide governing documents. Bishop Anderson agreed to this.

Secretary Almen introduced council member Mr. Dale V. Sandstrom, saying that in daily life, Mr. Sandstrom serves as a Justice on the Supreme Court of the state of North Dakota in Bismarck.

Mr. Sandstrom indicated that the assembly had before it different types of proposed amendments, and explained the primary differences for the adoption of the amendments.

Amendments to constitutional provisions of the churchwide constitution may be adopted by a two-thirds vote at one meeting of the Churchwide Assembly. This can be accomplished, provided the Church Council has given at least six months notice to the synods of the proposed amendments. That was done in connection with the constitutional amendments for the churchwide constitution that were submitted to this assembly. The pattern prescribed in churchwide constitutional provision 22.11.b. was followed. The text of such churchwide constitutional amendments cannot be changed from the form in which the amendments were submitted by the council in the official notice to the synods. This restriction exists in accord with Minnesota non-profit law, under which the ELCA is incorporated. The requirement of notice of amendments is in keeping with both the churchwide constitution and the stipulation of the Minnesota statute. Such proposed constitutional amendments may be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the voting members who are present and voting.

By contrast, bylaws for the churchwide governing documents may be adopted by the Churchwide Assembly on a two-thirds vote, but a six-month notice for bylaw amendments is not required. Such bylaws may not conflict with constitutional provisions.

Amendments to mandatory provisions in the *Constitution for Synods* that record constitutional provisions of this church must follow the same pattern as amendments to the constitution of this church. This is provided in churchwide constitutional provision 10.13. Amendments to mandatory provisions in the *Constitution for Synods* that incorporate bylaws of this church and amendments to non-mandatory provisions of the *Constitution for Synods* follow the pattern provided for amendments to the churchwide bylaws.

Finally, according to churchwide bylaw 9.53.02., amendments to the *Model Constitution for Congregations* shall be made in the same manner as prescribed in churchwide constitutional provision 22.21. for amendment to the bylaws of this church.

Secretary Almen then announced that a request had been submitted to remove from *en bloc* consideration 8.72.14. As outlined by Mr. Sandstrom, that falls in the category of a bylaw amendment. The proposed language is the same language that has been in force in the implementation of the *Formula of Agreement* that was adopted by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly. The language was prepared originally in such a way that it would apply in this church to the implementation of all agreements for full communion, and was submitted upon recommendation of the Church Council for adoption:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To adopt the following amendments to constitutional bylaw 8.72.14.:

8.72.~~B98~~14. An ordained minister from a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been declared and established by a Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America may be granted the privilege of both voice and vote in the Synod Assembly during the period of that ordained minister's service in a congregation of this church, in accord with ELCA churchwide ~~continuing resolution~~ bylaw 8.72.~~B98~~12.

Ms. Stephanie A. Olson [East-Central Synod of Wisconsin], having asked that this provision be removed from the *en bloc* resolution, moved to amend.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To substitute the following for 8.72.14.:

ELCA rostering and membership will be required for clergy voice and vote privilege at Synod and Churchwide Assemblies.

Ms. Olson explained that her rationale for this motion is that membership is a requirement for voting privileges in all governmental, social, and religious organizations. "I can work in Minnesota," she said, "but if my residence is in Wisconsin, I must return to Wisconsin to vote or hold office. To gain the right to hold office or vote in Minnesota, I must transfer my residence to that state. I can worship in an Episcopal church, but I must join an Episcopal congregation to hold office or have voice and vote as a lay person. Non-rostered clergy in denominations with which we are in full communion are free and welcome to cross denominational lines and work in the ELCA. They will have a contract that is renewable and at this time there is no limit on the number of extensions. This is good for congregations served as it offers stability for them. They will not be called by the congregation they are serving as their Letter of Call will be held by their own denomination. They will continue to be members of their own denominations while working in ELCA congregations. The option to become rostered in the ELCA is open to these clergy. And I would assume that if an individual should decide, after serving a term of service, they could be rostered. Currently, no lay person can have office or vote in more than one congregation, dual rostering is not allowed clergy, membership in ELCA congregations is a requirement for laity, and an ELCA pastor serving interim in another synod may not have voice or vote in that synod, as his Letter of Call is held in his home synod."

Bishop Anderson informed Ms. Olson that her two minute limit had elapsed.

Secretary Almen reported that, as a proposed amendment to the bylaw, this matter had been processed through the Committee of Reference and Counsel, and the chair of that committee, Ms. Linda J. Brown, had information on the committee's advice to the assembly. Bishop Anderson invited Ms. Brown to address the assembly.

Ms. Brown directed voting members to the text of the amendment and the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel in Section IV, page 117, Item A, the proposed amendment to proposed bylaw 8.72.14. She noted that the rationale of the

committee also included a reference to a portion of the report of the Memorials Committee regarding unrostered clergy. That section addresses the issue of Churchwide Assembly voting membership in addition to the issue currently before the house. She explained that Churchwide Assembly voting membership is restricted to ELCA members, and that there was no intent of changing that restriction. The proposed bylaw would determine the synodical assembly vote and voice eligibility only. She concluded by stating that it was the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel to disapprove the proposed amendment to the proposed bylaw.

Bishop Richard F. Bansemer [Virginia Synod] rose to speak in opposition to the proposed amendment of the proposed bylaw, referring to a situation in Virginia where Presbyterians and Lutherans have made common cause. "I believe it has been very helpful for the good of the synod," he asserted, "and for our relationship both with Presbyterians and with Episcopalians." He urged the assembly to adopt the bylaw as originally presented.

Ms. Dixie Lee Benson [East-Central Synod of Wisconsin] asked the chair if she could concede her two minutes to Ms. Olson so that she could conclude her remarks. Bishop Anderson said this would be fine.

Ms. Olson continued to speak to her motion to amend by observing that becoming rostered with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America was an option open to clergy in other churches. "I would assume that if an individual should decide after serving a term of service, they could choose to become rostered, and it would be an easy step for them if they were already evaluated when they applied for the job." She insisted that giving non-rostered clergy both voice and vote is inconsistent with the voice and vote requirement for rostered clergy moving from synod to synod, and for lay people who sometimes worship in two different congregations. She also objected to the possibility that non-rostered clergy could exercise voice and vote, and even to hold office in more than one denomination, which is prohibited by the constitution and bylaws of this church.

She concluded by reporting upon a telephone conversation she had with a staff person from the Division for Ministry, who she says dismissed her concerns saying "It is only a few votes, so it should not matter much." Ms. Olson insisted that, in her experience at synod and churchwide assemblies, a few votes can be very significant.

Bishop Jon S. Enslin [South-Central Synod of Wisconsin] spoke against this motion to amend, noting that there is a Presbyterian pastor serving in one of the synod's parishes. Before authorizing such service, he had to assure that she was able to express the faith of this church clearly and directly. "She has proved that. She is a valuable member at our synod assembly." He insisted that prohibiting full participation stands against the spirit of the full communion agreements that have been adopted.

Ms. Suzanna A. Sabol [Delaware-Maryland Synod] stated that it was her understanding that the two-minute rule for speeches was just for the social statement discussion. Bishop Anderson clarified that, while the rule was introduced at that time, the maker of the motion did not specify that it was limited only to that discussion, and the assembly has observed this rule consistently since then.

The Rev. William E. Saunders [Southern Ohio Synod] spoke in support of the proposed amendment, saying that it helped to clarify the difference between "relationship" and "merger." "I think that is something that is going to be confused over the next few weeks and few months, and so, to help clarify that relationship of clergy in this new association, I support the amendment as written."

The Rev. G. Scott Cady [New England Synod] spoke in opposition to the amendment. "It flies in the face of the spirit of our agreements. If you were to have a small, or any size, congregation with temporary service from another denomination, that congregation would essentially be deprived of a vote at the synod assembly, not having its own ordained pastor there." He pointed out that the proposed bylaw contained language of permission, that voice and vote "may be granted," and each synod would have the option to withhold this privilege if there was some reason to do that. "But why we would entrust the spiritual care of an entire congregation to somebody who we would not then hear from at a synod assembly, that I do not understand. It is clearly more important, the weekly pastoral care of our churches. If they're wise enough, doctrinally clear enough, spiritually mature enough, to care for our people—to bury them, marry them, and preach to them—surely we can hear their words at a synod assembly," he insisted.

The Rev. Roger W. Spencer [New Jersey Synod] asked if any of our ecumenical partners have taken any reciprocal or mutual action in their churches to afford our pastors such votes. Secretary Almen replied that they have, under their own forms of polity.

The Rev. Paul M. Kopka [Metropolitan Chicago Synod] asked if there was any other constitutional language providing either voice or vote for our ecumenical partners serving in this kind of relationship. Secretary Almen indicated that the proposed bylaw would be the place where the matter is addressed in the constitution and bylaws of our church.

Bishop Anderson invited the Rev. Joseph M. Wagner, executive director of the Division for Ministry to speak to the motion. Pastor Wagner, responding to Ms. Olson's having been told that "It is only a few votes, so it should not matter much," insisted that this was not his position.

He then continued by explaining why the division would not be in favor of the proposed amendment. "The fact is that, as Secretary Almen mentioned, this is a courtesy suggestion because many of our ecumenical partners already offer this kind of a gift, this kind of a privilege, to our pastors if they are serving in congregations of the other denominations." He also observed that the proposed bylaw was a "may" provision, rather than a "must" or "shall" provision, and therefore is still the option of the synod to exercise it or not. He asserted that it was the desire of the Division for Ministry that this is a privilege which should be given to a person who is serving for occasional service or extended service in one of the congregations of our denomination from one of the other full communion partners.

The Rev. Richard J. Thompson [Northeastern Iowa Synod] rose to a point of order, asking if Ms. Olson's motion had yet been moved and seconded. Secretary Almen indicated that the original motion for adoption came from the Church Council. The motion to amend that original recommendation was made from the floor. Pastor Thompson reported that he did not recall hearing a motion or a second. Bishop Anderson, upon reflection, indicated that Pastor Thompson might be correct, at which point several voices from the floor offered seconds. Satisfied, Bishop Anderson called upon the next speaker.

Ms. Barbara Brocker [Oregon Synod] explained that she worships in a small congregation of both Episcopalians and Lutherans. "Pastor Nancy is my pastor, although she is an Episcopal priest. In a year, if the Episcopalians pass 'Called to Common Mission,' I hope that we will move to call her as our pastor. I cannot imagine going to a synod assembly and her not having voice and vote."

The Rev. Murray A. Ziegenfuss [Virginia Synod] stated, "I recently formed an ecumenical parish of Lutherans and Presbyterians, and operating as an effective Presbyterian

pastor at this point, I have been accorded full voice and vote in my local presbytery, and was even invited to be a commissioner at the synod of the Mid-Atlantic Assembly in July, which I have certainly appreciated and taken advantage of. I move in opposition to the amendment.”

Bishop Mark R. Ramseth [Montana Synod] rose to speak in opposition to this amendment. “The Montana Synod has five yoked ministries with the Presbyterians. Those ministries are served alternately and on rotation by Lutherans and by Presbyterians. For those ministries that are then served by Presbyterians, a time of colloquy is spent with those ministers so that they are brought to a place of understanding confessional theology and Lutheran liturgy. We invite those pastors who are Presbyterian that serve our Lutheran congregations to be a part of our synod assembly, to stand with the congregations that they serve. It is a matter for us of justice and a matter of morale.”

Mr. Robert A. Addy [South Carolina Synod] moved to close debate on this matter.

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes-897; No-50

CARRIED: To move the previous question.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes-214; No-741

DEFEATED: To substitute the following for 8.72.14.:

ELCA rostering and membership will be required for clergy voice and vote privilege at Synod and Churchwide Assemblies.

Bishop Anderson then indicated that the amendment proposed by the Church Council was before the assembly.

The Rev. Susan E. Nagle [New Jersey Synod] asked if the reference in the proposed bylaw to “relationship of full communion exists” was understood to include the churches of the Lutheran World Federation. Recalling that the member churches were declared to be in altar and pulpit fellowship at the General Assembly in Budapest, and that action was taken to interpret the federation as a “communion of churches” at the General Assembly in Curitiba, she concluded “we do not have a formal relationship [of full communion]. Does this [bylaw] include them?” Secretary Almen responded, saying that in the governing documents of this church, the language of full communion has been understood as bilateral declarations of full communion, under action of the Churchwide Assembly. “In relation to the matter of this church’s relationship with the member churches of the Lutheran World Federation, and the understanding of the Lutheran World Federation as a communion of churches, that is an issue that, it appears, will need to be addressed in the coming biennium through the Department for Ecumenical Affairs, and then, subsequently, the Church Council, to address any possible language that would reflect any language in our governing documents that would specifically reflect that different type of relationship that exists between this church and the other member churches of the Lutheran World Federation.”

The Rev. Robin K. Nice [Northwestern Minnesota Synod] explained that it was his understanding, “as we have gathered here for the Churchwide Assembly, that we are

considered voting members, clearly not delegates. We do not represent our congregations, we represent ourselves. I have been hearing [during debate] about non-rostered persons representing their congregations at synod assemblies, yet my understanding is that they are not delegates, they are voting members representing themselves. Can you answer this question for me? Secretary Almen responded, saying that under the polity of this church, persons come together in synod assemblies to act on behalf of the church on that territory. The system under which voting members come together in synod assemblies differs from the way in which voting members come together in the Churchwide Assembly.

“In synod assemblies, lay voting members come together, chosen by their congregations, to serve in that way on behalf of the church on the territory of the synod. In the case of ordained ministers, with some exceptions, depending on the synod’s constitutional provisions, ordained ministers serve as voting members of the synod assembly on the basis of serving under call in the synod.

“In the Churchwide Assembly, persons, as we know, are elected by synod assemblies to serve on behalf of this whole church within the Churchwide Assembly. In the case of the Churchwide Assembly, as is indicated in the action of the Committee of Reference and Counsel, there is the legal requirement, under our *Articles of Incorporation*, that each voting member be a member of a congregation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. There is the possibility, under what has been previously a continuing resolution and is now proposed for adoption as a bylaw, for a synod to grant that privilege, at the discretion of the synod, to an ordained minister serving under extended service in an ELCA context.”

The Rev. William D. Meiers [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] asked, if this bylaw were adopted, how the final decision would be made, and by whom, to grant voice and vote. Secretary Almen explained that this bylaw is the enabling bylaw in the churchwide constitution that would enable synods to have that freedom, at the discretion of the synod, upon decision of the synod assembly.

ASSEMBLY

Two-Thirds Vote Required

ACTION

Yes—860; No—105

CA99.05.17 To adopt the following amendments to constitutional bylaw 8.72.14.:

8.72.~~D98~~14. An ordained minister from a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been declared and established by a Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America may be granted the privilege of both voice and vote in the Synod Assembly during the period of that ordained minister’s service in a congregation of this church, in accord with ELCA churchwide ~~continuing resolution~~ bylaw 8.72.B9812.

Secretary Almen then announced that the second amendment for consideration was of continuing resolution 8.72.E98. in its entirety. As outlined by Mr. Sandstrom, this provision fell in the category of bylaw amendments. Secretary Almen then indicated that, by action of the Church Council, proposed 8.72.15. was submitted for adoption by this assembly.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To adopt the following amendments to constitutional bylaw 8.72.15.:

~~8.72.E98~~15. The availability of ordained ministers from a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been declared and established by a Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America shall be understood normally in three categories: availability to serve in an occasional situation; availability to meet an extended need, including service in “yoked parish” settings; and availability for a transfer of roster status.

- a. *Occasional service:* An occasional situation is defined as one in which an ordained minister of a church body with which a relationship of full communion exists may be asked to preach or administer the sacraments in an ELCA congregation on an occasional basis with the authorization of the synodical bishop.
- b. *Extended service:* An ordained minister of a church body with which a relationship of full communion exists may be invited to serve as the pastor of an ELCA congregation for an extended period of time, yet remain an ordained minister of his or her present church body. Such a person would be expected to preach, teach, and administer the sacraments in an ELCA congregation in a manner that is consistent with the “Confession of Faith” of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and to live in a manner consistent with the ministerial policy of this church. Such service shall be rendered only as authorized by the synodical bishop in order to serve the ministry and mission needs of the ELCA in a given situation.
- c. *Transfer:* An ordained minister of a church body with which a relationship of full communion exists who seeks to serve indefinitely within the ordained ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America may apply for admission to the roster of ordained ministers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and be approved through the candidacy process for admission to the roster. Such an ordained minister would then become an ELCA pastor upon receipt and acceptance of a regular call and installation in an ELCA congregation or other setting.
- d. Roster status in more than one church body is precluded in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. As required by

ELCA churchwide constitutional provision 7.22. and bylaw 7.31.11., ordained ministers on the roster of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America must accept and adhere to this church's "Confession of Faith," as well as abide by this church's standards and policies for ordained ministers.

Ms. Stephanie A. Olson [East-Central Synod of Wisconsin] moved to amend proposed bylaw 8.72.15.b.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To add the following sentence as the second sentence of 8.72.15.b.:

Such a person would be required to demonstrate an understanding of the Lutheran Confessions consistent with the candidacy process of a person seeking to be rostered in the ELCA.

Ms. Olson spoke to her motion by saying, "In the Conference of Bishops resolution [regarding "Called to Common Mission"], they have stated that other persons, persons ordained in other denominations would not be expected to subscribe personally to the Lutheran Confessions of faith, and thus, the instructions in these Confessions may not be a part of their education. And so, I would like to see that this be clarified. For myself, as a lifelong Lutheran, if I were working or serving in an Episcopal church, I would seek instruction and understanding before I would teach there. And for non-rostered clergy serving under renewable contracts, I would like to see the same standards set. I do not see any provision for this as I read through the bylaws, and so I propose that we put one of these in. I notice that the [Committee of] Reference and Counsel concern was that this would blur the distinction between extended service and rostered clergy, but the impression I got is that we want it all to be pretty much the same."

Bishop Anderson invited Ms. Linda J. Brown, chair of the Committee of Reference and Counsel, to explain the rationale for suggesting disapproval of this amendment by the assembly. Ms. Brown directed the assembly to the location of the text of the proposed amendment to the proposed bylaw, and then stated that the rationale maintained that the distinction between extended service and permanent transfer, as described in section c. of that same bylaw, would be blurred. This is why it was the committee's recommendation to disapprove the proposed amendment.

The Rev. Roger E. Timm [Metropolitan Chicago Synod] said he had noticed in the report of the Church Council that they had voted to adopt *Policies and Procedures Related to the Availability of Ordained Ministers*, and wondered if the Division for Ministry recommended resources for such persons coming from other church bodies, or even listed a set of books with which such persons should be familiar. "Will people serving in our churches need to express some kind of familiarity with these documents?" he asked. Secretary Almen explained that the original continuing resolution that was adopted for the initial implementation of *A Formula of Agreement*, and now other full-communion

agreements, was written to provide for (also in keeping with the churchwide bylaws, the development, and the relevant policy by the Division for Ministry) the review of that policy by the Conference of Bishops, and the adoption of that policy by the Church Council. “That policy was adopted, and provides guidance for synods to give resources to ordained ministers of other church bodies with which this church body is in full communion, for those ordained ministers to become familiar with this church and with the teachings of this church to enable them, in keeping with the proposed provision, to teach and preach, consistent with the confession of faith of this church. So, in answer to the question raised, the policy document provides that guidance to synods.”

The Rev. Darrell H. Jodock [Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod] asked for clarification, asserting that the rationale of the Committee of Reference and Counsel really missed the point. “The point of the amendment is to ask for an understanding of the Confessions, whereas Item C. on page 111, to which reference is made, involves a transfer which would include personal commitment to the Confessions.” He insisted that there is a difference “between personal commitment and acceptance.”

Bishop Jon S. Enslin [South-Central Synod of Wisconsin] spoke against the amendment, saying, “As was pointed out, the expectation is, rightly so, that the person will be expected to preach, teach, and administer the sacraments in ELCA congregations in a manner that is consistent with our church. The problem I have with this [amendment] is the inclusion of the words ‘candidacy process.’ That can really create a great deal of difficulty, it seems to me, based upon what is being requested here. Does that mean that the person has to go before the candidacy committee? There are all sorts of steps that are part of the candidacy process that we would not ask of somebody coming into a full communion situation here.”

The Rev. William L. Hurst Jr. [Metropolitan New York Synod] spoke against the amendment, “particularly because of the phrase ‘confession of faith.’ That section of our constitution is not just about ‘consistent with the church.’ Read that page and you will see it expresses what we believe about the living Word of God, who is Christ; about the witness to that Living Word in the Augsburg Confession, in the Small and Large Catechisms, the other books of the Book of Concord. Anyone who with integrity teaches, preaches, and administers the sacraments and ministers in a way that is consistent with that page of our constitution will have gone far enough. Would that all of us on the rostered ministries of this church do the same.”

Bishop Anderson, seeing no indication of further discussion, instructed the assembly that it would vote first on the amendment, and then upon a final motion.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—205; No—712

DEFEATED: To add the following sentence as the second sentence of 8.72.15.b.:

Such a person would be required to demonstrate an understanding of the Lutheran Confessions consistent with the candidacy process of a person seeking to be rostered in the ELCA.

ASSEMBLY

Two-Thirds Vote Required

ACTION

Yes-858; No-67

CA99.05.18

To adopt the following amendments to constitutional bylaw 8.72.15.:

8.72.15. The availability of ordained ministers from a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been declared and established by a Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America shall be understood normally in three categories: availability to serve in an occasional situation; availability to meet an extended need, including service in “yoked parish” settings; and availability for a transfer of roster status.

- a. *Occasional service:* An occasional situation is defined as one in which an ordained minister of a church body with which a relationship of full communion exists may be asked to preach or administer the sacraments in an ELCA congregation on an occasional basis with the authorization of the synodical bishop.
- b. *Extended service:* An ordained minister of a church body with which a relationship of full communion exists may be invited to serve as the pastor of an ELCA congregation for an extended period of time, yet remain an ordained minister of his or her present church body. Such a person would be expected to preach, teach, and administer the sacraments in an ELCA congregation in a manner that is consistent with the “Confession of Faith” of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and to live in a manner consistent with the ministerial policy of this church. Such service shall be rendered only as authorized by the synodical bishop in order to serve the ministry and mission needs of the ELCA in a given situation.
- c. *Transfer:* An ordained minister of a church body with which a relationship of full communion exists who seeks to serve indefinitely within the ordained ministry of the

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America may apply for admission to the roster of ordained ministers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and be approved through the candidacy process for admission to the roster. Such an ordained minister would then become an ELCA pastor upon receipt and acceptance of a regular call and installation in an ELCA congregation or other setting.

- d. Roster status in more than one church body is precluded in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. As required by ELCA churchwide constitutional provision 7.22. and bylaw 7.31.11., ordained ministers on the roster of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America must accept and adhere to this church's "Confession of Faith," as well as abide by this church's standards and policies for ordained ministers.**

Bishop Anderson said that the assembly would consider the remaining provisions removed from the *en bloc* resolution at a later time.

Report: "Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification"

Bishop Anderson introduced the Most Reverend Alexander J. Brunett, Archbishop of Seattle, Roman Catholic Church, and chair of the ecumenical affairs committee of the National Conference of Roman Catholic Bishops. Bishop Anderson reported that when the 1997 Churchwide Assembly approved the Lutheran-Roman Catholic "Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification," later approved by an overwhelming majority of member churches of the Lutheran World Federation and the Vatican, it was "truly a milestone on the road to Christian unity." The official signing of the document, he announced, will take place in Augsburg, Germany, on October 31, 1999. He then invited voting members to stand and, in anticipation of this historic event, praise God, using the Service of Thanksgiving distributed earlier in the day.

Following this service, Archbishop Brunett addressed the churchwide assembly, saying:

"Bishop Anderson and my brothers and sisters in Christ: It is a great joy for me to be here today to bring greetings from the 65 million Roman Catholics in the United States. Indeed, it is a privilege to stand before you at the end of this millennium and to join hands with you with hope for a new century.

"I am filled with euphoria today because we have witnessed together the power of the Holy Spirit to bring us together in the 'Joint Declaration on [the Doctrine of] Justification,' for which we just gave thanksgiving to God. I want to share with you some further reflections on our Joint Declaration during these few moments of greeting, for there is no

more important greeting than to greet you in the name of the unity that we share in Jesus Christ.

“During the years of hard work by our dialogues we did hear voices questioning whether we were really getting anywhere. They wondered if all that might result would be a number of learned volumes resting quietly in bookshelves in our seminaries and our rectories, undisturbed and undisturbing. Such a minimal (one might say dismal) expectation has been exceeded by far. In response to our shared discoveries together in dialogue, the churches indeed are acting and receiving the results into the life of the Church. This is nothing we can take for granted.

“That it is coming to pass necessarily gives a great lift to all our spirits. We have to observe and reflect upon the fact that as Lutherans and Catholics we are coming to this renewed common understanding of the central reality of the Christian life of grace, just at the dawn of the third millennium of Christianity. That it comes precisely at this time must give us pause and make us think. Does this confluence of events signal that, really, we are at a turning point in Christian history, and in the history of the Church?

“One is always well advised to be hesitant in saying which events witnessed in a particular lifetime will prove, in the end, to be of true historic significance. But seeing the tremendous impact in the life of the Church which resulted from the perceived disagreements, definite misunderstandings, and condemnatory warnings that have stood between us since the sixteenth century, it now seems altogether plausible to expect that our turning from controversy to a common understanding will also have a great impact on the future course of our history.

“And here we are speaking not only of our future as Lutherans and Catholics, for the controversies concerning justification which divided the Reforming and the Roman parties centuries ago marked the enduring boundaries within the Western Church, setting apart Protestantism and Roman Catholicism ever since.

“Of course, one cannot speak of erasing centuries of history, and we do not. Naturally we recognize that as a result of the separated developments of our church teachings and traditions, there remain certain differences, which might be described as characteristics of us as Lutherans or Catholics. Now these differences, freed from mutual condemnations, are anchored in a common mind which we know and share. In this new context, our remaining differences are to be seen in a new light and a new reality. They may, at times, be mutually corrective of one another, at other times mutually enriching of our life of faith, but no longer the source of estrangement between us.

“This is a powerful gift from God, which is given to us after 400 years. The deepest significance of our common understanding of the grace of Christ as central in our lives, in a culture dominated by competition, by status, by merit and self-reliance, is that what we receive as a gift we must recognize also comes to us as a common task and challenge. What we understand anew we must teach anew and live out together anew. This is the last stage that opens between us as Lutherans and Catholics. There are many aspects of our life together in the Church which, over time, I am confident will be touched and reshaped as a result of the accord expressed in the Joint Declaration.

“In my view this should, above all, be especially evident in our mission of evangelization, proclaim together the Gospel of the Lord. This is a treasure that has been given to us, the faith which the Spirit of Christ has brought to the life of our souls, endowing us with a new freedom and a new destiny. We encourage one another in giving thanks to the

Lord for so great a gift, yet this is not a treasure only to be cherished, but a treasure to be shared. The Good News of salvation, which means healing to one's core, and the message of redemption, which means ultimate freedom, should radiate through us and shine out through our lives to encourage and enlighten all those with whom we come in contact. We should be recognized by all people as a people of joy.

"To have been touched by faith is to feel deeply. To feel one's inadequacies in the face of the joy offered, at the same time to be overwhelmed with gratitude [for what] has been placed before us. This is not something we can keep to ourselves. May the voices of all those who are gathered here go out to all the earth and proclaim the message of Jesus Christ. All of this I believe will require a profound faith, if we are to finish together our journey toward unity.

"The story of Abraham's adventure of faith is one of the most compelling stories in the Bible. Well beyond the middle years of life he left his home to seek out a promised land. Other people went along with Abraham. They felt the call and shared the dream but never made it to the promised land. One was Terah. He made it to Haran, and settled there. It was only half-way to the promised land. Like Terah, many have the dream of Christian unity, and push forward with their insights, and with their sights on the land of ideals and achievement, but never quite make it. They stop at the half-way place. They stop where it is comfortable. They lost their vision, and do not want to risk moving forward and beyond. The land of Haran is a familiar place. It is the place of arrested unity, the place of indifference, the place of compromise of our ideals. An important function of our coming together today and praying is to give us the staying power to move beyond the way which is the half-way place. It enables us to keep our goals high and gives us the vision that keeps us on the path to unity.

"On behalf of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and its Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, I wish to express our heartfelt thanks to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and to its Department for Ecumenical Affairs. I thank Bishop Anderson for his leadership, and I am grateful to hear that both he and Dr. Ishmael Noko will sign this agreement in Augsburg [Germany] on October 31 [1999]. I thank all of them for being our patient and steadfast partners on this journey together in faith.

"And my thanks go to all of you. I thank you for your attention. It is a wonderful ministry to which we have been called. The pilgrimage together, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to the full communion is itself a joy and a blessing on our churches and their witness. God bless you."

Bishop Anderson thanked Archbishop Brunett and presented him with a gift.

Bishop George P. Mocko [Delaware-Maryland Synod] recognized that this must be an auspicious moment in the life of the Church, and he requested that a copy of the archbishop's remarks be distributed to the assembly prior to its adjournment.

Proposed Social Statement on Health Care

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 107.

BACKGROUND

The policies and procedures for the selection and approval of topics for ELCA social statements are delineated in the document, *Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns*, adopted by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly.

The policies indicate that the board of the Division for Church in Society shall recommend topics for social statement development to the Church Council and the Churchwide Assembly for approval. Further, the Church Council and Churchwide Assembly may adopt, modify, or reject the recommendations of the board of the Division for Church in Society.

At its September 1998 meeting, the board of the Division for Church in Society voted to recommend that the Church Council approve the development of a social statement on health and the ethical challenges of health care, and to request that the Church Council forward the board resolution and accompanying explanation to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly for action.

The board will appoint a working group on health and health care to begin a process of study of the topic. If the 1999 Churchwide Assembly approves development of a social statement on the topic of health and the ethical challenges of health care, the work group may become the division's task force mandated to develop a social statement for consideration by the 2003 Churchwide Assembly.

***RECOMMENDATION OF THE
CHURCH COUNCIL***

To recommend that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly adopt the following resolution:

To request that the Division for Church in Society undertake the development of a social statement on health and ethical challenges of health care for possible presentation and adoption by the 2003 Churchwide Assembly.

Bishop Anderson said that the assembly would now move to a presentation of a proposal for a new social statement on "health and ethical challenges for health care." He also explained that, in accordance with this church's guidelines for the development of social statements, it is the responsibility of the Churchwide Assembly to authorize the drafting of this social statement, which would be presented to the 2003 Churchwide Assembly for action. He called upon the Rev. Charles S. Miller, executive director of the Division for Church in Society, the Rev. Karen L. Bloomquist, director for studies in the division, and the Rev. Ronald W. Duty, associate director of studies in the division, to present the proposed social statement.

Pastor Miller said that one of the reasons for prior approval was to establish a process which would lead to "ownership" of the finished statement by a larger percentage of this church.

Pastor Duty, saying that health and healing are gifts from God, noted that there are more than 43 million Americans who are without health insurance and that many who have coverage fear losing it in the future. He recognized that the issues are complex and difficult, and that remedies are not obvious, easy, or inexpensive, but insisted that the lives of people involved are precious in God's sight. He said the Division for Church in Society proposes that the statement be limited to four areas:

- 1) Biblical and theological position;
 - 2) Addressing issues of access to health care and equity of health care;
 - 3) Taking a fresh look at this church and the health care institutions connected with it;
- and

4) The role of congregational health ministries.

Bishop Anderson called upon Secretary Almen to read the recommendation of the Church Council.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To request that the Division for Church in Society undertake the development of a social statement on health and ethical challenges of health care for possible presentation and adoption by the 2003 Churchwide Assembly.

Bishop Paul R. Swanson [Oregon Synod] commended the Church Council and the Division for Church in Society for bringing this issue before the assembly, and then explained how the policies of the church-related hospitals were guided by this church's social statements, referring specifically to the statements on abortion and end-of-life decisions.

The Rev. Terri K. Stagner-Collier [Southeastern Synod] asked about the scope of this study, asserting that it also should include health care issues in other parts of the world. Pastor Duty replied that the scope would be limited to the territory of the 65 synods of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Mr. John Prabhaker [Northern Illinois Synod], who identified himself as a surgeon in his daily life, stated that he was proud to be a part of a church which takes seriously the whole person. He strongly encouraged development of a social statement on health care.

Mr. James D. Reyner [Sierra Pacific Synod] expressed support for the idea but questioned the time line. He moved to delete the word "possible" in the recommendation to assure the statement would come before the 2003 Churchwide Assembly.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To delete the word "possible" to assure that the statement would come before the 2003 Churchwide Assembly.

Pastor Miller said the intention of the word "possible" was to honor the authority of the Church Council in its role of guidance in the development of social statements.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes-329; No-525

DEFEATED: To delete the word "possible" to assure that the statement would come before the 2003 Churchwide Assembly.

The Rev. Donald L. Hunseker [Nebraska Synod], supportive of a statement on health care, said he believes it is important to hear from rural and remote areas of the country as this statement is developed.

The Rev. Robert D. Johnson [Minneapolis Area Synod] said he believes that mental illness also needed to be addressed by this statement because "it is sadly neglected." Pastor Duty agreed that the study should include mental health.

Bishop Guy S. Edmiston [Lower Susquehanna Synod] moved to end debate.

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes-860, No-39

CARRIED: To move the previous question.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-879; No-45

CA99.05.19 To request that the Division for Church in Society undertake the development of a social statement on health and ethical challenges of health care for possible presentation and adoption by the 2003 Churchwide Assembly.

Bishop Anderson called upon Ms. Addie J. Butler, vice president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to assume the chair. While Vice President Butler made her way to the speakers' platform, Secretary Almen made several announcements about the evening meal, the location and time of the evening worship service, access to the Festival Plaza, and that former youth staff persons were invited to a special meeting. He announced also that the special offering received for the Lutheran Disaster Response for use with the earthquake victims in Turkey to date was \$9,905. He concluded by assuring the assembly that Archbishop Brunett's address would be ready for distribution prior to Plenary Session Nine.

Report: Youth Convocation

Chair *pro tem* Butler reported that two convocations were being held concurrently with this Churchwide Assembly: the Youth Convocation and the Young Adult Convocation. She said that, while the young adults would bring their report to Plenary Session Ten, the more than 50 high-school aged young people in the Youth Convocation would at this time present their report.

The following youth presented brief reports: Mr. Ben Wagner [Metropolitan Chicago Synod] introduced the report; Mr. Jake Francis [Northeastern Iowa Synod] spoke about leadership and service; Ms. Amy Lyon [Northeastern Ohio Synod] spoke about working in an Episcopalian center for the homeless; Mr. Aaron Werner [North/West Lower Michigan Synod] spoke about being the "pray-er and the prayer;" Mr. Rafael Malpica [Northern Illinois Synod] spoke about facing the issues confronting this church. Finally, Mr. Wagner thanked the youth voting members for being the eyes and ears of this assembly.

Recess

Plenary Session Eight stood in recess at 5:04 P.M. as the assembly processed behind a Mariachi band into the Festival Plaza.

Plenary Session Nine

Saturday, August 21, 1999

8:30 A.M.–12:00 NOON

The Rev. H. George Anderson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, called Plenary Session Nine to order on Saturday, August 21, 1999 at 8:34 A.M. Mountain Daylight Time. He immediately relinquished the chair to Ms. Addie J. Butler, vice president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, who expressed thanks to “For Praise,” a singing group from Bethany Lutheran Church, who had provided pre-plenary music. Chair *pro tem* Butler then asked Ms. Beverly A. Peterson, a member of the Church Council, to lead the assembly in morning prayer.

Bible Study IV

Following worship, chair *pro tem* Butler announced that the last of the assembly’s Bible studies with the Rev. Wayne E. Weissenbuehler would focus on leadership. Ms. Butler said that she had been blessed by Pastor Weissenbuehler’s studies and that she was certain that the assembly had been as well. Ms. Butler thanked Pastor Weissenbuehler for leading the Bible studies.

Before beginning the study, Pastor Weissenbuehler then apologized to members of the assembly for remarks concerning people from the Upper Midwest that he had made tongue-in-cheek but that had been printed in the newspaper. He said that he did not mean them, had never expected that they would be printed, and asked for forgiveness.

After pausing for a word of prayer, Pastor Weissenbuehler began his study by saying that he was deeply grateful for and proud of the leadership of this church. The assembly responded with applause. “I have never been so encouraged,” he continued. “Nothing is as important to the church as Christ-centered, Spirit-filled, courageous leadership.” He directed attention to Paul’s farewell speech in Acts 20:17-24, saying that it was Paul’s call to servant leadership in the Church, a leadership that knew both tears and trials. “This kind of leadership is public, communal, and inclusive,” he said.

Pastor Weissenbuehler gave the assembly his suggestion for memory work, the great “but” of Acts 20:24 (NRSV): “But I do not count my life of any value to myself, if only I may finish my course and the ministry that I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify to the good news of God’s grace.” He said that this knowledge allows God’s children to be free from being awash with guilt. “I have spent an entire life repenting,” he confessed, “and that is why I am so thankful to be a Lutheran. We know that we sit at the throne of God’s grace.”

Commenting on Acts 20:28, Pastor Weissenbuehler observed that as Paul had identified as “overseers” the leaders of the church who had gathered to hear his speech, so, too, are assembly participants all “bishops.” “Do not be afraid,” he quickly cautioned. “Remember who is responsible. It is the Holy Spirit who has called you.” He said the responsibility of this call was two-fold: tend to one’s own spiritual life and tend the flock of God. Acts 20:35 makes clear our responsibility to tend the flock and help the poor, he said. “If I were to write a new Beatitude it would be this: Blessed are those who have the humility to receive, for without them, none could give.”

Pastor Weissenbuehler concluded by telling the assembly what he believed that the Apostle Paul would say if called to address it: “I commend you to God and to the word of God’s grace which is able—oh, is it able!—and so will we be.”

As the study ended, chair *pro tem* Butler announced, "And the people of God said, 'Amen.'" Her amen was joined by the grateful amen and standing ovation of assembly participants.

Greetings: Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service

Chair *pro tem* Butler introduced the first of the day's greetings by reminding the assembly that Lutherans have been actively involved in the ministry of resettlement since the conclusion of World War II. She said that it was likely, in fact, that many of the voting members and their congregations have participated in some way with the ministry of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS). "In this time when our country is increasingly resistant to immigrants and refugees," she noted, "this church can provide a powerful witness through our advocacy and active involvement." Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service helps to make this witness to God, "whose mercy does not stop at the borders of countries," she pointed out. Chair *pro tem* Butler then invited Mr. Ralston H. Deffenbaugh Jr., the executive director of LIRS, to greet the assembly.

Mr. Deffenbaugh said that LIRS had been overwhelmed by people wanting to help with the crisis in Kosova. He said that LIRS had been very involved with Kosovar refugees, resettling 1600 persons and advocating behind the scenes with the U.S. government for humane immigration procedures for them. Mr. Deffenbaugh expressed his gratitude for the overwhelming support for the Kosovars, yet he reminded the assembly of the need also to remember refugees elsewhere. "God calls us to use our hearts, hands, and minds to extend God's welcome to others," he said; "and in return our lives become enriched through helping others." This year marks the 60th birthday of LIRS, years of service made possible by the compassion and support of Lutheran people, he stated. Mr. Deffenbaugh reported that many people at the assembly were partners in the ministries of LIRS, and he expressed his thanks for their participation.

Mr. Deffenbaugh recounted that since 1939 LIRS has helped 275,000 people make a new start in this country, and he reminded the assembly that, "Refugees make their own contributions." He cited the fact that 97 per cent of the refugees that LIRS has settled are employed after their first six months here. This year LIRS will work with about 26,000 refugees from all parts of the world, and many congregations extend this ministry even further, he stated.

Mr. Deffenbaugh added that LIRS also works with others immigrating to the U.S., including asylum-seekers and undocumented persons. He told a story about Gloria, an asylum-seeker from El Salvador. Gloria had been shot in the head at close range. Miraculously, she survived, but as late as 1994, eleven years after the attack, she was still traumatized. That year an LIRS agency in Galveston, Texas, helped her through the asylum process, and today she is doing well.

Mr. Deffenbaugh announced that LIRS would be relocating to Baltimore, Maryland, from New York City, to a building it will share with Lutheran World Relief and the Delaware-Maryland Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. He extended special thanks to Ms. Lily R. Wu, the first Asian member of the Church Council, and thanked all the staff of LIRS. Mr. Deffenbaugh closed his remarks by saying, "What a great privilege it is to be involved in bringing new hope and new life to people. You are part of this new life and new hope. Thank you."

Theme Focus: Signs of Hope

Chair *pro tem* Butler announced the day's sign of hope: ways this church is a *compassionate* church.

Using the metaphor of the strings of an instrument vibrating in close harmony, Ms. Butler illustrated how compassion links people. She said that compassion finds expression in action; compassion dares to look in the face of hunger and to say, "No more." Compassion is demonstrated when the members of this church fight hunger in daily life and work, and when they live out this church's mission globally and personally. One sign of hope and compassion, she said, is the \$2 million given to the World Hunger Appeal and the hundreds of thousands of lives those dollars have changed for the better. Action has helped, she stated, reporting approximately eighty million fewer people are going to bed hungry now than when the World Hunger Appeal first began. "We have the ability to end chronic malnourishment in our time," she asserted. Chair *pro tem* Butler asked the assembly to imagine a world in which no child must go to bed hungry, and she termed it "a sign of hope" that such a future can be imagined and that the means exist to make it so.

Report: Urban Strategy

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section III, page 34.

Chair *pro tem* Butler then turned the attention of the assembly to an update on the "In the City for Good" program, a ten-year urban plan approved by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly. Ms. Butler said that at a time of tremendous change in both urban and rural landscapes, this church has been and will continue to be ministering in places of great opportunity. She said that later in the day Ms. Sandra A. LaBlanc, director for rural networking and resources, would address the assembly, noting that in many ways the rural and urban initiatives of this church complement each other and strengthen the whole Church. Ms. Butler informed the assembly that in the two years since the 1997 assembly, the urban team of this church had been putting energy and dollars to work to breathe life into this biblically-based vision of ministry in the city, which seeks to transform the lives of people, congregations, and whole communities. She then invited to the podium members of the "In the City for Good" urban team: the Rev. Richard A. Magnus, executive director of the Division for Outreach; the Rev. Warren A. Sorteberg, executive for congregational outreach services; and the Rev. Jerrett L. Hansen, chair of the urban team.

Using the theme of transformation, Pastor Hansen reviewed the activities of the "In the City for Good" program since its establishment. The starting place for transformation is Jesus Christ, he said, citing 2 Corinthians 5:17: "If anyone is in Christ there is a new creation, the old has passed away. Behold the new has come." This transformation in us leads to the transformation of our congregations and communities, he said. Pastor Hansen reviewed the kinds of transformation possible: "transformation of congregations into lively, viable, and effective places; transformation of lives so that we love God, love ourselves, and love others; and transformation of communities into safe, sound, and healthy places."

With "In the City for Good," Pastor Hansen asserted, the ELCA has said "yes" to the transformative message and expectation, acknowledging that this church is a mission church. He continued by saying that this initiative is about the future and trusting in God's power to transform us. Pastor Hansen then reviewed some highlights of the year's work, including a day of prayer on April 26, 1998; six urban convocations during 1998-1999 to celebrate the city and offer new skills for ministry; a resource binder available through Augsburg Fortress,

which includes a Bible study and a new hymn; and four synod consultations in 1998 and 1999. He announced a fund of \$500,000 available each year for 20 years for support of transformative efforts by congregations and synods; it funded 23 projects for 1999. Through gifts to this fund and through the vision, energy, hope, and collaboration of this church, Pr. Hansen promised that this church would be “In the City for Good” well into the 21st century.

At the conclusion of the update on “In the City for Good,” chair *pro tem* Butler returned the chair to the Bishop Anderson. Bishop Anderson thanked Vice President Butler and called the assembly’s attention to the morning’s *Denver Post*, which featured an article on the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Bishop Anderson quipped that he had never shared a stage with a “living legend” before.

Bishop Anderson then warned the assembly that it had an appropriately *full* agenda for the last *full* day of this churchwide assembly. Accordingly, he proposed that the assembly begin the afternoon plenary session at 1:30 P.M. and then called for a vote to adopt this change in the agenda.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—745, No—121

CARRIED: **To amend the agenda in order to begin the afternoon plenary session at 1:30 P.M.**

The Rev. Robert D. Johnson [Minneapolis Area Synod] rose to present a motion that he thought would present a context for “In the City for Good” by requesting synods to provide to each voting member a copy of the special issue of *Time* magazine on corporate welfare. After consultation with Secretary Almen, Bishop Anderson ruled that the motion was not germane to “In the City For Good” and recommended that Pastor Johnson consult with the Committee for Reference and Counsel for an appropriate way and time to present his motion.

Bishop Anderson returned to the order of the day, reminding the assembly that unfinished business remained from the previous plenary session. He outlined the agenda for Plenary Nine: greetings from the Rev. John H. Thomas, newly elected president of the United Church of Christ, and reports from the Committee of Reference and Counsel, the Elections Committee (including distribution of the Second Common Ballot), and the Memorials Committee. The morning also would hold a special event: presentation of the faceted glass window, created with the help of assembly members, to Chinese Lutheran Church, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Greetings: The Reformed Churches

Bishop Anderson turned to a greeting from some of this church’s “full communion” partners: the Reformed Churches. Bishop Anderson said that one question he often hears is, “What can we do together to advance Christ’s mission?” Ecumenical partnerships being one of the ways, he welcomed the Rev. John Thomas, the newly elected president of the United Church of Christ, to bring greetings on behalf of our full communion partners.

President Thomas opened his remarks with a word of appreciation to Bishop Anderson and the staff of the Department for Ecumenical Affairs, who represent this church with

integrity, grace, and distinction. He recalled that last October the three Reformed churches and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America had gathered for a glorious celebration of full communion and said that since that time people have been gathering together to decide how this full communion can be embodied. Referring to this assembly's ecumenical decisions, President Thomas characterized them as an offering to this church's Reformed partners, encouraging and challenging them. He acknowledged that the new ecumenical decisions would be received by this church with excitement but also with anxiety and reluctance. To respond to those fears, President Thomas offered some "priestly reminders," encouraging the members of this church to remember their baptisms, remember that they are dust, and remember the saints, familiar, personal, and unfamiliar. That great cloud of witnesses, said President Thomas, have seen it all and they will help this church see it through. Lastly, he stated, the members of this church should remember that we belong not to ourselves but to our faithful Savior, Jesus Christ. At the conclusion of President Thomas' remarks, Bishop Anderson thanked him and presented him with a gift. The assembly responded to President Thomas's talk with warm applause.

Report of the Committee of Reference and Counsel (continued)

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section X, pages 2-5 (Section I, pages 7, 13, 17, 28); continued on *Minutes*, pages 284, 548, 628.

Bishop Anderson then asked Ms. Linda J. Brown, co-chair of the Committee of Reference and Counsel, to come to the podium to present additional resolutions for the assembly's consideration.

Ms. Brown directed the assembly's attention to Motion B, concerning the use of God's name.

Motion B: Repudiation of Hate Groups

The following motion was submitted by Mr. Jeffrey L. Burrell [Minneapolis Area Synod]:

WHEREAS, the World Church of the Creator and other groups use the names of God and Jesus Christ and have also used the Bible to justify violence against persons and destruction of property; and

WHEREAS, the Gospel teaches us of God's love and care for all peoples; and

WHEREAS, we are charged by Christ to bring this Gospel to all of the world and be fearless witnesses to it; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA is one of the corporate voices for this witness; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the ELCA, through the Office of the Presiding Bishop and the appropriate boards and committees, vigorously repudiate those who advocate violence against persons or destruction of property in the name of our God or under cover of the Bible; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the ELCA, through appropriate boards and committees, provide education to adults and youth about how to recognize and resist manipulation by, and recruitment into, these groups; and be it further

RESOLVED, the ELCA work with other organizations to present a unified voice condemning this evil use of God's name and God's word; and be it further

RESOLVED, the ELCA's Department for Information Technology use the ELCA Website to be an active witness and counterbalancing force on the Internet.

The Committee of Reference and Counsel offered the following recommendation:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To refer the resolution regarding the repudiation of hate groups to the Division for Congregational Ministries.

Mr. Jeffrey L. Burrell [Minneapolis Area Synod], the author of the original motion, said that he heartily endorsed the committee's recommendation. Considering the various actions called for in this motion, he said that he understood that referring it to the Division for Congregational Ministries would be appropriate.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-837; No-24

CA99.06.20 To refer the resolution regarding the repudiation of hate groups to the Division for Congregational Ministries.

Motion C: Implementation of 2000 Congregations Program

The following motion was submitted by the Rev. Lloyd L. Menke [Southeastern Minnesota Synod]:

WHEREAS, the Division for Outreach has set a goal of 100 new ministry starts per year in the next 20 years through "2000 Congregations" which will seek to encourage established congregations to start new ministries in the United States; and

WHEREAS, smaller congregations may not have the resources to undertake the challenge of beginning a new ministry start in the U.S. on their own; and

WHEREAS, there may be smaller congregations that would be willing to contribute to the start of a new ministry; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the assembly affirm the concept of "2000 Congregations" as an exciting way to proceed on a goal of increasing the start of new congregations; and be it further

RESOLVED, to encourage the Division for Outreach as it works with synods to plan for ways in which smaller congregations can be connected to participate in "2000 Congregations," and be it further

RESOLVED, to encourage the Division for Outreach to bring a progress report on "2000 Congregations" to the 2001 Churchwide Assembly.

The Committee of Reference and Counsel offered the following recommendation:

To approve (vote yes) the resolution.

Ms. Brown read Motion C concerning the program of the Division for Outreach called "2000 Congregations" and stated the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel was that the assembly approve it.

The Rev. Lloyd L. Menke [Southeastern Minnesota Synod], the motion's author, moved its adoption.

Moved;

Seconded: WHEREAS, the Division for Outreach has set a goal of 100 new ministry starts per year in the next 20 years through "2000 Congregations" which will seek to encourage established congregations to start new ministries in the United States; and

WHEREAS, smaller congregations may not have the resources to undertake the challenge of beginning a new ministry start in the U.S. on their own; and

WHEREAS, there may be smaller congregations that would be willing to contribute to the start of a new ministry; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the assembly affirm the concept of "2000 Congregations" as an exciting way to proceed on a goal of increasing the start of new congregations; and be it further

RESOLVED, to encourage the Division for Outreach as it works with synods to plan for ways in which smaller congregations can be connected to participate in "2000 Congregations," and be it further

RESOLVED, to encourage the Division for Outreach to bring a progress report on "2000 Congregations" to the 2001 Churchwide Assembly.

Pastor Menke spoke in support of his resolution by expressing his optimism about the possibilities for mission that are created by the "2000 Congregations" program. He said, "I know there are congregations and individuals in this church who could get very excited about mission, but may be in congregations that are too small to found a new congregations by themselves. And so I am confident that there is the creativity, imagination, and innovation present in the Division for Outreach to work and find ways to broaden the possibilities for participation in "2000 Congregations."

Bishop Philip L. Hougen [Southeastern Iowa Synod] spoke in strong support of this motion, expressing his enthusiasm for the "2000 Congregations" program. "I simply want to comment, as I do the math on this proposal and as we accept these goals, that we would recognize that this is extremely ambitious," he asserted. He observed that, according to the introductory report, throughout this church about 40 congregations per year might be established by the Division for Outreach, leaving 60 congregations to be established on a local level. "That is an average of one new congregation established each year by [each] synod of this church. I hope when we vote for this, and when we go home with the '2000 Congregations' initiative, that we will recognize that we, as leaders in our synods, have a responsibility for providing the resources to start one congregation every year for the next 20 years in each of our synods." He urged voting members to take very seriously the ambitious nature of this goal-affirming that he would support it wholeheartedly. He concluded by saying, "We are going to have to work very hard to do this and do this well."

The Rev. Dennis E. Remenschneider [North/West Lower Michigan Synod] asked if there would be intentional work with the ecumenical partners of this church in the development of these new missions. He indicated that he understood new mission starts "would be done in consultation with our ecumenical partners, so that we do not plant missions where there are vital ministries that can be supported and encouraged by these ecumenical agreements."

The Rev. Richard A. Magnus, director of the Division for Outreach, indicated that there would be such consultation. He expressed his desire to meet with our partners and to look

at planning for new congregational development, and asserted that this would be a part of the strategy, especially during the next two years.

Mr. Wesley R. Johnson [Eastern Idaho-Washington Synod] spoke in favor of the motion, but also drew attention to the fact that “there are a lot of congregations that are just barely keeping their doors open. I happen to belong to a congregation that has just slightly over 100 members. Eighty percent of those members are over the age of 70.” While his congregation is very active within the community, he indicated that it could be much more involved if provided more help from churchwide units. He insisted that inner-city congregations need help to keep their doors open, and asserted that this should be “every bit as much of a priority as opening new congregations out in the suburbs.”

Seeing no indication of anyone else wishing to speak to this motion, Bishop Anderson invited the assembly to vote on the motion before the house.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes—837; No—49

CA99.06.21

WHEREAS, the Division for Outreach has set a goal of 100 new ministry starts per year in the next 20 years through “2000 Congregations” which will seek to encourage established congregations to start new ministries in the United States; and

WHEREAS, smaller congregations may not have the resources to undertake the challenge of beginning a new ministry start in the U.S. on their own; and

WHEREAS, there may be smaller congregations that would be willing to contribute to the start of a new ministry; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the assembly affirm the concept of “2000 Congregations” as an exciting way to proceed on a goal of increasing the start of new congregations; and be it further

RESOLVED, to encourage the Division for Outreach as it works with synods to plan for ways in which smaller congregations can be connected to participate in “2000 Congregations,” and be it further

RESOLVED, to encourage the Division for Outreach to bring a progress report on “2000 Congregations” to the 2001 Churchwide Assembly.

Motion D: Theme of the A.D. 2001 Churchwide Assembly

The following motion was submitted by the Rev. James H. Hanson [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod]:

WHEREAS, there is a crisis in rural America that threatens the future not only of the food and fibre producers but also the consumers; and

WHEREAS, 48 percent of the congregations of this church identify themselves as rural and small town churches and are in crisis because of declining population and changing economics; and

WHEREAS, the impact of this crisis affects the whole church and all other denominations that have rural and small town churches; and

WHEREAS, the magnitude and complexity of this crisis is little known by most of our constituency as a church; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the 2001 Churchwide Assembly of the ELCA focus thematically and programmatically on this rural crisis to bring to the whole church the information necessary to initiate and implement procedures and programs to support the farmers, ranchers, and producers to insure a continued supply of food and fibre to our nation and the world and working together with other denominations to support the ministry of our churches in small town and rural areas.

Citing churchwide bylaw 12.31.04, which specifies that “the arrangements for agenda, program, and worship [of the Churchwide Assembly] shall be under the supervision of the presiding bishop,” the Committee of Reference and Counsel offered the following recommendation:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To refer the resolution regarding the theme of the 2001 Churchwide Assembly to the Office of the Presiding Bishop.

The Rev. James H. Hanson [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod], the author of the resolution, said that he was delighted that the issue was going to be referred to the Office of the Presiding Bishop since Bishop Anderson had been present at the recent Great Plains Coalition meeting to decide how seeds of hope might be sown in the midst of crisis. Pastor Hanson reported that Bishop Anderson had admitted that he did not know much about the crisis but was grateful to be informed. Through this resolution, declared Pastor Hanson, the whole of this church will be informed, and “We need the help of this whole church.”

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes—853; No—51

CA99.06.22 To refer the resolution regarding the theme of the 2001 Churchwide Assembly to the Office of the Presiding Bishop.

Motion E: Response to the Drought Crisis

The following motion was submitted by the Rev. Roger D. Quay [Southern Ohio Synod]:

WHEREAS, severe drought afflicts many regions of our country, including Mid-Atlantic, Midwestern, and Central Northwestern states; and

WHEREAS, the drought is causing dire economic, social, and mental health distress; and

WHEREAS, the drought is compounding pre-existing economic, social, and mental health distress in parts of Appalachia and rural America; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America allocate emergency relief funds from designated Domestic Disaster Relief monies; and be it further

RESOLVED, that Lutheran Domestic Disaster Relief transmit official communications to all ELCA congregations that increase awareness and raise relief monies for continuing natural disaster needs; and be it further

RESOLVED, that LDR strengthen its current policies regarding drought disaster relief; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Division for Church in Society provide a list of available economic, social, and mental health services by January 1, 2000, to all bishops serving in drought-afflicted areas.

The Committee of Reference and Counsel offered the following recommendation:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To refer to the Division for Church and Society and Division for Congregational Ministries, with encouragement to give strong consideration for response from Domestic Hunger funds and disaster funds as appropriate.

The Rev. Roger Quay [Southern Ohio Synod], the author of the original motion, moved a substitute resolution, which would keep the resolves as they were but not refer the issue.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To substitute for the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel lines 13-29 of the original motion, keeping the original "Resolves."

Pastor Quay asserted that this issue was too significant to refer. "We need to acknowledge and communicate to those affected by this year's drought and those who may suffer in the future that we act as the baptized people of God to reach out with the gifts that God has given us. Therefore, we need to address this and let the people know now the feelings and the emphasis of this assembly."

Bishop Anderson explained that discussion would begin with the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel. Seeing no indication of discussion, he invited discussion of the substitute.

Bishop Ralph W. Dunkin [West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod] spoke in favor of the motion to substitute, saying, "There are parts of West Virginia that are in a two-year drought. Chicken farmers have sold off their crops, cow farmers have sold off their livestock. We responded to floods. We do not know how to respond to a drought, and I am not sure there is time to waste."

Bishop Anderson invited a response from the Committee of Reference and Counsel. Ms. Brown replied that, given the scope of what is needed and the appropriations involved, the committee thought it would be best to refer, noting this strong consideration as direction to those two units of the church to give this good and serious consideration.

Mr. William O. Sowers [Lower Susquehanna Synod] said that it would be helpful to hear what the Rev. Gilbert B. Furst, director for Domestic Disaster Response, and Lutheran Disaster Response would have to say to this.

Bishop Anderson invited Pastor Furst to speak, first noting that there were no speakers on the floor indicating opposition to this action.

Pastor Furst said, "One of the things I have become very aware of in our work in the Upper Midwest after the blizzards and floods is the ongoing rural crisis farmers, farm families, and ranchers are facing in this country. One of the previous speakers talked about the fact that we respond to floods, but we do not respond to droughts. And that is true. Lutheran Disaster Response, which is a cooperative ministry of the ELCA, as well as our own ELCA Domestic Disaster Response, responds to event disasters, that is hurricanes, floods, tornadoes, landslides, fires, and the like.

"The church does not have the appropriate capacity to respond to the ongoing rural crisis, and a drought is part of a rural crisis. It does not mean we overlook the needs of the farmers and ranchers in times of rural crises, but it means that we look to the interdependent nature of this church and work with the different units and agencies that are available and can interface with the kinds of resources that are available for things such as drought or blizzards or the other kinds of farm crises—falling farm crop prices, for example. And so we look for examples to cooperate with the new rural desk person to see how we can network to respond to the needs of the farmers in the ongoing crisis that affects farm communities across this country. We also look to work with our Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs in Washington, D.C., as they work with legislation on farm issues. We also look to work with Lutheran Services in America as we work with social ministry organizations to deal with the emotional impact of the rural crisis. Right now, we are sending truckloads of hay to Ohio and Pennsylvania to help with those areas that have asked specifically for help, and we have farm specialists we are sending from North Dakota and Wisconsin to work specifically with Northeastern Pennsylvania to help the synod to do some strategizing with its farmers, with its farm agencies, to help the farmers in this drought.

Bishop Anderson asked Pastor Furst if he felt that this motion would change the mandate of his program. Pastor Furst said that it would.

Bishop Lee M. Miller [Upstate New York Synod] asked if there was not some way to respond to both kinds of crises. "If a crop fails because there is no rain, I would regard that as an event. That sounds somewhat facetious, but that is the level at which a lot of people are experiencing the drought. I think it is very appropriate for us to indicate the immediacy of this, and it is also very appropriate for us to engage in the long-term work that has been described, and that would be done by way of referral. So my question is, 'Can we put them together?'"

Bishop Anderson said he did not think so, unless Bishop Miller could think of a parliamentary way to combine them. "It has been posed as a substitute motion, so we are presently in an either/or situation. You could amend the substitute, I presume, by adding some clause about referral, but you should write that out so we know what it is."

Bishop Miller replied, "All right. It would be my intent to add a clause, and also refer to the structures indicated there."

Bishop Anderson encouraged Bishop Miller to review the language used in the report of the Committee of Reference and Counsel, but that he would need to wait until action had been taken on the motion to substitute before introducing new amendments.

The Rev. Reinold Schlak Jr. [West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod] reported that another state had been declared a disaster area earlier that morning, and urged the quickest possible resolution to this issue. "If this means that it does not go to the Division for Church in Society, so be it, as long we do it quickly."

Bishop Callon W. Holloway Jr. [Southern Ohio Synod] spoke in support of the motion to substitute, observing that not all events are as fast moving in their disastrous course as others. "This is one which has been in slow motion, but it has just as devastating an effect. Many of our own people are affected, and not only the rural areas, but also in the metropolitan areas. Our economies are intertwined and global." He asserted that the revision suggested by Bishop Miller was appropriate, and offered to work with him in finding a parliamentary way of resolving this issue.

The Rev. Glenn D. Miller [Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod] asked, "As I read the 'Resolves,' I am not quite sure that the first one says everything that its author wants it to say. It does not specifically say where the allocated monies are to go to. That is only addressed in the 'Whereases,' as I read the resolution.

Mr. Dennis Johnson [Southwestern Minnesota Synod] rose to speak against the substitute motion saying, "I come from a synod that has received support a number of times through the Domestic Disaster Appeal. We are grateful for it, and certainly have suffered agricultural disasters, like others, and are concerned in other parts of the country. However, the concern in passing the substitute motion is that it reduces flexibility from the people who are making the decisions of where limited amounts of disaster funding can be allocated. I think they can work most effectively if we give them the maximum amount of flexibility in allocating those funds."

The Rev. Doyle G. Karst [Nebraska Synod] asked for a realistic timetable for a response to this resolution if it were to be referred to the appropriate divisions. Bishop Anderson invited the Rev. Charles S. Miller, executive director of the Division for Church in Society, to respond.

Pastor Miller reported that if the resolution were referred to the Division for Church in Society, "I assure you that the concerns raised in the 'Resolves' will not be lost nor unattended to, but, in fact, we will immediately, upon return to Chicago, invite our partners in other units appropriate to this cause to confer and respond within our capacity. That means, as one of the previous speakers indicated, taking up the question of what is the best source of funds, and our capability of achieving some of the requests in the 'Resolves.' And so, indeed, we will get to the task immediately if the assembly refers to the division."

Bishop Mark R. Ramseth [Montana Synod] suggested that it would be helpful to ask if Bishop Miller or Bishop Holloway were intending to bring an amendment to the motion to refer. Bishop Anderson indicated that he had seen them consulting with one another, and it seemed likely that they would be bringing a suggested amendment before the house. He asked if Bishop Ramseth wished to address the issue. Bishop Ramseth indicated that some notice of intent would be helpful.

Bishop Miller responded, "The notice would be that if the substitute is adopted, we will move to amend it so that it would say: 'To deal with the long-term effects, we also refer this to the Division for Church in Society, Division for Congregational Ministries...', and the rest of the bold type."

Bishop Anderson asked if Bishop Miller had considered proposing that as an amendment to the substitute. "In other words, adding to the 'Resolves' an additional one that would say: 'We encourage the Division for Church in Society and the Division for Congregational

Ministries, to give strong consideration for response.” Bishop Miller indicated that he would be happy to propose such an amendment. Bishop Anderson continued by noting that such an amendment would omit the word “refer” for clarity. “This would not be in contrast to the main motion because that is a procedural motion, and you are talking now about action within the frame of reference of the other ‘Resolves.’ Is that correct?” Bishop Miller responded that for him the resolution simply needed to deal with both the immediacy and the long-term effects of the drought. He then moved to amend the motion.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To add as a new RESOLVED to the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel:

RESOLVED, to refer this resolution to the Division for Church in Society and the Division for Congregational Ministries, with encouragement to give strong consideration for response from domestic hunger funds and disaster funds as appropriate.

Bishop Anderson informed the assembly that debate would now be on the amendment, to address the question, “Do you wish to add this to the substitute motion?”

Pastor Quay, author of the original resolution, stated that he considered this a friendly amendment and would approve of its adoption by the body.

Mr. Bachman Brown Jr. [North Carolina Synod]: I move the previous question on all matters before the house.

To assure that the assembly understood the implications of the motion, Bishop Anderson described it as “kind of a vacuum cleaner” and explained what would follow immediately. “First, we are going to vote, and if you approve the vote now to move the previous questions on all matters before the house, we will then proceed immediately to vote on whether we want to add the amendment to the original motion that you have printed—the long motion. If that [motion to amend] is approved, we then will vote on whether to substitute that amended motion for the bold print at the bottom, which was the recommendation from the Committee of Reference and Counsel. If you approve that, we will then decide—take the vote on—the new substitute as the main motion, and that would complete our activity. So, we have a series of votes, but there will be no discussion on anything if we start this process with this vote.”

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes—907; No—33

CARRIED: To move the previous question on all matters before the house.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—914; No—33

CARRIED: To add as a new RESOLVED to the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel:

RESOLVED, to refer this resolution to the Division for Church in Society and the Division for Congregational Ministries, with encouragement to give strong consideration for response from domestic hunger funds and disaster funds as appropriate.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—838; No—111

CARRIED: To substitute the amended motion for the original recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes—917; No—44

CA99.06.23 WHEREAS, severe drought afflicts many regions of our country, including Mid-Atlantic, Midwestern, and Central Northwestern states; and

WHEREAS, the drought is causing dire economic, social, and mental health distress; and

WHEREAS, the drought is compounding pre-existing economic, social, and mental health distress in parts of Appalachia and rural America; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America allocate emergency relief funds from designated Domestic Disaster Relief monies; and be it further

RESOLVED, that Lutheran Domestic Disaster Relief (LDR) transmit official communications to all ELCA congregations that increase awareness and raise relief monies for continuing natural disaster needs; and be it further

RESOLVED, that LDR strengthen its current policies regarding drought disaster relief; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Division for Church in Society provide a list of available economic, social, and mental health services by January 1, 2000, to all bishops serving in drought-afflicted areas; and be it further

RESOLVED, to refer this resolution to the Division for Church in Society and the Division for Congregational Ministries, with encouragement to give strong consideration for response from domestic hunger funds and disaster funds as appropriate.

Report of the Elections Committee (continued)

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section 1, pages 9-12, 28; continued on *Minutes*, pages 409, 516, 622, 651, and Exhibit B.

Bishop Anderson next called upon Mr. Scott S. Fintzen, chair of the Elections Committee, for a report from the elections committee. Mr. Fintzen announced that the results

of the ballots had been printed and distributed and, that being the case, proposed that the assembly dispense with having them read.

Mr. Fintzen's report was interrupted by the discovery that a number of voting members had not received the results. Bishop Anderson announced that the report of the Elections Committee would be deferred until the problem was corrected.

Report of the Memorials Committee (continued)

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 9-18, 61-62 (Section I, pages 7, 17, and 28); continued on *Minutes*, pages 188, 274, 285, 553.

Bishop Anderson turned to the co-chair of the Memorials Committee, Ms. Beverly A. Peterson, to present several memorials for the assembly's consideration.

Category 1a: Regarding "Called to Common Mission"

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 9-18.

This category includes 41 memorials, both for and against the ecumenical proposal "Called to Common Mission." Fourteen of these memorials are based upon a single model commonly known as the "Mahtomedi Resolution." Where a synod has adopted this "Mahtomedi Resolution" without any changes, the words "Adopted the 'model memorial'" replace the text. If a synod has modified the "model memorial" the changes are specifically noted. The "model memorial" is as follows:

Model Memorial

WHEREAS, we affirm our commitment to the mission and ecumenical mandate given by our Lord that "all may be one" (John 17:12). In affirming such we rejoice in the unity we share with our sisters and brothers of The Episcopal Church; and

WHEREAS, we Lutherans confess that "It is sufficient for the true unity of the Christian church that the Gospel be preached in conformity with a pure understanding of it and that the sacraments be administered in accordance with the divine Word. It is not necessary for the true unity of the Christian church that ceremonies instituted by men should be observed uniformly in all places. It is as Paul says in Ephesians 4:4-5, 'There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope that belongs to your call, one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'" (*Augsburg Confession*, Article VII); and

WHEREAS, the document "Called to Common Mission" (November 1998) declares that the ELCA asserts that the historic episcopate is not necessary (CCM 18), it nevertheless requires that we adopt the historic episcopate as a condition for fellowship with The Episcopal Church, thereby—in reality—asserting that it is necessary; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the _____ Synod recommend that the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly reject the document "Called to Common Mission"; and be it further

RESOLVED, that we reaffirm our commitment to continue to work together with our Episcopal neighbors in common faith and mission, gathering at the Lord's Table and sharing in each other's ministry which is our practice under the guidelines of the *Interim Agreement for Eucharistic Sharing* (1982) between our two churches; and be it further

RESOLVED, that we acknowledge the ordination of Episcopal clergy, and welcome them to serve in ELCA parishes or pastoral positions, preaching and teaching in a manner that is consistent with the ELCA's "Confession of Faith" as written in Chapter Two of the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the ELCA*.

A. Southwestern Washington Synod (1C) [1998 Memorial]

WHEREAS, churches and synods of the ELCA have been asked to offer suggestions and proposals for a revised Lutheran-Episcopal ecumenical agreement; and

WHEREAS, all pastors and congregations of the ELCA, by constitution, subscribe to the Augsburg Confession which states that it is sufficient to have agreement on Word and Sacrament; and

WHEREAS, the use of the title "bishop" in American Lutheranism has consistently referred to an office with administrative responsibility, rather than a person with sacramental authority; and

WHEREAS, the issue of the historic episcopate is potentially divisive in the ELCA and an issue over which persons of good conscience and good ecumenical intentions honestly disagree; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA in its 1993 Churchwide Assembly adopted the study of ministry which 1) formally rejected the threefold understanding of ministry and affirmed that in our Lutheran tradition we have one ordained clergy who serve in various ways as servants of the church, be that as pastors, teachers, administrators or bishops, and 2) established as policy that, under certain circumstances, lay persons can preside at and administer the Lord's Supper; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA has repeatedly affirmed the centrality of the Gospel celebrated in Word and Sacrament in the local congregation, and an understanding of ordained ministry that arises from the needs and the affirmation of local congregations who constitute "the priesthood of all believers"; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Washington Synod memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the ELCA to affirm a Lutheran-Episcopal ecumenical agreement that is mutually respectful of the full breadth of both traditions, and that does not require the ELCA to adopt the historic episcopacy but retain its flexible structure with one ordained ministry and an empowered ministry of the priesthood of all believers; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Washington Synod memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the ELCA to reject any proposed agreements which compromise on these issues which are so vital for the mission of the church; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the voting members of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly elected from Southwestern Washington Synod be given a copy of this memorial as the will of this assembly.

B. South Dakota Synod (3C) [1998 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the ELCA will be asked to vote on the proposed *Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the Concordat of Agreement* (hereinafter CCM); and

WHEREAS, the 1997 South Dakota Synod Assembly, by a vote of 547 to 143, expressed opposition to the ordinarily proposed *Concordat of Agreement*, and requested a revised *Concordat* which did not require the introduction of the historic episcopate into the ELCA for full communion; and

WHEREAS, CCM does require the introduction of the historic episcopate into the ELCA for full communion with The Episcopal Church; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the 1998 South Dakota Synod Assembly memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly and the ELCA Church Council to:

- a) receive the CCM with thanks;
- b) affirm the unity in Christ and partnership in the Gospel we now enjoy with The Episcopal Church;
- c) continue to affirm the current agreement between the ELCA and The Episcopal Church (i.e., Interim Sharing of the Lord's Supper);
- d) direct the ELCA Department for Ecumenical Affairs to prepare jointly with The Episcopal Church a document which focuses our resources and our unity in mission and outreach but does not require the historic episcopate for full communion; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1998 South Dakota Assembly memorialize the Lutheran-Episcopal Drafting team, the 1999 Churchwide Assembly and the ELCA Church Council to oppose the introduction of the historic episcopate into the ELCA as a prerequisite for full communion with any Christian church.

C. Northeastern Minnesota Synod (3E) [1998 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the revised *Concordat* entitled, "Called to Common Mission" (CCM), requires adoption by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America of the historic episcopate for full communion; and

WHEREAS, under the terms of CCM, The Episcopal Church does not enter into full communion with the ELCA until, 1) all active bishops are incorporated into the historic episcopate, and 2) a "process of collegial consultation in matters of Christian life and faith" is established, including "common decision making in fundamental matters"; and

WHEREAS, the *Augsburg Confession*, Article VII, states that nothing more can be required of Lutherans for church unity than that the Gospel is rightly preached and the sacraments administered according to that Gospel; and

WHEREAS, Lutherans can bend and compromise on many things, but when ecumenical partners insist on additional practices as required for unity, then Lutherans have said "no"; and

WHEREAS, Lutheran World Federation member churches are in pulpit and altar fellowship with each other and therefore accept each other's ministries without further conditions because of the Gospel (as with the Swedish Lutheran Church); therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the 1998 Northeastern Minnesota Synod Assembly affirms the ELCA's ecumenical relationships with our Christian sisters and brothers in The Episcopal Church, but the Northeastern Minnesota Synod opposes the ELCA's proposed adoption of the historic episcopate; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1998 Northeastern Minnesota Synod Assembly memorialize the ELCA to continue in interim Eucharist fellowship and in mission with The Episcopal Church and jointly explore other models of unity which do not include the ELCA's mandatory adoption of the historic episcopate.

D. Southwestern Minnesota Synod (3F) [1998 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the revised *Concordat* entitled "Called to Common Mission" (CCM) requires a "commitment by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to receive the historic episcopate" for full communion (CCM-A8); and

WHEREAS, under the terms of the CCM, The Episcopal Church does not enter into full communion with the ELCA until (1) all active bishops are incorporated into the historic episcopate and (2) a "process of collegial consultation in matters of Christian life and faith" (CCM-A12) is established including "common decision making...in fundamental matters" (CCM-D20); and

WHEREAS, the Article VII of the *Augsburg Confession* states that nothing more can be required for unity than that the Gospel is rightly preached and the sacraments administered according to that Gospel; and

WHEREAS, Lutherans can bend and compromise on many things, Lutherans have said "no" when ecumenical partners insist that additional practices are required for unity; and

WHEREAS, Lutheran World Federation churches are in pulpit and altar fellowship with some churches who embrace the historic episcopate (i.e., the Lutheran Church of Sweden), they have done so by accepting each others' ministries without further conditions, acknowledging their unity in the Gospel; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Minnesota Synod memorialize the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to not accept the historic episcopate as a requirement (implied or explicit) for full communion; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Minnesota Synod memorialize the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to continue the 1982 agreement with The Episcopal Church for "Interim Eucharistic Sharing" including joint ministry efforts in worship, education, and mission, while jointly exploring other models of unity.

E. Northwest Synod of Wisconsin (5H) [1998 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the historic episcopate and its implications for changes in the constitution of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, is an important theological issue; and

WHEREAS, the debate concerning the historic episcopate within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is significant apart from its relevance to full communion with The Episcopal Church; and

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America needs to resolve for itself the issue of the historic episcopate before it enters into full communion with a church that sees the historic episcopate as definitive or constitutive for the whole church; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northwest Synod of Wisconsin, meeting in assembly, memorializes the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to suspend official movement toward full communion with The Episcopal Church until a statement of teaching on the historic episcopate has been produced and approved by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in churchwide assembly.

F. Southwestern Washington Synod (1C) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” known as the “Mahtomedi Resolution,” printed above on page 492.

G. Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod (1D) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” known as the “Mahtomedi Resolution,” printed above on page 492.

H. Oregon Synod (1E) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, Hope Lutheran Church of Heppner, Oregon, and Valby Lutheran Church of Ione, Oregon, have a joint parish; and

WHEREAS, the sole purpose of the Hope-Valby congregations is to spread the Word of God and to minister to its membership and community; and

WHEREAS, these two congregations are located in a typical American rural area where the potential for congregational growth is limited; and

WHEREAS, there is difficulty in rural congregations such as Valby and Hope Lutheran Churches in obtaining and retaining pastors in such rural conditions; and

WHEREAS, Hope and Valby have experienced extreme difficulty in meeting their financial goals in order to accomplish their ministry; and

WHEREAS, Hope and Valby Lutheran Churches have initiated a ministerial agreement with the All Saints Episcopal Church in Heppner, Oregon, with the blessings of the bishops of both churches; and

WHEREAS, this ministerial agreement provides that Lutheran pastors may conduct joint services between Hope, Valby, and All Saints parishes and allows for Episcopal priests to conduct worship services for Lutherans and both to administer the sacraments in either congregation; and

WHEREAS, this cooperative agreement is working extremely well in terms of enhancing worship services, providing a more encouraging atmosphere in which the presiding pastor or priest may carry out his or her mission, providing a stable financial position and causing all of the three participant churches to experience increased attendance at their services; and

WHEREAS, Hope, Valby, and All Saints strongly believe that the teachings of the Holy Bible encourages children of God, of all ages, to “Come unto me,” without regard to race, creed, color, or preference of denomination; and

WHEREAS, the three congregations of Hope Lutheran, Valby Lutheran, and All Saints Episcopal strongly urge that the delegates of this assembly give prayerful consideration recommending adoption of the “Called to Common Mission” by the ELCA; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Oregon Synod memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to accept the document “Called to Common Mission.”

I. Southern California (West) Synod (2B) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has before it a proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church, "Called to Common Mission"; and

WHEREAS, Jesus prayed, "I ask not only on behalf of these, but on behalf of those who will believe in me through their word, that they may all be one. As you, Father, are in me and I am in you may they also be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me. The glory that you have given me I have given them, so that they may be one, as we are one, I in them and you in me, that they may become completely one, so that the world may know that you have sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me" (John 17); and

WHEREAS, as Christ's body, the Church, in the world, we are called by one Spirit to be one body, just as there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all"; and

WHEREAS, this unity, willed by God, desired by Jesus Christ, and prompted by the Holy Spirit, leads us to affirm our common understanding of Word and Sacrament with our Episcopal sisters and brothers and our common faith as professed in the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds; and

WHEREAS, many Lutherans around the world are already celebrating full communion with the Anglican-Episcopal community; and

WHEREAS, past fears have been raised and inflamed regarding the historic episcopate, and the ethnic controversies of the 19th century have been reawakened, including:

- Fears that the bishops within the ELCA might somehow use this agreement to aggrandize themselves and the authority of their ministries;
- Fears that bishops within the ELCA would have the administrative authority of their office for life; and
- Fears regarding what clothes the bishops of the ELCA will wear.

While these fears may have been understandable in other historical contexts, and at times even been shared by our Episcopal brothers and sisters in America, such fears are in no way legitimate in that they are not supported by the actual proposal "Called to Common Mission"; and

WHEREAS, the proposal "Called to Common Mission" does in no way call for, initiate, allow, envision, suggest or implement any change of our confessional understanding of the office of ministry, the role of bishops, or the priesthood of all believers, and in fact inhibits any such changes; and

WHEREAS, the proposal "Called to Common Mission" does not in any way suggest that the historic episcopate or apostolic succession is a necessary element of the Church, it does, however, call us to be proactive for the sake of the unity of the Church; and

WHEREAS, the proposal only asks that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America receive the historic episcopate from other Lutheran churches in Africa, Central America, and Europe as a gift of the Holy Spirit and a sign of the unity of the Church; and

WHEREAS, most Lutheran bodies around the world enjoy and celebrate the gifts of the historic episcopate; and

WHEREAS, the Lutheran Confessions endorse the office of bishop within the historic episcopate when it aids in the promotion of the Gospel; and

WHEREAS, the proposal aids in the promotion of the Gospel, by providing a more effective witness and enhancement of our ability to "speak publicly to the world in solidarity with the poor and the oppressed, calling for justice and proclaiming God's love for all" (*Constitution, Bylaws and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*); and

WHEREAS, the proposal provides for a clearer witness to the world of the unity of the Body of Christ; and

WHEREAS, the proposal will enable a more effective mission effort in the development and redevelopment of congregations; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Southern California (West) Synod Assembly does hereby memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to adopt in full the proposal "Called to Common Mission."

J. Pacifica Synod (2C) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" known as the "Mahtomedi Resolution," printed above on page 492.

K. Rocky Mountain Synod (2E) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has clearly stated that “Ecumenism is the joyous experience of the unity of Christ’s people and the serious task of expressing that unity visibly and structurally to advance the proclamation of the Gospel for the blessing of humankind”; and

WHEREAS, the Lutheran basis for Christian unity enunciated in Article VII of the *Augsburg Confession*, “For the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments,” grants freedom to the church in matters of polity; and

WHEREAS, the Reformers of the 16th century signaled their willingness to retain the historic episcopate so long as the Gospel could be preached freely (*Augsburg Confession* Article XXVIII, *Apology of the Augsburg Confession* Article XIV); and

WHEREAS, our brothers and sisters in Christ in many of the Lutheran churches of the Nordic countries, Africa, Central America, and Southeast Asia, faithfully carry out their ministry and mission under a polity that includes the historic episcopate; and

WHEREAS, “Called to Common Mission” provides for the ELCA to receive episcopal succession from those Lutheran churches which share in the historic episcopate as well as from The Episcopal Church; and

WHEREAS, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* adopted by the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches (Lima, 1982), encourages “churches which have not retained the episcopate to appreciate the episcopal succession as a sign, though not a guarantee, of the continuity of the church”; and

WHEREAS, “Called to Common Mission” affirms historic Lutheran teaching of the priesthood of all believers, and the one office Word and Sacrament ministry; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA Church Council recommends that the resolution adopted by the Conference of Bishops at its meeting in Tucson, Arizona, March 8, 1999, be added to “Called to Common Mission” as a correct interpretation of the document; and

WHEREAS, “Called to Common Mission” offers the opportunity for the ELCA to join in full communion with The Episcopal Church in response to Christ’s grace and love to us, and for the sake of Christ’s mission in the world; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Rocky Mountain Synod encourage the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to adopt the document “Called to Common Mission.”

L. Western North Dakota Synod (3A) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” known as the “Mahtomedi Resolution,” printed above on page 492.

M. Eastern North Dakota Synod (3B) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted “model memorial” known as the “Mahtomedi Resolution” printed above on page 492, except that the last “RESOLVED” deletes “that we acknowledge,” and adds the words, “to reassure The Episcopal Church of our church’s desire to recognize the ordination”

N. South Dakota Synod (3C) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” known as the “Mahtomedi Resolution,” printed above on page 492.

O. Northwestern Minnesota Synod (3D) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted “model memorial” known as the “Mahtomedi Resolution” printed on page 492, except that the first “WHEREAS” is divided into two separate “WHEREAS” clauses after “(John 17:12)”; and

The synod’s third “WHEREAS” deletes “we Lutherans confess that” and adds “the ELCA confesses, as a true witness to the Gospel”; and

The synod's third "WHEREAS" adds the words in bold print: "unity of the Christian church that human traditions or rites and ceremonies..."; and

The synod's fourth "WHEREAS" adds "'Called to Common Mission' is inconsistent with Article VII and itself when it declares, on the one hand" and continues with "that the ELCA asserts"; and

The final "RESOLVED" deletes "parishes or pastoral positions, preaching and teaching."

P. Northeastern Minnesota Synod (3E) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" known as the "Mahtomedi Resolution" printed above on page 492, except that in the second "WHEREAS" the words in bold type are added so that it now reads: "...Christian church that human traditions, or rites and ceremonies instituted by men,..."; and

The last "RESOLVED" adds the phrase "that the ELCA be encouraged to" in the beginning of the first sentence, and deletes "we."

Q. Southwestern Minnesota Synod (3F) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" known as the "Mahtomedi Resolution" printed above on page 492, except that the synod's third "WHEREAS" adds "that human traditions or rites" and now reads "unity of the Christian church that human traditions or rites and ceremonies...."

R. Minneapolis Area Synod (3G) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" known as the "Mahtomedi Resolution" printed above on page 492, except that in the synod's second "WHEREAS" the words in bold type are added so that it now reads: "...Christian church that human traditions, or rites and ceremonies instituted by men...."

S. Southeastern Minnesota Synod (3I) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" known as the "Mahtomedi Resolution," printed above on page 492.

T. Central States Synod (4B) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Scriptures call us to make "every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Ephesians 4:3). Our Lutheran Confessions state that "we on our part shall not omit doing anything, so far as God and conscience allow; that may serve the cause of Christian unity" (Preface to the *Augsburg Confession*, 13); and

WHEREAS, the Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America meeting in Philadelphia in August of 1997 overwhelmingly adopted a resolution to "Aspire to ratification of an agreement for full communion with The Episcopal Church at the 1999 Churchwide Assembly." "Called to Common Mission" (CCM), a revision of the *Concordat*, has responded to points raised in contention with the *Concordat* by:

- making clear that this agreement does not make ordination in episcopal succession a condition of an authentic ministry of Word and Sacrament, and does not commit the ELCA to stating, in either word or deed, that the historic episcopate is necessary to the essential being of the church or to the realization of full communion, thus ensuring that the ELCA is not changing its confessional stance as in Article VII of the *Augsburg Confession*;

- providing for a periodic review of the Office of the Bishop to see that it is being exercised under the Gospel;
- providing for the continuing election of ELCA bishops to six-year terms, with eligibility for re-election, subject to term limits (not as bishops for life), with no defined role after their tenure in office is completed;
- providing for the continued participation of both pastors and bishops in the laying on of hands at ordinations, with the bishop presiding as a sign of the larger unity of the church;
- defining the office of bishop as a sign of unity and continuity in the church, but not a requirement or guarantee of it;
- clarifying that the understanding of ministry in the ELCA will continue to be that there is only one ordained ministry of Word and Sacrament, that bishops and pastors have distinctive responsibilities within that one ministry, and that by adopting CCM the ELCA is not committing itself to establishing the office of deacon which will include ordination; and

WHEREAS, the Conference of Bishops and the ELCA Church Council have adopted a document which clarifies their understandings and expectations concerning CCM, which document has been agreed to by the Episcopal members of the committee which produced CCM, and which states, among other things, that:

- ordinations of pastors will continue to be held at synodical worship services and in congregations, as is the present pattern;
- lay persons may continue to be licensed in unusual circumstances to administer the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion as is the present practice of the ELCA;
- The Episcopal Church accepts fully, and without reservation, present Lutheran pastors and bishops who are not in the historic episcopate;
- pastors of the ELCA will continue to preside at confirmations;
- future Churchwide Assemblies of the ELCA will be free to make whatever decisions they deem necessary on matters related to full communion; and

WHEREAS, we believe that our participation in God's mission to the world through the church will be genuinely enhanced by an agreement for full communion with The Episcopal Church, with whom we have enjoyed an interim Eucharistic sharing since 1982; and

WHEREAS, more than thirty years of dialogue and the commitment of many faithful leaders have brought the ELCA to this moment of opportunity in which we can make more visible the unity between churches of varying Reformation traditions; and

WHEREAS, we believe that clear witness to our unity in the Gospel with our Episcopalian brothers and sisters is a faithful response to the Gospel we are to proclaim to the world; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that we, the Central States Synod of the ELCA, pledge our support to "Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*," which indicates our readiness to join in full communion with The Episcopal Church, and we call upon the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to adopt it in response to our Lord's Prayer "that they may all be one...that the world may believe" (John 17:21).

U. Northern Illinois Synod (5B) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, in the Preface of the *Augsburg Confession* the Reformers declared their willingness to do "anything insofar as God and conscience allow, that may serve the cause of Christian unity"; and

WHEREAS, Article VII of the *Augsburg Confession* reads as follows: "It is also taught among us that the one, holy Christian church will be and remain forever. This is the assembly of all believers among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel. For it is sufficient for the true unity of the Christian church that the Gospel be preached with a pure understanding of it and that the sacraments be administered in accordance with the divine Word"; and

WHEREAS, Article VII allows the Church the freedom to order its public ministry in such a way as to promote and empower the proclamation of the Gospel; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of "Called to Common Mission" would allow for greater cooperation and effectiveness in furthering the mission of Christ's Church; and

WHEREAS, there are specific opportunities for such cooperation in Northern Illinois awaiting the outcome of this church's action on "Called to Common Mission"; and

WHEREAS, both Lutherans and Episcopalians are making concessions for the sake of greater unity:

—ELCA Lutherans will receive the evangelical and historic episcopate, which can be understood not as a required essence (*esse*) but as nevertheless a good thing (*bene esse*), and

—Episcopalians are suspending the requirement of ordination by bishops in the historic episcopate for all current pastors of the ELCA; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA will receive the historic episcopate primarily through other churches of the world-wide Lutheran communion, rather than through The Episcopal Church (“Called to Common Mission,” paragraph 19); therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northern Illinois Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to ratify the “Called to Common Mission” document.

V. Central/Southern Illinois Synod (5C) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” known as the “Mahtomedi Resolution” printed above on page 492, except that in the synod’s second “WHEREAS” the words in bold type are added so that it now reads: “...Christian church that human traditions, or rites and ceremonies instituted by men...”

W. Southeastern Iowa Synod (5D) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, Article VII of the *Augsburg Confession* reads as follows, “It is also taught among us that the one, holy Christian church will be and remain forever. This is the assembly of all believers among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel. For it is sufficient for the true unity of the Christian church that the Gospel be preached with a pure understanding of it and that the sacraments be administered in accordance with the divine Word. It is not necessary for the true unity of the Christian church that ceremonies, instituted by men [sic], should be observed uniformly in all places. It is as Paul says, in Ephesians 4:4-5: ‘There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope that belongs to your call, one Lord, one faith, one baptism’”; and

WHEREAS, Article VII has to do with the salvation of persons, and not with the public ordering of the Church’s ministry; and

WHEREAS, in Article XIV of the *Apology of the Augsburg Confession* the Lutheran Reformers express their “deep desire to maintain the church polity and various ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, although they were created by human authority”; and

WHEREAS, in the “Preface” of the *Augsburg Confession* the Reformers professed their willingness to do “anything in so far as God and conscience allow, that may serve the cause of Christian unity”; and,

WHEREAS, Lutheranism has historically served as an “ecumenical bridge movement” between mainline Protestantism on the one hand, and the Anglican, Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches on the other hand; and

WHEREAS, rejection of the historic episcopate by the ELCA would inevitably harm this important and useful ecumenical stance; and

WHEREAS, Article VII allows the Church the freedom to arrange its public and ordered ministry in such a way as to promote and empower the public proclamation of the Gospel; and

WHEREAS, the existing mission situation in Southeastern Iowa requires a unified, public proclamation of the Gospel; and

WHEREAS, the document, “Called to Common Mission,” will promote the unity and mission of the Church; and

WHEREAS, the Southeastern Iowa Synod continues to enjoy an ongoing and fruitful relationship with the Iowa Episcopal Diocese through our joint campus ministry efforts located at the Old Brick Church in Iowa City; and

WHEREAS, The Episcopal Church has recognized the validity of the public and ordered ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Southeastern Iowa Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to ratify the “Called to Common Mission” document.

X. Western Iowa Synod (5E) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” known as the “Mahtomedi Resolution,” printed above on page 492.

Y. Northern Great Lakes Synod (5G) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will this summer be asked to adopt the document “Called to Common Mission”; and

WHEREAS, there have been submitted to the Northern Great Lakes Synod Assembly two resolutions expressing divergent viewpoints on this issue; and

WHEREAS, the Synod Council wishes to provide time for voting members of this Synod Assembly to discuss and to make a judgment on the substance of this important issue; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that this Synod Assembly shall vote by ballot on the question, “Shall the Northern Great Lakes Synod recommend to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly that the document ‘Called to Common Mission’ be adopted?” and be it further

RESOLVED, that this vote occur at a time established by the chair of this assembly, that all points of order be waived, that no amendments to the question above be accepted, and after a period of debate evenly divided as closely as possible between the proponents and opponents of the “Called to Common Mission”; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the record of the count of the votes cast be forwarded to the Churchwide Assembly of the ELCA as an indication of this Synod Assembly’s position on this important ecumenical issue (yes-129, no-145); and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Northern Great Lakes Synod Assembly accept Resolutions Number eight and nine as information only, and they are hereby removed from further consideration by the assembly.

Z. Northwest Synod of Wisconsin (5H) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the historic episcopate is not essential to the being of the one holy catholic and apostolic Church; and

WHEREAS, acceptance of the historic episcopate and implementing the necessary constitution changes would cause serious divisions in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; therefore be it

RESOLVED that the Northwest Synod of Wisconsin memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to amend “Called to Common Mission” to provide for altar and pulpit fellowship with The Episcopal Church without requiring the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to accept the historic episcopate.

AA. Northwest Synod of Wisconsin (5H) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Lutheran-Episcopal *Concordat*, “Called to Common Mission” (CCM), provides for a two stage process for achieving “full communion” between the ELCA and The Episcopal Church; and

WHEREAS, for The Episcopal Church full communion with the ELCA is not fully realized until the second stage (#14); and

WHEREAS, the first stage (*the Concordat*) is a 20 plus year transition period during which The Episcopal Church temporarily suspends its Ordinals (rules which govern the three offices of the historic episcopate: Bishop, Priest, and Deacon), until such future time that practically all ELCA pastors have been ordained by bishops in the historic episcopate; and

WHEREAS, the second stage (full communion) occurs when there is “common and fully interchangeable ministry of bishops in full communion” (#14); and

WHEREAS, acceptance of CCM in 1999 commits the ELCA to adopt the principles of the Episcopal Ordinals at “Full Communion,” stage two: “The purpose of temporarily suspending [these Ordinals] . . . is precisely to secure the future implementation of the ordinals’ same principle in the sharing of ordained ministries” (#16); and

WHEREAS, the 1993 ELCA Study of Ministry concluded that the ELCA would be best served by retaining its single office of ministry, shared equally by bishops and pastors, in order to protect the integrity of the Gospel and maintain flexibility for mission; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northwest Synod of Wisconsin of the ELCA urge the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to vote “no” on the CCM, and to instruct the ELCA Department of Ecumenical Affairs to develop new models for effective ecumenism that do not require the ELCA to adopt any particular structure (such as the historic episcopate); and be it further

RESOLVED, that the ELCA renew its commitment to joint mission with The Episcopal Church by affirming the 1982 Lutheran-Episcopal “Agreement for Interim Eucharistic Sharing” which calls for joint evangelism, outreach, service ministries, worship, and joint communion where authorized.

BB. Northwest Synod of Wisconsin (5H) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” known as the “Mahtomedi Resolution,” printed above on page 492.

CC. East-Central Synod of Wisconsin (5I) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the *Augsburg Confession* (Article VII) teaches that the purity of the Gospel preached and the administration of the sacraments according to the Gospel are sufficient for unity; and

WHEREAS, the proposal “Called to Common Mission” (revised *Concordat of Agreement*) is divisive because it:

1. Requires the ELCA to adopt the Anglican historic episcopate as the common pattern shared in the ministry of bishops,
2. Requires the three-fold ministry is to be acknowledged as needing “continuing exploration, renewal and reform” despite its rejection by the 1993 Church wide Assembly,
3. Requires the ELCA to make significant legislative, constitutional and liturgical changes,
4. Requires that the ELCA reach full communion when “Called to Common Mission” is approved by both churches, while The Episcopal Church will realize full communion only when there is a shared ministry of bishops in the historic episcopate; and

WHEREAS, our current structures have proven flexible and effective in our mission of proclaiming Christ; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA in its 1993 Churchwide Assembly formally rejected the three-fold understanding of ministry and affirmed that in our Lutheran tradition we have one ordained clergy who serve in various ways as servants of the Church, whether as pastors, teachers, administrators or bishops; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA has repeatedly affirmed the centrality of the Gospel celebrated in Word and Sacrament in the local congregation, and an understanding of ordained ministry that arises from the needs and the affirmation of local congregations who constitute the “priesthood of all believers”; and

WHEREAS, “Called to Common Mission” claims to be formulated for the sake of unity, yet is proving to be divisive within the ELCA; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the East-Central Synod of Wisconsin memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the ELCA to affirm only Lutheran-Episcopal ecumenical agreements that do not require the ELCA to adopt the historic episcopacy, but retain its flexible structure with one ordained ministry and an empowered ministry of the priesthood of all believers; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the East-Central Synod of Wisconsin in assembly understands this resolution to function in complete and total support of the “Mahtomedi Resolution”; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the East-Central Synod of Wisconsin in assembly acknowledge and celebrate the Interim Agreement for Eucharist Sharing which has ably served as a sign of the unity which already exists between the ELCA and The Episcopal Church, and, because the issues of the historic episcopate have proven to be so divisive within the ELCA, respectfully invite The Episcopal Church to formulate a response to the “Concordat of Agreement” which does not include the historic episcopate; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the voting members of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly elected from the East-Central Synod of Wisconsin be given a copy of this memorial as the will of this assembly.

DD. New England Synod (7B) [1999 Memorial]

RESOLVED, that the New England Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at this assembly go on record expressing its endorsement of the Lutheran Proposal for Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement* known as “Called to Common Mission”; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this assembly invoke the blessing and guidance of the Holy Spirit upon our dealings with The Episcopal Church and that a blessed and God-pleasing result will be achieved under full communion; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this assembly humbly petition God for the grace of the Holy Spirit that our action in this matter be taken in Christian love and mutual respect for one another and that our unity be preserved to the honor of Jesus Christ and the Gospel.

EE. Metropolitan New York Synod (7C) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the 1997 ELCA Churchwide Assembly, after narrowly defeating the *Concordat of Agreement*, overwhelmingly mandated an inclusive process to revise the Concordat so that it might be approved at the 1999 Churchwide Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the Rev. Dr. Martin E. Marty, The Rev. Dr. Todd Nichol, and Dr. Michael Root were appointed to serve as the drafting team and produced “Called to Common Mission”; and

WHEREAS, the drafting team has faithfully accomplished the tasks set before them, namely to address issues directly related to the *Augsburg Confession*, and to include a clearer statement on the ministry of all the baptized; and

WHEREAS, “Called to Common Mission” provides a clear statement on the ministry of all the baptized and is fully faithful to the intent and texts of the *Augsburg Confession*, and has shown by its work the valuable contributions Lutheran theology can make to The Episcopal Church; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Assembly of the Metropolitan New York Synod memorialize the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to thank and commend the Rev. Dr. Martin E. Marty, the Rev. Dr. Todd Nichol, and Dr. Michael Root for their faithful work in drafting “Called to Common Mission”; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Assembly of the Metropolitan New York Synod memorialize the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to approve “Called to Common Mission” and thereby enter into full communion with The Episcopal Church.

FF. Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod (8A) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the 1999 Churchwide Assembly is called upon to take action on “Called to Common Mission,” a Lutheran proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church, as part of the ecumenical mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and

WHEREAS, the Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod in assembly in 1997 took similar action to encourage the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to adopt the *Concordat of Agreement*; and

WHEREAS we understand “Called to Common Mission” to be faithful to the intent of the Concordat and yet to have addressed some of the issues that were problematic for some Lutherans; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to adopt “Called to Common Mission” with a strong affirmative vote.

GG. Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod (8B) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the current draft of “Called to Common Mission” has clarified many issues lingering from the Churchwide Assembly in Philadelphia in 1997 and is a much more readable and accessible document than the *Concordat of Agreement*; and

WHEREAS, the document drafted by the Conference of Bishops at their March 8, 1999, meeting in Tucson, Arizona, further clarified what adopting CCM and the historic episcopate would and would not mean for the ELCA, in its content, intent, and extent; and

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has been blessed by more than a decade of interim sharing of Holy Communion with The Episcopal Church; and

WHEREAS, this sharing, we believe, has been demonstrated in response to Jesus’ prayer “that all may be one”; and

WHEREAS, this mission and witness of the church has been strengthened by this sharing; and

WHEREAS, the beginning of a new millennium gives us special opportunity to make more visible the unity that is ours in Christ; and

WHEREAS, the document “Called to Common Mission,” if adopted by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church, would substantially increase the visible unity of the church in ministry and witness; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, meeting in assembly, urgently pray for, encourage, and support the adoption of “Called to Common Mission” by the ELCA Churchwide Assembly, and call upon our congregations, pastors, and leaders to seek its fullest implementation in our life and mission together.

HH. Allegheny Synod (8C) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in its 1997 Churchwide Assembly called for a revised proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church to be brought to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the revision titled “Called to Common Mission” has been approved for transmission by the ELCA Church Council to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly; and

WHEREAS, “Called to Common Mission” seeks to provide a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church based upon an understanding that both unity and mission are at the heart of the church’s life; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Allegheny Synod express its support for “Called to Common Mission” as a method of establishing a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church and urge its adoption at the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

II. Lower Susquehanna Synod (8D) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in its 1997 Churchwide Assembly called for a revised proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church to be brought to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the revision titled “Called to Common Mission” has been approved for transmission by the ELCA Church Council to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly; and

WHEREAS, “Called to Common Mission” seeks to provide a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church based upon an understanding that both “unity and mission are at the heart of the church’s life, (“Called to Common Mission,” Introduction); therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Lower Susquehanna Synod express its support for “Called to Common Mission” as an important step toward a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church; and be it further

RESOLVED, that congregations of the Lower Susquehanna Synod be urged to study “Called to Common Mission.”

JJ. Upper Susquehanna Synod (8E) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the 1999 Churchwide Assembly is called upon to take action on “Called to Common Mission,” a Lutheran proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church, as part of the ecumenical mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and

WHEREAS, “Called to Common Mission” is a significant improvement over the previous proposal for full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Upper Susquehanna Synod memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to adopt “Called to Common Mission” with a strong affirmative vote.

KK. Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod (8G) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, Scriptures affirm that our unity in Christ is a gift from God but inform us that members of the body of Christ do not always publicly express this unity (1 Corinthians 1:10f; Ephesians 4:1-10; John 17:6ff) and “Called to Common Mission” affirms our unity in Christ to be both a gift and a task (CCM, C.28) calling us to express greater visible unity in the body of Christ, and the *Augsburg Confession* and the *Apology to the Augsburg Confession* are catholic documents that emphasize the unity of the church and the goal of the reformers for reconciliation “under the one Christ” (*Augsburg Confession*, Preface; *Augsburg Confession* Article VII); and

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) in its 1997 Churchwide Assembly called for a revised proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church to be brought to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the revision titled “Called to Common Mission” has been approved for transmission by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America Church Council to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly in Denver, Colorado; and

WHEREAS, “Called to Common Mission” seeks to provide a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church based upon an understanding that both “unity and mission are at the heart of the church’s life,” (CCM, Introduction); therefore be it

RESOLVED, that this synod in assembly express its support for “Called to Common Mission” as a necessary step toward a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this synod in assembly urge its member congregations, in partnership with congregations of the dioceses of Washington, D.C., and Virginia, to study “Called to Common Mission” for implementation in their ministry and mission; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the bishop of the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod transmit a copy of this resolution to the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly in Denver, Colorado, and to the Diocese of Washington, D.C., and the Diocese of Virginia of The Episcopal Church.

LL. West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod (8H) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, Jesus prays in John 17, “I ask not only on behalf of these, but also on behalf of those who will believe in me through their word, that they may all be one. As you, Father, are in me and I am in you, may they also be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me. The glory that you have given me I have given them, so that they may be one, as we are one, I in them and you in me, that they may become completely one, so that the world may know that you have sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me” (John 17:20-23); and

WHEREAS, the August 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will vote to approve or reject “Called to Common Mission,” the revised proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church; and

WHEREAS, a proper broad interpretation of Article VII of the *Augsburg Confession* and the Lutheran confessional preference for episcopal polity as expressed in Article XIV of the *Apology of the Augsburg Confession* support the adoption of full communion with The Episcopal Church; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod calls on the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to adopt “Called to Common Mission,” the revised proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the voting members from the West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod take into account the desire of their synod for full communion with The Episcopal Church when casting their vote; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the bishop of the West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod inform in writing the synod’s voting members of the synod’s desire for approval of “Called to Common Mission” by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the bishop of the West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod share this desire of the synod with the entire voting delegation of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly by forwarding this resolution to the Conference of Bishops and requesting that they forward it to their synods’ voting members; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod thank and commend Bishop Curtis Miller and the Conference of Bishops for their framing and adoption of CB99.03.06 (i.e. “Resolution Concerning ‘Called to Common Mission’”).

MM. Virginia Synod (9A) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America through its predecessor bodies entered into a relationship of “Interim Eucharistic Sharing” in 1982 with The Episcopal Church, growing out of a number of years of mutual explorations theologically and pragmatically; and

WHEREAS, there was a proposal known as the *Concordat of Agreement* that would have recognized full communion between these two churches, had it been mutually approved in both the General Convention of The Episcopal Church and the Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in 1997; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Synod Assembly recorded its support of the previous proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church in 1997; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Virginia Synod supports the document entitled “Called to Common Mission”; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Virginia Synod transmit this action as a memorial to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

NN. North Carolina Synod (9B) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in its 1997 Churchwide Assembly called for a revised proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church to be brought to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the revision entitled “Called to Common Mission” has been approved for transmission by the ELCA Church Council to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly; and

WHEREAS, “Called to Common Mission” seeks to provide a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church based upon an understanding that both “unity and mission are at the heart of the church’s life,” (“Called to Common Mission,” Introduction); therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the North Carolina Synod memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to adopt “Called to Common Mission” as a desired step toward a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the congregations of the North Carolina Synod be urged to study “Called to Common Mission,” doing so whenever possible and practical in conversation with Episcopalian parishes.

OO. Southeastern Synod (9D) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, in his high priestly prayer recorded in John 17, our Lord Jesus Christ fervently prayed that all his followers should be one, even as he is one with the Father; and

WHEREAS, this model of oneness allows for unity of mind and purpose while still allowing for the individual uniqueness of both entities; and

WHEREAS, the purpose for such unity is visible witness so that the world might believe that Jesus Christ was sent by the Father; and

WHEREAS, the present divisions within Christianity are therefore an impediment and a scandal for our common purpose of witnessing to Christ; and

WHEREAS, Lutherans and Anglicans have been in dialogue with one another in Europe since the time of the Reformation, and in North America since colonial times; and

WHEREAS, the predecessor bodies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America entered into an interim agreement with The Episcopal Church in 1982 that has proved of great value for common mission, an agreement that presupposes eventual Full Communion, and which will no longer be in effect if Full Communion is not adopted; and

WHEREAS, the dialogue team has recommended the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America enter into Full Communion with The Episcopal Church as outlined in the document “Called to Common Mission,” and as consistent with the guiding ecumenical principals of the ELCA; and

WHEREAS, this agreement allows for unity while still respecting each church’s unique tradition and heritage; and

WHEREAS, Lutherans and Anglicans in northern Europe have already entered into such an agreement; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Southeastern Synod memorialize the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to adopt the amendment in the resolution of understanding and expectation, paragraph VI adopt the recommendation for Full Communion with The Episcopal Church as set forth in the document, “Called to Common Mission”; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the congregations of the Southeastern Synod be encouraged to study “Called to Common Mission” and seek to work in cooperative ways with our brothers and sisters of The Episcopal Church in neighboring parishes.

BACKGROUND

At the 1997 Churchwide Assembly, the *Concordat of Agreement*, which would have established a relationship of full communion between this church and The Episcopal Church, fell a half-dozen votes short of passage. Instead the assembly adopted the following action related to a proposal for full communion:

RESOLVED, that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America seek conversations with The Episcopal Church, building on the degree of consensus achieved at this assembly and addressing concerns that emerged during consideration of the *Concordat of Agreement*. The aim of these conversations is to bring to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly a revised proposal for full communion; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1982 agreement for “Interim Eucharistic Sharing” continue to guide joint ministry efforts in worship, education, and mission; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1997 Churchwide Assembly direct the bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to communicate this request to the presiding bishop of The Episcopal Church [CA97.05.24].

A detailed summary of the process that led to the development of “Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*” was printed in Section IV, pages 5-10, of the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*.

In submitting “Called to Common Mission” to this church for consideration, the chair of the drafting team, Pr. Martin E. Marty, addressed the question of the necessity of including the historic episcopate as an integral part of any proposal to establish a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church. Pastor Marty wrote:

“Not once in this year of intense work or in our consulting of the records of antecedent conversations through the years did we [the members of the drafting team] find a single Episcopal thinker who envisioned their departing from the Anglican Communion by exchanging ministries apart from the episcopate.”

Members of the drafting team from The Episcopal Church likewise made it clear that it is not possible for The Episcopal Church to enter a relationship of full communion with another church body apart from the historic episcopate when they wrote:

“It is the unanimous affirmation of Episcopal members of the ‘Called to Common Mission’ Drafting Team that this accurately reflects The Episcopal Church’s position, that of our Presiding Bishops, our General Conventions, and worldwide Anglicanism which counts the historic episcopate, along with the Holy Scriptures, the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds, and the two Sacraments ordained by Christ as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of the Christian Church.”

“Called to Common Mission” was written to fulfill the charge of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly to “bring to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly a revised proposal for full communion.” Since a relationship of full communion must include the historic episcopate in order for The Episcopal Church to enter such a relationship, “Called to Common Mission” asks that in the future bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America be installed into office and enter the historic episcopate.

In the course of the discussion related to establishing a relationship of full communion with The Episcopal Church, a group of pastors, theologians, and lay persons met on February 8-9, 1999, at St. Andrew’s Lutheran Church in Mahtomedi, Minn. to express their opposition to the adoption of “Called to Common Mission.” During the course of the meeting, a model resolution was developed as an alternative to the proposal for full communion with The Episcopal Church. Commonly referred to as the “Mahtomedi Resolution,” this alternative proposal was affirmed by 14 synodical assemblies.

Ms. Peterson called the assembly’s attention to the memorials in Category 1a, removed from the *en bloc* resolution, which referred to “Called to Common Mission.” Even though the assembly had acted on the ecumenical document, she said, this memorial still needed formal consideration. She then introduced the recommendation of the Memorials Committee.

Moved;

Seconded: To acknowledge the action of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly on “Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*, as the response of this assembly to the memorials listed in category 1a of the Report of the Memorials Committee to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

Bishop Anderson invited discussion from the assembly. Seeing no indication of discussion, he called for the vote on the recommendation of the Memorials Committee.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes—762; No—50

CA99.06.24 To acknowledge the action of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly on “Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*” as the response of this assembly to the memorials listed in Category 1a of the Report of the Memorials Committee to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

Category 20: Ordination of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section VI, page 61; continued on *Minutes*, pages 409, 534, and Exhibit F.

A. Sierra Pacific Synod (2A) [1998 Memorial]

WHEREAS, we are witnesses to God’s call to ministry of individuals with diverse gifts and characteristics, including gays and lesbians in faithful relationships; and

WHEREAS, ELCA policies now in effect state that “Practicing homosexual persons are precluded from the ordained ministry of this church,”¹ and “Ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships.”²; and

WHEREAS, these ELCA policies interfere with God’s call to gays and lesbians for the ministry of Word and Sacrament, prohibit loving and faithful relationships of gay and lesbian pastors and candidates, and implicitly demand either celibacy or dishonesty concerning the intimate relationships of millions of humans who are gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender; and

WHEREAS, the voices of individuals throughout the church are needed to move the ELCA’s Division for Ministry, Conference of Bishops, and ELCA Church Council to rescind these policies; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Sierra Pacific Synod calls precariously—that is, filled with prayers—for the rescission by the ELCA Division for Ministry, Conference of Bishops, and Church Council of the policies now in effect that “Practicing homosexual persons are precluded from the ordained ministry of this church,”¹ and “Ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships.”²; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Sierra Pacific Synod calls upon all members of the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to move the ELCA’s Division for Ministry, Conference of Bishops, and ELCA Church Council to rescind these policies immediately; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Sierra Pacific Synod asks the members of all ELCA synod assemblies to voice this same call for the rescission of these policies, and directs the Sierra Pacific Synod Council to intentionally and faithfully circulate our call for rescission throughout the ELCA.

1 From “Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline of Ordained Ministers,” at Paragraph b.4., as approved in its current form by the ELCA Church Council at its December 1993 meeting.

2 From “Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,” at Section III, as adopted by the ELCA Church Council at its October 1990 meeting.

BACKGROUND

This memorial calls for the rescission of ELCA policies as found in both “Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline of Ordained Ministers” (adopted by the ELCA Church Council in 1989) and “Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America” (adopted by the ELCA Church Council in 1990), which relate to standards for ordained ministry relative to homosexual persons.

This memorial is essentially the same as that adopted by the Sierra Pacific Synod Council subsequent to the synod assembly that called upon the ELCA Church Council “to communicate to the board and staff of the Division for Ministry, that the Sierra Pacific Synod has called for the rescission of these same policies, and that its council urges the Division for Ministry to recommend changing the ‘Vision and Expectations’ guidelines accordingly.”

The ELCA Church Council voted, in its April 1999 meeting: “To refer the resolution of the Sierra Pacific Synod on rescinding the policies for ordination of gay and lesbian persons noted in the ‘Vision and Expectations’ guidelines to the Division for Ministry [and] to request the Division for Ministry respond directly to the synod on this matter.”

In addition to acting on the resolution from the Sierra Pacific Synod, the Church Council, at its April 1999 meeting, received a report from five churchwide units in response to 1997 ELCA Churchwide Assembly memorials.

Inter-unit Response to 1997 Synodical Memorials

The inter-unit response came as the result of the 1997 ELCA Churchwide Assembly’s consideration of memorials from the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod and the Sierra Pacific Synod on the ordination of gay and lesbian persons and referred [CA97.06.28] the memorial to the Division for Ministry and the Division for Church in Society. The assembly action further requested that the divisions continue dialogue and that “...a status report on the learnings of these conversations be brought through the Church Council to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.”

In April 1998, the Executive Committee of the Church Council voted to concur with a recommendation by the Division for Ministry, the Division for Church in Society, the Division for Outreach, the Division for Congregational Ministries, and the Commission for Women that a “bundled” report in response to these synodical memorials be brought to the Church Council in April 1999.³

The report begins with a common introduction prepared by an inter-unit staff team. This introduction was received and reviewed by the board of each of the churchwide units involved and serves as an introduction to the separate responses from several of the units. The introductory statement includes five points that are suggested as important considerations that this church should keep in mind as it continues conversation on the place of homosexual persons in the life of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The separate responses from the units involved also are provided. Some of these reports respond directly to the question of the possible ordination, consecration, and commissioning of such persons while other reports deal with different aspects of how this church relates to gay and lesbian persons.

At its April 1999 meeting, the ELCA Church Council received the inter-unit report and voted to transmit it to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly. The report was printed in the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section V, pages 15-26.

³ The full text of the “Inter-unit Response to Synodical Memorials on the Ordination, Consecration, and Commissioning of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons” has been included in these minutes for ease of reference as Exhibit F.

Ms. Peterson then drew the assembly's attention to the memorials in Category 20 concerning the ordination of gay and lesbian persons. She informed the assembly that the committee wanted to amend its recommendation by adding the words "at this assembly" following the words "decline to propose...." She then introduced the recommendation of the Memorials Committee, as amended, to the assembly.

Moved;

Seconded: To receive with thanks the "Inter-unit Response to 1997 Synodical Memorials on the Ordination, Consecration, and Commissioning of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons" as an adequate response to the 1998 memorial of the Sierra Pacific Synod;

To acknowledge the deep level of anxiety and anguish felt by many members, whether heterosexual or homosexual, lay or rostered, male or female, young or old, as this church addresses this concern;

To continue discerning conversations about homosexuality and the inclusion of gay and lesbian persons in our common life and mission and to encourage churchwide units, synods, congregations, and members of this church to participate in thoughtful, deliberate, and prayerful conversations through use of such resources as "Talking About Homosexuality-A Guide for Congregations";

To acknowledge that because there is no arbitrarily set timetable for concluding the discussion, we await a time of clearer understanding provided by the Lord of the Church and, in the meanwhile, pray for the Holy Spirit's guidance and work to the best of our ability;

To decline to propose at this assembly a change in the standards for rostered ministry related to non-celibate gay or lesbian persons; but

To reaffirm 1991 and 1995 actions of the ELCA in Churchwide Assembly that "gay and lesbian people, as individuals created by God, are welcome to participate fully in the life of the congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

The Rev. Paul K. Erbes [Rocky Mountain Synod] requested to suspend the rules "to encourage the voice of the Lutheran Youth Organization and the Youth Convo, that have done significant work on this in the past three years; particularly Mr. Jay McDivitt, the vice president of the Lutheran Youth Organization and of the Rocky Mountain Synod [youth organization], is here present and would like the voice of the ELCA youth on this."

Bishop Anderson asked if Pastor Erbes wished to recommend a time limit for this speaker. Pastor Erbes requested five minutes. Bishop Anderson responded, "Okay, the request is to suspend the rules for—I think we could do it another way. I think we could simply request permission of the assembly to have him speak. We will need a two-thirds vote, however, but it is a little simpler way to do it. The proposal is that we hear from Mr. Jay McDivitt for up to five minutes. You are asked to vote. It requires a two-thirds majority to pass. If you favor the action, press 1; if you oppose it, press 2. Please vote now."

Bishop Anderson continued, "All right, voting has closed. Let us see the results. By a vote of 689 to 230, he is given the privilege of the floor up to five minutes."

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes-689; No-230

CARRIED: To give Mr. Jay McDivitt five minutes on the agenda to present the viewpoint of the Lutheran Youth Organization and the Youth Convo.

Mr. Jay McDivitt said, "I am a college student and in the next few years, I may happen to bump into somebody, begin dating them and happen to fall hopelessly and desperately in love with them, as many of you have probably have experienced. If that person happens to be a female, I will be able to commit myself to that woman in marriage, and I will be able to serve this church by following the call that has been recklessly and relentlessly pursuing me all of my life.

"I have a passion to serve this church. Unfortunately, if that person happens to be male, and that is a definite possibility, I will not be able to do that. Something changes. I do not know what changes, I am still just as passionate for the Gospel of Jesus Christ. I am still just as willing and able to proclaim that Gospel in both Word and Sacrament. But for some reason, one sentence in this 'Vision and Expectations' document prevents me from being able to serve the church that I love and can serve my entire life. This hurts me deeply because it is wrong. As a youth, and as someone who will soon not be a youth anymore—hopefully, not too soon—I want desperately to serve this church and I want you to give and others like me that possibility.

"Now, we have in this 'Vision and Expectations' document a sentence which talks about justice, that the church is the witness to God's call for justice in every aspect of life, including testimony against injustice and oppression, whether personal or systemic. This church expects its ordained ministers to be committed to justice in the life of the church, in the society and in the world. We cannot claim to be a church which strives for peace and justice if we continue to practice injustice, we continue to practice discrimination and uphold age-old prejudices that we have had for centuries. In order to truly proclaim the Gospel of Christ and to be the presence of the Body of Christ in this world, we need to be able to proclaim that with integrity, be able to proclaim that in truth. To be consistent proclaimers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, we must allow our people in that Body of Christ to follow God wherever he or she happens to call us to go. And that sometimes means into the ordained ministry, and whether I happen to stumble into a woman or a man and fall in love with them should not have anything to do with that. This is the Gospel of Christ, a Gospel of love, a Gospel of compassion, a Gospel that says anyone can and should preach the message to all the peoples of the world, regardless of who they happen to love, regardless of what their sex might be or who they happen to be living with. This is a church of integrity, it is the church of faith. And this is a church which can and must, as the new millennium approaches, assure that all of its members who are called by God to the ordained ministry can do so.

"I urge you, please, to take a vote for justice and a vote for encouraging this church to move towards being the people that might have six causes to be the people who do justice, who love kindness and mercy and who walk humbly with their God."

Ms. Beth Reichert [Northwestern Ohio Synod] said, "I really encourage you to vote "Yes" for this. I have many friends who stand on many sides of this conversation. I have friends like our previous speaker who are not ordained because of their sexual preference. I have friends whom I respect and love deeply, who would be uncomfortable with a gay preacher. I encourage churches to use the resources we learned about yesterday, and to

discuss in your congregations the different ideas, the different scriptural backgrounds, where we might go as a church, in order to avoid some of the arguing and division as we progress in the future. We need to keep talking about this.”

Ms. Gloria Ware [Greater Milwaukee Synod] said, “Reverend Chair, I move that we go to a quasi-committee of the whole for the purpose of 30 minutes of dialogue, limiting each speaker to two minutes, and Reverend Chair, I respectfully request a moment of prayer before we vote.”

MOVED;

SECONDED: To recess into a quasi-committee of the whole for 30 minutes for the purposes of discussion of this matter.

Bishop Anderson instructed, “It has been moved and seconded that we go into a quasi-committee of the whole. I would say to the speaker, though, if we do that, it might not be a 30-minute session at one stretch. We have Special Order at 11:05 a.m., and I would also like to get the Elections Committee in, so we would probably split it up. Is that okay? There is a motion now, seconded, to go into quasi-committee of the whole. It requires a majority vote. Is there someone wishing to speak to that proposal? I do not see anybody. Very well. What is the white card at [microphone] 9 for?”

The Rev. Martha V. Sheaffer [Lower Susquehanna Synod] explained that she had risen for a point of information regarding the difference between “chaste” and “celibate” in the “Vision and Expectations” document. Bishop Anderson ruled that this would come following the vote, and instructed the assembly, “All favoring moving into quasi-committee of the whole will vote ‘yes;’ all opposed will vote ‘no.’ Please vote now.”

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—529; No—429

CARRIED: To recess into a quasi-committee of the whole for 30 minutes for the purposes of discussion of this matter.

Quasi-Committee of the Whole for General Discussion: Ordination of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons

Bishop Anderson announced, “By a vote of 529 to 429, we will have 30 minutes of discussion. Now, if we follow the rule we did before, this is for discussion only. However, it is possible for a committee of the whole to make a report to the main assembly. I will proceed on the basis that you want to talk rather than make motions. So now we are in quasi-committee of the whole. Microphone 10.”

Mr. Earl L. Mummert [Lower Susquehanna Synod] said, “I am happy that we are in this state of the session because I think we are all in a learning process. I am an actuary. Actuaries have a working discipline to substitute facts for appearances. And so I have a few questions to ask our experts in the Division of Ministry.

“In setting the standards for ordained ministry, which we understand from Secretary Almen we are free of civil law to do, what is the basis for exclusion of homosexuals that they

cannot competently serve in the capacity of ordained ministry? What data do we have to support that conclusion? And if we have no data, what studies are we engaged in to test our premise?"

The Rev. Joseph M. Wagner, executive director of the Division for Ministry, said, "The policies of this church regarding ordaining practicing gay and lesbian persons have been established by the Church Council, in consultation with the Division for Ministry and the Conference of Bishops. That is the way all standards of this church are established. They were established on the basis of past practices of the predecessor church bodies and the judgment of the church in the early years of ELCA regarding this issue.

"In terms of research that has been done, there has been some research done by the Department for Research and Evaluation, using the Lutheran Listening Post process, to test the mind of this church around this issue. It indicated, as I recall, that some 60 percent of the members of this church who were in that sample had strong objection to the full acceptance of gay and lesbian persons in terms of being candidates for ordination, or even beyond that, for dealing with that issue very much at all.

"I would say that the primary judgment that is at stake to date, in dealing with this issue, relates not only to the technical qualifications in terms of education and those kinds of issues—doctrinal and theological issues—but the issue of ordination, and the right to ordination has to do with the suitability of candidates to serve the congregations of this church so there is a matching of the readiness of the church as well as the capacity of particular candidates. We also would make a distinction in terms of the difference between justice and the privilege of the church to serve in ordained ministries of the church."

Bishop Donald H. Maier [Northwest Washington Synod] said, "I am bishop of a synod that is in the process of some discernment on this question, and I have been drawn personally, rather reluctantly, into a pastoral concern in this area. My pastoral concern is for gay and lesbian Christians who are members of our congregations—people that we have baptized as infants at our fonts, we have confirmed them as you, they are part of our church. And they are waiting upon us to deliberate as to their role and their life in our church. We have taken step one of inviting them to be a part of who we are in our congregations. But now they are asking us to accept their life as couples.

"One of the concerns that I have is that as a church body, we make an orderly decision with regard to what we will expect of gay and lesbian persons who want to live together as couples. Then we will be able to go on to ask ourselves the question about ordination of gay and lesbian people in a relationship. I am also concerned that when we engage in the dialogue, that we bring to it what is best of our Lutheran life—the discernment of Law and Gospel, the central concept of justification by grace through faith. I plead for that."

Ms. Lisa Jennison [Southeastern Iowa Synod] said, "I just want to say I am trying to understand this issue. I do have a very dear family member that is a practicing homosexual, whom we love and support, that I am trying to understand. I am looking forward to receiving the material from our church to learn more. My question is, I just basically have a question. The gentleman from the Youth Convocation describing his experience—I am wondering if we change this memorial, an analogy of...instead of openly gay and lesbian persons, what if it was similar to what might be in a denomination in Salt Lake City—and I will not name the denomination—but there are factions that do practice polygamy. What if it was ordination of polygamy? What if there was a pastor that was hopelessly and incredibly in love with two women and wanted to serve in his congregation? Would that person—I am just trying to look

at the future as far as when we go to the gay, what other changes may be in store for us. That may or may not be an appropriate analogy, but I just went through this memorial and substituted instead of 'gay and lesbian person,' I substituted 'bigamist.'"

Bishop Anderson reminded the assembly that, "If you favor generally the Memorials Committee's memorial, you should be at an odd-numbered microphone; if you oppose it, you should be at an even-numbered microphone. Maybe you are, but I just want to be sure because I do not want to start calling people out of order; I would rather call them out of turn. Microphone 3."

Mr. Brian Farmer [Sierra Pacific Synod] said, "I actually am not totally in favor of the proposal from the Memorials Committee, so I can speak or I can move to another microphone, if you prefer." Bishop Anderson replied, "You should be at another microphone. Is there a person at microphone 3 favoring the recommendation of the Memorials Committee? Microphone 3."

The Rev. Aaron J. Couch [Rocky Mountain Synod] said, "I believe that it is wise for us as a church to take time for deliberation. I know from experience in my own family and in the congregations I have served that we had deep abiding differences of not only opinion, but of belief, based sometimes in Scripture and sometimes in experience of life. I believe that the wisest course for us as a church is to take time for serious and careful deliberation, and for that reason, I believe it is wise for us to proceed with the recommendation from Reference and Counsel."

The Rev. Deborah L. Conrad [Indiana-Kentucky Synod] said, "I would like to serve notice that when we are back in regular session, I will be offering an amendment to this resolution from the Memorials Committee. May I read that now?" Bishop Anderson said that she could. Pastor Conrad said that her amendment would delete paragraph five altogether and would add, after paragraph six:

To suspend the enforcement of the following statements in the Church Council documents in regard to rostered leaders: Practicing homosexual persons are precluded from the ordained ministry of this church, found in "Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline of Ordained Ministers" (paragraph b.4.), and ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships, found in "Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America" (Section III), as well as parallel provisions and companion documents relating to associates in ministry, diaconal ministers and other rostered leaders, and to stipulate that this suspension shall be carried out in conversation with the Conference of Bishops and the Division for Ministry, and shall remain in effect until study is complete and the ELCA, in a future Churchwide Assembly, affirms an understanding regarding human sexuality and rostered leadership.

Pastor Conrad then continued, "It is a serious issue facing us and we need to talk and time to listen, and we know it won't be easy. This amendment would invite us to live in grace while we seek understanding, to live in compassion. It brings fuller conversation and sanctuary, refuge from sanction or derision while we talk, so we can have trust. This proposal would also give us time; it would allow us sabbath to reject rashness and idleness alike, and create safe, holy space for the conversation. In this assembly we have been marked by compassion and by partnership with our ecumenical partners and with our solidarity with the poor. We have told the Episcopalians and the Moravians that we will accept and honor

the ministries of their clergy, and now is the time to offer the same gift to our own clergy and to all our rostered leaders.”

Ms. Amanda J. Wahlig [Southeastern Synod] said, “I know that as youth we are prepared to lead the way in this issue. However, there are a lot of differing opinions, not only among ourselves, but among the older members of the ELCA, and so I feel that this resolution is a very appropriate one to encourage dialogue among all of our members. I know this is a difficult issue and will probably never be an easy issue to discuss, but it is one that needs to be discussed before we actually move to action so that there can be a greater understanding of why we wish to allow homosexual people to be ordained ministers.”

Bishop Anderson said, “Thank you. Microphone 6, and that will be the end of our first 15 minutes.”

The Rev. A. Bruce Todd [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod] said, “I do speak opposed to the recommendation to decline to propose. I have a lesbian woman who has come to me and said she feels a call from God to enter the ministry. And at the time of my ordination, I made a commitment to encourage people to enter the ordained ministry. This person pointed out that in recent times, we have knowledge through science and medical resources that people are indeed created to be gay or lesbian, and what God creates is good. And as a result, I feel as though I am sort of hypocritical in, at ordination, encouraging people to enter the ordained ministry, but then, having to tell this woman, ‘Well, no, this does not mean you.’

“There have been times untold when our African American brethren were not welcome into the ordination. The church wrestled with that, resolved it, and the church is a better place for it. I remember a time and participated in a time to change the effects when women were not welcomed into the ordained clergy. The church wrestled with that, resolved it, and the church is a better place for it. Now we are wrestling with whether or not gay and lesbian people should be welcomed into the ordained clergy. I feel that if we wrestle with it and resolve it, the church will indeed be a better place for it. We talked about the element of time. My lesbian member does not have as much time as we might need if we want to use her gifts. Perhaps we could include these people in the ministry while we talk about, and even let some of their ministries speak for them.”

Resumption of Plenary Session Nine

Bishop Anderson announced that the assembly had reached the order of the day, and explained, “we have 15 minutes remaining of the 30 minutes in quasi-committee of the whole. When we come back after lunch, we can pick this discussion up and after we go out of quasi-committee of the whole, we will still discuss it until the assembly decides to stop. The rest of the speakers will have a chance to talk with us this afternoon.”

Report of the Elections Committee (continued) Second Common Ballot Distributed

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section 1, pages 9-12, 28; continued on *Minutes*, pages 409, 491, 622, 651, and Exhibit B.

Mr. Scott S. Fintzen, associate general counsel, announced that all voting members should have received the results of the first common ballot and instructed anyone who had not to raise a hand. When it appeared that everyone had the appropriate document, Mr. Fintzen asked to dispense with reading the results. Hearing no objection, Bishop

Anderson so ruled. Mr. Fintzen reviewed the meaning of the ballot results, indicating that the names of those nominees who had received a majority of votes and had thus been elected were printed in bold-face type. Mr. Fintzen asked Bishop Anderson to declare those nominees elected. Hearing no objection, Bishop Anderson did so.

Mr. Fintzen continued by saying that in those elections where no one had received a majority, the two receiving the most votes would appear on the second common ballot, which had already been distributed. He reviewed the materials the voting members would need and asked them to vote carefully, making certain to mark the letter corresponding to the person whom they wished to elect. He indicated the location of the ballot boxes and said that balloting closed at 6:00 P.M. this day.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Voice Vote

CA99.06.25 To receive the written report of the Elections Committee on the results of the First Common Ballot for filling vacancies on the Church Council, and churchwide boards and committees;

To dispense with the reading of the report; and

To request that the chair hereby declare elected, in keeping with this church's bylaws, those persons receiving a majority of the votes cast.

Church Council

Pr. Jonathan L. Eilert, Wooster, Ohio (6E)

Pr. Diane "Dee" S. Pederson, St. Cloud, Minn. (3F)

Pr. Kim R. Taylor, Tucson, Ariz. (2D)

Pr. Kirkwood J. Havel, Midland, Mich. (6B)

Ms. Ellen T. Maxon, Hartland, Wis. (5J)

Ms. Janet Thompson, Eagan, Minn. (3H)

Ms. Linda J. Brown, Moorhead, Minn. (3D)

Mr. Mark Buchheim, Tulsa, Okla. (4C)

Mr. Karl D. Anderson, Neenah, Wis. (5I)

Mr. Ghassan "Gus" Khoury, Chicago, Ill. (5A)

Division for Congregational Ministries

Pr. Robert H. Shoffner, Hickory, N.C. (9B)

Pr. Steven T. Kruse, Scottsdale, Ariz. (2D)

Mr. Robert F. Mueller, Wyoming, Ill. (5C)

Division for Ministry

Mr. Michael J. Root, Columbus, Ohio (6F)

Mr. John E. Dellis, Seguin, Texas (4E)

Division for Outreach

Pr. J. Elise Brown, New York (Bronx), N.Y. (7C)

Pr. Linda Boston, San Jose, Calif. (2A)
Ms. Ardith Senft, Phoenix, Ariz. (2D)
Ms. Jan Weness, Adams, Minn. (3I)
Ms. Deborah R. Joncas, Newark, N.J. (7A)
Mr. Ronald J. Solimon, Albuquerque, N.M. (2E)

Division for Higher Education and Schools

Pr. Linda J. Kraft, Stafford Springs, Conn. (7G)
Ms. Diane G. Scholl, Decorah, Iowa (5F)
Ms. Jennifer N. Peterson, New Braunfels, Texas (4E)
Ms. Gay S. Steele, Columbus, Ohio (6F)
Mr. Bolivar Roman, San Juan, Puerto Rico (9F)

Division for Church in Society

Pr. James B. Martin-Schramm, Decorah, Iowa (5F)
Pr. J. Pablo Obregon, Willmar, Minn. (3F)
Mr. Stewart W. Herman, Moorhead, Minn. (3D)

Division for Global Mission

Pr. Natanael F. Lizarazo, Decorah, Iowa (3I)
Ms. Hermina Meyer, Kendrick, Idaho (1D)
Ms. S. Christine Mummert, Harrisburg, Pa. (8D)
Ms. Judy St. Pierre, Newport News, Va. (9A)
Mr. Terfassa Yadessa, St. Paul, Minn. (3G)

Publishing House of the ELCA

Pr. Richard F. Bansemer, Salem, Va. (9A)
Pr. Barbara R. Rossing, Chicago, Ill. (5L)
Ms. Janice M. Bowman, Thousand Oaks, Calif. (2B)
Ms. Karen Albers-Sigler, Bloomsburg, Pa. (8E)

Board of Pensions

Pr. Lawrence W. Wick, Woodstock, Ill. (5B)
Ms. Jane C. Von Seggern, Atlanta, Ga. (9D)
Ms. Nancy J. Haberstick, Lincoln, Neb. (4A)
Ms. Sarah C. Murphy, Dayton, Ohio (6F)
Mr. Jon Christianson, St. Paul, Minn. (3H)

Nominating Committee

Ms. Cheryl L. Hollich, Blue Springs, Mo. (4B)
Ms. Margaret A. Messick, Zanesville, Ohio (6F)
Mr. Carlos Peña, Galveston, Texas (4F)

Committee on Discipline

Pr. Paula J. Gravelle, Altamont, N.Y. (7D)
Pr. David G. Gabel, Traverse City, Mich. (6B)
Pr. Dale R. Skogman, Marquette, Mich. (5G)

Pr. Obed E. Nelson, Anchorage, Alaska (1A)
Pr. Synde Manion, Woodland Hills, Calif. (2B)
Pr. Gary J. Woodruff, Southampton, Pa. (7F)
Pr. Vicki R. Hultine, Zumbrota, Minn. (3I)
Pr. Eugene W. Beutel, Camp Hill, Pa. (8D)
Ms Ivonne M. Valazquez, San Juan, Puerto Rico (9F)
Ms. Deborah S. Yandala, Westlake, Ohio (6E)
Ms. Faith A. Ashton, Durham, N.C. (9B)
Mr. D. Mark Klever, Dayton, Iowa (5E)
Mr. Mark S. Helmke, San Antonio, Texas (4E)
Mr. Ralph B. K. Peterson, Escanaba, Mich. (5G)

Committee on Appeals

Pr. James E. Sudbrock, Mount Vernon, N.Y. (7C)
Pr. Reuben T. Swanson, Omaha, Neb. (4A)
Ms. Mary Alice Bjork, Salem, Ore. (1E)
Mr. Daniel W. Joy, Jamaica, N.Y. (7C)

Presentation of Church Window

Bishop Anderson offered special thanks to the artist, Mr. Dennis Roberts of IHS Studios in Fredericksburg, Texas, who designed the faceted glass window that assembly participants assembled. Bishop Anderson reminded the assembly that a window has been assembled at each churchwide assembly to symbolize the support of the entire Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for new missions. He told us that later on this day the window would begin the journey to its new home.

Bishop Anderson asked the assembly to welcome to the platform members of Chinese Lutheran Church, Honolulu, Hawaii, the congregation where the window would find its permanent home: The Rev. Simon W. S. Lee and Mr. Tin Po Lai, a student at Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota. He also asked the following persons to join him on the podium: the Rev. Richard A. Magnus, executive director of the Division for Outreach; Bishop Murray D. Finck of the Pacifica Synod; the Rev. Fred E. N. Rajan, director of the Commission for Multicultural Ministries; the Rev. Pongsak Limthongviratn, director for Asian ministries and multicultural mission strategy in the Commission for Multicultural Ministries; the Rev. Arnold O. Pierson, vice president for marketing of the Mission Investment Fund; Ms. Marlys A. Waldo, director for Mission Partners and outreach services in the Division for Outreach; Mr. Dennis Roberts, who designed, created, and donated the window, and his wife, Linda; and Mr. Dean Hiner, who built the frame for the window, and his wife, Jean.

Bishop Anderson talked about the partnership of congregation, synod, and the churchwide organization that is responsible for planting new congregations. This exciting and effective partnership is undergirded by the prayers and gifts of all members of our church, he said. He announced that since the beginning of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 284 new congregations and ministries have been planted.

Bishop Anderson then gave a brief history of Chinese Lutheran Church, established in 1974. It serves first-generation Chinese, Chinese exchange students, and visiting scholars.

The congregation averages more than 300 people on a typical Sunday. Bishop Anderson described the congregation's membership as comprised of a variety of Chinese ethnic communities: one-third from Taiwan, one-third from mainland China; and one-third from Hong Kong, Macau, or South East Asia. He noted that the congregation had recently begun additional English-speaking services for spouses and second- and third-generation Chinese.

Bishop Anderson said that evangelism is important to Chinese Lutheran Church. Fifty to sixty people are baptized there every year. In 1998, 40 of the 54 baptized were adults. The congregation also encourages young people to consider full-time church vocations, with impressive results. Seven members have completed theological training and are now serving in various congregations. Another six members, including Mr. Tin Po Lai, are currently attending seminaries.

Because real estate is so expensive, Bishop Anderson explained, Chinese Lutheran Church has been leasing space from other churches for over 20 years. They have purchased, however, a large lot close to Chinatown in Honolulu and will break ground this fall. The first facility will be completed, and this window put in place, by the fall of 2000, he stated.

Bishop Anderson then presented the window to Chinese Lutheran Church on behalf of this assembly, the Division for Outreach, the Commission for Multicultural Ministries, and the Pacifica Synod. He then invited Pastor Lee to address the assembly.

Pastor Lee greeted the assembly with "a warm 'Aloha' from the Pacific islands!" He spoke of the privilege and honor of receiving this gift, and offered his thanks on behalf of his congregation. "In spite of the different colors of our skins, the barriers between different languages, and the geographic distance, you reach out your helping hands to the middle of the Pacific Ocean to a remote ethnic congregation," he said. "Your support is deeply appreciated."

Bishop Anderson concluded the presentation by thanking Chinese Lutheran congregation for its ministry.

Bishop Robert A. Rimbo [Southeast Michigan Synod] moved that the assembly delay continuing as a quasi-committee of the whole until 2:00 P.M. during Plenary Session Ten. The motion was carried by a voice vote without discussion.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Voice Vote

CARRIED: **To proceed as a quasi-committee of the whole at 2:00 P.M. during Plenary Session Ten.**

Greetings: Lutheran World Federation

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section III, pages 70.1-70.4.

Bishop Anderson reminded the assembly that it had heard about the many connections this church has with Lutherans around the world through the Lutheran World Federation (LWF) and that it had also heard briefly from the general secretary of the Lutheran World Federation, the Rev. Ishmael Noko, during debate on the ecumenical proposals. Bishop Anderson invited to the podium General Secretary Noko and the Rev. Arthur Lechnitz, director for the Lutheran World Federation regional office in North America.

General Secretary Noko said that he brings greetings on behalf of the 58 million people in 128 churches and 69 countries who are the Lutheran World Federation. He thanked this

church for its partnership with LWF through the Division for Global Mission, the World Hunger Appeal, and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service. He affirmed the current appointment of approximately 300 students from Lutheran colleges and universities studying abroad. He thanked Bishop Anderson for his role as vice president of LWF and the three additional members of the LWF council from this church: the Rev. Emmanuel F. Y. Grantson, the Rev. Susan E. Nagle, and Ms. Dianha Ortega.

Bishop Anderson thanked General Secretary Noko and said that he hopes that this church can begin to make a “mental leap to think of ourselves as a global church.”

Celebration and Recommitment: 25th Anniversary of the ELCA World Hunger Appeal and Program

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 55-57.

BACKGROUND

In 1974, in the midst the famine in the African Sahel, and the harsh realities of urban unrest and a rural crisis at home, The American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America launched their world hunger appeals, joining The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod in this effort. Continuing what had become a long-standing tradition, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at its 1987 Constituting Convention established the ELCA’s World Hunger Appeal [ELCA87.01.24]:

WHEREAS, the proposed ELCA Constitution (16.41.A87.j.) Assigns responsibility to the [Division] for Church in Society in the program of this church to combat world hunger; and

WHEREAS, the uniting churches have been engaged in world hunger appeals since the mid-1970s; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to assure continuity of the World Hunger Program since worldwide hunger needs and their underlying causes still exist; now, therefore, it is hereby

RESOLVED, that the following proposal be adopted by the Constituting Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America:

Because the Holy Spirit calls us to share in God’s continuing care for all people and the entire creation;

Because God asks us to love our neighbors as Christ loves us;

Because God places us in a global neighborhood, with neighbors near and far who suffer hunger and oppression; and

Because God has given our uniting churches a positive experience with generous responses from our members to the world hunger reality, particularly through our special appeals since the mid-1970s; therefore,

- a. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America establishes a World Hunger Program with these objectives:
 - 1) to provide relief and development assistance for those who suffer from hunger and injustices related to hunger in this and other countries;
 - 2) to foster the education of the members of this church to understand and confront the reality and underlying causes of hunger;
 - 3) to advocate policies and actions for social and economic justice relating to hunger—with governments, business institutions, and structures of this church and its related agencies;
 - 4) to encourage members to practice responsible stewardship of their lives and their financial resources toward the prevention and alleviation of hunger; and
 - 5) to facilitate listening to and working together with those who have special awareness of the realities of food and hunger, including poor and hungry people in local and global communities, and those who produce, process, and distribute food.
- b. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in order to sustain its World Hunger Program, establishes a continuing hunger appeal. It directs that funds be expended in the range of 25-30 percent within the territorial jurisdiction of this church and 70-75% in other parts of the world.
- c. The three uniting churches shall begin immediately to combine their hunger programs.

The ELCA World Hunger Program and Appeal took deep root in our congregations and has become an important channel for the generosity of our members. The World Hunger Appeal now raises \$12 million annually. Since 1974, gifts have totaled more than \$200 million.

This 25th anniversary of the World Hunger Appeal presented an opportunity to give thanks: to God, for the abundance of this land and for our ability to share with others; to women's and men's groups, youth, pastors, rostered lay leaders, and faithful members who have heard God's call to service and justice; to those who serve on our behalf in places we cannot all be—our partners, Lutheran World Relief and the Lutheran World Federation, ELCA missionaries, Lutheran social service agencies, and community organizations, among others.

The year 1999 also was characterized as an opportunity for the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as a whole and each member of every ELCA congregation to renew our commitment to support generously this church's work to combat hunger at home and throughout the world. In the 25th anniversary year, each congregation was encouraged to continue—and to intensify—its traditional offerings and hunger-focused special events. In addition, each congregation was invited to join with others across this church in a special 25-day period this fall—November 1 (All Saints Day) to November 25 (Thanksgiving)—for prayers, services of recommitment, activities, and offerings in celebration of the 25th anniversary of our World Hunger Appeal.

At its March 1999 meeting, the Conference of Bishops voted to encourage the Church Council to affirm the plans for a 25th anniversary celebration of the World Hunger Program as a special accent in this church during 1999, and called on congregations and individuals to support this effort (CB99.03.02). The bishops also affirmed a goal of raising \$25 million in honor of the 25th anniversary of the ELCA World Hunger Program, twice the amount currently raised.

Responding to possibilities relating to the 25th anniversary and beyond, the boards of the Divisions for Congregational Ministries, Church in Society, and Global Mission, at their fall 1998 meetings, recommended that the Church Council take action related to this anniversary. In response, the Church Council, at its November 1998 meeting, voted:

To acknowledge that 1999 will be the 25th anniversary of the ELCA World Hunger Appeal and Program;

To encourage in this 25th anniversary year activities that will help this church achieve the “the intentional strengthening of our church's commitment to a comprehensive response to world hunger and its causes through the ELCA World Hunger Program” that was envisioned by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly [CA97.6.50];

To call on individuals and congregations, as well as synods and the churchwide organization, to use the occasion of this 25th anniversary of the World Hunger Program:

! to increase their awareness of hunger in this country and throughout the world, and

! to increase their financial support of the World Hunger Program through regular contributions and designated gifts [CA97.06.50]....

At their winter 1999 meetings, the boards of the Divisions for Congregational Ministry, Church in Society, and Global Mission considered the following resolution of thanksgiving and recommitment to the ELCA World Hunger Appeal, and recommended its transmittal to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

The Church Council, at its April 1999 meeting, discussed the renewal of commitment to the World Hunger Appeal, affirmed the visionary goal outlined by the Conference of Bishops, and voted to recommend the following action to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly for adoption. At that same meeting, the Church Council joined the Cabinet of Executives and the Conference of Bishops in pledging a leadership goal, for the special 25th anniversary celebration, of \$25,000 from each group.

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE
CHURCH COUNCIL**

That the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, on this 25th anniversary of the World Hunger Appeal of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA):

(1) Give thanks for the breath of the Spirit that stirred up the Lutheran churches a quarter century ago,

(a) opening eyes to the reality of human need,

(b) moving hearts to compassion and commitment,

(c) inspiring minds to imagine life in human community not as it is, but as God wills it to be, and

(d) engaging wills to work tirelessly to alleviate hunger and poverty at home and throughout the world;

(2) Remember with thanksgiving the actions constituting the World Hunger Appeal taken by our predecessor bodies and by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at its Constituting Convention:

Because the Holy Spirit calls us to share in God's continuing care for all people and for the entire creation;

Because God asks us to love our neighbors as Christ loves us;

Because God places us in a global neighborhood, with neighbors near and far who suffer hunger and oppression...

Therefore, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America establishes a World Hunger Program (Constituting Convention, 1987);

(3) Give thanks for those who have been part of this church's World Hunger Appeal over the past quarter century:

(a) for the men and women of vision and action who shaped the World Hunger Appeals of our predecessor church bodies and those who helped our church grow in both understanding and commitment to this cause;

(b) for pastors, associates in ministry, deaconesses, diaconal ministers, and lay leaders who today "hear the cries of the poor" and inspire others to act through direct service and through financial gifts to the World Hunger Appeal;

(c) for the individuals and congregations who work in their communities to combat hunger and poverty and give generously and regularly to the ELCA World Hunger Appeal;

(d) for the faithful partnership of Women of the ELCA, Lutheran Men in Mission, and the Lutheran Youth Organization in our church's World Hunger Appeal through prayer, study, advocacy, and generous contributions of money, time, and material goods; and

(e) for the enrichment of our church's life that has resulted from this active partnership with the poor at home and throughout the world.

(4) Express deep appreciation to those who, over the past 25 years, have utilized wisely and effectively the funds raised by the ELCA's World Hunger Appeal, especially:

(a) Lutheran World Relief, the historic partner through which the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod work with the U.S. government and partner agencies in cooperative relief and development projects;

(b) Lutheran World Federation, through which the ELCA joins in a coordinated international effort with other Lutheran churches throughout the world to serve in crisis situations and in long-term, sustainable development work;

(c) ELCA missionaries who, as an integral part of their ministry, witness to God's grace through their service and advocacy on behalf of persons living in extreme poverty;

(d) ecumenical partners and others of good will with whom this church works in its ministry of service and justice at home and throughout the world; and

(e) those serving in ELCA congregations, in synods, and in the churchwide organization, in church-based community organizations, and in Lutheran agencies and institutions in this country and the Caribbean who "walk with," serve, and advocate for persons living in poverty in this country and the Caribbean.

That the 1999 Churchwide Assembly, responding to God's call to feed the hungry and seek justice in God's world:

(1) Express this church's commitment to continue "walking with the poor" through its World Hunger Appeal, supporting both relief work in emergency situations and efforts to achieve sustainable development at home and throughout the world;

(2) Take up the challenge of doubling the annual income raised through the World Hunger Appeal within the next five years for the sake of people in great need;

(3) Call upon each congregation of the ELCA to participate in this appeal and to invite members to contribute ongoing and planned gifts and to include the World Hunger Appeal in their wills;

(4) Call upon each active or retired pastor, associate in ministry, deaconess, and diaconal minister, and lay leader of this church to advocate ever more strongly for this appeal—and for the people it serves—in their place of ministry;

(5) Call upon each synod to develop a plan for increasing support for the World Hunger Appeal among the congregations of the synod and to share regularly their ideas and plans with synod assemblies, other synods, and with their churchwide partners in this ministry;

(6) Call upon this church's social service agencies to continue and intensify their work with and among persons living in poverty;

(7) Call upon the churchwide organization, in consultation with synods, to develop an integrated strategy for increasing financial support for this vital ministry of service and justice and to report this strategy to the next churchwide assembly;

(8) Call upon the colleges, universities, seminaries, schools, camps, and congregations of this church to develop new ways of inviting young people to grow in their understanding of and commitment to the ministries supported by the World Hunger Appeal; and

(9) Encourage the youth of this church to consider vocations that contribute to the alleviation of hunger and poverty in God's world and to take up the challenge of providing leadership to this church's World Hunger Appeal in the coming decades.

That the 1999 Churchwide Assembly encourage all congregations and members to begin this process of recommitment with special prayers, services of thanksgiving, and “third-mile” giving this fall to mark the 25th anniversary year of the World Hunger Appeal.

Bishop Anderson reported that the World Hunger Appeal was celebrating its 25th anniversary in 1999, and expressed his excitement about the ongoing observances. “Over the past quarter century, it has become the primary way for the church as a whole to respond to hunger and poverty at home and throughout the world, much as the way you do day in and day out in your local communities.” He then invited Ms. Lita Brusick Johnson, director for the World Hunger and Disaster Appeals, Ms. Kathryn Wolford, president of Lutheran World Relief (LWR), and the Rev. Ronald B. Warren, bishop of the Southeastern Synod, to bring their report.

Ms. Brusick Johnson said, “One of God’s greatest gifts is holy imagination—imagination that is born of our faith in a loving and a gracious God. The World Hunger Appeal is an expression of the holy imagination of those who created it 25 years ago, and those today who can imagine a world without chronic hunger. Holy imagination inspires generous giving and partnerships with people living in poverty. Holy imagination inspires our work with others of good will to strengthen what is life-giving in our society, in our economy, and to change the systems and structures that trap people in a deadly cycle of poverty and hunger. Through the World Hunger Appeal, we walk with those who are hungry for the length of the journey not when it is convenient or when the road is easy; we fight hunger and poverty at its bud and its stem and its root, using all the tools at our disposal through relief, sustainable development, education and advocacy, always seeking to understand the relationship between our abundance and the scarcity of others.

“Gifts to the World Hunger Appeal are not second-mile giving, they are the way our church walks in partnership with our worldwide Lutheran family, the Lutheran World Federation, to respond to disasters and to break the cycle of poverty and hunger. They are the way we support Lutheran World Relief through which we partner with The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, and so it is now my privilege to ask Kathryn Wolford, president of LWR, to share a glimpse of our work in relief and development.”

Ms. Wolford brought greetings on behalf of the board of directors and staff of Lutheran World Relief, saying, “Together with you, we join in celebration and thanksgiving for the 25th anniversary of the ELCA World Hunger Appeal. Through your generous support to the Hunger Appeal, LWR is present with help and hope when disaster strikes, when people are forced to flee their homes because of conflict and warfare, and in the forgotten corners of our globe, where people struggle daily for bread, for justice and dignity. Almost one year ago, we saw terrible scenes of destruction in Central America, caused by the pounding rains of Hurricane Mitch. At that moment, you provided food and medicine and tents and other emergency aid, but even more important, you are still there today in Christ’s name. You are working together with church organizations to rebuild homes, establish health clinics, and help farmers replant their lost crops.

“More recently, it is the suffering in Kosovo, in neighboring Serbia and Albania, which grips our hearts and our minds. Lives have been shattered by violence and atrocities that go beyond our imagination. Working with international and local church partners, you were there on all sides of the conflict, regardless of creed or ethnic origin or national identity. And, of course, today in Turkey, where LWF [Lutheran World Federation] is already at work

with the Middle East Council of Churches, a long-standing partner, to reach out to those whose lives have been touched so dramatically by this earthquake. One of our staff, Gwen, and her Turkish husband happened to be in Istanbul at the time that the earthquake struck, and we give thanks to God that they are safe. But Gwen has confirmed that nation is absolutely gripped by trauma, caused by the disaster itself and the continued aftershocks which rock that nation.

“But thanks to your support for the Hunger Appeal, LWR is also present in the places that never see a CNN news crew. We work with people in the Philippines, for example. There farmers are increasing their production, at the same time reducing soil erosion and reforesting the hillsides. Mang, a community leader, says, ‘Before we lived from hand to mouth; today we support a health clinic in our village, we send our children to school, and thanks to you, we can share these skills with other communities so that they, too, can experience our joy.’ Thanks to you, not only boys, but now also young girls are in school in rural west Africa for the first time. Educated girls marry later, they have fewer and healthier children, and they share more fully in family and community decisions. Clementine, the dynamic director of a local partner that works with Christian and Muslim women, says, ‘Alone it is too difficult, but when we come together and bear one another’s burdens, the load becomes very light. So we thank you for that support.’

“Thanks to the faithful quilters across this country, LWR was able to send a half million quilts last year to places like Chechnya, the Sudan, and Sierra Leone. The Lutheran Church in Sierra Leone writes, ‘Words cannot adequately express our true gratitude to you for sending us this timely aid in the midst of our rainy season and our warfare. May God continue to bless you and all who have sent us these gifts of love.’

“Thanks to you, health workers in India are dramatically reducing malnutrition and raising immunization rates to 98 percent of children. They also provide loans for family businesses. Smiling with new-found confidence, the women recount their stories of personal growth and transformation. When I first went to that area, the women looked down, they were afraid to speak in public. Today, they’re being elected to positions of leadership in their communities.

“And finally, a special thanks to all you coffee drinkers who already participate in the LWR coffee project. Helping farmers in places Nicaragua and El Salvador, last year you purchased over 38,000 pounds of fairly traded coffee. It kind of gives new meaning to the idea of a ‘wired church.’

“So, in final closing, I would like to thank you. Thank you for your prayers, for your participation in LWR parish projects, and for your continued faithful and generous support to the ELCA World Hunger Appeal. May God continue to guide and bless your ministry in Lutheran World Relief so that together, we might indeed be a sign of hope for a new century. Thank you.”

Ms. Brusick Johnson then invited Bishop Warren to report on the difference Domestic World Hunger grants are making in the life of the Southeastern Synod.

Bishop Warren said, “Our synod is the third largest, geographically, of our church’s 65 synods, and is made up of the states of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi and Tennessee. The Southeastern Synod is a thriving, exciting, growing multicultural mission field.

“Domestic hunger grants have played a profound role in reaching the poor, the poorest of the poor, and people with other needs in rural, urban and suburban areas of our synod. One such ministry is ENRICH, coordinated by Lutheran Ministry of Alabama (LMA).

ENRICH is a summer day camp experience, six to seven weeks in duration, to reach children ages four through Grade 8, with Christian education, community building, crafts and other activities. ENRICH provides a safe place for youth and enriching meals. Ella Mae has just completed the fifth summer of this expanding ecumenical ministry, which this year included 12 sites, and more than 750 youth across the state of Alabama. ENRICH has received domestic hunger grant funds from its inception. In 1994, and because of its impact, ENRICH recently received a substantial grant from one of our fraternal life insurance companies.

“For a brief moment, go with me to a remote, isolated area of the deep South, in southeastern Alabama. The place: Wilcox County, one of the poorest counties in the country, approximately 30 miles from the nearest moderately sized town with a predominantly African American population. It was the first day of ENRICH in Wilcox County, and Lutheran Ministries of Alabama’s executive director, Norma Stagner, was about to greet a noisy, enthusiastic group of youth. In Wilcox County, Ella Mae was conducting ENRICH in cooperation with a Baptist church because there are no ELCA congregations in the area. As Norma was about to stand, a little four-year-old African American young man sat down next to her, and he was apparently intrigued by the fact that Norma is white. Apparently he was not accustomed to seeing white people. With an inquisitive and somewhat shy look on his face, he looked Norma over very carefully; their eyes met, and he asked in all seriousness, “If I touch you, will I turn white?” Norma smiled, took his hand in hers, and gently said, “No, you are a loved child of God as you are.” And as Norma told me that story, she said, “I made a friend in Christ that day.” Our living Lord Jesus says to us, “As you do it to the least of these, you do it to me.” And for more than a decade, through your contributions to the ELCA Hunger Appeal, lives have been transformed in the name of Jesus.

“Thanks to all of you, and for the Domestic Hunger Appeal team, for living the Great Commission with us in our multicultural mission field.”

Ms. Brusick Johnson continued, “In this 25th anniversary year of the World Hunger Appeal, we remember, we recommit, and we reclaim the gift of holy imagination that can envision possibilities like you just heard; imagination that can envision a world where chronic hunger is no more. In this anniversary year, we are thanking all of those who have brought this Appeal to life in the congregations, and we are encouraging congregations to engage in special anniversary activities this fall, especially between November 1 (All Saints Day) and November 25 (Thanksgiving Day). We hope this will be a celebratory springboard for renewed commitment and intentional planning in the new century, as described in the resolution you will have before you this afternoon.

“Our synod bishops have cast before our church the visionary goal of doubling our church’s giving to fight world hunger, moving from the current \$12.6 million to \$25 million each year. Calls for increased commitment and increased giving are easy to make, but turning a goal into a reality takes more than words; it takes strong leadership. So, last March, the bishops themselves agreed to give \$25,000 above and beyond what they and their families normally give. Then the ELCA Church Council and Cabinet of Executives each pledged an additional \$25,000. And now, what a delight it is to report that last week, the total of the bishops’ individual pledges far exceeded their goal, totaling almost \$33,000. Let us thank the bishops, council and cabinet! What marvelous leadership! What a challenge to our giving and to the giving of the whole church!

“This 25th anniversary provides congregations the opportunity to renew their commitment, to walk with hungry people until they are hungry no more—with serious intent, with prayer, and, we hope, with lighthearted 25th anniversary spirit. So, thank you for all you have done, and thank you for all you will do, and Happy Anniversary!”

Bishop Anderson expressed his thanks for the report, describing them as “wonderful partners for us in Lutheran World Relief, through the Lutheran World Federation.” He then invited the assembly to express its thanks for all those persons “who help us work so well.” The assembly responded with a standing ovation.

He then directed the assembly’s attention “to the future of world hunger and what we can do about it,” inviting them to turn to the resolution of recommitment. “What I would propose for us to do is not to take this as a usual kind of routine action, but if you would turn to [the resolution] so you can read it, I am going to suggest that we stand up and read it responsively, with Secretary Almen reading one of the challenges to us, we responding with another. And then, at the end, I will ask for a vote of approval for this Resolution of Recommitment.”

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Voice Vote

CA99.06.26 **That the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, on this 25th anniversary of the World Hunger Appeal of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA):**

(1) Give thanks for the breath of the Spirit that stirred up the Lutheran churches a quarter century ago,

(a) opening eyes to the reality of human need,

(b) moving hearts to compassion and commitment,

(c) inspiring minds to imagine life in human community not as it is, but as God wills it to be, and

(d) engaging wills to work tirelessly to alleviate hunger and poverty at home and throughout the world;

(2) Remember with thanksgiving the actions constituting the World Hunger Appeal taken by our predecessor bodies and by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at its Constituting Convention:

Because the Holy Spirit calls us to share in God’s continuing care for all people and for the entire creation;

Because God asks us to love our neighbors as Christ loves us;

Because God places us in a global neighborhood, with neighbors near and far who suffer hunger and oppression...

Therefore, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America establishes a World Hunger Program (Constituting Convention, 1987);

(3) Give thanks for those who have been part of this church's World Hunger Appeal over the past quarter century:

(a) for the men and women of vision and action who shaped the World Hunger Appeals of our predecessor church bodies and those who helped our church grow in both understanding and commitment to this cause;

(b) for pastors, associates in ministry, deaconesses, diaconal ministers, and lay leaders who today "hear the cries of the poor" and inspire others to act through direct service and through financial gifts to the World Hunger Appeal;

(c) for the individuals and congregations who work in their communities to combat hunger and poverty and give generously and regularly to the ELCA World Hunger Appeal;

(d) for the faithful partnership of Women of the ELCA, Lutheran Men in Mission, and the Lutheran Youth Organization in our church's World Hunger Appeal through prayer, study, advocacy, and generous contributions of money, time, and material goods; and

(e) for the enrichment of our church's life that has resulted from this active partnership with the poor at home and throughout the world.

(4) Express deep appreciation to those who, over the past 25 years, have utilized wisely and effectively the funds raised by the ELCA's World Hunger Appeal, especially:

(a) Lutheran World Relief, the historic partner through which the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod work with the U.S. government and partner agencies in cooperative relief and development projects;

(b) Lutheran World Federation, through which the ELCA joins in a coordinated international effort with other Lutheran churches throughout the world to serve in crisis situations and in long-term, sustainable development work;

(c) ELCA missionaries who, as an integral part of their ministry, witness to God's grace through their service and advocacy on behalf of persons living in extreme poverty;

(d) ecumenical partners and others of good will with whom this church works in its ministry of service and justice at home and throughout the world; and

(e) those serving in ELCA congregations, in synods, and in

the churchwide organization, in church-based community organizations, and in Lutheran agencies and institutions in this country and the Caribbean who “walk with,” serve, and advocate for persons living in poverty in this country and the Caribbean.

That the 1999 Churchwide Assembly, responding to God’s call to feed the hungry and seek justice in God’s world:

(1) Express this church’s commitment to continue “walking with the poor” through its World Hunger Appeal, supporting both relief work in emergency situations and efforts to achieve sustainable development at home and throughout the world;

(2) Take up the challenge of doubling the annual income raised through the World Hunger Appeal within the next five years for the sake of people in great need;

(3) Call upon each congregation of the ELCA to participate in this appeal and to invite members to contribute ongoing and planned gifts and to include the World Hunger Appeal in their wills;

(4) Call upon each active or retired pastor, associate in ministry, deaconess, and diaconal minister, and lay leader of this church to advocate ever more strongly for this appeal—and for the people it serves—in their place of ministry;

(5) Call upon each synod to develop a plan for increasing support for the World Hunger Appeal among the congregations of the synod and to share regularly their ideas and plans with synod assemblies, other synods, and with their churchwide partners in this ministry;

(6) Call upon this church’s social service agencies to continue and intensify their work with and among persons living in poverty;

(7) Call upon the churchwide organization, in consultation with synods, to develop an integrated strategy for increasing financial support for this vital ministry of service and justice and to report this strategy to the next churchwide assembly;

(8) Call upon the colleges, universities, seminaries, schools, camps, and congregations of this church to develop new ways of inviting young people to grow in their understanding of and commitment to the ministries supported by the World Hunger Appeal; and

(9) Encourage the youth of this church to consider vocations that contribute to the alleviation of hunger and poverty in God’s world and to take up the challenge of providing

leadership to this church's World Hunger Appeal in the coming decades.

That the 1999 Churchwide Assembly encourage all congregations and members to begin this process of recommitment with special prayers, services of thanksgiving, and "third-mile" giving this fall to mark the 25th anniversary year of the World Hunger Appeal.

Following the responsive reading of the resolution, Bishop Anderson instructed, "All in favor of that, please say 'We will.'" The assembly expressed its enthusiastic support. "It has passed!" Bishop Anderson responded. He then directed the assembly to the worship book to sing Hymn 57, "Seek Ye First." Following the singing of this hymn, Bishop Anderson explained that this day's lunch would be a simple meal of soup, bread, and something to drink—a meal that would be different from the usual assembly fare. He said that the assembly would eat this meal as a sign of solidarity with the millions of children, men, and women who are hungry. It would also eat this meal in the hope that the actions of this church, joined with those of others of good will, would bring an answer to the second verse of the common table prayer: *Blessed be God who is our bread; may all the world be clothed and fed.*

The Rev. Richard C. Little [North Carolina Synod] rose to a point of personal privilege. He said that Ms. Virginia G. Stackel, widow of the Rev. Robert W. Stackel, director of the Lutheran Church in America's World Hunger Appeal, is a voting member of the assembly from the North Carolina Synod. The assembly saluted her with a standing ovation.

Ms. Anjelita Avers [Northwestern Ohio Synod] rose to a point of personal privilege, reminding the assembly of the responsibility of its members to be responsive to each other.

Mr. Richard J. Sherrill [Delaware-Maryland Synod] rose to a point of personal privilege, and requested a common meal blessing before plenary session adjournment. Bishop Anderson responded that such a blessing was planned.

Ms. Louise P. Shoemaker [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod] called to the attention of the assembly the lack of the poor among those gathered for the assembly.

Recess

Bishop Anderson called upon Secretary Almen for announcements.

Secretary Almen humorously announced that, contrary to the newspaper article that day in the *Denver Post*, he is a legend only in his own mind; his wife Sally and his children remind him of that frequently.

He announced that news releases for this assembly are translated into Spanish, and that the Reference and Counsel Committee and the Memorials Committee will meet following the adjournment of this session.

Secretary Almen shared the good news that today is the 28th wedding anniversary of Bishop Ralph W. and Mrs. Terry Dunkin of the West Virginia-Western Maryland Synod.

Bishop Anderson called upon the Rev. Nadine F. Lehr, a member of the Church Council and of the board of Lutheran World Relief, to lead the assembly in a closing hymn and prayer. At 12:02 P.M., following worship, Bishop Anderson announced that the assembly would be in recess until 1:30 P.M.

Plenary Session Ten

Saturday, August 21, 1999

1:30 P.M.—5:00 P.M.

The Rev. H. George Anderson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, called Plenary Session Ten to order at 1:32 P.M. Mountain Daylight Time on Saturday, August 21, 1999. He noted that the intent of the lunch had been to provide a simple meal consistent with the emphasis on world hunger but that more had been provided by the caterer than had been requested. He said that the hunger bowls, distributed to each voting member, were intended to encourage the assembly to do more to answer God's call for "justice in our world." He said that voting members would need to find a means to share bowls in order to use them to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the World Hunger Appeal, as this church works "to end chronic malnutrition." He thanked the artists from Lutheran colleges and universities for the handmade bowls, and offered a prayer of dedication.

The ELCA Study of Ministry: Ministry in Daily Life

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section V, pages 7-9; continued in *Minutes*, Exhibit G, Part 2.

Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Joseph M. Wagner, executive director of the Division for Ministry; Mr. Nelvin Vos, chair of the board of the Division for Ministry; and Ms. Sally A. Simmel, director for daily life ministry. Mr. Vos indicated that the report on Ministry in Daily Life¹ was a progress report on "how well this church has affirmed the ministry of all the baptized." While much had been accomplished, he said, "there is more to be done." He suggested to the assembly that this topic represented "an unfinished Reformation," and urged congregations to see themselves as "faith communities" which send people to "their primary arena for ministry."

Introduction: Director for Rural Ministry Resources and Networking

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section V, pages 31-36; continued in *Minutes*, Exhibit I.

Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Richard A. Magnus, executive director of the Division for Outreach, and Ms. Sandra A. LaBlanc, director for rural ministry resources and networking,² who said that she had been serving in her new position for three months. She reported the stories of the struggle of many people who live and work in rural America. "There is a lot of hurt in rural America right now," she said. She told of her grandparents who emigrated from Sweden to the U.S. to practice their faith and to build a new life. That same spirit will help rural people to survive the current crisis, she asserted, pointing to the "indomitable spirit" of rural people. "We will survive," she said, through the power of the Holy Spirit.

¹ The full text of the "Study of Ministry—Ministry in Daily Life" has been included in these minutes for ease of reference as Exhibit G, Part 2.

² The full text of the report "Director for Rural Ministry Resources and Networking" has been included in these minutes for ease of reference as Exhibit I.

The ELCA Study of Ministry: A Review of its Effects Six Years Later

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section V, pages 11-14; continued in *Minutes*, Exhibit G, Part 1.

Bishop Anderson introduced the Rev. Joseph M. Wagner, executive director of the Division for Ministry, who noted that all studies carried out by this church are in danger of being filed in the “black hole of forgotten studies.” Before that happened to the “Study of Ministry—A Review of its Effects Six Years Later,”¹ he said, the assembly should take note of the practical effects this study has had on the life of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. He reported five areas of impact resulting from the report:

- 1) the ministry of the baptized has been “immeasurably strengthened” in the life of this church;
- 2) a new group of rostered leaders, diaconal ministers, has been created with 27 persons now serving in these ministries;
- 3) the ministry of bishops has been clarified as “an extension of pastoral ministry” in this church;
- 4) new categories of ministries have been created to provide flexibility in changing ministry environments as licensed lay ministers and non-stipendiary pastors serve congregations;
- 5) means have been found to enable ministers from ecumenical partner churches to serve in ELCA congregations.

Introduction: Director for the Fund for Leaders in Mission

Bishop Anderson called upon the Rev. Donald M. Hallberg, executive director of the ELCA Foundation, who introduced Ms. Cynthia Halverson, newly-appointed director for the Fund for Leaders in Mission. Ms. Halverson explained that the goal of this fund is to provide financial support for every synodically endorsed candidate preparing for future ordained or lay ministry in this church. She spoke about an acquaintance of her husband that had helped him to complete his seminary education, and how her husband, in turn, has been helping another candidate to finish seminary. The goal of the fund, she said, is to assist those who respond to the call to serve in this church to finish their education without a crushing burden of debt.

Recommitment to the ELCA World Hunger Appeal

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 55-57.

Bishop Anderson observed that, while the assembly during its morning plenary session had taken action on a resolution to recommit this church to addressing the issue of world hunger, enacting this commitment would require the efforts of all members and congregations.

¹ The full text of the “Study of Ministry—A Review of its Effects Six Years Later” has been included in these minutes for ease of reference as Exhibit G, Part 1.

Quasi-Committee of the Whole for General Discussion: Ordination of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 61-62; continued on *Minutes*, pages 409, 509, 537, and Exhibit D.

Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson explained that the plenary session would once again recess into a quasi-committee of the whole to continue its general discussion begun in Plenary Session Nine of the memorial related to the ordination of non-celibate gay and lesbian persons. This discussion, beginning at 2:00 p.m., concluded the final 15 minutes described in the implementing motion.

The Rev. James H. Hanson [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod] said, "I speak in favor of the original motion of the Memorials Committee. I think there are some distinctions that need to be made. What is legal is not necessarily moral. It is not a justice issue; it is an issue of morality. Scripture speaks very clearly on the whole matter of homosexuality. I think the time has come for us to decide if whether or not we are a church under Scripture or under accommodation to a culture that surrounds and feeds our minds with those views that are contrary to Holy Scripture."

The Rev. Scott W. Lingenfelter [Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod] said, "Sir, I would speak against the proposed action as I believe and am concerned that we are once again beginning to take action regarding our church's view toward homosexuality, about which there is a lack of fundamental consensus. We are being strongly encouraged to be welcoming congregations to gay and lesbian people. However, there remains the foundational issue yet to be resolved, which is the question of whether homosexual sexual activity is sinful in its very essence or if it is sinful unto itself. A key portion of congregations' ministry to homosexuals, as with all people, should be a call to repentance for the forgiveness of sins for them, including the sin of homosexual sexual activity, to proclaim God's forgiveness in love and to call them to go and sin no more. However, the church may determine that homosexual sexual activity in and of itself, but, rather, is situationally sinful; that is to say, homosexual sexual activity, like all sexual intimacy, is appropriate only within the fidelity of marriage. This seems to be the implication of "Vision and Expectations" and "Definitions and Guidelines," whereby ordination of non-celibate homosexuals is not possible, for sexual intimacy is only to be expressed within the fidelity of the marriage relationship. We are being called to welcome gay and lesbian people into our congregations. Should we be working to help curb control and cure sinful activity, or should we be formulating a method whereby they can enter into fidelity and committed relationships between two partners?"

The Rev. Thomas A. Lyberg [Northwestern Ohio Synod] said, "Reverend Chair, I would speak in favor of the motion from the Memorials Committee. I agree with the gentleman who just spoke. We are confusing the issue of homosexual orientation with that of homosexual behavior. The issue is not an issue of justice or political fairness, but, I think, one of spiritual discernment. As a member of the Ohio candidacy committee, we seek, as a committee, to discern with candidates whether a person has the gifts for ministry, as well as the ability to live by "Vision and Expectations." A sense of call simply is not enough. It is not a process of justice. It is a process of discernment. As a church, I think we need to discern whether there is sufficient evidence biblically to call homosexual behavior either a gift from God rather than the manifestation of the brokenness of creation and human sin, as has been the teaching of the church for two thousand years. It is not a process of justice, but, rather, a discernment process. Fundamentally, it is not a social justice issue, but an issue of spiritual discernment as to what we believe both biblically and confessionally. I urge approval of this

motion to begin a deliberate time of study and discernment on the issue of homosexual behavior within the life and teaching of the church.”

Ms. Sharon M. Ruff Richter [Lower Susquehanna Synod] said, “I rise to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the committee because I feel it is tragically lacking in courage, vision, and in hope for a new century. How can we rally under the banner of ‘Hope for a New Century’ while we continue to deny the hope of Christ’s ministry in this church to some of the most faithful among us? We deny it, God does not. In the animal kingdom, in God’s kingdom, alternate sexual behaviors and alternate sexual identities are common. They are common because God created them. Surely they are a blessing and they enrich us. Polygamy, which was mentioned earlier, is a historic and cultural choice. It was a common and accepted practice among the cultures of the Old and the New Testament. Homosexuality is not a cultural and a social choice; it is a biological fact, a gift from God, like all other biological gifts. That the people of the Bible did not accept homosexuality—if they did not—was a cultural decision, even as their acceptance of polygamy and our rejection of polygamy are cultural choice. When God gives us the gifts, we are called to accept it in humility, not to denounce it in our human arrogance. We maintain the myth that we expect the same thing from all unmarried clergy—celibacy—but it is a myth because for homosexual persons there is no consecrated option. Thus, we expect of them celibacy for life. We expect them to be priests, in the [Roman] Catholic tradition. It is not the same thing we ask of heterosexual clergy. We expect our homosexual clergy to deny the gift God has given them and if they do not, we pronounce them unfit them to serve in Christ’s church. How can we be so arrogant?”

The Rev Richard C. Little [North Carolina Synod] said, “I am very sympathetic to what Jay McDivitt was sharing because I have been in ministry with gays and lesbians for much of my 30 years of ministry. But I have come to realize that I need to support the recommendation of the Memorials Committee because we do need to spend more time reflecting and thinking about this whole issue, especially in relationship to defining the relationship between a gay couple or lesbian couple. Until we as a church define what the relationship is and what the limits are, and what the boundaries within such a relationship are, we will not be able to do ordination of gays and lesbians. So, I would encourage us, as the church, to think about how we can focus on—is there any place, is there any place within our church that we can publicly affirm a committed relationship so that we can then establish boundaries and guidelines within that relationship? As complex and painful as it is when a pastor divorces, and the pastor and the spouse and the congregation must go through the pain of the split of that relationship, how in the world do you deal with a gay or lesbian person in a committed relationship when their relationship with their partner becomes estranged? When you have no boundaries, you have no guidelines, you have no description of what that relationship is to look like in the nature of the church. Many gays and lesbians that I have spoken to have clearly defined for themselves what those boundaries are, but they differ from individual to individual, and I hope that we, the church, could find the time and the place to talk about what that may look like for us to accept those types of relationships.”

Mr. R. Guy Erwin [New England Synod], identifying himself as a teacher of the Confessions of the Lutheran Church as well as of Church History, said, “I have been very impressed at this assembly by the respect for Lutheran doctrine shown by our voting members and representatives. The internalization of the idea of the priesthood of all believers is very strong, that we are all equal before God, all sinners standing in need of grace, and all justified by our faith in the salvation offered us in Christ. We expressed this

self-understanding again and again in our documents in this church, and were reminded yesterday and today that we also welcome gay and lesbian persons into our congregations as full members with us in the Body of Christ, but we do not allow them to exercise ministries of rostered leadership in our church. We ask candidates for the ministry questions that are designed either to disqualify them or to force them to lie to the church and hope to serve. We probably have years of study and consensus–discussion before us before we reach some kind of firm consensus on issues of human sexuality. But in the meanwhile, and I can tell you this as a teacher of seminarians, there are very enormously gifted talented young people who, I believe, are being denied their role in our church, who are being told they cannot live faithful lives and exercise a call to God’s ministry. So I reject this document as it stands and speak in favor of the amendment that is to come.”

Bishop David C. Wold [Southwestern Washington Synod] said, “I rise to support the action of the Memorials Committee. As an advisory member of the board of the Division for Ministry, it has been a privilege of mine to sit in on some conversations that I think you have heard reported from there and other boards and commissions that I think are rich and exciting; they have pressed the limits of some of our imagination and our life backgrounds. But they have invited people of all kinds of persuasions into places that are safe and illuminating. I would not like to see that conversation curtailed or shut down by what would appear to be a preemptive strike if this assembly takes an action that suggests we already made some decision. Sometimes what looks to be prophetic has more political overtone and is not as pastoral as we would hope. We have created space in this church for people to express themselves in ways that are deep in their hearts, are part of their deepest conviction of faith and understanding, but we have also made it possible for the conversation to be broadened so that we can be challenged. I know that most of us think that when these conversations are held, it is just a way of forestalling the future. I think that we have begun a process which will not allow that to happen, and I urge this assembly to be patient, but also to be sensitive to the working of the Spirit here. I think the church trusts us and we are in a good position to do something right.”

The Rev. Darlene B. Muschett [Upstate New York Synod] said, “Good Bishop and Memorials Committee, I feel the urging of the Spirit in my head and heart to respectfully speak against the resolution. In 1 Corinthians 14:34 we read that women should be silent in church and if they have a question, to go home and ask their husbands. There have been many times that my parishioners and my husband have so wished that I would follow the literal interpretation of this Scripture. I understand that this church that we love and one of its predecessor church bodies, the LCA, rejected such literal interpretation of this passage when in 1970 we ordained the first woman to the ministry of Word and Sacrament. I further understand that our church has rejected this literal interpretation of this Scripture as we support and celebrate the countless laywomen who speak publicly in many leadership positions around the world, in positions of daily vocations, including congregational and churchwide agencies. Why, then, do we use such a literal inerrant model of Scripture to prevent qualified gay and lesbian candidates living in faithful monogamous relationships from serving in positions of ordained ministry? I truly believe that the loving, gracious and gentle spirit of Jesus Christ is moving us beyond the exclusiveness of literalism. I believe that Jesus’ spirit is moving this church beyond the literal word of Scripture which has often been quoted.” Bishop Anderson explained that the speaker’s time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

The Rev. Martha V. Sheaffer [Lower Susquehanna Synod] said, “I had raised a question at the end of the first 15-minute session regarding the meaning of ‘chaste’ as the writing

committee used it, as opposed to the meaning of 'celibate' [*Minutes* page 513]. Could there be an answer to that?" Bishop Anderson responded, "Yes. I was going to ask Dr. Wagner to make that at the end of this quasi-committee session. We have now reached that point, so we will hear from him."

The Rev. Joseph M. Wagner, executive director of the Division for Ministry, said, "I believe the context in which this question is asked is a part of the statement in "Vision and Expectations for Ordained Ministers," which reads: 'Single ordained ministers are expected to live a chaste life. Married ordained ministers are expected to live in fidelity to their spouses, giving expression to sexual intimacy within a marriage relationship that is mutual, chaste and faithful.' The word 'chastity' or 'celibacy' or 'celibate' does not appear in the statements of this church. But for the record, the dictionary definition of 'celibacy' is 'the condition of being unmarried, especially for reason of religious vows.' The word 'chaste' is defined as 'abstaining from unlawful sexual intercourse.' And here we are speaking of God's Law, not of civil law."

Resumption of Plenary Session Ten

Category 20: Ordination of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, page 61; continued on *Minutes*, pages 409, 534, and Exhibit D.

Bishop Anderson declared at 2:16 P.M. Mountain Daylight Time that the assembly had returned to plenary session, and explained that amendments and motions were once again in order in addition to making general comments upon the motion before the house.

The Rev William E. Saunders [Southern Ohio Synod] said, "I urge support of the recommendation as it comes before this assembly. It seems to me that the discussion that has gone on for the last 15 minutes in this session and prior to this shows how divided we are in our understanding. There are two points of issue here. One is, 'Is homosexuality to be looked at as a sinful act, or are we going to look at it as an expression of human sexuality, and, therefore, bring it to an issue of fidelity and monogamy within the confines and structures of what we have in the church?' If so, then certainly we have to engage in more Bible study, we need to open our Bibles, we need to engage in prayer, and we need to listen to the Holy Spirit, because at this point, we are clearly divided on these issues. The second point is a point of process. We have lifted up materials at this assembly that are going to allow us to go home and to raise these issues with our congregations, to talk to professors and to try to learn more as we pray and discern this process. And so, I certainly support the recommendation that we refer this for committee and bring this back at another assembly."

The Rev. Bruce H. Davidson [New Jersey Synod] moved to amend the recommendation.

Moved;

Seconded: To amend the recommendation of the Memorials Committee by deleting paragraph four and substituting the following:

4. To call on the Division for Ministry and the Conference of Bishops to consult together and with other churchwide units, agencies, and institutions in order to propose strategies which might allow for the ordination of non-celibate lesbian and gay persons. The Division for Ministry and the Conference of Bishops shall assure that the voices of

lesbian and gay people and those who oppose change in current policies are included in this consultation. Attention shall also be given to solid biblical study and the experience and understanding of ecumenical partners. Recommendations shall be presented at the Churchwide Assembly in 2003, with a progress report to the next churchwide assembly.

Pastor Davidson spoke in favor of his amendment, saying, "I applaud what was in the interunit report. Many good things were said and I think the report is accurate in saying that we are not yet in a position in our church where we can move forward with great unanimity. However, I am concerned in the Memorials report that the timeline for progress on resolving issues related to ordination seems to be more open-ended than I would like. Also, in the interunit report, the Division for Outreach made the same observation, saying that the Division for Outreach's concern with language contained in the document, which reads: 'We await a time of clearer understanding.... We believe that this church must lead in matters of the Great Commission and that God has already spoken that all people are equal in God's reign....' I would say that this motion attempts at least to give us some time to study while the church is in the process itself of discernment. I would ask that bishops and the Division for Ministry also work intentionally, discerning what might be possible for our church and those who are serving in its ministries, related to ordination of those who are in committed relationships. And I hope that this amendment might allow us to do that."

Bishop Anderson explained that discussion would now be limited to consideration of the motion to amend. He asked that the motion be displayed on the video monitors, and reviewed its intent.

Ms. Josie Brown [New England Synod] said, "I am for the recommendation that we had in the beginning. Being here, all of us, we acknowledge the love of God and love for the Bible. And we are called to love all people, not just some people, all people. When we are called to love all people, it is not God's intention to love the sin, but the sinner. We are responsible for our actions, and if you choose one or the other, if you are gay or lesbian, not by choice, but being born that way, you still have a choice. God made it possible for us all to have choices. We all sin, but we do not, or should not, flaunt our sins, love the individual, the sinner, not the sin. Like... [Jay McDivitt, *Minutes*, pages 512-512] said, he may fall in love with a male as well as a female. That is his choice. If he loves the church, and we are supposed to love this church, the decision is his. We did not make the decision. He decided between his love of the church and his way of life. And taking other matters, we did get a chance to decide. God always gave us a chance. We all sin, we all ask for forgiveness. But, we do not and should not accept sin. We have to be discerning, and we are not discerning. We know right from wrong, and good people who do not make the decision and who do not say, 'No, we will not accept it; let us talk about it and make a decision,' then we did wrong."

Bishop Anderson responded, "Thank you. Now, you said you were speaking for the original resolution, and I take it, then, you were against the amendment. We will have to be sure we are at the right microphones now. If you are for the amendment, you need to be at an odd-numbered microphones, talk to your friends. If you are at an even-numbered microphone, that means that you are opposed to the amendment. Microphone 6."

The Rev. Terri Stagner-Collier [Southeastern Synod] said, "Dear Reverend Chair, I oppose this amendment because it sets a timeline—chronological time—in which God will act.

I believe that God acts in *kairos* time in bringing discernment and understanding. There are very fundamental issues involved here, particularly of how we define marriage, how we define and understand homosexual union in relation to marriage. My basic struggle, and it is with a pastoral heart and a saddened heart, is that I do feel Scripture speaks in favor of heterosexual marriage and does not speak at all of homosexual marriage. So I am not proof-texting. I am not speaking of literal interpretation of Scripture. In fact, I am not strongly influenced by the Scripture passages which speak against homosexual acts. Instead, there is an overwhelming pattern within Scripture towards heterosexual marriage. I have had difficulty reconciling that understanding that is so clearly seen in Scripture with understanding how we can endorse or bless homosexual union in the same way as heterosexual marriage. I am very open to other understandings of these patterns. I certainly request this dialogue continue in a prayerful and careful manner, but I do feel that this amendment would stop dialogue and force us into a corner when we must make a step, perhaps before society makes the step, to understand homosexual union in the same way we understand heterosexual union, and I do not see that as the pattern within Scripture.”

The Rev. Charles R. Leonard [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod] said, “As one of the directors of contextual education around the church, I have the opportunity to visit a lot of congregations and to see a lot of our students from the beginning when they come into the seminary all the way to the end. And many times when I am looking in these congregations, I am seeing many, many gifts that these students bring as young pastors—people preparing for the ministry. And what I hear from the lay people, what I hear from the pastors, are very good things, and as I come, then, back to the seminary, I am very saddened as the students, they come forth and come to the dean in the last year of their seminary training to say, ‘Yes, I would like to go forward, but I cannot. I am homosexual.’ And that is very painful to us as a faculty, as one who has worked with these students to see that the gifts indeed are there. I think it is a loss to the church that these people are not able to utilize the gifts in service to the church. We use the word in—we use the word ‘fully’—that they have full membership, be embraced into full membership into the church, but we cannot be one until all of these people are allowed to have the same rights and privileges as others. That is why I have that understanding—that being one means they also have not only rights at the table, but right also to ordination. And on that basis, I address the assembly.”

Bishop Robert W. Mattheis [Sierra Pacific Synod] said, “Bishop Anderson, it was our synod that brought the original resolution in Category 20 to this assembly. And we have struggled with this as we have sought to be creative and faithful in our ministry with gay and lesbian people in the Sierra Pacific Synod. It has not been an easy conversation, but we have moved through it in what I believe is a salutary and helpful way. I want to support this resolution because I believe it gives us the freedom and flexibility we need as we seek to discern the leading of the Holy Spirit at this particular time in history. We are the first people to live at the edge of the second millennium and the third millennium. We are called to exercise discernment, and as the pastor from Upstate New York indicated earlier, we do that with a particular view of Holy Scripture, which is not literal, but which is faithful to the Word of God who is revealed to us in the Scriptures. And on the basis of that, I want to encourage this assembly to support that amendment, and to provide the flexibility and the accountability that this amendment provides for us. I thank you, and I urge your support for the amendment.”

The Rev. James E. Weist [Western North Dakota Synod] said, “I speak in opposition to the amendment. Let me tell you how the wording of this amendment will be heard, I believe,

by rural congregations in Western North Dakota. I believe it will be heard this way: the ELCA will ordain homosexuals; it is only a matter of time. I have to go back and explain 'Called to Common Mission' to a very skeptical congregation. Please do not make me try to explain this. I believe we will invite a firestorm from rural people if we take this action. Please vote 'no' to the amendment; vote 'yes' to the original wording."

Bishop E. Roy Riley [New Jersey Synod] said, "I am acknowledging the last speaker because I believe there is going to be difficulty in interpreting where we are at this point as a church. I want to support the amendment because as I understand it, it is not about calling us to be at a certain place in 2003, but it calls us to see if there is a process, a way in which we can go to a new place. If there is no way to get there, then we will never get there. And this is, as I understand it, part of the process—an intermediate kind of step—that would allow us to explore ways or avenues that we can most effectively continue this conversation and discussion. So I would be in favor of the amendment, but I want, too, to acknowledge the difficulty that presents for interpreting what that means for the whole church."

The Rev. Kurt S. Strause [Lower Susquehanna Synod] said, "Discernment by its very nature takes time, and I am not sure that a timeline can be attributed or imposed upon that very important process of discernment. I speak against the amendment simply to honor what is already in the interunit report. In the introduction, in the fourth point, drafted by that coordinating team, are these sentences, and I think they are very important: 'Fourth, there is no arbitrarily set timetable for concluding the discussion. We await a time of clearer understanding provided by the Lord of the Church and, in the meanwhile, pray for the Holy Spirit's guidance and work to the best of our ability. Those who wish the issues resolved quickly one way or the other should not interpret the absence of a "schedule" as foot dragging.' And I think by keeping the Memorials Committee's original recommendation in place honors this very important point drafted by the interunit team."

The Rev. Mark I. Wegener [Minneapolis Area Synod] said, "For some ten years I served as the pastor of a central city congregation that was known in the community as a gay-friendly congregation. Members of the lesbian community called the neighborhood in which our church was located 'Dyke Heights.' That tells you something of my biases with which I approach this particular subject. I am in favor of the amendment which allows us and encourages us to move with all deliberate speed on this matter because at the present time, our church body lives with the rather intolerable inconsistency in its practice. We cannot with a consistent Lutheran ethic do both things. We do not encourage our congregations to accept gay and lesbian people as full members of the parishes—no qualifications—and at the same time, deny those congregations the opportunity to call qualified gay and lesbian people as their pastors. Therefore, I would encourage the amendment that allows us to proceed as speedily as possible in order that we can avoid this intolerable inconsistency in our practice and give definition to our practice in the future."

The Rev. John H. P. Reumann [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod] said, "I speak in support of the recommendation of the Memorials Committee, and therewith express certain doubts about strategies that precipitously or gradually might move toward the goal of one group or another. I bring two particular concerns at least to it. In the discussion of nature versus nurture or needs, all too often norms are overlooked. The whole counsel of Scripture, as it was called in the Acts passage this morning, needs to be heard, wrestled with, and not bypassed by hermeneutical sleight of hands. I am willing to run the danger of taking Scripture not only seriously, but in points, sometimes, even literally: 'This is my body...,' Luther rather literally argued [in regard to Christ's presence in the Sacrament of Holy

Communion]. At issue in this whole matter is nothing less than the authority of Scripture. Secondly, the ecumenical dimension. It is not only Lutherans and Episcopalians and Baptists that wrestle with this, but all church groups. The Episcopal Church, I am told, has taken a stance that it should proceed only in concert with, or discussion with, other churches. This must mean Roman Catholics, conservative evangelicals, Pentecostals, and Black churches as well, lest we become simply a reflection of liberal Protestantism. Finally, I hold in my hand the document from the [United] Methodist Church, 'In Search of Unity,' where the struggle, the debate, the fight is at the point whether compatibilists and incompatibilists can stay in the same church. Strange term. The question is whether those who are conservative and liberal are compatible enough to remain within the United Methodist Church, or each needs to go its own way."

The Rev. Gloria H. Espeseth [Pacifica Synod] said, "I speak in favor of the amendment for two reasons. One is that the whole spectrum of voices is clearly indicated in the amendment so that both those who wish to uphold the tradition and those who desire to change are clearly included in the conversation. And then, secondly, while I have really enjoyed getting to understand the Orthodox in how they do their process of discernment, I heard once that they expected to speak for a hundred years before making a decision. I think we do not have that culture, and I think that our conversation will be more orderly and intentional and inclusive if there is a timeline given to it, as opposed to it being open-ended."

Ms. Regina D. Jemison [Southeast Michigan Synod] said, "It continues to amaze me how we blame our own opinions of morality and justice on God. When taken out of context, Scripture has been abused and used to justify many things. As an African American woman in the ELCA, I constantly struggle with this church—what this church means to me in my faith journey. I also understand that the Bible was used to justify the enslavement of my ancestors and continues to be used today to oppress my people. So today, it astounds me and grieves my heart that we, as the priesthood of all believers that we claim we are, that we would continue to exclude, oppress, and separate each other by ranking and category, that we would say to each other, 'we who are created God's people,' that we would say to each other that because persons are of a different sexual orientation or behavior, that they are not capable, that they are not called to preach the Gospel. Who are we to say that? In a process of discernment, in a process of prayer, yes, it would take a process of discernment, but we use God's Word, we use God's words for our own opinions, for our own justifications. Who the Son sets free is free indeed. We are all empowered by the Holy Spirit to spread the Gospel and the Good News as that priesthood of all believers. We are empowered to testify about what God has done for us and continues to do for us, but we stand here again, as the priesthood of all believers, claiming to be an inclusive church. For people that look like me as a woman, as an African American, we claim to be inclusive for people that are of different sexual orientations, but we still categorize and separate." Bishop Anderson explained that the speaker's time had elapsed, and invited the next speaker to begin.

Mr. Paul Mogged [East-Central Synod of Wisconsin]: I move the previous question on the amendment.

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes—825; No—124

CARRIED: To move the previous question.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes-414; No-559

DEFEATED: To amend the recommendation of the Memorials Committee by deleting paragraph four and substituting the following:

4. To call on the Division for Ministry and the Conference of Bishops to consult together and with other churchwide units, agencies, and institutions in order to propose strategies which might allow for the ordination of non-celibate lesbian and gay persons. The Division for Ministry and the Conference of Bishops shall assure that the voices of lesbian and gay people and those who oppose change in current policies are included in this consultation. Attention shall also be given to solid biblical study and the experience and understanding of ecumenical partners. Recommendations shall be presented at the Churchwide Assembly in 2003, with a progress report to the next churchwide assembly.

The Rev. Deborah L. Conrad [Indiana-Kentucky Synod] moved an amendment.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To delete paragraph five of the recommendation of the Memorials Committee and to add after paragraph six:

To suspend the enforcement of the following statements in the Church Council documents in regard to rostered leaders:

“Practicing homosexual persons are precluded from the ordained ministry of this church” (“Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline of Ordained Ministers,” paragraph b.4); and

“Ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships” (“Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,” Section III), as well as parallel provisions in companion documents relating to associates in ministry, diaconal ministers, and other rostered leaders; and

To stipulate that this suspension shall be carried out in conversation with the Conference of Bishops and the Division for Ministry and shall remain in effect until study is complete and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in a future Churchwide Assembly affirms an understanding regarding human sexuality and rostered leadership.

Pastor Conrad spoke in support of her amendment, saying, “I would like to draw our attention to a prayer that is found in *Lutheran Book of Worship*, a prayer that I find to bring peace and courage: ‘Lord, you have called us to ventures of which we cannot see the ending by paths as yet untrodden, through perils unknown, give us grace to go out in good courage, not knowing where we go, but only that your hand is leading us and your love supporting us, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen’”

Bishop Anderson asked Parliamentarian David J. Hardy to provide guidance as to whether or not the amendment was constitutional.

Mr. David Hardy explained, "The question as a matter of parliamentary law is very simple in statement: 'No motion can be considered by an assembly which is in violation with the Articles of Incorporation, the Constitution, the Bylaws, of the organization.' The question, as it arises under our documents at page 46 of Section IX, in case you are interested, two provisions appear there. Provision 12.21.d.: 'The Churchwide Assembly shall establish churchwide policy,' and the last sentence in provision 12.11.: 'The powers of the Churchwide Assembly are limited only by the provisions of the Articles of Incorporation, this constitution and bylaws, and the assembly's own resolutions.'

"What is problematic in this amendment is, first of all, the question of whether suspension is the equivalent of a change in policy, and, secondly, whether it would be appropriate for this assembly, in order, under our constitution, to effectuate this change of policy without the involvement of the Division for Ministry, Conference of Bishops, and Church Council, as provided in Chapter 7, and the Committee on Appeals, as provided in Chapter 20.

"In contrast, the previous motion that was considered and the amendment that was rejected did not rise to this constitutional issue since it clearly contemplated that only a process was beginning. The question, therefore, as I see it, is that on the one side, the status of this amendment is problematic at best, and at the other extreme, it is out of order. I have given you my advice, sir, and you will have to decide."

Bishop Anderson responded, "Thank you. I am going to rule that it is problematic at best, and let the assembly decide whether it wishes to vote it up or down. I will not rule it out of order, but it is very close.

"Now, we spent over an hour on this. I would suggest that by 3:00 P.M. we consider closing debate, but that will be up to you. Our next item will be the budget proposal.

"All right. We have heard pro and sort of con, so let us go now to Microphone 1."

Mr. Steve Troester [Sierra Pacific Synod] said, "I stand in support of this amendment, and I urge all voting members to prayerfully consider approval of this amendment. As a church, our stated policies decry all discrimination against many marginalized persons, including persons of homosexual orientation, and yet, seemingly, in the very next breath, we declare these particular brothers and sisters are unfit for ordained ministry if they choose to fully live out the sexual portion of their identity as whole beings created by God. In Christ's calling of apostles, Jesus seemed to choose persons who by their lifestyles and/or vocations, be they fishermen, tax collectors, etc., were seemingly, by the world's standards, unfit to pastor and minister as his disciples. But Christ knew and we, as Lutherans, hold that God's grace and mercy are adequately boundless to allow all people into the holy priesthood and acceptance. The current policy and questions seem to stand—seem to place some arbitrary limits on the power and depths of God's grace and love. As a church, we openly recognized, as did Martin Luther, the nurturing richness that many of our pastors experienced through loving, committed, sexual relationships with their spouses. And yet, we soundly deny the supportive and nurturing partner relationship to our fellow Christian brothers and sisters of homosexual orientation who may be equally called by the Spirit and would be accepted into the clergy of the ELCA. As individuals and as a church, perhaps we have still not learned to tolerate with Christ-like love and to accept those who express their God-given gifts in nature, including their sexual identity. Christ calls us to constant change and renewal."

Bishop Anderson indicated that the speaker's time had elapsed. He then acknowledged that the assembly had not seen the text of the proposed amendment, and read it slowly aloud.

Mr. David F. Hagen [Church Council member] said, "Exercising personal privilege, Mr. Chairman, I rise against the amendment. I have a friend, his name is DeQuan Kuntu. He is on our Church Council. He is a representative of the youth. This gentleman is possessed of gifts for ministry which are unassailable. He is lively, energetic. He is articulate. He is dynamic. He is Christian. Above all, he is even comedic and he dances and would probably be excellent as a pastor, and he is now in his senior year of college. Recently, he has realized that he is of a gay sexual orientation, and that knowing, he has already decided that his career needs to be interrupted. I think the need to save people for our ministry, such as DeQuan, and to count all the others that are out there that may, in fact, need to change their careers with the policies we have, I would say we need to have something much more intentional than was on the floor, but not as problematical as what is being proposed, and so I speak against it."

The Rev. Roger D. Quay [Southern Ohio Synod] moved the question of all the items before the house at this time.

Moved;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

Seconded;

Yes-741; No-235

Carried: To move the previous question on all matters before the assembly.

The Rev. Peter A. Pettit [Pacifica Synod] said, "I believe it would be helpful for the house to observe that, by moving to vote on this amendment, the chair has implicitly ruled that this amendment would not be out of order. Is that correct?" Bishop Anderson responded that this was correct.

The Rev. Jayne M. Thompson [Central States Synod] said, "Reverend Chair, I request a point of personal privilege and call upon DeQuan Kuntu to speak on his own behalf." Bishop Anderson said that the request was out of order since the assembly had voted to close debate on this motion.

An unidentified speaker asked, "If this is passed, does that mean that gays and lesbians would be ordained by suspending this? Is that correct?" Bishop Anderson asserted, "I think you will have to read it and make your own decision on that matter."

Mr. Marc S. Williams [La Crosse Area Synod] asked, "For clarification, I understand that we are dealing with a motion that has been ruled in order. Given that we are dealing with a borderline area of our ability to act, is there--will there be review, if this amendment is passed, as to whether or not we are really competent to perform this action?" Bishop Anderson said there would be such a review.

The Rev. William E. Saunders [Southern Ohio Synod] asked for a point of clarification. "As I understand it now, gays and lesbians may be ordained in the ELCA as long as they are chaste. Is that correct?" Bishop Anderson replied, "Celibate, I think, is the word." Mr. Saunders continued, "Celibate, thank you. But if the amendment is passed, then that would suggest that there would be absolutely no sexual accountability for..." Bishop Anderson interrupted to repeat that the assembly had voted to end debate, and that the speaker seemed to be exceeding asking a question.

Mr. Timothy L. Barr [Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod] said, “Knowing the deep impact that this amendment can have across the church on heterosexual and homosexual individuals, may I request a prayer before we vote?” Bishop Anderson said, “You may. We already had prayer requested before the final vote on this matter, but perhaps we can pray now since we are going through the whole process. The Lord be with you. [Response: And also with you.] Let us pray. O God, you give us many ways to discern your will. We ask you to give us a measure of your Spirit that in this time we may follow what you would have us do, through Christ, our Lord. Amen

“All right. We now proceed to vote. We are voting on the amendment. A positive vote will include it in the text and will delete paragraph five. All favoring the amendment, please vote ‘yes;’ all opposed vote ‘no.’ Vote now.”

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—267; No—716

DEFEATED: To delete paragraph five of the recommendation of the Memorials Committee and to add after paragraph six:

To suspend the enforcement of the following statements in the Church Council documents in regard to rostered leaders:

“Practicing homosexual persons are precluded from the ordained ministry of this church” (“Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline of Ordained Ministers,” paragraph b.4); and

“Ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships” (“Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,” Section III), as well as parallel provisions in companion documents relating to associates in ministry, diaconal ministers, and other rostered leaders; and

To stipulate that this suspension shall be carried out in conversation with the Conference of Bishops and the Division for Ministry and shall remain in effect until study is complete and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in a future Churchwide Assembly affirms an understanding regarding human sexuality and rostered leadership.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes—820; No—159

CA99.06.27 To receive with thanks the “Inter-unit Response to 1997 Synodical Memorials on the Ordination, Consecration, and Commissioning of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons” as an adequate response to the 1998 memorial of the Sierra Pacific Synod;

To acknowledge the deep level of anxiety and anguish felt by many members, whether heterosexual or homosexual, lay or rostered, male or female, young or old, as this church addresses this concern;

To continue discerning conversations about homosexuality and the inclusion of gay and lesbian persons in our common life and mission and to encourage churchwide units, synods, congregations, and members of this church to participate in thoughtful, deliberate, and prayerful conversations through use of such resources as “Talking about Homosexuality—A Guide for Congregations”;

To acknowledge that because there is no arbitrarily set timetable for concluding the discussion, we await a time of clearer understanding provided by the Lord of the Church and, in the meanwhile, pray for the Holy Spirit’s guidance and work to the best of our ability;

To decline to propose at this assembly a change in the standards for rostered ministry related to non-celibate gay or lesbian persons; but

To reaffirm 1991 and 1995 actions of the Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America that “gay and lesbian people, as individuals created by God, are welcome to participate fully in the life of the congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.”

Floor Debate: 2000-2001 Budget Proposal

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 65-105; continued on *Minutes*, page 150.

Bishop Anderson introduced Ms. Sandra G. Gustafson, a member of the Church Council, and the Rev. Robert N. Bacher, executive for administration, and invited debate on the 2000-2001 budget proposal. Ms. Gustafson explained that the budget proposal “reflects the best estimates, as of today” with flexibility to adjust if income exceeded expectations.

Bishop Anderson asked Secretary Almen to read the recommendation of the Church Council regarding the budget proposal.

MOVED;

SECONDED: ▶ *2000 Budget Proposal:*

To approve a 2000 fiscal year current operating fund income proposal of \$83, 490,000 including an Expanded Ministry Fund of \$160,000;

To approve a 2000 World Hunger income proposal of \$12,700,000; and

To authorize the Church Council to establish a spending authorization after review of 1999 revised income estimates.

▶ *2001 Budget Proposal:*

To approve a 2001 fiscal year current operating fund income proposal of \$84,845,000 including an Expanded Ministry Fund of \$160,000;

To approve a 2001 World Hunger income proposal of \$12,800,000; and
To authorize the Church Council to establish a spending authorization after review of 2000 revised income estimates.

Mr. John D. Litke [Metropolitan New York Synod] pointed out that by adjusting for inflation, ELCA [churchwide] income has declined by 30 percent over ten years. “No amount of financial acumen will save us,” he said, if real income continues to decline. He asked what the church’s plans were to deal with that reality. Ms. Gustafson responded that “the answer is more dollars.”

The Rev. Kevin S. Kanouse [Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod] noted an inconsistency in that the recommendation shows an income proposal of \$12.7 million for world hunger, while the stated anniversary goal is \$25 million. Ms. Gustafson said that the income proposal is intended to allow church officers to plan. If additional world hunger income materializes, she said, the Church Council has flexibility to use those funds.

Mr. Marc S. Williams [La Crosse Area Synod] said that he recalled that a prior assembly had made a commitment to double funding for world hunger over ten years.

Ms. Doris Dunsmore [Southeast Michigan Synod] asked about a newspaper article that suggested that the ELCA has a \$12 million surplus available. She asked whether the 1999 assembly would deal with that. Bishop Anderson responded that \$12 million has already been allocated.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-689; No-14

CA99.06.28

►2000 Budget Proposal:

To approve a 2000 fiscal year current operating fund income proposal of \$83, 490,000 including an Expanded Ministry Fund of \$160,000;

To approve a 2000 World Hunger income proposal of \$12,700,000; and

To authorize the Church Council to establish a spending authorization after review of 1999 revised income estimates.

►2001 Budget Proposal:

To approve a 2001 fiscal year current operating fund income proposal of \$84,845,000 including an Expanded Ministry Fund of \$160,000;

To approve a 2001 World Hunger income proposal of \$12,800,000; and

To authorize the Church Council to establish a spending authorization after review of 2000 revised income estimates.

Greetings: Lutheran Men in Mission

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section III, pages 7-18.

Bishop Anderson introduced Mr. Charles R. Schwartz, president of Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM), saying that LMM had just completed a “breathtaking” gathering in Breckenridge, Colorado. Mr. Schwartz noted that, according to the Rev. Lyle Schaller, in 1952 on an average weekend 47 percent of the adults in worship were men, the same percentage as in the population as a whole. In 1999, he said, that figure is now 33 percent. The focus of LMM is to help men build a relationship with Jesus Christ. He said that more than 600 men had attended the recent gathering, which he called the ELCA’s largest men’s gathering to date and “a turning point for men’s ministries in this church.” He introduced Mr. Malcolm Carroll who had served as emcee for the gathering. Mr. Carroll said that those in attendance were “greatly enriched and blessed.” Mr. Schwartz noted that LMM had recently invited the Women of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to provide an advisory member for the LMM board and that men at the Breckenridge gathering had pledged more than \$50,000 for the work of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Report of the Committee of Reference and Counsel (continued)

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section X, pages 6-7, 11; continued on *Minutes*, pages 284, 482, 628.

Bishop Anderson called upon Ms. Linda J. Brown, member of the Church Council and chair of the Committee of Reference and Counsel, to present the report of the committee.

Motion F: Proposed Study of the Ordination of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons

The following motion was submitted by the Rev. Bruce H. Davidson [New Jersey Synod]:

RESOLVED, that a full study be undertaken under the guidance of the Division for Ministry, the Department for Synodical Relations, and the Conference of Bishops to propose strategies that might allow for the ordination of non-celibate lesbian and gay people. This study shall be conducted in consultation with these divisions and commissions of the church which were involved in the inter-unit response, and with other churchwide units, institutions, or agencies which might offer information or guidance to the process. The study also shall include gay and lesbian persons, representatives of Lutherans Concerned, Lutheran Lesbian and Gay Ministries, the Network, and individuals who oppose change in the current policy. This study shall be completed with recommendations to the Churchwide Assembly in the year 2003, with a progress report being presented at the next Churchwide Assembly.

RESPONSE OF THE COMMITTEE OF REFERENCE AND COUNSEL

Ms. Brown explained that, in accordance with the assembly’s Rules of Organization and Procedure, Section 1, page 17, the request for study was referred by the Reference and Counsel Committee to the Department for Research and Evaluation, which concluded that it could not adequately evaluate the proposal prior to assembly adjournment. The rules provide that in such circumstances, the Church Council is designated to receive the evaluation at a later time and make appropriate determination as to whether or not to initiate a study.

Ms. Brown then introduced the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To receive this response of the Committee of Reference and Counsel to Motion F [as proposed by the Rev. Bruce H. Davidson] as information.

Bishop Anderson observed that the substance of the Pastor Davidson's resolution was essentially something that this assembly voted on earlier and voted down. He asked that the assembly take that into consideration as it voted, and said that if the recommendation was adopted, that it would be received as information. "The Church Council will also take your response into consideration when they consider the possibility of this study," he concluded.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-563; No-139

CA99.06.29 To receive this response of the Committee of Reference and Counsel to Motion F [as proposed by the Rev. Bruce H. Davidson] as information.

Motion G: Concern about Strip Mining

The following motion was submitted by Ms. Mary Lu Bowen [Upstate New York Synod]:

WHEREAS, coal and mineral mining corporations have removed entire mountain tops and filled valleys with un-reclaimed debris in the Appalachian areas of West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, and Ohio; and

WHEREAS, mountain-top removal/valley-fill strip mining wounds the physical, emotional, and spiritual well-being of people in nearby communities; and

WHEREAS, mountain-top removal/valley-fill strip mining harms the economic and social livelihood of Appalachian peoples; and

WHEREAS, mountain-top removal/valley-fill strip mining injures the environment and upsets the ecological balance by polluting streams and rivers, exacerbating soil erosion and displacing plant, animal, and human life; and

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has adopted a social statement, "Caring for Creation: Vision, Hope, and Justice"; and

WHEREAS, several ELCA synods within Appalachia have adopted resolutions condemning mountain-top removal/valley-fill strip mining; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, through its Division for Church in Society, convey its concerns about mountain-top removal/valley-fill strip mining, including a copy of this resolution, to the United States Department of Energy, the Environmental Protection Agency, and appropriate congressional committees; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Division for Church in Society encourage regions, synods, congregations, and members to contact national and state legislators and prompt them to enact legislation that

- promotes deep mining rather than strip mining;

- develops alternative energy resources that do not require cheap coal; and
- requires land reclamation that renews the environment and restores ecological balance; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Division for Church in Society provide regions, synods, and congregations with current progress reports and timely direction for needed action that serves further abatement of mountain-top removal/valley-fill strip mining.

Ms. Brown reported that the issue of mining practices is complex and requires thorough study beyond that which can occur in this assembly. Accordingly, the committee encouraged referral for possible study.

Ms. Brown introduced the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel:

MOVED;

SECONDED: To refer this resolution [Motion G as proposed by Ms. Mary Lu Bowen] to the Division for Church in Society.

Mr. Scott M. Dillon [Southern Ohio Synod] moved to amend the recommendation.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To amend the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel by adding “and ask that the division prepare a report to the Evangelical Lutheran Coalition for Ministry in Appalachia for its spring 2001 assembly.”

Ms. Mary Lu Bowen [Upstate New York Synod], author of the original motion, spoke in favor of the amendment, saying a report on the issue of “mountain-top removal and valley-fill strip mining” was of concern to many synods.

The Rev. Roger D. Quay [Southern Ohio Synod] said that the Division for Church in Society is a member of the Evangelical Lutheran Coalition for Ministry in Appalachia, and that the coalition would be aided by direction from the division.

The Rev. Charles S. Miller, executive director of the Division for Church in Society said that he doubted that the division could prepare “a thorough report” by that date.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes-523; No-274

CARRIED: To amend the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel by adding “and ask that the division prepare a report to the Evangelical Lutheran Coalition for Ministry in Appalachia for its spring 2001 assembly.”

The Rev. Paul K. Erbes [Rocky Mountain Synod] requested that the study be expanded to include regions such as the Powder River area of Wyoming.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-786; No-42

CA99.06.30 To refer this resolution [Motion G as proposed by Ms. Mary Lu Bowen] to the Division for Church in Society, and ask that the division prepare a report to the Evangelical Lutheran Coalition for Ministry in Appalachia for its spring 2001 assembly.

**Motion N: Support of Conference of Bishops' Decision
not to Convene in South Carolina**

The following motion was submitted by the Rev. Kris A. Zierke [La Crosse Area Synod]:

WHEREAS, the ELCA Conference of Bishops, in its meeting prior to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly, voted to change its spring 2000 gathering from Charleston, South Carolina, in response to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People boycott related to the presence of the confederate flag over the South Carolina capitol; and

WHEREAS, our own South Carolina Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has passed several resolutions requesting the removal of the confederate flag; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly affirm and support by a vote of confidence the action of the Conference of Bishops in moving their spring 2000 gathering.

Ms. Brown explained that the recommendation of the Committee of Reference and Counsel was to approve (vote yes) this resolution.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To affirm and support by a vote of confidence the action of the Conference of Bishops in moving their spring 2000 gathering.

Mr. Patrick L. Mansfield [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] moved to amend the motion.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To add after line 17 "and that a letter be sent to the South Carolina legislature by the presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America about the South Carolina Synod's concerns."

Bishop David A. Donges [South Carolina Synod] explained that three flags fly over the state capitol in South Carolina, the U.S. flag, the state flag, and the Confederate battle flag, and that the battle flag has only flown there since 1962. Describing the battle flag as "a symbol so offensive to so many," he said his synod has twice voted to ask the legislature to remove it.

Bishop Curtis H. Miller [Western Iowa Synod] offered what he described as a friendly amendment to replace “the South Carolina Synod’s concerns” with “the action of this assembly.” The suggestion was accepted by Bishop Anderson and Mr. Mansfield.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—821; No—32

CARRIED: **To add after line 17 “and that a letter be sent to the South Carolina legislature by the presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America about the action of this assembly.”**

The Rev. Kris A. Zierke [La Crosse Area Synod], author of the original motion, said that “the bishops made a courageous move” by moving their meeting and that assembly approval of this motion would “add our voices to this action.”

The Rev. R. Mark Swanson [Southwestern Minnesota Synod] said that a Scripture verse had occurred to him that seemed to apply to this situation particularly well: “Let your zeal be unflagging.”

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes—849; No—23

CA99.06.31 To affirm and support by a vote of confidence the action of the Conference of Bishops in moving their spring 2000 gathering and that a letter be sent to the South Carolina legislature by the presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America about the action of this assembly.

Bishop Anderson said that, as a 23-year resident of the state of South Carolina, “I will try to write in language that the legislature understands.”

Report: Young Adult Convocation

Bishop Anderson invited members of the Young Adult Convocation to come forward. He recognized the musical group of Ms. Jeni Ramseth, Mr. Jakob Fleming, Mr. Jonathan Hemphill, and Mr. Will Sappington. He called on Mr. Arthur Norman and Ms. Sara Aden to address the assembly. Following two musical selections, Mr. Norman and Ms. Aden described the work of the Young Adult Convocation, noting that young adults between the ages of 18 and 35 are often absent from church functions. They led the assembly in prayer.

Vice President Addie J. Butler described this young adult ministry as “another sign of hope” in this church. As she spoke, Mr. Jim Colver, by pre-arrangement, rode into the assembly on a bicycle. Ms. Butler explained that Mr. Colver was taking part in “Trek ’99” by riding his bicycle from Rhode Island to his home in San José, California, to raise money for Prison Congregations in America (PCA). She said that Mr. Colver had been inspired to

undertake this effort by attending the ELCA National Youth Gathering in New Orleans in 1997 where he learned about this prison ministry. Mr. Colver explained that PCA is working with prison officials to attempt to develop a congregation in every prison in the United States.

Bishop Anderson led the assembly in singing the hymn, "Soon and Very Soon."

Point of Personal Privilege

Ms. Annemarie Hartner [New Jersey Synod] asked for a point of personal privilege on behalf of herself and several other youth voting members and recommended that in the future the planning committee for the Churchwide Assembly consider having a one-day fast during the assembly to highlight world hunger concerns. Bishop Anderson asked that she submit her recommendation to the secretary's deputy to the right of the speaker's platform.

Report of the Memorials Committee (continued)

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 1, 46-48, and 55; continued on *Minutes*, pages 188, 274, 285, 492, .

Bishop Anderson called on Mr. Carlos Peña, co-chair of the Memorials Committee, to present additional recommendations from the committee.

Category 18a: Non-Rostered Clergy

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, page 55.

A. East-Central Synod of Wisconsin (5I) [1998 Memorial]

WHEREAS, *A Formula of Agreement* was approved at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and

WHEREAS, there are differences in how some of these denominations view the Holy Scripture as the Word of God and the creeds; and

WHEREAS, voting members to an ELCA assembly have long been restricted to actual members of ELCA congregations; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA Division for Ministry is considering a change in the requirements of voting members to an ELCA assembly to allow non-rostered clergy serving in ELCA parishes to be voting members; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the East-Central Synod of Wisconsin memorializes the ELCA to continue to limit voting members, eligibility to those who are members of ELCA congregations, and that these restrictions apply to non-rostered clergy serving in ELCA congregations.

B. East-Central Synod of Wisconsin (5I) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the *Formula of Agreement* was approved at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly; and

WHEREAS, agreements with the Episcopalian and Moravian churches are being considered at the 1999 Churchwide Assembly; and

WHEREAS, because of these documents, clergy ordained and rostered in these denominations may serve assignments or terms of employment in ELCA congregations without letters of call or choosing to be rostered in the ELCA; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA Division for Ministry is considering a change in the requirements of voting members to synod and ELCA Churchwide Assemblies to allow non-rostered clergy serving in ELCA parishes to be voting members, even though these clergy will not be members of an ELCA congregation; and

WHEREAS, voting rights in most organizations, religious or secular, are a privilege of their members; and

WHEREAS, voting members to an ELCA Churchwide Assembly have long been restricted to actual members of ELCA congregations; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that we of the East-Central Synod of Wisconsin memorialize the ELCA to continue to limit voting member eligibility at synod and Churchwide Assemblies to those who are members of ELCA congregations, and that these restrictions include non-rostered clergy serving in ELCA congregations; and be it further

RESOLVED, that for clergy not ordained in the ELCA to be considered for voting privileges, they must apply for and become rostered as an ELCA clergy and be a member of an ELCA congregation.

BACKGROUND

Churchwide bylaw 12.41.13. in the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America* requires, "Each voting member of the Churchwide Assembly shall be a voting member of a congregation of this church and shall cease to be a member of the assembly if no longer a voting member of a congregation of this church...."

There is no proposal to change this requirement related to the Churchwide Assembly. Nothing in the established or proposed agreements for relationships of full communion with other church bodies envisions such a change in regard to the voting members of the Churchwide Assembly. Voting members of the Churchwide Assembly must be voting members of ELCA congregations.

At the request of some synods, provision has been made for synods to grant, if a synod so decides, voting privileges in synodical assemblies to a pastor serving in an ELCA congregation who is an ordained minister from a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been established. As was provided in churchwide continuing resolution 8.72.D98. [renumbered churchwide bylaw 8.72.14.], "An ordained minister from a church body with which a relationship of full communion has been declared and established by a Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America may be granted the privilege of voice and vote in the Synod Assembly during the period of that ordained minister's service in a congregation of this church...."

Mr. Peña introduced the recommendation of the Memorials Committee regarding the memorial on non-rostered clergy.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To transmit this information as the response of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to the 1998 and 1999 memorials of the East-Central Synod of Wisconsin related to voting membership of the Churchwide Assembly.

Seeing no indication of discussion, Bishop Anderson instructed the voting members of the assembly to vote on the motion.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-776; No-42

CA99.06.32 To transmit this information as the response of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to the 1998 and 1999 memorials of the East-Central Synod of Wisconsin related to voting membership of the Churchwide Assembly.

Category 9: Abortion

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 46-48.

A. Southwestern Minnesota Synod (3F) [1998 Memorial]

WHEREAS, we are called upon as Christians to care for the least of these (Matthew 25:40); and

WHEREAS, life is a gift from God and we are challenged to “choose life” (Deuteronomy 30:19); and

WHEREAS, the Lord said to Jeremiah “Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you” (Jeremiah 1:5); and

WHEREAS, our bodies are not our own because we were bought with a price and we are now the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians. 6:19- 20); and

WHEREAS, abortion affects not only the woman but also the child in the womb, the father of that child, and all of society that loses an aborted child; and

WHEREAS, aborting imperfect babies could send a negative message to persons with special needs that they are burdensome and unwanted in our society; and

WHEREAS, assisting a woman with an unwanted pregnancy must involve counseling and spiritual help, providing information on adoption and parenting along with financial assistance; and

WHEREAS, God has commanded, “Thou shalt not kill,” (Exodus 20:13) the church has an opportunity and responsibility to clearly oppose abortion in its teaching; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the 1998 Southwestern Minnesota Synod Assembly memorialize the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly, meeting in Denver, Colorado, to amend the ELCA “Social Statement on Abortion” in two places as follows:

1. Amend the following paragraph from the ELCA Social Statement on Abortion, Part V, Section C, page 9, by adding the words in parentheses:

In the case of abortion, public policy has a double challenge. One is to be effective in protecting prenatal life. The other is to protect the dignity of women and their freedom to make responsible decisions in difficult situations (by providing counseling and spiritual guidance, information on adoption and parenting along with financial assistance). Pursuing those ends is particularly formidable because our society is so divided on this issue, and because women, people of color, and those of low income are so under-represented in legislative and judicial processes. In its advocacy regarding these issues, this church should exert every effort to see that the needs of those more directly affected, particularly the pregnant woman and the life in her womb, are seriously considered in the political process.

2. Delete the following paragraph from the ELCA Social Statement on Abortion (Part V, Section C, page 10):

The position of this church is that, in cases where the life of the mother is threatened, where pregnancy results from rape or incest, or where the embryo

or fetus has lethal abnormalities incompatible with life, abortion prior to viability should not be prohibited by law or by lack of public funding of abortions for low income women. On the other hand, this church supports legislation that prohibits abortions that are performed after the fetus is determined to be viable, except when the mother's life is threatened or when lethal abnormalities indicate the prospective newborn will die very soon.

and replace it with the following paragraph:

“The position of this church is that in cases where the life of the mother is threatened, or where pregnancy results from rape or incest, abortion could be considered as a last resort”;

and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Minnesota Synod memorialize the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to request that ELCA congregations encourage their members to organize and/or participate in a chapter of “Lutherans for Life” in their community, a non-profit national inter-Lutheran organization founded in 1978, “dedicated to upholding the dignity and worth of all human life—including the unborn”; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Minnesota Synod memorialize the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to request that ELCA congregations encourage their members to become active in organizations which assist women facing unplanned pregnancies such as Crisis Pregnancy Center, Birthline, or others which promote alternatives other than abortion.

BACKGROUND

The 1997 ELCA Churchwide Assembly approved “Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns.” The process for reconsideration of a social statement says:

Churchwide Assemblies may reconsider previously adopted social statements. Such reconsideration may involve either a revision or removal of the statement. This may be done in two ways:

1. A Churchwide Assembly, by a two-thirds vote, may call for the reconsideration of a social statement at the next assembly. Subsequent to such a vote, the social statement shall be referred to the Division for Church in Society for re-study. The proposed change and the reasons for it shall be made available to this church with an official notice of such proposed action to be sent to the synods by the secretary of this church at least one year prior to the Churchwide Assembly at which it will be considered. A two-thirds vote of the assembly shall be required to revise or remove the social statement.
2. The Church Council by a two-thirds vote of its voting members may ask the Churchwide Assembly to reconsider a social statement. Such Church Council action must be taken no later than at the Church Council meeting in the autumn prior to the assembly. The proposed change and the reasons for it shall then be made available to this church with an official notice of such proposed action to be sent to the synods by the secretary of this church at least four months prior to the Churchwide Assembly. A two-thirds vote of the assembly shall be required to reconsider the statement and also to revise or remove it. Both actions may occur at the same assembly.

The memorial from the Southwestern Minnesota Synod recommends specific amendments to the ELCA “Social Statement on Abortion,” which was approved by the 1991 ELCA Churchwide Assembly. According to the procedures outlined above, it is the responsibility of either the Churchwide Assembly or the ELCA Church Council to call for reconsideration of the social statement.

Development of the “Social Statement on Abortion”

Following extensive discussion on abortion at the 1989 Churchwide Assembly, the board of the Commission [the commission became the Division for Church in Society in 1991] for Church in Society assessed the differences in the statements of ELCA predecessor churches on abortion, and decided to develop an ELCA social teaching statement on abortion. The commission’s plan to bring a statement on abortion to the 1991 Churchwide Assembly was affirmed by the Church Council in November 1989.

A 14-member task force (plus staff and consultants) was appointed and met first in January 1990. By September 1990, a first draft, “Abortion: A Call to Deliberate,” was developed. The document was circulated throughout the ELCA for the purpose of facilitating deliberation among those with diverse perspectives on this issue and to stimulate feedback and input for the further development of the statement. Thirteen regionally based hearings were held, as well as some synodically-based conversations and hundreds of congregational discussions of the document. Thousands of ELCA members responded to the draft. Written responses were read by staff and considered by the task force. At the Church Council’s request, a much briefer document was prepared. The draft sought to clarify the positions proposed for assembly action and to continue the deliberative process.

The draft prepared by the committee was reviewed by the board of the Commission for Church in Society and forwarded to the Church Council. At its April 1991 meeting, the council commended the document, “Social Statement on Abortion,” to the 1991 Churchwide Assembly for adoption with a recommendation for an amendment. The amended document was approved by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly by a vote of 837 in favor and 14 opposed. Since the document was approved, there has been wide affirmation of this statement because of the way it honors the competing moral claims at stake in this often contentious issue.

***RATIONALE OF THE
MEMORIALS COMMITTEE***

The memorial from the Southwestern Minnesota Synod would essentially shift the balance in these moral claims, and thus significantly change the overall position and implications of the statement. (1) Adding the parenthetical phrase, “by providing counseling and spiritual guidance, information on adoption and parenting along with financial assistance” is redundant, because this is already emphasized elsewhere in the statement. Placing it here changes the intent of the sentence to which it is attached. (2) Deleting the paragraph in Part V, Section C, page 10 would omit the parameters for an ELCA position on this issue in the public arena, including opposition to abortions after viability. What is set forth in the original paragraph is consistent with the overall position developed throughout the statement. The proposed substitution ignores the moral guidance for what might be a morally responsible decision for abortion, as delineated earlier in the statement, and instead only observes that “abortion could be considered as a last resort.” Whereas the statement has earlier emphasized that “abortion ought to be an option only of last resort.”

The subsequent “resolved” sections of the memorial call for ELCA endorsement of organizations and programs identified with one side of the abortion issue but not the overall position as developed through the social statement. Although the statement affirms seeking alternatives to abortion, it also “recognizes that there can be sound reasons for ending a pregnancy through induced abortion.”

Mr. Peña introduced the recommendation of the Memorials Committee regarding the memorial on abortion.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To decline to propose amendments to the social statement of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America on abortion, based on the requirements for reconsideration of social statements detailed in “Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns”;

To encourage continuing moral deliberation throughout this church on abortion, and to decline to recommend involvement in specific organizations; and

To transmit this action as information to the Southwestern Minnesota Synod.

Bishop Anderson invited discussion of the recommendation of the Memorials Committee before the house.

Ms. Lisa Jennison [Southeastern Iowa Synod] moved to substitute the original motion from the Southwestern Minnesota Synod for the recommendation before the house.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To replace the recommendation of the Memorials Committee with the original memorial proposed by the Southwestern Minnesota Synod.

Bishop Anderson indicated that such a substitute motion would be in order, and informed voting members that if the substitute were to become the main motion before the house, it would require a two-thirds majority vote because that memorial proposed amending a social statement whose approval required a two-thirds majority vote when it was adopted in the 1991 assembly. After receiving a second, Bishop Anderson indicated that discussion of the recommendation from the committee would proceed first, and then discussion of the substitute motion would follow.

The Rev. G. Scott Cady [New England Synod] spoke in support of the recommendation from the committee, and opposed the motion to substitute. Working part-time as a chaplain at a local hospital, he reported that “it seems clear that in all matters of life and death, whether it means shutting off life-support machines, withholding life support from cruelly deformed infants, or terminating pregnancies, that these decisions are quite properly made between the families, the doctors and the clergy involved, and are not well-served by blanket prohibitions or blanket assumptions of the type that the substitution would offer us.” He

supported continuance of “our traditional stance” of asking people to prayerfully and thoughtfully deliberate, and then make wise choices; and then trust that those choices would be faithful.

The Rev. Harvey L. Nelson [Southwestern Minnesota Synod] reported that voting members from the synod that had adopted the substitute motion had discussed the matter and decided not to remove the memorial from the *en bloc* action, “because we recognize that our means of procedure was incorrect.” He stated that an action to amend a social statement should be subject to wide discussion throughout this church—wider discussion than is possible during a Churchwide Assembly. He also acknowledged that the original memorial was “mixing apples and oranges by talking about different organizations,” and indicated the intention to take the memorial back to the synod for refinement, and to bring it back through proper channels. Under these circumstances he spoke against the motion to substitute.

Ms. Janet Williams [La Crosse Area Synod] spoke in favor of the recommendation of the Memorials Committee and in opposition to the motion to substitute, referring especially to the second section of the memorial, which would delete a section of the “Social Statement on Abortion.” As both a volunteer and a professional genetic counselor, Ms. Williams said that one of the most difficult tasks that she must do is inform families of the event of a lethal abnormality in a pregnancy. “I walk with these families as they are informed of the presence a lethal abnormality, that their baby will die,” she said. Such couples are thrown from the heights of joy and expectation into the valley of fear and pain. “These are faith-filled people who agonize about the news and what to do in a situation in which there are only bad options. They ask about faith. They ask about their pastors. They ask about what their families and friends will say, and many find themselves very alone because they are afraid about what others will think. I have been very pleased to be able to use the ELCA social statement in communicating the support and understanding of our church. I urge you to support the ELCA social statement as it stands.”

Bishop Jon S. Enslin [South-Central Synod of Wisconsin] moved the previous question on all matters of the house.

Bishop Anderson, acknowledging that this motion normally is not debatable and moves immediately to a vote, asked if he might indulge the courtesy of the house for a minute, as he realized that he had neglected to allow the maker of the motion to substitute to speak. By unanimous consent, he then invited Ms. Jennison to speak to her motion.

Ms. Jennison thanked Bishop Anderson and the house. She then spoke in favor of substitution by saying, “I come before the assembly with a changed heart on abortion. Since the passage of *Roe vs. Wade* [by the U.S. Supreme Court], 30 million abortions have been performed, including thousands of partial-birth abortions, euphemistically called ‘late-term abortions.’ Along with this tragic loss—30 million saints—are newer findings of women and men experiencing post-abortion syndrome. This is a whole set of psychological symptoms, including depression, anxiety, and feelings of guilt that may last a lifetime.

“Bishop Anderson was right when he said that the world is watching us. Wednesday’s *Denver Post* brought up the fact that our assembly will be [debating] the issue of abortion and its stance on a woman’s right to choose. The woman’s right to choose: I question that [concept] by asking ‘What does that tell the world about our church and about caring for the least of these?’ Also, what does this tell the woman that I met at this assembly who blessed me, and then described her joy in receiving two precious children through adoption. She shared her thankfulness for the two women who chose life and the loving option of adoption placement.

“I just want to have our assembly revisit our church’s stance in light of increased education, newer research, and softened hearts on abortion. Abortion is not a choice, it is a child; choose life. Thank you.”

Bishop Anderson stated that the vote would proceed with the question of closing debate. The previous question was moved on all matters before the house, and that meant voting members would consider the question of substitution, and then move immediately to voting on whichever motion remained before the house.

MOVED; *Two-Thirds Vote Required*
SECONDED; *Yes-862; No-62*
CARRIED: **To move the previous question.**

MOVED;
SECONDED; *Yes-154; No-748*
DEFEATED: **To replace the recommendation of the Memorials Committee with the original memorial proposed by the Southwestern Minnesota Synod.**

ASSEMBLY

ACTION *Yes-846; No-78*

CA99.06.33 **To decline to propose amendments to the social statement of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America on abortion, based on the requirements for reconsideration of social statements detailed in “Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns”;**

To encourage continuing moral deliberation throughout this church on abortion, and to decline to recommend involvement in specific organizations; and

To transmit this action as information to the Southwestern Minnesota Synod.

***En Bloc* Action on Certain Memorials**

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages 1-65.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION *Yes-908; No-25*

CA99.06.34 **To approve *en bloc* the following responses to 1998 and 1999 synodical memorials printed in the Report of the Memorials Committee (*1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section VI, pages as listed):**

Category 1b: Bishops' Common Understanding of "Called to Common Mission"

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, page 18.

A. Northeastern Iowa Synod (5F) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Conference of Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America adopted at its March 8, 1999, gathering the following common understanding of the "Called to Common Mission" proposal for full communion:

- A. The Conference of Bishops understands that "Called to Common Mission" contains:
 1. no requirement that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America must eventually adopt the three-fold order of ministry. Rather, "Called to Common Mission" recognizes that the present understanding of one ordained ministry in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, including both pastors and bishops, may continue in effect;
 2. no requirement that ELCA bishops be elected to serve as synodical bishops for life. Rather, they will continue to be elected and installed for six-year terms, with eligibility for re-election, subject to term limits, where applicable;
 3. no defined role for the presiding bishop or synodical bishops after their tenure in office is completed;
 4. no requirement that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America establish the office of deacon, nor that they be ordained;
 5. no requirement that priests of The Episcopal Church will serve congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America without the congregation's consent;
 6. no requirement that the Ordinal (rules) of The Episcopal Church will apply to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;
 7. no commitment to additional constitutional amendments or liturgical revisions other than those presented to the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly (ELCA constitutional provisions 8.72.10-16.; 9.21.02.; 9.90.-9.91.02.; 10.31.a.9.; 10.81.01., and parallel provisions in synodical and congregational constitutions); and further
- B. The Conference of Bishops has the expectation that:
 1. ordinations of pastors will continue to be held at synodical worship services and in congregations, as is the present pattern;
 2. the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will continue to receive on to the roster of ordained ministers, without re-ordination, pastors from other traditions, some of whom will not have been ordained by a bishop in the historic episcopate;
 3. following the adoption of "Called to Common Mission," if someone who has been received on to the roster of ordained ministers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America who was not ordained into the pastoral office in the historic episcopate is elected bishop and installed, he or she will be understood to be a bishop in the historic episcopate;
 4. lay persons may continue to be licensed by the synodical bishop in unusual circumstances to administer the sacraments of baptism and holy communion as is the present practice of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;
 5. "Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline of Ordained Ministers" will apply to priests of The Episcopal Church and ordained ministers of the Reformed churches serving ELCA congregations [under ELCA bylaw 8.71.15.b., "...to live in a manner consistent with the ministerial policy of this church."];
 6. the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is not in any way changing its confessional stance that, "For the true unity of the church it is enough to agree concerning the teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments" (*Augsburg Confession*, Article VII);
 7. The Episcopal Church accepts fully, and without reservation, present Lutheran pastors and bishops who are not in the historic episcopal succession;
 8. priests of The Episcopal Church and ordained ministers of the Reformed churches will not be asked to subscribe personally to the Confession of Faith of the Lutheran Church as their personal faith. They will be expected to recognize the agreement in faith of the churches and to preach and teach in a manner consistent with the Lutheran Confessions;
 9. the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America receives the historic episcopal succession as a sign of and service to the continuity and unity of the Church and in no way as a guarantee of the faithful transmission of the faith;
 10. future decisions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America on matters of common concern will

be made in consultation with churches with whom a relationship of full communion has been declared, but these decisions will not require their concurrence or approval;

11. future Churchwide Assemblies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will be free to make whatever decisions they deem necessary after mutual consultation on matters related to full communion;
12. the joint commission [to which reference is made in "Called to Common Mission"] will have no authority over the appropriate decision-making bodies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America or The Episcopal Church; and
13. pastors of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will continue to preside at confirmations.

therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northeastern Iowa Synod in Assembly join with the Conference of Bishops in affirming their common understanding of the "Called to Common Mission" proposal for full communion which cannot be violated by the implementation of the proposal or by the joint commission which will be formed if the proposal is adopted; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Northeastern Iowa Synod in assembly memorialize the Churchwide Assembly to adopt this same understanding prior to consideration of the "Called to Common Mission" proposal for full communion.

BACKGROUND

During discussion of "Called to Common Mission" at the March 3-9, 1999, meeting of the Conference of Bishops, the Rev. Curtis H. Miller, bishop of the Western Iowa Synod, offered a resolution of understanding and expectation concerning "Called to Common Mission: A Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*."

The text of this resolution was first developed to inform the conversation related to "Called to Common Mission" at the 1999 Western Iowa Synod Assembly. Bishop Miller submitted the text to staff members in the Department for Ecumenical Affairs to confirm the accuracy of the statements made in the text. Similarly, consultation was conducted with staff members in the Office for Ecumenical Affairs of The Episcopal Church who likewise affirmed that the text presents an accurate reflection of the text of "Called to Common Mission." The Conference of Bishops voted (CB99.03.06), without audible dissent, to affirm the content of the text of this resolution.

In its continuing discussion of "Called to Common Mission," a subsequent action of the Church Council sought to insure that the action of the Conference of Bishops be acknowledged as an official and accurate interpretation of the document. The Church Council voted (CC99.04.41) to recommend that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly take the following action:

To add the following sentence at the end of paragraph three of "Called to Common Mission":

In adopting this document the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church specifically acknowledge and declare that it has been correctly interpreted by the resolution of the Conference of Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, adopted at Tucson, Arizona, March 8, 1999.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.35 To acknowledge the action of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly on the recommendation of the Church Council to amend "Called to Common Mission" by acknowledging the

action of the Conference of Bishops as a correct interpretation of “Called to Common Mission” as the response of this assembly to the memorial listed in Category 1b of the Report of the Memorials Committee to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

Category 1c: Bishops’ Relational Agreement

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, page 20.

A. Northeastern Iowa Synod (5F) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Conference of Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America adopted at its March 8, 1999, gathering the “Preamble to the Relational Agreement Among Synodical Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America” that reads:

The office of bishop has developed, been reformed and locally adapted for the sake of the Church over many centuries. As ministers of the Gospel and in keeping with Scriptural, confessional, and ELCA constitutional principles, we pledge to faithfully fulfill our responsibilities within the office of bishop. As this church and the world move into the twenty-first century and third millennium, our vision of the office is summarized in the following fourfold description:

The Office of the Bishop within the Office of Ministry

As a priesthood of believers, all baptized Christians are called to serve in the name of Christ. Some are also called and ordained for the ministry of Word and Sacrament, an office given by God for the sake of the Church. The ordained ministry of the Church, Lutherans agree, is “basically one ministry, centered in the proclamation of the Word of God and the administration of the Holy Sacraments. This ministry embraces both the ministry of pastor within and for a local community of believers and of bishop within and for a communion of local communities.” (*The Lutheran Understanding of Ministry*, LWF 1983) The ministry of bishops is understood as an expression of the pastoral ministry. Describing the office of the synodical bishop as the *synod’s pastor*, roots this ministry most deeply in its pastoral understanding.

The Office of the Bishop within the Life of the Church

“Each bishop shall give leadership for ordained and other ministries; shall give leadership to the mission of this church; shall give leadership in strengthening the unity of the church; and shall provide administrative oversight.” (ELCA Study of Ministry: *Together for Ministry*, 1993). In exercising this leadership, the bishop is to give attention to four tasks:

1. to preach and teach the apostolic faith of the Church;
2. to provide for Word and Sacrament Ministry within the territory of the bishop’s ministry, including the church’s power to ordain;
3. to oversee the work of the church’s mission within the territory of the bishop’s ministry;
4. to give witness to the unity of the Church.

This church’s understanding of the apostolic faith, and the Creeds and Confessions that give witness to it, are described in its constitutions under the chapter title “Confession of Faith.”

The Office of the Bishop within the Nature, Purpose, and Organization of this Church

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America understands itself to be one church in three expressions: congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization. Each expression is fully the church, but not, by itself, the whole church. These expressions work interdependently, rather than hierarchically. The ministry of bishops is to exemplify this understanding of interdependence. Bishops are accountable to the Gospel. Bishops are also accountable to those among whom they serve, to one another, and to this entire church. As individuals and as a conference, the bishops provide counsel to the church. In their public ministries, bishops draw attention to needs that must be addressed in church and society.

The Office of the Bishop within a Culture of Diversity and Change

In serving the Gospel, the ministry of the bishop serves the church. Because the church is called and gathered by the Holy Spirit in a wide variety of settings and circumstances, it is useful and even necessary for there to be a variety of gifts and styles of ministry exercised by those called to serve as bishops. Flexibility and adaptability according to the mission needs of the church, but always within the confessional and constitutional understandings of this church and the collegial agreements of the Conference of Bishops, are both honored and encouraged. Emphasis on the servant nature of this ministry provides the consistency of purpose within the diversity of practice.

We view these understandings to be normative for our life and work together as bishops. They represent our collegial intentions. They presume that neither ecumenical agreements, nor the participation of this church in conciliar movements or organizations with churches that hold differing views of episcopacy, alter these understandings in any essential way;

therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northeastern Iowa Synod in Assembly affirm the “Preamble to the Relational Agreement Among Synodical Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America” as the ELCA’s understanding of the office of ministry of the bishop that will not be altered by any agreement of full communion; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Northeastern Iowa Synod in Assembly memorialize the Churchwide Assembly to affirm “The Preamble to the Relational Agreement Among Synodical Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America” prior to consideration of the “Called to Common Mission” proposal for full communion.

BACKGROUND

The “Relational Agreement Among Synodical Bishops” is an internal document developed and adopted by Conference of Bishops. It provides guidance for bishops in their collegial relationships. The preamble offers commentary upon constitutionally defined responsibilities of bishops of this church.

Duties of the Churchwide Assembly, as defined in Chapter 12 of the ELCA constitution, do not include review of the work and internal policy documents of the Conference of Bishops. The Churchwide Assembly may amend constitutional, bylaw, or continuing resolution provisions regarding the Conference of Bishops and the offices of the presiding bishop and synodical bishops.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.36 To receive the memorial of the Northeastern Iowa Synod in regard to the “Relational Agreement Among Synodical Bishops” as information.

Category 1d: Lutheran-Moravian Relations

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 21.

A. Northwest Washington Synod (1B) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) seeks in its faith and life to manifest the unity given to the people of God by living together in the love of Christ and by joining with other Christians in prayer and action to express and preserve the unity which the Holy Spirit gives (ELCA Constitution 4.02.f); and

WHEREAS, on August 31, 1991, the Churchwide Assembly of the ELCA adopted the policy statement, "A Declaration of Ecumenical Commitment," which describes the goal of our ecumenism to be full communion with other Christian churches to manifest our oneness in Christ to the world; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA and the Southern and Northern Provinces of the Moravian Church recognize in each other the essentials of "the one holy, catholic and apostolic" faith in Jesus Christ as it is (1) affirmed in "Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion"; and

WHEREAS, in May 1998 the Synod of the Southern Province of the Moravian Church approved the full communion proposal with the ELCA, and the Northern Province took the same action in August 1998; and

WHEREAS, the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly in Denver will take action on a proposal to enter into full communion with the Southern and Northern Provinces of the Moravian Church, including:

4. a common confession and witness of the Christian faith;
5. a mutual recognition of baptism and a sharing of the Lord's Supper, allowing for joint worship and an exchangeability of members;
6. a mutual recognition and availability of ordained ministers to serve members of both churches, subject entirely to the disciplinary regulations of the respective church bodies;
7. a common commitment to mission, evangelism, and service;
8. a means of dialogue and discussion for common decision making on key common issues of faith and life; and
9. a mutual lifting of any condemnations that exist between churches; and

WHEREAS, this proposal for full communion is understood to be fully consistent with Article VII of the *Augsburg Confession* of the Lutheran Church, which says, "for the true unity of the church it is enough to agree concerning the teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments"; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northwest Washington Synod, in assembly, affirms its ecumenical commitment and prepares for the 1999 proposed action of full communion by encouraging congregations to:

1. Continue to study "A Declaration of Ecumenical Commitment" of the ELCA and "A Commentary on Ecumenism: the Vision of the ELCA" (Augsburg Publishing, 1990);
2. Continue to study the reports of the Lutheran-Moravian dialogue, including "Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion"; and
3. Continue to express our Christian unity as the people of God, through mission and service with neighboring non-Lutheran congregations; agencies or institutions, through ecumenical dialogue, worship and service, including with our fellow members of the body of Christ in the Moravian Church; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Northwest Washington Synod, in assembly, memorialize H. George Anderson, Presiding Bishop, and the ELCA Church Council of our support for the proposal to enhance the unity and mission of Christ's church as described in "Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion" and encourage the ELCA to maintain its schedule to consider this proposal at the 1999 Churchwide Assembly in Denver.

B. Central States Synod (4B) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, Jesus our Shepherd calls us to unity so that the world may believe; and

WHEREAS, Moravians and Lutherans share common theological traditions and commitments to mission; and

WHEREAS, in North America, Lutherans and Moravians have developed distinct church bodies while cooperating in serving our Lord; and

WHEREAS, "Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion," the report of the Lutheran-Moravian dialogue, affirmed that there are no church-dividing differences precluding full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America; and

WHEREAS, the Northern and Southern Provinces of the Moravian Church in America took the constitutional actions to ratify this agreement in 1998; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that we, the Central States Synod, pledge our support to “Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion,” the report of the Lutheran-Moravian dialogue; and be it further

RESOLVED, that we call upon the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to adopt it in response to our Lord’s Prayer “that they may all be one...that the world may believe” (John 17:21).

C. New England Synod (7B) [1999 Memorial]

RESOLVED, that the New England Synod memorialize the ELCA Churchwide Assembly in Denver to adopt the proposal called “Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion.”

D. Allegheny Synod (8C) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America through the members of the Lutheran-Moravian Bilateral Dialogue have recommended to their respective churches approval of our churches entering full communion with each other, as indicated in the recommendations of the report; and

WHEREAS, the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America voted (CC97.11.84): “To receive the request made by the Lutheran-Moravian Coordinating Committee that the resolution on full communion be considered in this form by the 1998 Synods of the Moravian Church and by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and to transmit the recommendation to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly for action”; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Allegheny Synod express its support for “A Resolution Concerning ‘Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion’” between the Moravian Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and urge its adoption by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

E. Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod (8G) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, Jesus our Shepherd calls us to unity so that the world may believe; and

WHEREAS, Moravians and Lutherans share common theological traditions and commitments to mission; and

WHEREAS, in North America Lutherans and Moravians have developed distinct church bodies while cooperating in serving our Lord; and

WHEREAS, both the Northern and Southern Provinces of the Moravian Church in America took the constitutional actions to ratify this agreement in 1998; and

WHEREAS, “Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion,” the report of the Lutheran-Moravian dialogue, affirmed that there are no church-dividing differences precluding full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church in America; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod in assembly express its support for the document “Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion,” the report of the Lutheran-Moravian dialogue; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the bishop of the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod transmit copies of this resolution to the Northern and Southern Provinces of the Moravian Church in America.

F. Southeastern Synod (9D) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, in his high priestly prayer recorded in John 17, our Lord Jesus Christ fervently prayed that all his followers should be one, even as he is one with the Father; and

WHEREAS, this model of oneness allows for unity of mind and purpose while still allowing for the individual uniqueness for both entities; and

WHEREAS, the purpose for such unity is visible witness so that the world might believe that Jesus Christ was sent by the Father; and

WHEREAS, the present divisions within Christianity are therefore an impediment and a scandal for our common purpose of witnessing to Christ; and

WHEREAS, relationships between Lutherans and Moravians predate the Reformation, with the Czech reformer Jan Hus, organizer of the *Unitas Fratrum*, serving as a forerunner and model for Martin Luther; and

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has been in formal dialogue with the Moravian Church in America since 1992; and

WHEREAS, the dialogue team has recommend our two churches enter into Full Communion with one another as outlined in the document "Following our Shepherd," and as consistent with the guiding ecumenical principles of the ELCA; and

WHEREAS, this agreement allows for unity while still respecting each church's unique tradition and heritage; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Southeastern Synod memorialize the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to adopt the recommendation for Full Communion with the Moravian Church in America as set forth in the document, "Following our Shepherd"; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the congregations of the Southeastern Synod be encouraged to study "Following our Shepherd" and seek to learn more about our brothers and sisters of the Moravian tradition.

G. Caribbean Synod (9F) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly in Denver will consider a proposal of full communion with the Moravian Church in North America; and

WHEREAS, the Lutherans and Moravians have a 300 year history of mutual support and interface in the mission of Christ in the Caribbean; and

WHEREAS, the Moravian Church in the Caribbean is a region not affected by the proposed agreement; and

WHEREAS, continuing dialogue between Lutherans and Moravians in the Caribbean should be encouraged; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Caribbean Synod heartily endorse the proposed agreement; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Department for Ecumenical Affairs approach the Moravians in the Caribbean, inviting them to ecumenical dialogue for the strengthening of a mission and ministry in the region.

BACKGROUND

"Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion" was the result of four years of dialogue between representatives of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Moravian Church. The report contained the recommendation of the Lutheran-Moravian Coordinating Committee that a relationship of full communion be established between the two church bodies. The "implementing resolution" that was considered and approved by the 1998 Moravian Synods was submitted for consideration by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

More detailed background information on the process that led to this proposal for full communion, as well as the "implementing resolution," was printed in the *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 11-15.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.37 To acknowledge the action of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly on “Following Our Shepherd to Full Communion” as the response of this assembly to the memorial of the Northwest Washington, Central States, New England, Allegheny, Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Southeastern, and Caribbean synods related to the proposal for the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to enter a relationship of full communion with the Moravian Church.

Category 1e: Lutheran-Jewish Relations

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, page 22.

A. New England Synod (7B) [1999 Memorial]

RESOLVED, that all congregations of the New England Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America be encouraged and urged to become acquainted with “Guidelines for Lutheran-Jewish Relations” adopted by the Church Council on November 16, 1998; and be it further

RESOLVED, that all congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America be encouraged and urged to implement the suggestions made in the guidelines for the establishment of relations between Lutheran and Jewish communities on the local level, wherever possible, or to utilize the guidelines to enhance relations between Lutheran and Jewish communities on the local level where such have already been established; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this New England Synod Assembly memorialize the Churchwide Assembly, meeting in Denver in August of 1999, to establish a special study committee or task force to address the question of the theological relation between Christianity and Judaism in order to offer guidance to pastors and congregations in this critical area of interfaith activity.

BACKGROUND

The ELCA Church Council adopted “Guidelines for Lutheran-Jewish Relations” in November 1998. The document was developed by the Consultative Panel on Lutheran-Jewish Relations of the Department for Ecumenical Affairs. The six-member Consultative Panel was responsible for developing the “Declaration to the Jewish Community,” which was adopted by the ELCA Church Council in April 1994, and the “Guidelines for Lutheran-Jewish Relations.” The guidelines were intended to replace a document of the same name issued in 1971 by the Lutheran Council in the USA by simply updating and re-issuing the earlier statement. It soon became clear, however, that the proposed revisions and additions were of such an extent as to make it a new document. A full draft was circulated for comment in April 1998 to ELCA college and seminary faculties, synodical bishops, the Lutheran Ecumenical Representatives Network (LERN), and persons on the department’s Lutheran-Jewish Concerns mailing list.

Thirty-eight responses were received, some of considerable length. The director for worship of the Division for Congregational Ministries, Pr. Paul R. Nelson, was consulted on worship-related aspects. Comments also were received from Jewish leaders with extensive experience in interfaith affairs, and from the Association of Lutherans of Arab and Middle Eastern Heritage (ALAMEH). Significant changes were made in the draft in response to these responses and comments.

The Consultative Panel on Lutheran-Jewish Relations continues its work developing statements on interfaith relations. Hence, we recommend that the memorial from the New England Synod be transmitted to the Consultative Panel for consideration as it continues its work.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.38 To refer the memorial of the New England Synod to the Consultative Panel on Lutheran-Jewish Relations as information.

Category 1f: Leuenberg Agreement

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 23.

A. Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod (8A) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has entered a relationship of full communion with the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the United Church of Christ, and the Reformed Church in America, by our mutual adoption of the *Formula of Agreement*; and

WHEREAS, the *Formula of Agreement* includes the principal of “mutual affirmation and admonition,” and authorizes further theological study as an ongoing task for all those churches who have adopted the *Formula*; and

WHEREAS, Lutheran, Reformed, and United Churches, principally in central Europe, have adopted the Leuenberg Concordat, thereby establishing altar and pulpit fellowship with one another; and

WHEREAS, there is a desire in many sectors of the church to deepen the theological agreements that have already been affirmed through the *Formula of Agreement*; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod memorialize the 1999 churchwide assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to authorize a churchwide study of the theological affirmations in the Leuenberg Agreement, specifically, Section II, “The Common Understanding of the Gospel,” and Section III, “Accord in Respect of the Doctrinal Condemnations of the Reformation Era”; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this study be carried out in partnership with the churches who have approved the *Formula of Agreement*; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this study engage as participants, congregations, judicatories, and theological seminaries of the churches, as may be determined by the Department for Ecumenical Affairs; and be it further

RESOLVED, that a report on the study be presented to the 2003 churchwide assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

BACKGROUND

The 1997 Churchwide Assembly voted to enter into a relationship of full communion with three members of the Reformed family of churches: the Reformed Church in America, the United Church of Christ, and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). The proposal for establishing such a relationship was contained in *A Formula of Agreement*, produced by the Lutheran-Reformed Coordinating Committee, which was appointed in 1992. After thorough discussion throughout this church of various areas of theological concern related to adoption of this proposal, the Lutheran-Reformed Coordinating Committee amended *A Formula of Agreement* to include an introduction in which 14 points of doctrinal consensus were listed in order to demonstrate more clearly that *A Formula of Agreement* “sets forth a fundamental theological consensus that is based on and presumes the theological agreements of earlier Lutheran-Reformed dialogues....” Among the agreements referred is the *Leuenberg Agreement* which resulted in a relationship of full communion between the Reformed and Lutheran Churches in Europe over 20 years ago.

Following the establishment of the full communion relationship between this church and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the Reformed Church in America, and the United Church of Christ, a Lutheran-Reformed Coordinating Committee was constituted for the purpose of assisting in the implementation of full communion. A Lutheran-Reformed theological conversation group has already begun its work.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.39 **To refer the memorial of the Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod on the *Leuenberg Agreement* to the Lutheran-Reformed Coordinating Committee for consideration and possible development of a recommendation to the churches.**

Category 2a: Peace–Nonviolence

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 24.

The 22 memorials in this category are based upon a single “model memorial.” Where a synod has adopted the “model memorial” without any changes, the words “Adopted the ‘model memorial’” replace the text. If a synod has modified the “model memorial” the changes are specifically noted. The “model memorial” for the “Peace–Nonviolence” category is as follows:

Model Memorial:

WHEREAS, Christ calls us to be peacemakers (Matthew 5:9) and the Church to be a reconciling presence for the world (2 Corinthians 5:18-19), breaking down the dividing walls of hostility among people (Ephesians 2:13-22); and

WHEREAS, violence takes many forms—on the street, at school, in family life, in the community in the media, and among nations—so that many children grow up in a “culture of violence”; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA social statement, “For Peace in God’s World,” eloquently reminds us that peacemaking and reconciliation are an important part of discipleship for both individuals and communities of faith, and explicitly calls for “education about nonviolence in our church and elsewhere” (page 20, adopted in 1995); and

WHEREAS, the “Initiatives for a New Century” calls on congregations to “turn inside-out in witness and service,” and urges that “we redouble our efforts to aid children, youth and young adults at risk from racism, hunger, violence and poverty, both at home and throughout the world”; and

WHEREAS, 20 Nobel Peace Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal “for the children of the world” calling for a Decade of Nonviolence (2001-2010) “to teach the practical meaning and benefits of nonviolence in our daily lives in order to reduce violence and...build a new culture of nonviolence”; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the _____ Synod,

1. Supports the Nobel Peace Prize Laureates’ appeal for a “Decade for a Culture of Nonviolence,” and a “Year of Education for Nonviolence” with special emphasis on children and youth;
2. Encourages congregations to make a priority to teach, practice, and model nonviolence—both for their own members and in service to their communities—making use of resources from Lutheran Peace Fellowship, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and other sources;
3. Memorializes the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to adopt this resolution; asks the Office of the Presiding Bishop to support its implementation; and requests that synods and churchwide units help provide the leadership and resources needed to carry out this much-needed “witness and service.”

[The “model memorial” uses a single “RESOLVED” statement followed by three numbered paragraphs that detail the main points of the memorial. Many of the memorials submitted by synods, however, present the main points of the memorial in separate “RESOLVED” statements. Either way is acceptable, but variations in the form of these memorials will not be noted below.]

A. Northwest Washington Synod (1B) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed on page 570, except that the third “WHEREAS” is separated into two “WHEREAS” clauses, so that it reads:

WHEREAS, the ELCA social statement, “For Peace in God’s World,” eloquently reminds us that peacemaking and reconciliation are an important part of discipleship for both individuals and communities of faith; and

WHEREAS, that same ELCA social statement explicitly calls for “education about nonviolence in our church and elsewhere” (“For Peace in God’s World,” 1995, page 20); and

The model’s fourth “WHEREAS” is deleted.

B. Pacifica Synod (2C) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 570, except that the second statement in the synod’s “RESOLVED” adds the following words: “Encourages congregations of the Pacifica Synod...”; and

The second statement in the synod's "RESOLVED" includes the Evangelical Lutheran Education Association in the list of resources to use.

C. Southwestern Minnesota Synod (3F) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that the synod's fifth "WHEREAS" deletes "calling for a Decade of Nonviolence (2001-2010)," and adds "calling upon everyone"; and

The memorial paraphrases the first two statements in the "RESOLVED" into one statement:

"RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Minnesota Synod endorses the Nobel Peace Prize Laureates' appeal for the children of the world by encouraging congregations to teach, practice, and model nonviolence among their own members and in their communities, making use of resources from Lutheran Peace Fellowship of Reconciliation, and other resources."

D. Minneapolis Area Synod (3G) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial," printed above on page 570.

E. Southeastern Iowa Synod (5D) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial," printed above on page 570.

F. Allegheny Synod (8C) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that the second statement of the synod's "RESOLVED" inserts the following: "in our speech and in our actions," so that it now reads:

2. Encourages congregations to make a priority to teach, practice, and model nonviolence—both in our speech and in our actions for their own members...

G. Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod (8G) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that this memorial adds the following as the concluding "WHEREAS" clause:

"WHEREAS, the Task Force on Crime and Violence Prevention of the Division for Church and Society of this synod has been constituted to assist congregations in crime and violence prevention, including providing speakers, collecting materials and planning events on these subjects, and can help in implementing congregational responses; therefore be it"; and

The "RESOLVED" was amended to read:

RESOLVED, that the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod, in assembly, commend the Nobel Peace Prize Laureates' call for a "Decade for a Culture of Nonviolence," and a "Year of Education for Nonviolence" with special emphasis on children and youth; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod, in assembly, memorializes the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to support the Nobel Peace Prize Laureates' appeal:

- that the first decade of the new millennium, the years 2000-2010 , be declared the “Decade for a Culture of Nonviolence”;
- that at the start of the decade the year 2000 be declared the “Year of Education for Nonviolence”;
- that nonviolence be taught at every level in our societies during this decade, to make the children of the world aware of the real, practical meaning and benefits of nonviolence in their daily lives, in order to reduce the violence and consequent suffering, perpetuated against them and humanity in general; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the secretary of this synod send a copy of this resolution to the Office of the Presiding Bishop asking him to request that synods and churchwide units help provide educational materials, training experiences and other forms of concrete assistance needed to carry out this much needed “witness and service” in our churches and in our communities; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Presiding Bishop be asked to urge the congress and the President of the United States to adopt the Nobel Peace Prize Laureates’ Appeal as national policy.

H. Southeastern Synod (9D) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 570, except this memorial reverses the first two “WHEREAS” clauses and the first two statements in the “RESOLVED”; and

The second statement of the synod’s “RESOLVED” adds the following words: “making use of resources from the synod, and the Division for Church in Society of the ELCA.”

I. Southwestern Washington Synod (1C) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed on page 570, except that the synod’s fifth “WHEREAS” deletes “20 Nobel Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal ‘for the children of the world’” and adds “the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1998, adopted the Nobel Laureates’ Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate...”; and

The first statement in the synod’s “RESOLVED” deletes “Year of Education for Nonviolence”; and

The following is added in the synod’s “RESOLVED” to become a new third statement: “Encourages congregations to urge schools, city councils, and legislatures to adopt the Nobel Peace Laureates’ Appeal as policy and to plan public education efforts and resources to implement it”; and

The third statement in the “RESOLVED” of the model has become the synod’s fourth statement.

J. Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod (1D) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 570, except that the synod’s fifth “WHEREAS” deletes “20 Nobel Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal ‘for the children of the world’” and adds “the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1998,

adopted the Nobel Laureates' Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate..."; and

The first statement in the synod's "RESOLVED" deletes "Year of Education for Nonviolence"; and

The following is added in the synod's "RESOLVED" to become a new third statement: "Encourages congregations to urge schools, city councils, and legislatures to adopt the Nobel Peace Laureates' Appeal as policy and to plan public education efforts and resources to implement it"; and

The third statement in the "RESOLVED" of the model has become the synod's fourth statement.

K. Oregon Synod (1E) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that the synod's fifth "WHEREAS" deletes "20 Nobel Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal 'for the children of the world'" and adds "the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1998, adopted the Nobel Laureates' Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate..."; and

The first statement in the synod's "RESOLVED" deletes "Year of Education for Nonviolence"; and

The following is added in the synod's "RESOLVED" to become a new third statement: "Encourages congregations to urge schools, city councils, and legislatures to adopt the Nobel Peace Laureates' Appeal as policy and to plan public education efforts and resources to implement it"; and

The third statement in the "RESOLVED" of the model has become the synod's fourth statement.

L. Southern California (West) Synod (2B) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that the synod's fifth "WHEREAS" begins with "the United Nations General Assembly has approved the Nobel Laureates' Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate 'for the children of the world' calling..."; and

The synod's third "RESOLVED" adds the following: "supports its implementation as a high priority, and requests...."

M. Grand Canyon Synod (2D) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that the synod's fifth "WHEREAS" deletes "20 Nobel Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal 'for the children of the world'" and adds "the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1998, adopted the Nobel Laureates' Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate..."; and

The first statement of the synod's "RESOLVED" deletes "Year of Education for Nonviolence"; and

The following is added in the synod's "RESOLVED" to become a new third statement: "Encourages congregations to urge schools, city councils, and legislatures to adopt the Nobel

Peace Laureates' Appeal as policy and to plan public education efforts and resources to implement it"; and

The third statement in the "RESOLVED" of the model has become the synod's fourth statement.

N. Central States Synod (4B) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that the synod's fifth "WHEREAS" deletes "20 Nobel Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal 'for the children of the world'" and adds "the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1998, adopted the Nobel Laureates' Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate..."; and

The first statement in the synod's "RESOLVED" deletes "Year of Education for Nonviolence"; and

The following is added in the synod's "RESOLVED" to become a new third statement: "Encourages congregations to urge schools, city councils, and legislatures to adopt the Nobel Peace Laureates' Appeal as policy and to plan public education efforts and resources to implement it"; and

The third statement in the "RESOLVED" of the model has become the synod's fourth statement.

O. Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod (4D) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that the synod's fifth "WHEREAS" deletes "20 Nobel Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal 'for the children of the world'" and adds "the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1998, adopted the Nobel Laureates' Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate..."; and

The first statement of the synod's "RESOLVED" deletes "Year of Education for Nonviolence"; and

The following is added in the synod's "RESOLVED" to become a new third statement: "Encourages congregations to urge schools, city councils, and legislatures to adopt the Nobel Peace Laureates' Appeal as policy and to plan public education efforts and resources to implement it"; and

The third statement in the "RESOLVED" of the model has become the synod's fourth statement.

P. Northeastern Iowa Synod (5F) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that the synod's fifth "WHEREAS" deletes "20 Nobel Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal 'for the children of the world'" and adds "the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1998, adopted the Nobel Laureates' Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate..."; and

The first statement of the synod's "RESOLVED" deletes "Year of Education for Nonviolence"; and

The following is added in the synod's "RESOLVED" to become a new third statement: "Encourages congregations to urge schools, city councils, and legislatures to adopt the Nobel Peace Laureates' Appeal as policy and to plan public education efforts and resources to implement it"; and

The third statement in the "RESOLVED" of the model is deleted and replaced by the synod's fourth statement in the "RESOLVED" which reads: "That the Northeastern Iowa Synod memorializes the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to make the necessary referrals to churchwide units in order to implement steps similar to those listed in the above resolved."

Q. East-Central Synod of Wisconsin (5I) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that the synod's fifth "WHEREAS" deletes "20 Nobel Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal 'for the children of the world'" and adds "the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1998, adopted the Nobel Laureates Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate..."; and

The first statement in the synod's "RESOLVED" deletes "Year of Education for Nonviolence"; and

The following is added in the synod's "RESOLVED" to become a new third statement: "Encourages congregations to urge schools, city councils, and legislatures to adopt the Nobel Peace Laureates' Appeal as policy and to plan public education efforts and resources to implement it"; and

The third statement in the "RESOLVED" of the model has become the synod's fourth statement.

R. South-Central Synod of Wisconsin (5K) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that the synod's fifth "WHEREAS" deletes "20 Nobel Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal 'for the children of the world'" and adds "the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1998, adopted the Nobel Laureates' Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate..."; and

The first statement of the synod's "RESOLVED" deletes "Year of Education for Nonviolence"; and

The following is added in the synod's "RESOLVED" to become a new third statement: "Encourages congregations to urge schools, city councils, and legislatures to adopt the Nobel Peace Laureates' Appeal as policy and to plan public education efforts and resources to implement it"; and

The third statement in the "RESOLVED" of the model has become the synod's fourth statement.

S. New Jersey Synod (7A) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial," printed above on page 570.

T. Upstate New York Synod (7D) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the "model memorial" printed above on page 570, except that the synod's fifth "WHEREAS" deletes "20 Nobel Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal 'for the children

of the world’” and adds “the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1998, adopted the Nobel Laureates’ Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate...”; and

The first statement in the synod’s “RESOLVED” deletes “Year of Education for Nonviolence”; and

The following is added in the synod’s “RESOLVED” to become a new third statement: “Encourages congregations to urge schools, city councils, and legislatures to adopt the Nobel Peace Laureates’ Appeal as policy and to plan public education efforts and resources to implement it”; and

The third statement in the “RESOLVED” of the model has become the synod’s fourth statement.

U. Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod (7F) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 570, except that the synod’s fifth “WHEREAS” deletes “20 Nobel Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal ‘for the children of the world’” and adds “the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1998, adopted the Nobel Laureates’ Appeal sponsored by every living Nobel Peace Laureate...”; and

The first statement in the synod’s “RESOLVED” adds the following: “Support the implementation of the Nobel...”; and

The first statement of the synod’s “RESOLVED” deletes “Year of Education for Nonviolence”; and

The following is added in the synod’s “RESOLVED” to become a new third statement: “Encourages congregations to urge schools, city councils, and legislatures to adopt the Nobel Peace Laureates’ Appeal as policy and to plan public education efforts and resources to implement it”; and

The third statement in the “RESOLVED” of the model has become the synod’s fourth statement.

V. North Carolina Synod (9B) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial,” printed above on page 570.

W. Eastern North Dakota Synod (3B) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 570.

X. Southeastern Minnesota Synod (3I) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 570.

Y. Greater Milwaukee Synod (5J) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 570.

Z. La Crosse Area Synod (5L) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 570, except that the synod’s fifth “WHEREAS” adds the following words: “Year of Education for Nonviolence (2000) and a [Decade . . .]”; and

The third statement of the “RESOLVED” deletes “help provide leadership and resources needed to carry out this much-needed ‘witness and service’” and adds “integrate this focus into the life and teachings of the ELCA.”

AA. Upper Susquehanna Synod (8E) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 570, except that the synod deletes the first “WHEREAS” of the model; and

The synod memorial deletes the first statement in the “RESOLVED” of the model; and

The first “RESOLVED” statement of the synod memorial now reads: “...that we encourage our congregations to make it a priority to teach, practice, and model nonviolent ways of conflict resolution making use of the resources of our ELCA Division for Church in Society, the Lutheran Peace Fellowship, and other sources”; and

The second “RESOLVED” of the synod memorial follows the final statement in the “RESOLVED” of the model with the following changes: the synod memorial deletes “...that synods and churchwide units help...” and adds “...our ELCA Division for Church and Society and our Division for Congregational Ministries to coordinate steps which would....”

BACKGROUND

At its meeting on October 14, 1998, the Executive Committee of the Church Council voted:

To transmit the Rocky Mountain Synod resolution concerning the Decade on Nonviolence to the Division for Church in Society; and

To request that the division provide a report to the April 1999 meeting of the Church Council on this matter.

Response from the Division for Church in Society

Ten synods passed resolutions supporting the Decade of Nonviolence during their 1998 Synod Assemblies. In addition to these ten synods, the Steering Committee of the Commission for Women and the board of the Division for Global Missions approved resolutions supporting the Decade of Nonviolence.

The Decade of Nonviolence results from an appeal by 23 Nobel Peace Laureates, including Nelson Mandela, the late Mother Theresa, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, and His Holiness the Dalai Lama, to the United Nations which called for the Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence. On November 10, 1998, the United Nations General Assembly unanimously voted to proclaim the first decade of the 21st century, “The Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World” (2001-2010). A year earlier, the General Assembly voted to proclaim the Year 2000 as the “Year of Education for Nonviolence” to kick-off the Decade for Nonviolence.

At present, non-governmental organizations worldwide are scrambling to make initial plans and to determine whether to sign on in support of the Decade. In January 1999, staff

of the Division for Church in Society convened two meetings of nine churchwide staff members and the executive director for the Lutheran Peace Fellowship to determine existing ELCA nonviolence resources and possible commitment to implement the synods' requests. The churchwide units and other ELCA structures present included the Division for Church in Society, the Division for Higher Education and Schools, the Division for Congregational Ministries, Commission for Women, Division for Global Mission, Women of the ELCA, and a representative from the Children's Initiative.

Prior to the first meeting held on January 13, 1999, the churchwide staff prepared a list of existing ELCA resources relating to nonviolence. The existing print and video ELCA resources relating to nonviolence are: two in the general category of peacemaking; 12 in the category of violence in the family; seven in the category of worship and Bible studies; eight in the category of international concerns; seven in the category of youth; two in the category of younger children; four social statements, including "For Peace in God's World" and a leader's guide; four in the category of overcoming violence and criminal justice; two in the category of conscientious objectors; and four in the category of miscellaneous. In addition, the Lutheran Peace Fellowship office has access to an additional 2,000 non-ELCA peace and justice resources.

As a result of the inter-unit discussions held at the two January 1999 meetings, the following churchwide units committed to provide a staff person to be present for future meetings regarding the Decade of Nonviolence: the Division for Church in Society, Division for Higher Education and Schools, Division for Congregational Ministries, Commission for Women, Division for Global Missions, and Women of the ELCA. The Lutheran Peace Fellowship also agreed to be present. Future Decade of Nonviolence meetings will include topics such as promotion of the Decade, coordination and promotion of existing ELCA nonviolence resources, advocacy internationally and domestically within current advocacy strategies, and communication with other existing ELCA structures including, the "Help the Children" Initiative, the Criminal Justice Working Group, Southern Africa Network, and the Middle East Working Group.

The Division for Church in Society recommends that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America become an active supporter of and participant in The Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World. The division believes that the recommendation in the resolution from the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod regarding advocacy by the Office of the Presiding Bishop is sound, and the division will support the Presiding Bishop in this effort. Further, the division recommends that the Presiding Bishop share this church's support for the Nobel Peace Prize Laureates' Appeal with the heads of other communions.

Response from the Division for Higher Education and Schools

The board of the Division for Higher Education and Schools passed the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Division for Higher Education and Schools of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America request the ELCA Church Council to adopt the following actions:

1. Support the Nobel Peace Prize Laureates' appeal for a "Decade for a Culture of Nonviolence," and a "Year of Education for Nonviolence" with special emphasis on children and youth;

2. Encourage congregations and schools to teach, practice, and model nonviolence—both for their own members and in service to their communities—making use of resources from Lutheran Peace Fellowship, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, Lutheran World Relief, and other sources.
3. Urge this church through the Bishop’s Initiatives Task Forces (particularly those focusing on leadership and safe havens for children) to allocate resources for the purchase of educational resources and training programs that will help youth, congregations and the related institutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to address the growing threats to the safety and peace of people everywhere (e.g., war, civil strife, school and community violence).
4. Encourage units of the church to work cooperatively in identifying strategic ways that adults and youth leadership might learn the elements of active nonviolent peacemaking and effectively serve and support victims of violence in their efforts to achieve wholeness, self-respect and peace.
5. Convey this action to the churchwide assembly.

Response from the Commission for Women

The Steering Committee of the Commission for Women passed the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Christ calls us to be peacemakers (Matthew 5:9) and the church to be a reconciling presence for the world (2 Corinthians 5:18-19), breaking down the dividing walls of hostility among people (Ephesians 2:13-22); and

WHEREAS, violence takes many forms—on the street, at school, in family life, in the community, in the media, and between nations—so that many children grow up in a “culture of violence”;

WHEREAS, the Bishop’s “Initiatives for a New Century” calls on congregations to “turn inside-out in witness and service,” and urges that “we redouble our efforts to aid children, youth and young adults at risk from racism, hunger, violence and poverty, both at home and throughout the world”; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA social statement, “For Peace in God’s World,” eloquently reminds us that peacemaking and reconciliation are an important part of discipleship for both individuals and communities of faith, and explicitly calls for “education about nonviolence in our church and elsewhere” (page 20, adopted in 1995); and

WHEREAS, women and children are increasingly becoming the primary victims of war and civil strife as we end the twentieth century and suffer poverty, hunger, dislocation, abuse, and rape in the process—both at home and abroad; and

WHEREAS, women, men and children in civilian populations everywhere are increasingly at risk through worldwide small arms transfers and technology which enables small groups of persons to terrorize local communities and whole populations with the threat of annihilation through the use of conventional, nuclear, chemical, and biological weaponry; and

WHEREAS, women and youth are increasingly victims of homelessness, pornography and prostitution while ordinary citizens of all ages can access pornographic Web sites that are now said to number in the thousands, contributing in the process to the development of a flourishing and profitable sex industry and the exploitation of our society’s most vulnerable members as well as to the growth in the number of persons with serious but largely unrecognized and therefore untreated sexual addictions; and

WHEREAS, twenty Nobel Peace Prize Laureates have sponsored an appeal “for the children of the world” calling for a Decade of Nonviolence (2001-2010) “to teach the practical meaning and benefits of nonviolence in our daily lives in order to reduce violence and...build a new culture of nonviolence”; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Commission for Women of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America request the Churchwide Assembly to adopt the following actions upon recommendation of the Program and Structure Committee and the ELCA Church Council.

At the April 1999 meeting of the Church Council, the Church Council took the following action (CC99.04.43.a.3):

To support the Nobel Peace Prize Laureates' appeal for a "Decade for a Culture of Nonviolence," and a "Year of Education for Nonviolence," with special emphasis on children and youth;

To encourage congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and church-related schools, institutions, and agencies to teach, practice, and model nonviolence—both for their own members and in service to their communities—making use of available resources on nonviolence;

To encourage this church in the development and distribution of educational resources and training programs that will help youth, congregations, and the related institutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to address the growing threats to the safety and peace of people everywhere (e.g., war, civil strife, school, and community violence); and

To urge churchwide units of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to work cooperatively in identifying strategic ways through which adult and youth leaders might learn the elements of active nonviolent peacemaking and serve effectively in support of victims of violence in their efforts to achieve wholeness, self-respect, and peace.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.40

To affirm the commitment of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to support a "Decade for a Culture of Nonviolence" (2001-2010) and a "Year of Education for Nonviolence" (2000);

To direct the Division for Church in Society to:

- 1) establish that an interunit team composed of representatives of the entities convened in January 1999, (e.g. Division for Church in Society, Division for Higher Education and Schools, Division for Congregational Ministries, Commission for Women, Division for Global Mission, Women of the ELCA, Lutheran Peace Fellowship);**
- 2) convene the interunit team and provide leadership to its work;**
- 3) organize and implement a churchwide response to "A Decade for a Culture of Nonviolence" and a "Year of Education for Nonviolence" by drawing on the suggestions made in the April 1999 report to the Church Council;**
- 4) bring a report to the April 2000 meeting of the Church Council; and**

To transmit this action as information to the Northwest Washington, Pacifica, Southeastern Minnesota, Eastern North Dakota, Southwestern Minnesota, Minneapolis Area, Southeastern Iowa, Greater Milwaukee, La Crosse Area,

Allegheny, Upper Susquehanna, Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Southeastern, Southwestern Washington, Eastern Washington-Idaho, Oregon, Southern California (West), Grand Canyon, Central States, Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana, Northeastern Iowa, East-Central Synod of Wisconsin, South-Central Synod of Wisconsin, New Jersey, Upstate New York, Southeastern Pennsylvania, and North Carolina synods.

Category 4a: United States War Matériel

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 33.

A. Minneapolis Area Synod (3G) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, war matériel (including helicopters, M-16 rifles, and HUMVEEs) which has been paid for by United States taxpayers is regularly sold, given, or loaned to governments in various parts of the world; and

WHEREAS, that war matériel is used by some of those governments (for example, in Indonesia and the Province of Chiapas, Mexico) against their own citizens to control free speech, the freedom of assembly and the right to petition for redress of grievances, all in the interests of political stability and the exploitation of natural resources, particularly in regions that are home to long-oppressed, indigenous peoples; and

WHEREAS, the Church is called to be a strong voice for the oppressed and marginalized, and to witness the Church's beliefs to the government of the United States; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Minneapolis Area Synod memorialize the ELCA at its next Churchwide Assembly to ask its Presiding Bishop to encourage strongly the National Council of Churches and the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops to enter into conversation on this subject with the President of the United States, in his role as Commander-in-Chief; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the purpose of this conversation be the identification of those policies of the United States, carried out through the Pentagon and the CIA, which cause pain and suffering to marginalized and impoverished peoples around the world, including those who are our brothers and sisters in faith; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this conversation bring forward proposed policies which would seek to "assist our neighbor in every need" rather than contribute to the suppression of indigenous peoples through the distribution of weapons and other instruments of conflict.

BACKGROUND

The ELCA social statement, "For Peace in God's World," named a number of tasks that voice "our hope that international relations can be ordered in ways that contribute to a just, free, secure, and nonviolent world." One of those tasks is to "control and reduce the arms trade." According to the statement:

Heavily armed nations continue to spend billions on arms. As one of the world's leading arms exporters, the United States has special responsibility to reduce arms sales and to seek proper international control agreements over the worldwide sale and transfer of arms by the major exporters. We support legislation to prohibit United States military assistance and arms transfers to governments that use them to oppress their own citizens or to engage in acts of aggression; and

encourage international efforts to make arms sales open to public scrutiny and to reduce the arms trade.

Application of this social statement is done through a biennial ELCA advocacy plan, which currently includes such components as: payment of U.S. dues to the United Nations, protection of human rights, provision of humanitarian assistance to developing nations, funding for debt reduction for heavily indebted poor countries, and promotion of U.S. ratification of the treaty to ban anti-personal landmines.

The specific concern raised in the memorial of the Minneapolis Area Synod has been part of this church's advocacy efforts for a number of years. One of the elements of this advocacy work has been support for the Code of Conduct on Arms Transfer Act, which is currently before the U.S. Congress. The European Union is considering a measure similar to the Code of Conduct.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.41 To affirm the ongoing work of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to support international relations that contribute to a just, free, secure, and nonviolent world;

To affirm the concern of the Minneapolis Area Synod about the need to work with various ecumenical partners in promoting U.S. policies that “assist our neighbor in every need” and in halting the spread of U.S. war matériel to governments that are not democratic, abuse human rights, and commit international aggression; and

To transmit this action as information to the Minneapolis Area Synod.

Category 4b: U.S. Navy Operations in Vieques, Puerto Rico

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 34.

A. Caribbean Synod (9F) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, our God, creator of heaven and earth, who made everything good, made the island of Vieques in the Caribbean so we all can enjoy this paradise; and

WHEREAS, the desire of our God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is that all human beings could live in peace and in community with one another; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Naval Force for more than 50 years has used the land of Vieques for its maneuvers with live ammunition; and

WHEREAS, in the island of Vieques live about 10,000 brothers and sisters for whom Christ gave his life; and

WHEREAS, in all these years the bombing and the landing of the marine forces have caused a severe damage to the environment in Vieques, destroying and killing species that are in danger of extinction; and

WHEREAS, the fishermen of Vieques cannot fish in the waters around the island because it is prohibited by the U.S. Navy, being this the only way to sustain and maintain their families; and

WHEREAS, on April 19 a civilian died by a “mistake” of one of the Navy airplanes that let a bomb of 500 pounds fall in the observation point where he was posted; and

WHEREAS, the condition to maintain that kind of maneuver has changed, due to changes in the cold war that the U.S. kept with the Soviet Union and Cuba. At the present moment none of them represent a real danger for the security of the U.S.; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Navy not only uses the island of Vieques for its maneuvers, but it also lets other countries use the land of Vieques for their practices with live ammunition for a fee; therefore be it

RESOLVED, to ask the U.S. Navy to cease its operations in the island of Vieques and to return to the people of the island the land that the U.S. Navy controls (75 percent of the territory); and be it further

RESOLVED, to ask the U.S. Navy to end its maneuvers with live ammunition immediately so that the island's 10,000 U.S. citizens can live in peace and without fear of being killed by a mistake; and be it further

RESOLVED, to send this memorial to the President of the United States, the U.S. Senate, the House of Representatives, the Department of Defense, and to the media for its publication; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the assembly approve this resolution and send it to the Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as a memorial to be approved.

BACKGROUND

The island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, has been used by the U.S. Navy for military exercises for more than 50 years. The western end of the island is used as an ammunition depot while the eastern third is a bombing and maneuver area. Residents have raised concerns that the military exercises threaten the lives, livelihood, and natural resources of Puerto Rico.

Community and environmental leaders in Puerto Rico are concerned that the U.S. practice of bombing on Vieques has destroyed coral reefs, mangroves, lagoons, coconut groves, and endangered species and marine organisms. According to studies by the University of Puerto Rico School of Public Health, the population of Vieques suffers from a 27 percent higher cancer case rate than the general population of Puerto Rico. According to Professor Seguinot Barbosa, director of the geography department of the University of Puerto Rico in Rio Piedras, "The destruction of the natural and human resources of Vieques violates the basic norms of international law and human rights. At the state and federal level the laws pertaining to the coastal zone, water and noise quality, underwater resources, archaeological resources and land use, among others, are violated."

In January 1999, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. gave the "Mauricio Amilcar Lopez" award to the people of Vieques, Puerto Rico, honoring their decades-long struggle against the U.S. Navy's occupation of three-fourths of the island's 33,000 acres. The military exercises and shelling have disrupted the fishing industry of the island and have left thousands of craters and cracked houses.

On April 19, 1999, bombs killed Mr. David Sanes Rodriguez and wounded four others. Because of this most recent occurrence of bombs going astray in Vieques and an incident earlier this year involving 263 banned depleted uranium armor-piercing shells, President Clinton called on the Department of Defense (DOD) to cease all use of live ordnance in Vieques until a panel appointed by the DOD could present recommendations in August 1999 with respect to the environmental, health and economic impacts of military operations in the island. In its editorial "Island Casualty" appearing on May 3, 1999, the *Washington Post* said that the military can find another site because there simply should be no bombing on a small inhabited island.

Legislation was introduced in previous Congresses that would have required the Defense Department to transfer 8,000 acres of land in the island of Vieques to the local government. Carlos Romero-Barcelo argued in his statement on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives that substandard economic and social conditions in Vieques are directly linked to the local government's lack of control over two-thirds of the island. Legislation to provide a process leading to full self-government for Puerto Rico passed the U.S. House of Representatives in 1998, but not the Senate. A referendum held in Puerto Rico in late 1998 was inconclusive with regard to the most-preferred option for governance among the Puerto Rican people.

Puerto Ricans continue to struggle for self-determination and the ability to have an impact on decisions related to such things as the military exercises. U.S. leaders, including former President Bush, have acknowledged that the people of Puerto Rico have never been consulted as equals concerning their political status. The United Nations Committee on Decolonization has adopted numerous resolutions recognizing Puerto Rico's colonial status and asked that the people of Puerto Rico be given the opportunity to determine their political status.

Policy of This Church

Taking a stand with the people of the island of Vieques is, according to Bishop Francisco Sosa of the ELCA's Caribbean Synod, "an act of peace and justice," not a political act meant to support one of the options for the future political status of the commonwealth.

The ELCA's social statement, "For Peace in God's World," affirmed this church's commitment to the promotion of human rights:

Promote respect for human rights.

"Recognition of the inherent dignity of and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world." These words from the Preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) are consistent with our understanding of humans created in God's image. Human rights provide a common universal standard of justice for living with our differences, and they give moral and legal standing to the individual in the international community.

Advocate participatory and accountable political structures within nations.

"We expect governments to be accountable to law and people, provide for the participation of all and space for loyal opposition, protect individual and minority rights, and offer processes for conflicts to be resolved without war.... In support for just political structures, we: call for assistance to nations struggling to form democracies...and insist that one of the most important contributions the United States can make to peace is to have its own democracy work for a just and peaceful ordering of its diverse society" (page 19).

Political Responsibility and National Security

"For the welfare of our neighbors, we in company with others must press for what is right and good within the limits and possibilities of the actual situation. Leaders

and citizens make decisions among many competing goods and interests when not all can be realized.... In pursuing their interests, all nations, including the United States, have an obligation to respect the interests of other states and international actors and to comply with international law. Nations should seek their own common good in the context of the global common good” (pages 9 and 10).

The ELCA social statement, “Caring for Creation,” provides a basis for challenging public policies that do not “address environmental issues in a manner consistent with the principles of participation, solidarity, sufficiency, and sustainability.” The ELCA Churchwide Blueprint for Action on Central America and the Caribbean authorizes this church to “support sustainable and equitable development which is environmentally responsible and economically viable as well as suitable to the needs of the poor majority, expressed through democratic participation.”

The issue of self-determination for Puerto Rico is listed in the “Comprehensive Plan for ELCA Churchwide Public Policy and Private Sector Advocacy” for 1999-2000.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.42 To acknowledge the concerns of the Caribbean Synod regarding U.S. military operations in Vieques, Puerto Rico;

To re-affirm this church’s commitment to human rights, national security, and concern for the environment as expressed in the social statements of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, “For Peace in God’s World,” and “Caring for Creation”; and

To direct the Division for Church in Society through the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, to encourage the U.S. government to seek reasonable solutions that will end all U.S. military operations on the island of Vieques and return the land to the people of the island while not compromising our nation’s security.

Category 5: Workfare (Work Programs)

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 35.

A. Metropolitan New York Synod (7C) [1998 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the tradition of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Metropolitan New York Synod thereof is based on the teachings of Jesus and the prophets’ teachings that call us to be committed to justice, fairness, and solidarity with our neighbor; and

WHEREAS, the teachings of Jesus lead to an understanding of the worth of all human beings and the right of individuals to be regarded with dignity and respect; and

WHEREAS, the policies and principles of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America/Metropolitan New York Synod are grounded in a belief system that emphasizes solidarity and inclusion; and

WHEREAS, the United States is a signatory to the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights which states clearly (in Article 23) that everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work, and to protection against unemployment; and

WHEREAS, workfare is a mandatory, coercive program that takes away people's freedom of choice; and

WHEREAS, workfare uses the threat of starvation and homelessness to force welfare recipients to accept work that may never lead to full and meaningful employment; and

WHEREAS, workfare is a prejudicial program based on the stereotype that most welfare recipients choose welfare rather than work, and that most lack work experience and a satisfactory work ethic; and

WHEREAS, workfare is often used as a tool to lower rates and conditions for the existing workforce and often to displace unionized workers in municipal settings; and

WHEREAS, workfare serves to isolate and separate the dependent poor from the rest of society and lock them into substandard work situations rather than offer hope and opportunity; and

WHEREAS, workfare programs generally assume that persons on welfare are able to work, when many in fact will never be able to hold a job, but will still need income support; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Metropolitan New York Synod

1. Educate and inform congregations concerning both the ethics and economics of workfare programs;
2. Communicate its ethical concerns to appropriate decision makers;
3. Urge that local and regional bodies become involved in the issue and carefully scrutinize the assumptions and practices of existing workfare programs in their area;
4. Call for the abolition of coercive and abusive workfare programs and their replacement by programs offering real jobs for those who can and want to work and needed income support for those who cannot;
5. Send this resolution as a memorial to the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly in Denver, Colorado.

BACKGROUND

The welfare reform legislation signed into law on August 22, 1996, established work requirements for persons participating in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, the replacement for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). In contrast to AFDC, the TANF program is not an entitlement program and is operated by the states with broad flexibility.

“Workfare,” or community service programs, are often required by states after an individual has been receiving TANF for a certain period of time. Some localities require welfare recipients to work in a “workfare” slot in exchange for their cash benefits almost immediately if they cannot find a salaried position.

Workfare programs are somewhat less costly than publicly funded job strategies, another alternative. However, research suggests that wage-paying transitional jobs may be more effective in boosting future employment and earnings.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has spoken against the concept of workfare in its ongoing advocacy work on welfare reform. This position rests on social statements of predecessor church bodies, including “Economic Justice” (LCA 1980), which states, “Through work, human beings are privileged and obligated to reflect the Creator whose work they are. The exclusion of persons from the community of work is a denial of the opportunity of realizing God’s intention for humanity. Work is important for human well-being, but not as an end in itself. Work is thus meant for persons in community, not persons for work.”

“Working Principles for Welfare Reform,” which adopted in 1994 by the board of the Division for Church in Society and reported to Church Council, observes, “‘Workfare’ (requiring work in exchange for welfare or public assistance) may not actually increase people’s long-term employability, but may contribute toward a permanent working underclass, eroding both wages and employment standards for other workers. Short-term structured work experience, however, may have a positive effect on some persons who have never been employed outside the home.” The document also states, “Stable jobs with living wages and adequate benefits should be the goal. Provision for these jobs should be done in ways that do not have the direct effect of displacing other workers.”

The 1999 Churchwide Assembly acted on the proposed social statement, “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All,” which provided theological and ethical perspectives on work and human dignity. These principles become a basis for considering specific workfare proposals. The document states, “No one should be coerced to work under conditions that violate their dignity or freedom, jeopardize their health or safety, result in neglect of their family’s well-being, or provide unjust compensation for their labor.... [People] should also be free to determine their lives independent of particular jobs. Public policy can provide economic and other conditions that protect human freedom and dignity in relation to work.”

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.43 To respond to the concerns raised by the Metropolitan New York Synod in regard to workfare programs by affirming this church’s opposition to such programs;

To direct the Division for Church in Society, through the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, to oppose workfare programs that in effect coerce people to work under conditions that violate their dignity or freedom, and to support employment opportunities that will in reality lead toward sufficient, sustainable livelihood for those who have been welfare recipients;

To urge synods, congregations, social ministry organizations, and individuals to assess the underlying assumptions and ongoing practices of their state and local workfare programs, and in cooperation with state public policy offices, to convey their concerns to appropriate state and local decision makers;

To request the Division for Church in Society to continue to educate and inform congregations, social ministry organizations, and individuals concerning the ethics and economics of workfare programs; and

To transmit this action to the Metropolitan New York Synod as information.

Category 6b: Economic Justice

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 40.

A. Upstate New York Synod (7D) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, "The Church is a people created by God in Christ, empowered by the Holy Spirit, called and sent to bear witness to God's creative, redeeming, and sanctifying activity in the world. To fulfill these purposes, this church shall . . . study social issues and trends, work to discover the causes of oppression and injustice; and develop programs of ministry and advocacy to further human dignity, freedom, justice, and peace in the world" (ELCA Constitution 4.01.03.); and

WHEREAS, the Church is a serving presence in society when it "holds power accountable, advocates justice, stands with those who are poor and vulnerable, provides sanctuary, and meets human need" (ELCA social statement, "For Peace in God's World," adopted by 96.4 percent of vote at the Churchwide Assembly on August 20, 1995); and

WHEREAS, there is a growing disparity between the rich and the poor, not only between rich and poor nations, but between the rich and middle class in this nation and this state; and whereby the numbers of people without health insurance, numbers of persons living in poverty, disparities in educational attainment and income distribution give evidence to this disparity such that the gap between rich and poor in this state is the widest in the nation; and

WHEREAS, there has been a substantial increase in the number of families turning to our feeding and homeless programs, including not only those who have been dropped from the welfare rolls, but also growing numbers of the "working poor"; and

WHEREAS, we believe that work is important to human development and that all persons should have the opportunity to do so; and as Christians we believe that the dignity of persons in the image of God needs to be reflected in their just and humane treatment as workers, including the payment of wages that will cover the essentials of human existence; and

WHEREAS, "As a prophetic presence, this church has the obligation to name and denounce the idols of greed before which people bow, to identify the power of sin present in social structures, and to advocate in hope with poor and powerless people" (ELCA social statement, "The Church in Society: A Lutheran Perspective," 1991); and

WHEREAS, narrow economic self interest all too often has influenced society negatively in obvious and subtle ways; and government is the people's opportunity to distribute the benefits and burdens of society justly; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Upstate New York Synod:

1. Go on record declaring that the growing gap between rich and poor is the result of human decisions and is contrary to the will of God.
2. Encourage us all to become better partners for an equitable and sustainable use of natural resources provided by God's creation.
3. Affirm that it is the responsibility of government to pursue policies that reverse the trend toward widening disparity between rich and poor.
4. Encourage our bishop, our conference deans, our pastors and our congregational members to work with the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs and state public policy offices to relate their information to public policy initiatives in order to contact their legislators with their concerns about the growing disparity between rich and poor, the implications for our emergency programs and the need for a humane society to provide for the basic necessities of all its citizens; and be it further

RESOLVED, that:

1. The Upstate New York Synod memorialize the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at its 1999 Churchwide Assembly to include such trends as herein described in the final draft of the social statement on economic life, to provide educational material for use in congregations and to provide through the Conference of Bishops, the Division for Church in Society, the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs and the state public policy offices a voice of this church about the trends described in this document and the need for corrective action.

2. Encourage our bishop and Synod Council with the Church in Society Committee to serve as resources to congregations by providing educational materials to congregations; such educational materials will discuss relevant theology and ethics and will examine alternatives for a just and sustainable economy.

3. Encourage Conference Deans to encourage the use of these materials in congregations and to gather (or appoint a committee) local facts concerning the usage of our emergency programs and the percentage of those that are “working poor.”

4. Encourage pastors to read the information gathered by the bishop and share this information through their newsletters, announcements and educational opportunities in their congregations.

5. Encourage congregational members to avail themselves of the information gathered by the bishop, sent to Conference Deans and shared with pastors; and to become aware of the local implications of the income disparity between rich and poor; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America study its own structure and practice and those of our societal systems so as to take the lead among denominations in calling the structures of society to account for maintaining privileges for and developing a just and sustainable society where the dignity and worth of every human is valued.

BACKGROUND

The memorial from the Upstate New York Synod addressed critical dimensions of economic life today and connected these issues of economic life with the self-understanding of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as expressed in its governing documents and social statements.

The economic issues raised in the memorial include the alarming trend in the growing disparities between rich and poor people in income, health insurance, and educational attainment, the expectations of a humane society, and human dignity and development as manifest in work. The memorial requested that trends related to these economic issues be included “in the final draft of the social statement on economic life.” The draft adopted by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly, within the relative brevity of the customary social statement format, attempted to name these trends through sentences such as these:

“Huge disparities in income and wealth, such as those we face in this country, threaten the integrity of the human community.”

“Enormous disparities between their compensations [top corporate officers and sports superstars] and the average wages of workers are scandalous” and also through separate sections in the draft on the topics of work and human dignity.

The memorial requested educational material for use in congregations. The intent of the Division for Church in Society is to develop, in collaboration with other churchwide units, materials on a variety of the topics identified in the social statement. It is expected that further study resources on economic themes of today will be developed to support the social statement study materials published in the course of the statement’s development.

The memorial also requested advocacy pertaining to the concerns raised by the Upstate New York Synod. The Division for Church in Society, through the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs and coordination of this church’s state public policy offices, dedicates significant time to public policy advocacy addressing welfare, the minimum wage, the earned

income tax credit, housing subsidies, hunger and nutrition programs, job training and creation, health insurance coverage, and child care.

The final resolution in the memorial called for study of the church's structure and practice as well as of societal systems. The implementing resolutions at the conclusion of the adopted social statement directed such studies to occur under many auspices. The study document, "Toward a Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All," was an important resource in the study of societal systems. An additional study, already under way, is examining the effects of welfare reform on the affiliated social ministry organizations and the congregations of this church, especially as these effects are experienced in relation to people living in poverty. Still another resource planned by the division is a study of the ELCA and its institutions as employers, and the ways in which the social policy of this church, including the proposed social statement on economic life, addresses the competing moral claims and complex economic issues faced by the church in this regard.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.44 To acknowledge the action of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly on the proposed social statement on economic life, including the statement's implementing resolutions, as the response of this assembly to the memorial of the Upstate New York Synod on economic justice.

Category 7: Immigration

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 42.

A. Northeastern Iowa Synod (5F) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, this church has a history of hospitality for immigrants and refugees and has among its members many whose ancestors were immigrants to the United States; and

WHEREAS, the objectives that have been important for Lutheran church bodies and have given content to understanding of fair and generous immigration have come from "A Statement on Immigration Policies: Moral Issues and National Interest" (Lutheran Council in the United States of America, 1969); and

WHEREAS, the objective from this 1969 document include:

"1. To admit to our permanent population a steady proportion of newcomers:

- a. by facilitating the reunification of families;
- b. by facilitating the entry of persons possessing special skills or other capacities needed by the American economy and culture;
- c. by assuming the United States' proper share of international responsibility for the resettlement of refugees and other persons urgently in need of compassionate haven of a new homeland"; and

WHEREAS, objectives a. and c. are still suitable and moral for church policy, objective b. is not, since it now causes harm to the home country of immigrants in order to benefit the United States and has been criticized internationally as a policy of "brain drain" that takes the best and most able citizens from developing countries to further the economy of the United States; and

WHEREAS, neither of the predecessor bodies adopted immigration policies after 1969 and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has not adopted an immigration policy for itself; and

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America seeks to follow the command of Christ to love our neighbors as ourselves and to have in place moral and Christian policies in dealing with its mission in the world; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northeastern Iowa Synod memorialize the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to establish a church policy on immigration with moral and ethical provisions, one that no longer includes an objective to facilitate entry of persons with special skills for the benefit of the United States, but instead includes an objective to facilitate the entry of persons who have been persecuted in their home country for their religious beliefs and/or their efforts to promote justice for their people.

B. North/West Lower Michigan Synod (6B) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, this church has a history of hospitality for immigrants and refugees and has among its members many whose ancestors were immigrants to the United States; and

WHEREAS, the objectives that have been important for Lutheran church bodies and have given content to understanding of fair and generous immigration have come from “A Statement on Immigration Policies: Moral Issues and National Interest” (Lutheran Council in the United States of America, 1969); and

WHEREAS, the objective from this 1969 document include:

- “1. To admit to our permanent population a steady proportion of newcomers:
 - a. by facilitating the reunification of families;
 - b. by facilitating the entry of persons possessing special skills or other capacities needed by the American economy and culture;
 - c. by assuming the United States’ proper share of international responsibility for the resettlement of refugees and other persons urgently in need of compassionate haven of a new homeland”;

WHEREAS, objectives a. and c. are still suitable and moral for church policy, objective b. is not, since it now causes harm to the home country of immigrants in order to benefit the United States and has been criticized internationally as a policy of “brain drain” that takes the best and most able citizens from developing countries to further the economy of the United States; and

WHEREAS, neither of the predecessor bodies adopted immigration policies after 1969 and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has not adopted an immigration policy for itself; and

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America seeks to follow the command of Christ to love our neighbors as ourselves and to have in place moral and Christian policies in dealing with its mission in the world; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the North/West Lower Michigan Synod memorialize the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to establish a church policy on immigration with moral and ethical provisions, one that no longer includes an objective to facilitate entry of persons with special skills for the benefit of the United States, but instead includes an objective to facilitate the entry of persons who have been persecuted in their home country for their religious beliefs and/or their efforts to promote justice for their people.

BACKGROUND

Concern for immigrants and refugees and advocacy for an open and just immigration policy are part of the legacy of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and its predecessor church bodies.

This church affirmed that legacy in the 1995 social statement, “For Peace in God’s Word,” which states that “we support a generous policy of welcome for refugees and immigrants. We pledge to continue our church’s historic leadership in caring for refugees and immigrants.” In 1998 the Church Council adopted the message “Immigration” as “a resource for deliberation on attitudes regarding immigrants and a resource to interpret and apply ELCA policy related to immigration,” as called for by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Although United States immigration policy is very complex, one can identify basically four streams of immigrants:

- a. refugees—persons who are recognized by the international community as having a well-founded fear of persecution if returned to their country of origin;
- b. immigrants who come for family unification—families with legal permanent residency in the United States are permitted to seek entry of immediate relatives, who must be approved by U.S. immigration authorities for admittance as legal immigrants. U.S. citizens (as well as families with legal permanent status) may petition for the immigration of relatives;
- c. employment-based immigrants—persons who come with an affidavit of employment for a specific job by a specific employer; generally they enter with a “non-immigrant visa,” although in time and under certain circumstances their status may be converted to legal permanent residence;
- d. immigrants who come through the worldwide lottery—anyone in the world may make an application to emigrate to the United States through a lottery mechanism effected once a year. The lottery is not open to anyone in the world—many countries are eligible (mainly in Europe and Africa) but some are not (mainly the current major source countries for immigrants, Latin America and the Caribbean and Asia).

Of some 950,000 legal immigrants who entered the United States in 1998, the largest stream came from family unification (about 65 percent), followed by employment-based immigration (approximately 22 percent); refugees (about eight percent); and, lottery-based immigration (five percent). Since World War II, employment-based immigration has been a part of United States’ immigration policy. The Lutheran churches in America, particularly after World War II with the influx of European refugees and immigrants, have accepted this type of immigration as one element of overall immigration policy that represents a consensus among those who support immigration policy. The Lutheran Council in the USA (LCUSA) stated this position in 1969 (see Memorial). The LCUSA at that time administered the refugee and immigration program now known as Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS). This church advocates with and through LIRS. It also draws upon LIRS’s vast experience and expertise in immigration and refugee affairs to determine its policy. While recognizing that governments have the right to set immigration policy, this church has consistently opposed restrictive immigration policies.

The “Message on Immigration” recalls the Lutheran history of hospitality and service to immigrants and refugees, calls for strengthening its ministry with the most vulnerable of newcomers, and highlights a number of areas of concern where United States’ laws should be improved. The message quotes the 1969 LCUSA statement, and then sets forth this church’s priority concern: “Our advocacy will continue to insist that family reunification should be the primary objective of immigration laws. It will oppose efforts to reduce the percentage of people admitted for family reunification reasons...” The message adds that this church’s advocacy “will oppose policies and practices that actively recruit workers from developing countries to their detriment and to our country’s benefit.”

ELCA advocacy does not actively promote employment-based immigration, although it does not oppose in principle such immigration, for various reasons, including the following:

- a. The freedom to move and to choose one’s place of residency is a basic human good. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes the right to leave one’s country, to seek employment, to change nationality.

- b. Persons migrate for a variety of reasons, which are often very complex. These reasons include the need to make a living and to satisfy the human spirit's desire to move beyond the limitations of one's place of birth to realize aspirations of personal, professional, and family well-being.
- c. "Brain drain" should not be understood one-dimensionally as a win-lose, zero-sum phenomenon (increasing skills in one nation equals reduction of skills in another). Especially in today's global economy and the interlocked communications age, the movement of skilled labor may contribute in very dynamic and positive ways to overall worldwide to social, economic, and political development. United States industry often seeks foreign-born skilled employees precisely to develop the networks and the expertise to be able to expand business in the country of origin of the immigrant employee, this to the benefit of both nations.
- d. Immigrants often contribute directly and substantially to the development and economic support of their countries of origin due to remittances sent from the United States to families in other countries. In some countries, such remittances are the major sources of foreign revenue. Many immigrants to the United States develop businesses and other economic ties to their country of origin and truly live and work in both nations.
- e. Free movement of labor is also an issue of fairness. Companies based in the United States often hope to place employees in other nations where they would live within the economy and culture of other peoples, with all the benefits (higher wages, knowledge of other nations, languages) and drawbacks (separation from family and familiar ways of life) this may imply. Many developing countries seek and need the skills of persons from the United States and other places. Such countries that welcome workers from the United States might view the elimination of employment-based immigration as creating a double standard.
- f. A movement to prohibit all employment-based immigration may have unintended consequences. It could lend support to those who want to eliminate or cut back on family reunification immigration since, it might be argued, all immigration contributes to "brain drain."
- g. This church is deeply concerned about the well-being of poorer nations and seeks to address the conditions that contribute to "brain drain." Both the social statement "For Peace in God's World" and "Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All," the proposed social statement to be considered at the 1999 Churchwide Assembly, address the world's economic disparities. Among other things, this church calls upon the United States to contribute more of its resources for international development, promote fair and equitable trade, and reduce the burdens of debt for highly indebted developing nations. It supports efforts to increase unilateral and multilateral mechanisms to promote peace and assist nations with reconstruction following conflict; to empower civil society; and to strengthen local and national economies, through democratic participation, the eradication of corruption, the reduction of militarism, and the fostering of the human development of women and children.

***RATIONALE OF THE
MEMORIALS COMMITTEE***

The memorial asked for a change in policy that would restrict immigration. Such a change would represent a significant break with this church's legacy that has consistently

called for a generous immigration policy. In refusing to support restrictive policies and giving priority to family reunification, existing ELCA policy on immigration continues to serve this church's advocacy well.

The memorial also urged that ELCA policy have as an objective "to facilitate the entry of persons who have been persecuted in their home country." This objective is already part of ELCA policy and practice, as represented in an exemplary way by LIRS's work with refugees and asylum seekers.

The recent "Message on Immigration" directs this church's attention to a number of vital policy concerns related to immigration. Initiating a study process leading to either a social statement or a social policy resolution would distract this church's resources from these significant issues. This church's energies are better directed to these issues.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.45 To decline to initiate a process that would lead to a policy change for the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in relation to employment-based immigration, but instead to reaffirm this church's present immigration policy, as summarized in the 1998 ELCA "Message on Immigration";

To commend Lutheran agencies, social ministry organizations, congregations, and individuals who have advocated for just immigration policies and served recent immigrants and refugees;

To encourage the promotion of justice and economic and social development for people of all nations to stem potential "brain drain"; and

To transmit this action as information to the North/West Lower Michigan Synod and the Northeastern Iowa Synod.

Category 10: Health Benefits

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 48.

A. Lower Susquehanna Synod (8D) [1998 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Board of Pensions is the primary provider of health, dental, and pension benefits; and

WHEREAS, most pastors, lay staff, and their families find it difficult to choose alternative plans, and many are unable to choose alternative plans; and

WHEREAS, plan participants in the Lebanon area experience a lack of choice in hospitals in close proximity to the participants and a similar lack of specialized care-providers under the plan managed by Aetna/US Healthcare; and

WHEREAS, the only hospital (Good Samaritan) on the territory accepting the plan refers within that hospital to numerous affiliated physicians groups that are not under the plan; and

WHEREAS, participants have been instructed to seek specialized medical care some distance from the area due to the inability of Aetna/US Healthcare to reach an accord with Penn State/Geisinger Hershey Medical Center; and

WHEREAS, using hospital facilities, specialists/specialized providers, and other health care specialties that are more convenient or more desired by members than those offered by the plan should be the privilege of plan participants; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Lebanon Conference through the Lower Susquehanna Synod Assembly memorialize the ELCA Churchwide Assembly to request the Board of Pensions of the ELCA to negotiate an alternative plan, which preserves equitable cost and equal access to equivalent health care, or, failing this, allows an unbundling of the medical benefits package from pension and disability portions of the plan without penalty or waiver fee.

BACKGROUND

For some time, the Board of Pensions has been aware of member dissatisfaction in certain Aetna U.S. Healthcare point-of-service (POS) networks. In early 1999, the Board of Pensions conducted a survey of the over 7,000 plan members covered by the point-of-service arrangement to develop a better understanding of the nature and depth of member dissatisfaction. In addition, the Board of Pensions held discussions with synodical bishops in Pennsylvania and considered the volume and duration of complaints to the Board of Pension's customer service unit.

Based on this input, the Board of Pensions has decided to offer POS members located in Pennsylvania and the Chicago area a choice of either the current POS arrangement or a new preferred provider arrangement through BlueCross and BlueShield. This arrangement was announced to members as a pilot project to become effective January 1, 2000. If offering a choice of plans is successful in improving member satisfaction while holding the line on plan costs, it may be expanded to more POS members in the future.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.46 To acknowledge that the alternative plan offered by Board of Pensions to point-of-service members in Pennsylvania and the Chicago area as an adequate response to the Lower Susquehanna Synod; and

To transmit this action as information to the Lower Susquehanna Synod.

Category 11: Nursing Home Care

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 48.

A. Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod (4D) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Board of Pensions offers no plan to retired ministers and their spouses for nursing home care or skilled nursing care, even though its present "three year strategy focuses on health care, sharing of benefit costs and customer needs" (*Board Talk*, Spring 1999); and

WHEREAS, according to President John G. Kapanke, of the Board of Pensions, "There are presently 3,400 retirees and surviving spouses (or 31 percent of pensioners) who receive less than \$300 a month in ELCA pension benefits"; and

WHEREAS, \$300 a month is hardly enough to cover even one day of in home care by a registered nurse or one week in a typical nursing home; and

WHEREAS, the most critical concern of many retired ministers and their spouses is insufficient finances to meet the costs of skilled nursing home care; and

WHEREAS, ministers and their spouses are living longer and medical costs continue to rise; and

WHEREAS, the growing number of "second-career" ministers will have abbreviated ministries and, consequently, smaller pensions than their younger peers, thus accentuating their problem in affording nursing home care during their retirement; and

WHEREAS, medicare, at best, offers hardly more than short-term nursing home care, and Medicaid is available only when family resources are exhausted, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod memorializes the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to request the Board of Pensions to prepare a Long-Term Care Plan with special emphasis on home care and nursing home care for clergy and spouses to be funded by increases to the annual contribution to the regular ELCA pension plan.

B. North Carolina Synod (9B) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Board of Pensions offers no plan to retired ministers and their spouses for nursing home care or skilled nursing care, even though its present "three year strategy focuses on health care, sharing of benefit costs and customer needs" (*Board Talk*, Spring 1999); and

WHEREAS, according to President John G. Kapanke, of the Board of Pensions, "There are presently 3,400 retirees and surviving spouses (or 31 percent of pensioners) who receive less than \$300 a month in ELCA pension benefits"; and

WHEREAS, \$300 a month is hardly enough to cover even one day of in home care by a registered nurse or one week in a typical nursing home; and

WHEREAS, the most critical concern of many retired ministers and their spouses is insufficient finances to meet the costs of skilled nursing home care; and

WHEREAS, enrolled members are living longer and medical costs continue to rise; and

WHEREAS, the growing number of "second-career" ministers will have abbreviated ministries and, consequently, smaller pensions than their younger peers, thus accentuating their problem in affording nursing home care during their retirement; and

WHEREAS, medicare, at best, offers hardly more than short-term nursing home care, and Medicaid is available only when family resources are exhausted, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the North Carolina Synod memorializes the ELCA in assembly to direct the Board of Pensions to prepare a full-faceted prospectus on a nursing home care plan for enrolled members for consideration by the Church Council.

BACKGROUND

The Board of Pensions acknowledges that there is a growing need for nursing home care and that such care can pose a major financial threat to our retired pastors. (Costs can range from \$40,000 to \$60,000 per year). It is true, as the resolution states, that 31 percent of our current pensioners receive less than \$300 per month from the Board of Pensions.

A key question in addressing this need is who should be responsible for paying the cost of nursing home care. Currently, individuals bear the initial responsibility with taxpayers taking over after individuals' assets are nearly exhausted. Few employers have assumed even partial financial responsibility. A growing number of employers, however, have arranged for their employees to purchase long term care insurance at group rates. We understand that the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has recently implemented such a program. This is likely the approach that the ELCA Board of Pensions would recommend. Incidentally, the Presbyterian

program allows parents and grandparents of plan members, as well as plan members themselves, to purchase coverage.

A project of the Board of Pensions is anticipated to explore possible design and implementation of a long-term care insurance program.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.47 To receive the memorials from the Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana and the North Carolina synods regarding nursing home care for rostered persons and their spouses;

To acknowledge the response of the Board of Pensions regarding plans for the design and implementation of a long-term care insurance program during the 1999-2001 biennium; and

To refer the memorials of the Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana and the North Carolina synods to the Board of Pensions as information.

Category 12: Equalization of Medical Costs

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 49.

A. Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod (ID) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Board of Pensions Health Plan seeks to provide comprehensive health care for clergy and other church workers; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Pensions Health Plan seeks to support the call process by providing a continuity of coverage by providing one plan covering the entire span of the ELCA; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Pensions Health Plan provides four different types of coverage (Point-of-Service, Standard Benefits, Preferred Provider Organization Benefits and Common Benefits) based on location of call, and benefits available in the vicinity of call; and

WHEREAS, the "out-of-pocket" costs to the beneficiary vary considerably by the type of plan provided and by the cost of medical services within a given geographical area; and

WHEREAS, persons serving congregations in rural and remote areas are most often unable to qualify, because of geographical location, for the lower out-of-pocket plans (\$15 co-pay, no deductible versus 20 percent of total after deductible is paid). As so, they generally incur higher out-of-pocket expenses than members who are able to use the point-of-service plan; and

WHEREAS, a high percentage of persons serving in these areas of higher out-of-pocket expense are first call with high debt and in some instances below guideline compensation; and

WHEREAS, the percentage of compensation paid to the Board of Pensions Medical Plan is the same for all members of the plan regardless of location; and

WHEREAS, cost of medical services vary geographically, generally being lower in areas of low population, rural, and remote areas; and

WHEREAS, costs for medical services are generally higher in areas of high population, such as ELCA Region 2, where the lower out-of-pocket plan is available; and

WHEREAS, congregations in rural and remote areas tend to subsidize medical benefits paid by congregations in other locations; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to request the Board of Pensions to develop a plan to provide health care services that are equitable to all members.

BACKGROUND

Equitable Benefits

Prior to 1995, all members of the ELCA health plan were covered by the same benefit plan, providing 80 percent reimbursement after a deductible. In 1995, the Board of Pensions began implementing a managed care point-of-service (POS) arrangement through a contract with Aetna U.S. Healthcare. Currently the point-of-service arrangement applies to about 55 percent of our covered members. Under the point-of-service arrangement, members have access to discounted fees through a network of doctors and hospitals under contract with Aetna U.S. Healthcare. Under Aetna's utilization management arrangement, members must obtain referrals from their primary care physician prior to seeking services from a specialist. The Board of Pensions' policy has been to allocate about one half of the savings from managed care to affected plan members in the form of increased benefits. This is seen as a tradeoff for members accepting the restrictions of managed care. Point-of-service members who seek care outside the Aetna U.S. Healthcare network receive the same 80 percent benefits as those with standard coverage.

In 1999, the Board of Pensions began implementing a preferred provider organization (PPO) through BlueCross and BlueShield in areas not served by Aetna U.S. Healthcare POS. Like the POS arrangement, the PPO contracts with a network of doctors and hospitals to deliver services to covered members at discounted prices. The PPO differs from POS, however, in that PPO networks tend to be broader and referrals are not required prior to seeking care from a specialist. PPO benefits are 85 percent after a \$240 deductible, in between POS and standard. Again, savings are shared with affected plan members through improved benefits. By the year 2000, the Board of Pensions expects to have nearly 30 percent of plan members covered by the PPO arrangement, leaving about 15 percent in standard benefits. The Board of Pensions plans to continue expanding the PPO and POS arrangements as far as possible, subject to the location of plan members and the availability of managed care arrangements.

As to the adequacy of standard benefits, the Board of Pensions believes that the plan is fully competitive in the marketplace. In fact the plan is more generous than most employer sponsored plans in that ELCA congregations pay the entire cost of coverage. In most corporate plans, employees are required to pay between 15 and 20 percent of the cost. Thus, while out-of-pocket expenses can be significant, they are generally less in total than with other employer sponsored plans. Also note that, after \$1,800 per year in out-of-pocket expenses, the standard benefits plan reimburses 100 percent of covered charges, the same out-of-pocket limit that applies to POS. Actually, the standard out-of-pocket limit is a bit more generous as the \$15 copays under POS do not count toward the out-of-pocket limit.

Equitable Cost for Employers

Employer contributions for sponsored members under the health plan are expressed as a percentage of salary, actually three percentages (employee only coverage, employee plus spouse or children, and full family) each with minimum and maximum rates. This contribution structure is based on the ELCA philosophy of sharing: those congregations with

greater means (as indicated by paying higher salaries) will pay more so that those congregations with lesser means (as indicated by paying lower salaries) can pay less. Savings for managed care not allocated to members through higher benefits are shared with all sponsoring employers by maintaining a single rate structure regardless of whether the sponsored member is covered by POS, PPO, or standard benefits.

The Board of Pensions is reviewing this structure to address concerns that, even with a salary based structure, congregations in areas with lower medical costs tend to subsidize congregations located in areas with higher medical costs. The Board of Pension is currently working on recommendations to improve equity among congregations in all areas, while continuing to support the mission of the ELCA.

The Board of Pensions will continue to strive to be an effective purchaser of health care, recognizing the wide variations in marketplace realities in balancing the economic needs of both plan members and sponsoring employers.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.48 To refer the memorial of the Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod as information to the Board of Pensions.

Category 13: Lutheran Men in Mission

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, page 51.

The 11 memorials in this category are based upon a single “model memorial.” Where a synod has adopted the “model memorial” without any changes, the words “Adopted the ‘model memorial’” replace the text. If a synod has modified the “model memorial” the changes are specifically noted. The “model memorial” for the “Lutheran Men in Mission” category is as follows:

Model Memorial

WHEREAS, statistical studies indicate that the participation of men in the laity of the church has declined to less than one third of its available potential; and

WHEREAS, the ministry of men is a vital part of fulfilling our call of the great commission; and

WHEREAS, men working together with the other ministries of the ELCA in a framework of inclusive mutuality can effectively address issues of concern and together forward the work of the church; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the _____ Synod, in assembly, memorialize the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in its 1999 assembly, to reaffirm that Lutheran Men in Mission is the principal means for enabling the ministry of men in the ELCA; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the leadership of all the expressions of the ELCA become active advocates of Lutheran Men in Mission and men’s ministry.

A. Montana Synod (1F) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 600.

B. Eastern North Dakota Synod (3B) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 600.

C. Southeastern Minnesota Synod (3I) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 600.

D. Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod (4D) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 600, except that the synod’s last “RESOLVED” uses the phrase “Lutheran Men in Mission/Master Builders.”

E. Southwestern Texas Synod (4E) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 600.

F. Northwest Synod of Wisconsin (5H) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 600.

G. Metropolitan New York Synod (7C) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 600, except the synod’s memorial has combined the two “RESOLVED” clauses into one that reads:

RESOLVED, that the Metropolitan New York Synod, in assembly, memorializes the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in its 1999 Churchwide Assembly to reaffirm that the Lutheran Men in Mission is the principle organization for enabling the ministry of men in the ELCA, and urge the leadership of all the expressions of the ELCA to strongly advocate for Lutheran Men in Mission and men’s ministry.

H. Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod (7E) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted only the first “RESOLVED” as amended:

RESOLVED, that the Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod memorialize the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in its 1999 Churchwide Assembly, to affirm that Lutheran Men in Mission is an important expression for enabling the ministry of men in the ELCA.

I. Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod (8A) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 600, except in the synod’s first “RESOLVED” the words “the principal” are replaced with “a principal.”

J. Lower Susquehanna Synod (8D) [1998 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 600, except that the synod’s first “RESOLVED” adds “one of” so that it reads: “Lutheran Men in Mission is one of the principal...”

K. Upper Susquehanna Synod (8E) [1999 Memorial]

Adopted the “model memorial” printed above on page 600, except that the synod’s first “RESOLVED” adds “one of” so that it reads: “Lutheran Men in Mission is one of the principal...”

BACKGROUND

The board of Lutheran Men in Mission developed a “model memorial” and sent it to all ELCA synods for consideration. In developing the model memorial, the board raised the following concerns:

- 1) To draw attention to the fact that in most ELCA congregations less than one-third of the worshipping adults on Sunday morning are male. According to Mr. George Barna, only 28 percent of American men identify themselves with a congregation.
- 2) To encourage discussion on the issues that men are facing today.
- 3) To recognize the uniqueness of Lutheran Men in Mission while acknowledging other men’s ministries that are active today. Lutheran Men in Mission seeks to maintain a unique theological perspective and a commitment to work in a spirit of mutuality and collegiality with women.
- 4) The active support of pastors, associates in ministry, bishops, and all leaders of this church is critical to the success of men’s ministry in every expression of this church.

The board of Lutheran Men in Mission has launched a three-year plan that emphasizes building men’s faith, relationships, and mission and ministry through men’s gatherings, congregational resources, and leadership development under the “Master Builders: Building Men for Christ” program. The largest men’s gathering in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to date concluded in Breckenridge, Colorado, the day before the ELCA Churchwide Assembly started in Denver.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.49 To reaffirm the commitment of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to Lutheran Men in Mission as a primary support system for men’s ministry in this church; and

To transmit this action as information to the Montana, Eastern North Dakota, Southeastern Minnesota, Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana, Southwestern Texas, Northwest Synod of Wisconsin, Metropolitan New York, Northeastern Pennsylvania, Northwestern Pennsylvania, Lower Susquehanna, Upper Susquehanna, and South Carolina synods.

Category 14: Lutheran Vespers

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 52.

A. South Dakota Synod (3C) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, Lutheran Vespers is the radio ministry of the ELCA, featuring Walter Wangerin Jr. as speaker; and

WHEREAS, Lutheran Vespers broadcasts reach the vast majority of members of the South Dakota Synod through its WNAX and KBHB broadcasts; and

WHEREAS, Lutheran Vespers is an outreach ministry to those who are not involved in local congregations; and

WHEREAS, there has been confusion among contributors to Lutheran Vespers over whether to send gifts in support of the broadcasts to the churchwide or to synod offices; and

WHEREAS, the current funding structure requires both staff time and money from the South Dakota Synod in seeking funding from individuals, groups, and congregations for local broadcast time; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the South Dakota Synod Council and Synod Communications Committee explore the possibility of funding the local broadcast of Lutheran Vespers by purchasing the broadcast time on WNAX and KBHB through the synod budget and the possibility of adding broadcasts to reach parts of the synod not reached by the current broadcasts; and be it further

RESOLVED, that congregations and individuals who currently support the local broadcasts financially be encouraged to continue to give financially to the synod in support of Lutheran Vespers broadcasts; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the South Dakota Synod in assembly memorialize the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly in Denver to include the production costs of Lutheran Vespers in the churchwide budget.

BACKGROUND

In 1998, Lutheran Vespers received \$475,000 from listeners in gifts and bequests. The ELCA churchwide budget, through the Department for Communication, supplemented this income with \$125,000 to support staff salaries and benefits. Thus, listeners provided 79 percent of the income for Lutheran Vespers. This income was used to pay for staff and program production and distribution.

Expenses for broadcast of the program on more than 220 radio stations in the United States, Guam, Denmark, Australia, and Swaziland were paid by local donors (individuals, congregations, groups of congregations, or commercial sponsors).

The amount of support Lutheran Vespers has received from the churchwide budget has doubled over the past five years.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.50 To refer the memorial on Lutheran Vespers from the South Dakota Synod to the Department for Communication with the request that it continue its efforts to increase both listener support and ELCA churchwide budget support for the radio outreach ministry of Lutheran Vespers.

Category 16: Rights for Associate Members in Congregations

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, page 54.

A. Florida-Bahamas Synod (9E) [1998 Memorial]

RESOLVED, that the Florida-Bahamas Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to revise the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America *Model Constitution for Congregations* (Chapter 8, "Membership," *C8.02.d.) to permit associate members to have voting rights and to serve on the congregation council as the local congregation deems appropriate.

BACKGROUND

This matter was addressed by a previous Churchwide Assembly. A memorial on the same subject was received from the Florida-Bahamas Synod in 1991.

Under the *Model Constitution for Congregations*, a category of associate members is defined in this way, “Associate members are persons holding membership in other [Lutheran] [Christian] congregations who wish to retain such membership but desire to participate in the life and mission of this congregation. They have all the privileges and duties of membership except voting rights and eligibility for elected offices or membership on the Congregation Council of this congregation” (*C8.02.d.).

The process for review of constitutions of congregations is the responsibility of synods of this church (ELCA churchwide bylaw 9.53.03.). Although a synod in the review process may permit congregations, except in required provisions, to depart from the *Model Constitution for Congregations*, the model is provided to reflect the unity of this church, the principles and patterns through which this whole church operates, and the interrelationships and interdependence that shape its life in ministry and service.

Granting voting rights to associate members appears to be the equivalent of permitting full membership in two congregations at the same time. Such a step removes the distinction between “voting members” and “associate members,” opens the way potentially for associate members to serve as officers or in the governance of more than one congregation of this church, or for associate members to be elected as voting members of the assemblies of two different synods.

In 1991, the Memorials Committee recommended that the Churchwide Assembly decline to take the action recommended Florida-Bahamas Synod relative to voting privileges for associate members. The same recommendation is appropriate now.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.51 To decline to propose an amendment to the *Model Constitution for Congregations* to eliminate the distinction between the categories of voting members and associate members of congregations; and

To transmit this response as information to the Florida-Bahamas Synod.

Category 17: Synod Assembly Franchise for all Conference Chairs

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, page 54.

A. Florida-Bahamas Synod (9E) [1998 Memorial]

RESOLVED, that the Florida-Bahamas Synod memorialize the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to include a non-mandatory amendment to the *Constitution, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*, and to the Constitution for Synods permitting voting privileges at synodical assemblies to all conference chairs who are not otherwise voting members under †S7.21.

BACKGROUND

A wide variety of patterns of operation exist in the various synods in the organization of conferences, clusters, coalitions, or other area subdivisions, established in Chapter 12 of the Constitution for Synods. Comparability does not exist in terms of the persons (clergy or lay) who serve as deans, chairs, or other designated leaders of area subdivisions in synods.

If the Florida-Bahamas Synod wished to allow voting privileges to conference chairs who are not already serving as voting members of the Synod Assembly, the synod could seek to adopt such a constitutional amendment under †S18.13. Such a provision would need to ensure that the representational principles specified in †S6.04. would continue to be observed under such an amendment.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.52 To transmit this information as the response of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly to the 1998 memorial of the Florida-Bahamas Synod related to voting membership in the Synod Assembly.

Category 18b: Representational Principles

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 55.

A. Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod (8B) [1998 Memorial]

WHEREAS, men and women have equal access and eligibility on all levels of the church within the ELCA (congregations, clusters, conferences, synods, regions, and churchwide offices); and

WHEREAS, no gender quota is prescribed for the congregation council, giving all church members of legal age, whether men or women, equal opportunity to be elected; based not on gender, but on each person's commitment and qualifications and on the trust of the voting members of the congregation council meeting and/or synod assembly respectively; and

WHEREAS, the gender quota is prescribed in the constitution for the election of voting members to the conference assembly, synod assembly, and the churchwide assembly can be a hindrance in the election of the most qualified persons; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod in assembly memorialize the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly to delete the gender quota prescription for voting members to all conferences, synods, and churchwide assemblies.

BACKGROUND

In response to memorials considered on this subject at the 1993 Churchwide Assembly, an extensive study was undertaken of the representational principles. That study showed general agreement that this church has considerable latitude to decide on its organizational patterns, within the limits of confessional integrity. Agreement also was evident through the study that the ELCA's representational principles are not an end in themselves, but means chosen to allow for the most complete and most inclusive participation by members of the ELCA in this church's decision-making processes.

Not only through the synodical memorials that led to the study, but also through widespread discussion and debate among individuals, several questions were raised. Among them were:

- 1) *Do the present representational principles compromise the Gospel in any way?* The charge was made that the present principles embody “reverse discrimination,” and so contradict the Gospel message that in Christ “there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female” (Galatians 3:28). From this perspective, the representational principles involve an attempt to impose a “new law” on the Church, which, however idealistic in its origins, leads to an oppressive legalism. In other words, a serious question about the role of Law and Gospel in the organizational life of this church was raised. On the other side of the issue, it was said that the goal of inclusivity is an imperative derived from the Gospel (ELCA constitutional provision 5.01.b.) and that the present principles—like all matters of church structure and organization—are an appropriate use of Law, employed as a guard against sin (“first use” of the Law, in a theological sense).
- 2) *Do the present principles enhance or hinder the ELCA’s stated goal of inclusivity?* Even those who believe that the present principles are satisfactory in light of a Law-Gospel dialectic sometimes argue that the present practice does not serve this church well. Specifically, they question whether sufficient attention has been paid to varying demographics within the ELCA.
- 3) *Should the representational principles be administered in a more flexible way?* Proponents of changing the principles argued that the problem with them, especially with regard to gender, ethnicity, and language was that more attention is paid to the “letter” of the law than to its “spirit.” They therefore argued for more flexibility in practice. For example, synod bishops and councils might be able to adjust local practices to their unique circumstances. Or some objectives might be phased in over time. Or the categories might be refined. Or percentages might be stated as ranges rather than as fixed numbers (e.g., “8-12 percent” rather than “10 percent”). The appeal was to the possibility of exercising appropriate discretion, particularly with regard to balancing the agreed-upon goal of inclusivity with certain pragmatic realities.
- 4) *Should a distinction be made between elected persons and those appointed to committees or task forces?* Persons who raised this question argued that there is a fundamental distinction that should be made between those who are elected to represent the membership of the ELCA on synodical or national boards and councils, on the one hand, and those who are asked to provide expert advice and counsel to this church through their service on appointed committees and task forces, on the other. It was said that appointed persons are accountable in a different way. Their function is to provide the elected “representatives” with the expert information and guidance necessary to make decisions for the good of this church. Thus, their qualifications should not be determined in the same way as elected persons. Specific expertise should be the principal qualification, not predetermined categories of gender, ethnicity, language, or clergy or lay status, except as these relate directly to the task.
- 5) *Do the representational principles position the ELCA properly for its mission in the world?* Advocates of the present principles said that they are necessary for missional purposes, as well as to satisfy the demands of simple justice. They argued that to include in highly visible positions those who have been habitually left out of this church and its structures sends a clear message—namely, that God’s unconditional mercy in

Jesus Christ is for all people. Those who raise their voices against present practice indicated that they were not questioning the goal of inclusivity, but were asking whether appropriate means are being employed. The question at stake was: "Are our present structures conducive to the articulation in word and deed of the very Gospel that has called us into being in the first place?"

The 1993-1995 study of this church's representational principles underscored this point, namely that members of this church dare not forget a crucial fact in any discussion of representational principles. That is, *we are not debating the core of the faith*, as embraced and confessed in the chapter, "Confession of Faith," in our church's governing documents. Rather, primarily but not exclusively, we are considering a matter of organization, that is, an aspect of how we as Lutherans have chosen to order our life together within this particular church body.

The study further noted that representational principles are not new for Lutherans in North America. So the discussion really could not be focused on whether or not we as a church will have representational principles. Rather, *consideration needs to be centered on the representational principles that we now have and why*.

Since the beginning of the first synods in North America, Lutherans have had "quotas" or representational principles. Initially, only pastors assembled in the Ministerium voted. Laymen could be observers. Eventually, on certain matters, both clergy and laymen voted.

At various points in North American Lutheran history, women gained voting privileges in their respective congregations. Likewise in synodical and national gatherings, women were included with vote. Only since the post-war period, however, have women had representation in increasing numbers within such governing bodies.

Upon receiving the full report [*1995 Pre-Assembly Report*, pages 745-783], the 1995 Churchwide Assembly adopted an amendment that provided for greater flexibility in synods in the composition of the Synod Assembly (revised †S7.21.c.). The assembly [*1995 Reports and Records: Assembly Minutes*, pages 269-276] also approved on a vote of 864-77 the following action [CA95.04.14]:

To receive with appreciation the theological study, analyses, historical review, and descriptions...in regard to the representational principles applied to councils, boards, and committees throughout the synods and the churchwide organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America...;

To affirm the judgment that the current representational principles do not compromise the Gospel but rather reflect an appropriate pattern for good order within the practice of this church's ecclesiology and polity;

To recognize that the current representational principles are not an end in themselves but are a means appropriate at this time in this church's history that have been chosen to allow for more complete and more inclusive participation by members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in this church's decision-making processes...;

To urge continued attention to community outreach and ministry by all congregations of this church so that each congregation may grow in awareness of being a mission center within its community as well as increase in commitment to the wider mission of this church throughout the respective synods and the churchwide ministries; and

To express gratitude for the salutary results that have emerged thus far through the practice of this church's representational principles.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.53 **To reaffirm the action of the 1995 Churchwide Assembly [CA95.04.14] in regard to the representational principles of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and**

To convey that action as the 1999 Churchwide Assembly's response to the 1998 memorial of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod related to representational principles.

Category 18c: Union and Federated ELCA Congregations

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 57.

A. Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod (7E) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Churchwide Assembly of the ELCA will consider adoption of a constitutional revision and bylaw section allowing for both union and federated congregations; and

WHEREAS, the Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod has a special interest in union church situations because of the presence on its territory of union churches in which one pastor jointly serves both a Lutheran and a United Church of Christ congregation; and

WHEREAS, Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod clergy currently serving in shared ministry situations see these revisions as an important and helpful asset for facilitating their ministries, especially in outreach to the unchurched; and

WHEREAS, the constitutions of the United Church of Christ and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), with whom the ELCA is now in communion, themselves allow and enable such arrangements; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod declares to the Churchwide Assembly of the ELCA its support of the constitutional amendment and encourages its adoption.

BACKGROUND

Constitutional and bylaw amendments were presented to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly related to this church's relationship to possible union or federated congregations. The amendments emerged from the implementation process related to the decision of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly to establish a full communion relationship with Reformed churches through *A Formula of Agreement*.

The proposed amendments were crafted carefully and provided for the possibility of specific agreements with partner church bodies in relation to these types of congregations.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.54 **To acknowledge the decision of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly on the constitutional and bylaw amendments in regard to union and federated congregations as the response to this memorial of the Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod.**

Category 18d: Spanish-speaking Heritage

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 57.

A. Caribbean Synod (9F) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is committed to diversity that fully represents the body of Christ; and

WHEREAS, diversity is enriched by the presence and gifts of ethnic groups of varying language, color, and race; and

WHEREAS, members of the ELCA of Spanish-speaking heritage are officially referred to by this church as “Hispanic”; and

WHEREAS, “Hispanic” is a name given by the U.S. Census Bureau; and

WHEREAS, the Spanish-speaking community defines itself as Latino and/or Hispanic; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the ELCA through its divisions, departments, and commissions and in its official documents, resources, and correspondence identify persons of Spanish-speaking heritage as “Latino/Hispanic”; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this resolution be forwarded to the ELCA 1999 Churchwide Assembly as a memorial.

BACKGROUND

Response from the Commission for Multicultural Ministries:

In the past, some of the ethnic communities through their respective associations have requested changing their names to reflect social trends. These requests were discussed and endorsed by the Commission for Multicultural Ministries Steering Committee and then forwarded to the Church Council with a request to adopt a resolution.

For example: “Black” was changed to “African American” in 1989 at the request of the African American Lutheran Association.

“Asian” was changed to “Asian and Pacific Islanders” in 1997 at the request of the Association of Asians and Pacific Islanders.

“Native American” was changed to “American Indian and Alaska Native” in 1998 at the request of the American Indian and Alaska Native Lutheran Association.

In each case, the request for changing a community’s name came from the community through its association.

In responding to the memorial of the Caribbean Synod, it may be wise to follow the same model. The Hispanic community is a very diverse community. In fact, Hispanic scholars rightly refer to their community as a “community of communities.” Since the Caribbean Synod, which is predominantly Puerto Rican Hispanic, is making this request, all Hispanics should have the opportunity to address this matter and bring a recommendation.

Response from the Office of the Secretary

For purposes of membership studies and comparisons with the general population, the official U.S. census designations are used by the churchwide organization in the statistical listing of persons of color and persons whose primary language is other than English. The governing documents do not use the slash mark virgule “/” because the meaning is not specific.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.55 To refer the memorial of the Caribbean Synod to the secretary of this church for review in consultation with appropriate churchwide units, particularly the Commission for Multicultural Ministries, and for consideration in the secretary's ongoing examination of the governing documents of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Category 19: Visiting the Holy Land

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, page 59.

A. New England Synod (7B) [1998 Memorial]

RESOLVED, that the New England Synod Assembly encourage any member of this synod, its congregations and institutions, when traveling to the Holy Land to arrange personal visits with congregations and members of Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan (ELCJ); and

RESOLVED, that the New England Synod office keep on file for our members the names, addresses, and other lines of communication to Bishop Munib Younan (or his successors) and congregations of the ELCJ; and

RESOLVED, that the New England Synod memorialize the ELCA in assembly through the Division for Global Mission to encourage all units of the church, its congregations and institutions, when traveling to the Holy Land, to arrange personal visits with congregations, and individuals of the ELCJ.

BACKGROUND

The memorial of the New England Synod provides a helpful reminder of the strategic role of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan (ELCJ) in that arena of ministry. The memorial also represents a reminder of the relationship of the ELCA and the ELCJ as member churches of the Lutheran World Federation.

Previous Action

In the context of a 1982 resolution on "peace with justice in the Middle East," the Eleventh General Convention of The American Lutheran Church (ALC) asked congregations and people of the ALC to seek, when making pilgrimage to the Holy Land, to establish contact with the Christian communities of the region. The Lutheran Church in America adopted a resolution in 1982 expressing solidarity with the churches of the Middle East by recognizing the suffering of their people from the ongoing Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Similarly, the 1989 ELCA Churchwide Assembly affirmed a message on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict expressing solidarity with members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan (ELCJ) "in their suffering and in their hope that peace might come in a place where there is little peace." The resolution of the 1989 Churchwide Assembly urged members of the ELCA to "familiarize themselves with the history of the Middle East and

current issues affecting the conflict so that they can be advocates for responsible political action.”

In a January 1998 address on the occasion of the consecration of the Rev. Munib Younan as bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan (ELCJ), Bishop Younan affirmed that it is part of the mission of the ELCJ “to promote peace, advocate justice, and build bridges between Palestinians and Israelis.” In July 1998, Bishop Younan wrote to the ELCA about the growing tensions in and around Jerusalem and requested that the ELCA promote U.S. policies that would protect the rights of all the inhabitants of Jerusalem and advocate for a just coexistence of Palestinians and Israelis and of Jews, Christians and Muslims in a shared Jerusalem.

In March 1999, the board of the Division for Global Mission approved the following resolution:

WHEREAS, we have heard the sense of urgency to address the issues associated with the status of Jerusalem, which require both more intensive education and advocacy within our church and in society on behalf of our Christian brothers and sisters and all others of good will in Jerusalem; and

WHEREAS, “Jerusalem is a holy city for three monotheistic religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—who share responsibility to cooperate to ensure that Jerusalem be a city open to the adherents of all three religions, a place where they can meet and live together”; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA Churchwide Assembly in 1993 affirmed in principle an ecumenical *Declaration on Christians in the Holy Land*, which called upon “the international community to respect and protect the unique historic nature of the Holy City of Jerusalem, and all the Holy Land, as being sacred to Jews, Christians and Muslims”; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA Church Council in 1996 welcomed the 1994 *Memorandum of Their Beatitudes, the Patriarchs, and of the Heads of Christian Communities in Jerusalem on The Significance of Jerusalem for Christians* and endorsed:

their affirmation that...[Jerusalem] “cannot belong exclusively to one people or to only one religion. Jerusalem should be open to all, shared by all”;

their invitation...“to give back to Jerusalem its true universal character and to make of the city a holy place of reconciliation for humankind”;

their call for a “special judicial and political statute for Jerusalem that reflects the universal importance and significance of the city”;

and advocated the strengthening of ecumenical efforts with the Vatican and others “to promote discussion on the future of Jerusalem, and thus, enable concerted Christian action on Jerusalem”; and

WHEREAS, Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson joined many other religious leaders in signing a 1996 statement calling for a Shared Jerusalem and a 1999 letter to the Israeli government expressing alarm and concern over the confiscation of East Jerusalem identity cards and the denial of residency rights in Jerusalem; and

WHEREAS, the Ninth Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation in 1997 adopted a *Statement on Jerusalem*, which reaffirmed that Jerusalem is a city of two nations—Palestine and Israel—and that it is significant for three religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam; and

WHEREAS, the Eighth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1998 issued a *Statement on the Status of Jerusalem*, adopting the following principles which must be taken into consideration in any final agreement on the status of Jerusalem and as the basis for a common ecumenical approach:

1. The peaceful settlement of the territorial claims of Palestinians and Israelis should respect the holiness and wholeness of the city.
2. Access to the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites should be free, and freedom of worship must be secured for peoples of all faiths.
3. The rights of all communities of Jerusalem to carry out their own religious, educational and social activities must be guaranteed.
4. Free access to Jerusalem must be assured and protected for the Palestinian people.
5. Jerusalem must remain an open and inclusive city.
6. Jerusalem must be a shared city in terms of sovereignty and citizenship.

7. The provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention must be honored with respect to the rights of Palestinians to property, building and residency; the prohibition of effecting changes in population in occupied territories; and the prohibition of changes in geographical boundaries, annexation of territory, or settlement which would change the religious, cultural or historical character of Jerusalem without the agreement of the parties concerned and the approval of the international community; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Board of the Division for Global Mission:

1. affirm the voice of the ELCA—through its Presiding Bishop, the Division for Church in Society and individual members—as the issue of Jerusalem has been advocated before the U.S. and other governments and call for continued faithfulness in advocacy on behalf of peace with justice for all in Palestine and Israel, including the rights and well-being of the Christian community;
2. reaffirm the on-going work of accompaniment between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan and the ELCA, mobilize for a stronger relationship and sharing of information, experiences and plans of action between our two churches, and call for our members to continue to pray for one another;
3. encourage plans underway by the Division, in cooperation with other churchwide units, to intensify awareness and understanding of the significance of Jerusalem for Christians among congregation members within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, including closer cooperation between churchwide units and the Association of Lutherans of Arab and Middle East Heritage (ALAMEH);
4. promote efforts—which are expected to include, but not be limited to, Bible studies, worship resources, suggestions for alternative travel and encounter with religious communities in Palestine and Israel, other educational programs, and statements and actions such as those above—to better equip ELCA members in the transition to the next millennium, particularly in relationship to the contemporary political, social and religious realities in Palestine and Israel; and
5. provide active consultation and assistance whenever possible in order to address specific issues which confront or affect the Christian community in Palestine and Israel.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.56 To receive the memorial of the New England Synod related to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan as information for members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America who travel to the Holy Land.

Category 21: Educational Materials on Homosexuality

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, page 62.

A. Southern California (West) Synod (2B) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, many persons in our congregations, perhaps even a majority, are impacted by homosexuality in their immediate or extended families; and

WHEREAS, the question of full inclusion of gay and lesbian persons in the life and mission of the ELCA has become divisive; and

WHEREAS, many gay and lesbian persons have experienced discrimination by pastors, congregations, and individuals of the ELCA; and

WHEREAS, an increasing number of the sexual majority in the ELCA have been saddened by what they feel is the un-Christian treatment of their gay and lesbian brothers and sisters; and

WHEREAS, the "Open Letter" from the Conference of Bishops, dated March 26, 1996, urged the ELCA and its members to be open and affirming of gay and lesbian persons. The bishops then asked gay and lesbian persons "to join with other members of this church in mutual prayer and study of the issues that still divide us, so that we may seek the truth together"; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA has not produced sufficient educational materials which congregations may use to study the issue of homosexuality, as has been accomplished in other denominations; and

WHEREAS, educational materials produced by the ELCA fall under the auspices of the ELCA Division for Congregational Ministries; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Southern California (West) Synod memorialize the ELCA to produce study materials, regarding the issue of homosexuality, for its member congregations; and be it further

RESOLVED, that study materials, produced by the ELCA regarding the issue of homosexuality, be prepared by a task force composed of Lutheran theologians, other professionals, and gay and lesbian persons from within the ELCA; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the preparation of study materials, produced by the ELCA regarding the issue of homosexuality, reflect the best possible interpretation of Scripture, examining both the traditional interpretation in the light of the latest biblical understanding and the latest scientific understanding; and be it further

RESOLVED, that study materials, produced by the ELCA regarding the issue of homosexuality, be prepared under the auspices of the ELCA Division for Congregational Ministries, and made available, preferably through the Augsburg Fortress Supply Catalog, at the earliest possible date for study by both adults and youth in our member congregations.

BACKGROUND

In 1995, the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America encouraged exploration by the Division for Church in Society of issues related to human sexuality, including "further development of study resources in cooperation with other churchwide units, ELCA-related seminaries, colleges and universities, and social ministry organizations." The 1995 Churchwide Assembly urged that "work continue unabated on resolving the church's position on homosexuality." In consultation with the Office of the Presiding Bishop, an *ad hoc* committee was formed in 1996 to consider the goals, scope, audience, methodology, and timeline for a deliberative process that would eventuate in recommendations on methods and resources for talking about homosexuality. The committee consisted of representatives from the Commission for Women, the Division for Ministry, the Conference of Bishops, the Office of the Presiding Bishop, a seminary and a college, Lutherans Concerned, and Faith and Life Forum. During 1997 and 1998, the committee helped sponsor eight discussions around the country; and, based on what it learned from these conversations, it developed suggestions for a resource to assist congregations in talking about homosexuality. The 1997 Churchwide Assembly affirmed the work of the Division for Church in Society in exploring models for discussing this topic.

In mid-1998, staff of the Division for Church in Society began work on a resource, drawing on what it learned from the eight discussions. The objectives for the development

of this resource were: 1) a balanced presentation articulating what the church teaches as well as challenges to this teaching, unlinked from churchwide policy making; 2) an emphasis on methods for organizing discussions, though short essays would be provided for the sake of congregations that have limited access to information from other sources; and 3) a resource geared to an adult audience with a basic to intermediate level of familiarity with the topic. Contributors to the resource are theologians of the church. The materials were reviewed by: gay and lesbian persons; representatives from synodical task forces that deal with gay and lesbian concerns; the Committee on Theological and Ethical Concerns of the Conference of Bishops; staff from other churchwide units; the Office of the Presiding Bishop; professionals with scientific expertise; the *ad hoc* committee that had created models of moral deliberation; the executive committee of the Division for Church in Society board; a group of seminarians; and a congregation. The Division for Congregational Ministries was consulted in the process of developing the resource.

While it was the intention of the Division for Church in Society to have this resource available by the end of 1998, a desire to be responsive to the critique of people at various places in the discussion delayed production. The resource will be in print and available from Augsburg Fortress, Publishers, in late summer 1999.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.57 **To acknowledge the publication of “Talking Together as Christians about Homosexuality, a Guide for Congregations” as the response of this assembly to the memorial from the Southern California (West) Synod.**

Category 22: Tax Issues in Congregations

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 64.

A. Southeastern Minnesota Synod (31) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, “an adequate parsonage...should be furnished for ordained pastors” (1999 Compensation Guidelines IV) and “(a parsonage) is to be an aid in the carrying out of the ministry” (Appendix A, Parsonage Guidelines, Southeastern Minnesota Synod, ELCA); and

WHEREAS, many congregations in small towns and rural areas still provide parsonages as an incentive for pastors to serve in places where buying a house is either difficult or not practical; and

WHEREAS, in recent years Internal Revenue Service rulings have increasingly insisted that ordained clergy file as employees for Federal income tax purposes but as self-employed for Social Security income; and

WHEREAS, the “fair-rental value” of parsonages is counted as Social Security income and ordained clergy pay self-employment tax based on this in addition to their cash wages; and

WHEREAS, living in a parsonage is becoming a financial liability due to the Federal income and Social Security tax situation and a disincentive for pastors to take calls where they would be required to live in a parsonage; and

WHEREAS, this adversely affects, in particular, congregations in rural settings who are increasingly unable to offer compensation packages which are competitive and adequately address the taxation issues; and

WHEREAS, this is hitting rural congregations at a time when all rural institutions are under increasing financial stress and are fighting for their survival; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Southeastern Minnesota Synod seek new ways, besides the "Compensation Guidelines," to assist congregations and pastors in dealing with the taxation issues involving parsonages; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America be memorialized to sponsor a study of financial issues in congregations in rural settings and how this impacts their ability to call and retain pastors to rural ministry in order to develop new ways to help rural ministry situations; and be it further

RESOLVED that the ELCA work with other church bodies, including but not limited to its ecumenical partners, to seek ways to assist rural congregations in attracting and keeping pastors in rural ministry.

BACKGROUND

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has ongoing concern for congregations in small towns and in rural and inner city settings which find it difficult to offer adequate compensation packages to pastors and other rostered leaders. The memorial from the Southeastern Minnesota Synod relates to the ongoing work of synods as well as the churchwide organization through the Division for Ministry and the Division for Outreach. The Division for Ministry works with ELCA synods to develop compensation guidelines to assure adequate salaries and benefits for rostered leaders. The Division for Ministry is engaged in a study of clergy supply and demand. Factors related to compensation, as well as a churchwide strategy concerning the recruitment of potential leaders, are elements in the study. The Division for Outreach recently established a Rural Desk with concern for the health of rural, small-membership congregations.

The memorial raises issues that go beyond the work of these churchwide divisions. Internal Revenue Service regulations and current federal income tax law related to payment of self-employment tax on the value of the parsonage may be issues which can be addressed only by engaging in the legislative process required to change tax law or in seeking a ruling by the IRS.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.58 To acknowledge the concerns that are expressed in the memorial of the Southeastern Minnesota Synod on tax issues for congregations with parsonages;

To refer the memorial from the Southeastern Minnesota Synod to the Division for Ministry, the Division for Outreach, and the ELCA Office of the Secretary for study; and

To request that a report on the study be brought through the Church Council to the 2001 Churchwide Assembly.

Category 23: Independent Sports Leagues

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section IV, page 64.

A. Saint Paul Area Synod (3H) [1999 Memorial]

WHEREAS, independent sports leagues for youth are growing in popularity; and

WHEREAS, tournaments and tryouts and practices often take place during times that conflict with family and religious activities; and

WHEREAS, sports can become a religion of its own; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Saint Paul Area Synod of the ELCA enter into conversation with the various independent sports leagues in order to form a family- and religion-friendly policy regarding the scheduling of tournaments, tryouts and practices; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Saint Paul Area Synod memorialize the ELCA to study the sports phenomena which has developed in our culture and to develop study materials for its members to assist them in relation to this phenomenon, where appropriate in consultation with the broader faith community.

BACKGROUND

The matter of how the phenomena of sports have developed in our culture is one aspect of complex cultural trends and influences. These trends and influences compete with and often compromise family and religious life. The Division for Church in Society, under whose auspices such a study could appropriately occur, does not at this time have the resources, staff, or priority to devote to this particular focus.

This focus, however, is part of the wider cultural milieu that deeply affects what it means to be faithful followers of Jesus Christ in our world today. "Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns" describes a process for planning and overseeing the development of resources to equip and nurture members of this church for their calling in the world. The coordinating team responsible for the Sphere One area might consider the possibility of a study to examine the wider cultural milieu, including the sports phenomenon, that affect faith and moral formation in this society.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.06.59 To affirm the concern addressed in the memorial of the Saint Paul Area Synod describing the frequent competition and conflict of recreational and leisure activities with family and religious life inherent in today's culture;

To refer this memorial, and the wider issue of cultural trends and forces that affect family and religious life, to the Coordinating Team described in Sphere One of "Policies and Procedures of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for Addressing Social Concerns," requesting the team to consider the development of study resources pertaining to these concerns; and

To transmit this response as information to the Saint Paul Area Synod.

Mr. Peña thanked the members of the committee and added the name of Ms. Sheila Barr, whose name was inadvertently omitted from the official list of committee members. Bishop Anderson thanked the members of the committee and noted that the work of the Memorials Committee had been completed.

Amendments to Constitutions and Bylaws (continued) Removed from the *En Bloc* Resolution

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, pages 109-116; continued on *Minutes*, pages 445, 459, 461, 625.

Bishop Anderson invited Mr. Dale V. Sandstrom, a member of the Church Council, to the podium as a resource person for the discussion of constitutional amendments.

MOVED;

SECONDED: *To amend †S14.13.d. and *C9.05.d. as follows:*

†S14.13.d. In the case of alleged local difficulties that imperil the effective functioning of the congregation, all concerned persons shall be heard, after which the bishop of this synod together with the committee described in †S14.13.b. shall decide on the course of action to be recommended to the pastor and the congregation. If they agree to carry out such recommendations, no further action shall be taken by this synod. If either party fails to assent, the congregation may dismiss the pastor by a two-thirds majority vote of the voting members present and voting at a regularly legally called meeting after consultation with the bishop. Should the vote exceed a majority of the voting members present and voting but be less than two-thirds of the votes cast, the bishop may consent, in her or his sole discretion, to the dismissal of the pastor by the congregation on the basis of such simple majority vote.

***C9.05.d.** In the case of alleged local difficulties that imperil the effective functioning of the congregation, all concerned persons shall be heard, after which the bishop of the synod together with the committee described in *C9.05.b. shall decide on the course of action to be recommended to the pastor and the congregation. If they agree to carry out such recommendations, no further action shall be taken by the synod. If either party fails to assent, the congregation may dismiss the pastor by a two-thirds majority vote of the voting members present and voting at a regularly legally called meeting after consultation with the bishop. Should the vote exceed a majority of the voting members present and voting but be less than two-thirds of the votes cast, the bishop may consent, in her or his sole discretion, to the dismissal of the pastor by the congregation on the basis of such simple majority vote.

Secretary Almen informed the assembly that the first half of each proposal deals with clarifying items in the *Constitution for Synods* and the *Model Constitution for Congregations* to bring consistency in language dealing with how meetings are called. The second half of each proposal is based on the experience of recent years, he said, and is intended to provide additional protection to congregations.

Bishop Robert D. Berg [Northwest Synod of Wisconsin] moved to divide the question.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes-494; No-370

CARRIED: To divide the question so that the amendment in the second to last sentence and the amendment proposed in the last sentence can be considered separately.

The Rev. Lloyd L. Menke [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] asked Secretary Almen whether a synod or congregation constitution would take precedence in the case of a discrepancy. Secretary Almen said the synod constitution would prevail in issues related to ordained ministry.

Bishop Robert L. Isaksen [New England Synod] said that when he deals with congregations in conflict, he always hopes the issue “never gets to a vote,” because then “we are in a real pickle.” Adoption of the change, he said, “allows a way out.”

The Rev. Marshall E. Hahn [Northeast Iowa Synod] said that in cases of conflict “there is enough blame to go around.” All too often, he said, the “first resort” is to get rid of the pastor, rather than the last resort. The two-thirds requirement, he said, parallels the vote necessary to call a pastor. “You do not want it to be easy to get rid of a pastor,” he said, so that “people work on the real issue.”

The Rev. Harvey L. Nelson [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] asked two questions: first, whether the proposed changes opened up greater possibilities for litigation; and second, whether they properly reflect the interdependence of this church.

Mr. Philip H. Harris, general counsel of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, said that, while anyone can sue over virtually any issue, he believed that civil courts would continue to respect decisions made by churches which conformed to the church’s own procedures.

Secretary Almen responded that the changes would be a proper reflection of the interdependence in this church.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Yes-832; No-65

CA99.06.60 To amend †S14.13.d. and *C9.05.d. as follows: “...If either party fails to assent, the congregation may dismiss the pastor by a two-thirds majority vote of the voting members present and voting at a regularly legally called meeting after consultation with the bishop.”

Bishop Lee M. Miller [Upstate New York Synod] offered an amendment.

MOVED;

SECONDED: To insert “and/or decision of the Synod Council” in the final sentence following “discretion.”

Bishop Anderson noted that this amendment must be submitted to the Committee of Reference and Counsel and would be returned for further deliberation at Plenary Session Eleven.

Recess

Secretary Almen introduced Bishop Allan C. Bjornberg [Rocky Mountain Synod] who told voting members that the blue spruce seedlings on their tables were a gift from the Rocky Mountain Synod and from the assembly volunteers whom he called the “purple people pleasers,” referring to the color of the shirts worn by the volunteers.

Secretary Almen announced several items related to departure procedures and also announced that the assembly Web site had received 45,000 “hits” daily, on average, and that “Wilbur the pig” had received more than \$4,500 in contributions to the ELCA World Hunger Appeal.

Bishop Anderson called on Mr. DeQuan C. Kuntu, youth advisory member of the Church Council, for the prayer and closing hymn, “We Come To the Hungry Feast.”

At 5:03 P.M. Bishop Anderson declared the assembly in recess until 8:30 A.M. on Sunday morning, August 22, 1999.

Plenary Session Eleven

Sunday, August 22, 1999

8:30 A.M.–12:00 NOON

The Rev. H. George Anderson, presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, called Plenary Session Eleven to order on Sunday, August 22, 1999, at 8:31 A.M. He thanked the members of the vocal group who provided music to the assembly prior to the opening of the plenary session. Bishop Anderson invited Ms. Lily R. Wu, a member of the Church Council, to lead the assembly in the opening hymn and prayer.

Acknowledgment of Retiring Bishops

Bishop Anderson asked the assembly to take a moment to acknowledge the service of a number of bishops who had completed terms in office, retired, or resigned between 1997 and the end of August 1999. Bishop Anderson read the names of the following bishops, acknowledged those who were present, and expressed this church's gratitude to them for their service to their synods and to the whole Church:

Richard F. Bansemer – Virginia Synod
Ronald K. Hasley – Northern Illinois Synod
Robert M. Keller – Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod
Ralph A. Kempinski – Indiana-Kentucky Synod
Robert L. Miller – Pacifica Synod
Donald D. Parsons – Alaska Synod
James A. Rave – Northwestern Ohio Synod
Dale R. Skogman – Northern Great Lakes Synod
J. Philip Wahl – Southeast Michigan Synod

Saying that "When one is elected, the whole family is affected," Bishop Anderson asked the bishops' spouses to come forward as well. He also recognized the spouses of the active bishops and gave thanks for them.

Expression of Thanks

Bishop Anderson expressed his gratitude "to the many people who helped to make the assembly a wonderful event," saying that the Committee of Reference and Counsel would introduce a number of resolutions of gratitude later in the plenary session. He began his expressions of gratitude by thanking the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, for his many contributions to the assembly and asked the assembly to join him in expressing thanks. The assembly responded with applause. Bishop Anderson invited Secretary Almen to say a few words of thanks to his staff for all their work.

Secretary Almen, acknowledging the participation of numerous people and units in planning and carrying out the assembly, first thanked the Rev. Paul R. Nelson, director for worship, and the other members of the worship staff of the Division for Congregational Ministries. He then commended the members and volunteers of the Department for Communication for their essential contributions. Secretary Almen went on to thank his staff and the staff of the Office of the Presiding Bishop for their heroic efforts. From the Office of the Secretary, he noted in particular the Rev. Randall R. Lee, executive assistant to the secretary, Ms. Mary Beth Nowak, director for meeting management and travel, and Ms. Alpha E. Ekstrom, director for official roster records. He praised Ms. Ekstrom's 43 years of churchwide service in this and predecessor church bodies and presented her with a certificate of appreciation.

Secretary Almen concluded his remarks with thanks to the voting members “for the conscientious, informed, and thoughtful ways in which you have carried out your responsibilities for the well-being of our church.” He also expressed gratitude to Bishop Anderson, saying, “You have led this assembly with vision, graciousness, superb fairness, clarity, and thoughtful care for all present. Our church, I believe, is appropriately grateful to you. I thank you, dear brother in Christ. I thank you, dear presiding bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.” Secretary Almen’s statement of gratitude to Bishop Anderson was affirmed by the assembly with applause.

Bishop Anderson asked the assembly to turn to page six in their assembly program for others whom he wanted to thank. Bishop Anderson offered a word of special thanks to the Rev. Eric C. Shafer, director for the Department for Communications, and to the “terrific communications staff and the many volunteers in that area.” Bishop Anderson also thanked Lutheran Brotherhood, for their media support. In addition he thanked Aid Association for Lutherans and Lutheran Brotherhood for their overall support for this assembly. “Many of the things that made this hard-working assembly enjoyable were made possible because of their financial assistance,” he reported, “from tote bags to voting machines.” He directed the voting members’ attention to a list of the specific grants in their assembly *Program*.

Bishop Anderson extended gratitude to the members of his immediate staff: the Rev. Robert N. Bacher, executive for administration, the Rev. Michael L. Cooper-White, and Ms. Myrna J. Sheie, executive assistants to the presiding bishop, and members of his office staff, including Ms. Patricia A. Hoyt, administrative assistant to the presiding bishop, Ms. Nancy L. Vaughn, administrative assistant, and Mr. Ryan Brodin, summer intern.

Theme Focus: Signs of Hope

Bishop Anderson called upon Ms. Addie J. Butler, vice president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to share the last in a series of “Signs of Hope” leading this church into a new century, saying that one sign of hope is that this church is a serving church. Ms. Butler began her presentation by reminding the assembly of the response at the conclusion of the liturgy in *Lutheran Book of Worship*, in which the congregation is exhorted to “Go in peace and serve the Lord.” “And we have,” she announced, introducing a video that surveyed examples of service. One example was a program administered by Lutheran Social Services of Illinois that links prisoners with Habitat for Humanity, “Building Homes, Rebuilding Lives.” In this partnership walls for new houses are built in prison, then shipped to the site. Volunteers and the families who will live in the Habitat houses come to the prison to meet their prisoner partners. At the conclusion of this theme focus, Bishop Anderson invited the assembly to recognize Vice President Butler for her work.

Greetings: Federal Chaplains

Bishop Anderson recognized a number of federal chaplains who had been present throughout the assembly, among them the Rev. Paul A. Anderson; the Rev. Carl W. Rosenberg; the Rev. Jeffrey L. Zust; the Rev. Heinz E. Malon; the Rev. Victor Langford III; and John Armistead. He thanked the Rev. Lloyd W. Lyngdal, executive assistant to the presiding bishop for federal chaplaincies, who coordinates this ministry. He called to the podium the Rev. Howard D. Stendahl, a lieutenant colonel with the Air Force Recruiting Service at Randolph Air Force Base in Texas, to bring a greeting from the chaplains.

____Saying that he had thought long and hard about how to share the experience of chaplaincy with the assembly, Pastor Stendahl told a story from an assignment to the

countries of eastern Europe where he was to work toward establishing programs for human freedom, especially religious freedom, for soldiers. While traveling in Croatia, he met four “giants of the faith,” nuns who had been bombed in the war but continued to minister to their neighbors out of the basement of their dwelling. After the Dayton Accords restored peace to the region and their house was rebuilt, the nuns greeted Pastor Stendahl in 1998. Presenting him with a single bottle of wine saved from the ruins and bread they had baked, they said, “We thank God for you because you bring us hope for freedom again.” Pastor Stendahl told of how embarrassed he was to be served by those who had suffered so much, but explained that this story illustrates the many ways chaplains minister in addition to ministering to troops. During his time in Croatia, Pastor Stendahl said “at each step of the way I thought of you who make this ministry possible.” He concluded by saying that all chaplains have stories to tell about helping those who may not have a voice, who may not have religious freedom to receive the ministry of Word and Sacrament. He blessed the assembly, saying, “God’s peace to you and to us all.”

Report of the Elections Committee

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, pages 9-12, 28; continued on *Minutes*, pages 409, 491, 516, 651, and Exhibit B.

Bishop Anderson called upon Mr. Scott S. Fintzen, associate general counsel of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and chair of the Elections Committee, for a final report. Mr. Fintzen reported that the ballots had been counted and the results had been distributed to all voting members. He observed that the names of candidates receiving a majority of votes were printed in bold-face type. He asked Bishop Anderson for permission to dispense with the reading of the results and to declare those persons whose names appeared in bold-face type to be elected. Hearing no objection, Bishop Anderson asked that the election results be approved by a voice vote. Following approval by the assembly, Bishop Anderson thanked Mr. Fintzen for his work and the work of the committee.

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Voice Vote

CA99.07.61 To receive the written report of the Elections Committee on the results of the Second Common Ballot for filling vacancies on the Church Council, and churchwide boards and committees;

To dispense with the reading of the report; and

To request that the chair hereby declare elected, in keeping with this church’s bylaws, those persons receiving a majority of the votes cast.

Church Council

Pr. Michael G. Merkel, New Haven, Conn. (7B)

Division for Congregational Ministries

Pr. Jeffrey L. Schock, Latrobe, Pa. (8B)
Ms. Fran Burnford, North Hollywood, Calif. (2B)
Ms. Virginia A. Kneuppel, Norcross, Ga. (9D)
Mr. Michael E. Krentz, Emmaus, Pa. (7E)

Division for Ministry

Pr. Robert J. Karli, Austin, Texas (4E)
Pr. Jean Bozeman, Newport News, Va. (9A)
Pr. Mary P. Lund, Apple Valley, Minn. (3H)
Ms. Lynn H. Askew, New Brunswick, N.J. (7A)
Ms. Mary J. Mikulski, Harlan, Ind. (6C)

Division for Outreach

Mr. James R. Judy, Greenville, Pa. (8A)

Division for Higher Education and Schools

Pr. Jayne M. Thompson, Manhattan, Kan. (4B)
Mr. Rod Schofield, Colorado Springs, Colo. (2E)

Division for Church in Society

Ms. Rebecca P. Judge, Northfield, Minn. (3I)
Ms. Charlene Lipscomb, Parma, Ohio (6E)
Mr. Roger Gutmann, Des Moines, Iowa (5D)
Mr. Robert W. Tuttle, Washington, D.C. (8G)

Division for Global Mission

Pr. L. Paul Bartling, Seattle, Wash. (1B)
Pr. Harvey L. Nelson, Litchfield, Minn. (3F)

Publishing House of the ELCA

Pr. Gregory C. Moser, Sioux Falls, S.D. (3C)
Mr. R. Guy Erwin, New Haven, Conn. (7B)
Mr. James “Jim” Myers, Kailua, Hawaii (2C)

Board of Pensions

Ms. Karen (Schaaf) Southward, Columbus, Ohio (6F)
Mr. Bradley C. Engel, Burlington, Wis. (5J)

Nominating Committee

Pr. Clark K. Cary, Blue Earth, Minn. (3I)
Pr. Stephen R. Herr, Blairsville, Pa. (8B)
Mr. Steven L. Knowles, Whitefish Bay, Wis. (5J)

Committee on Discipline

Pr. J. Christian Quello, Appleton, Wis. (5I)
Mr. Mark N. Reed, Luray, Va. (9A)

Introductions of Churchwide Board and Committee Chairs, and Churchwide Unit Executive Directors and Directors

Reference: *1999 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section I, 27-28.

Bishop Anderson read the names of those who work with churchwide units and asked those present to come to the podium: the chairs of boards, steering committees, and advisory committees; and the directors of the various churchwide units. Those thanked for their service included:

Division for Congregational Ministries

Board Chair: Pr. Nancy I. Amacher

Executive Directors: Pr. M. Wyvetta Bullock

Pr. Mark R. Moller-Gunderson

Lutheran Laity Movement for Stewardship

Board President: Mr. Dean Arnold

Executive Director: Ms. Joyce Cain

Lutheran Men in Mission

President: Mr. Charlie Schwartz

Director: Mr. Douglas Haugen

Lutheran Youth Organization

President: Ms. Rebecca Lawrence

Division for Ministry

Board Chair: Mr. Nelvin Vos

Executive Director: Pr. Joseph M. Wagner

Division for Outreach

Board Chair: Pr. Julius Carroll IV

Executive Director: Pr. Richard A. Magnus

Division for Higher Education and Schools

Board Chair: Pr. John G. Andreasen

Executive Director: Pr. W. Robert Sorensen

Division for Church in Society

Board Chair: Ms. Ingrid Christiansen

Executive Director: Pr. Charles S. Miller

Division for Global Mission

Board Chair: Pr. Winston D. Persaud

Executive Director: Pr. Bonnie L. Jensen

Commission for Multicultural Ministries

Steering Committee Chair: Pr. W. Arthur Lewis

Executive Director: Pr. Frederick E. N. Rajan

Commission for Women

Steering Committee Chair: Pr. Ann M. Tiemeyer

Executive Director: Ms. Joanne Chadwick

Church Periodical, *The Lutheran*

Advisory Committee Chair: Ms. Hazel H. Reinhardt

Executive Director and Editor: Pr. Edgar R. Trexler

ELCA Foundation

Board Chair: Mr. David D. Swartling
Executive Director: Pr. Donald M. Hallberg

Publishing House of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Augsburg Fortress, Publishers
Board Chair: Mr. Todd P. Engdahl
President: Pr. Marvin L. Roloff

Board of Pensions

Chair of Board of Trustees: Ms. Emma Graeber Porter
President: Mr. John G. Kapanke

Women of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

President: Ms. Linda Chinnia
Executive Director: Ms. Catherine I. H. Braasch

Department for Communication

Director: Pr. Eric C. Shafer

Department for Ecumenical Affairs

Director: Pr. Daniel F. Martensen

Department for Human Resources and Management Services

Director: Ms. Else B. Thompson

Department for Research and Evaluation

Director: Mr. Kenneth W. Inskeep

Department for Synodical Relations

Director: Pr. Michael L. Cooper-White

**Amendments to Constitutions and Bylaws (continued)
Removed from the *En Bloc* Resolution**

Reference: 1999 *Pre-Assembly Report*, Section IV, page 114; continued on *Minutes*, pages 445, 459, 461, 617.

Bishop Anderson called upon Ms. Linda J. Brown, co-chair of the Committee of Reference and Counsel, to continue the discussion of the second part of the proposed amendments to †S.14.13.d. and *C9.05.d., concerning procedures for dismissing a pastor. Ms. Brown reported that the committee recommended that the assembly not approve the amendment to the proposed amendment, asserting that it would be unwise to involve the synod council in the personnel decisions of congregations.

Bishop Lee M. Miller [Upstate New York Synod] said that he had proposed this amendment because there are some situations where the bishop is perceived as erring on one side or another in a conflicted congregation, while many would consider the synod council to be a neutral party. He stated that if this assembly thought that his proposal was too problematic, he would monitor situations in his parishes and return in two years to address the issue again.

Mr. Wayne Goerlich [New Jersey Synod], a member of the New Jersey Synod Council, spoke against the amendment, saying that he did not consider it appropriate for the council to take on the problems of congregations. He also recommended that conflicted congregations “not air dirty laundry in the press.”

Bishop Donald J. McCoid [Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod] reported an example of a synod council providing successful adjudication for a congregation that had followed the constitutional process for dismissing a pastor but whose vote had not quite reached the required two-thirds majority.

Ms. Janet E. Thompson [Saint Paul Area Synod] spoke in opposition to the amendment, saying that she understood the work of the synod council to be mission and the work of the bishop to be oversight of congregations. The two should be kept separate.

The Rev. Diane E. Wheatley [Upstate New York Synod] stated that her synod has been blessed with a very good bishop but that she could foresee a time when a bishop might be too close to a pastor involved in a conflict or a case of misconduct. She urged a way for the synod council to move forward independently.

Mr. Patrick L. Mansfield [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] argued that the synod council was “just another committee” and that synod committees should not tell a congregation how to govern its life. He recommended that the two-thirds majority remain in effect.

Mr. Y. T. Chiu [Northeastern Ohio Synod] noted that the bishop at times has to be the pastor of the pastor, so that when a congregation is in trouble the bishop is personally involved. He thought that the synod council would be unbiased.

Bishop David C. Wold [Southwestern Washington Synod] called the removal of a pastor “one of the most sensitive actions a bishop would ever take” necessitating care and patience. He stated that this church already has in place the opportunity for a bishop to consult with others, and he claimed that the proposed amendment confuses the roles of synod council and the Office of Bishop. He noted that when a bishop’s fairness is questioned, the synod council can be an avenue for appeal. “Things are already in place,” he said.

Bishop Steven L. Ullestad [Northeastern Iowa Synod] asked whether the “synodical administration” provisions already cover the concerns of the proposed amendment. Secretary Almen replied that the specific provisions could not be circumvented by the request for synodical administration.

Ms. Sandra R. Cline [North Carolina Synod] moved to end debate on this matter.

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes-795; No-77

CARRIED: To move the previous question.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes-248; No-631

DEFEATED: To amend the proposed amendment of †S.14.13.d. and *C9.05.d. by inserting after the word “discretion” the following phrase:

“and/or decision of the Synod Council,”

Bishop Anderson said that debate would continue with the proposed amendment as recommended by the Church Council.

Bishop Roy G. Almquist [Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod] spoke in favor of the amendment because it would give the bishop a role in a negotiated settlement so that a conflicted congregation would not become “stuck.” At the same time the amendment also would give the bishop an opportunity to truly support a pastor if the pastor has taken a prophetic stance, he said. It strengthens the office of the bishop, he concluded.

Bishop Donald H. Maier [Northwest Washington Synod] was opposed to the amendment, saying that when he needs to take up such an awesome decision, he wants some mechanism to stand behind him in the place of appeal. The function of the synod council is to have a place for appeal, he stated.

Mr. Gerald Johnson [Nebraska Synod], using his own experience as a president of a conflicted congregation, argued that the bishop should have the power to intervene.

Ms. Cynthia A. Jurisson [Metropolitan Chicago Synod] objected to the amendment, saying that in a deeply-conflicted situation, the congregation, pastor, or bishop all were capable of making a mistake. In really crucial decisions, she argued, working toward the two-thirds consensus is the best way. It makes sense, she thought, to keep a checks-and-balances system as is already in place.

The Rev. William L. Hurst Jr. [Metropolitan New York Synod], suggesting that one person’s malfeasance is another’s prophetic stance, asserted that bishops need the authority that the amendment provides.

Mr. Patrick L. Mansfield [Southeastern Minnesota Synod] stated that “we are a negative society.” Even in congregations, he said, people gather around the negative, so retaining a two-thirds majority would ensure that a simple majority of disaffected members could not force the removal of a pastor.

Mr. Michael Franklin [Indiana-Kentucky Synod] moved to end debate on this matter.

MOVED;

Two-Thirds Vote Required

SECONDED;

Yes-781; No-64

CARRIED: To move the previous question.

ASSEMBLY

Two-Thirds Vote Required

ACTION

Yes-567, No-296

CA99.07.62 To not adopt the further amendment of †S.14.13.d and *C9.05.d. by the addition of the following:

Should the vote exceed a majority of the voting members present and voting but be less than two-thirds of the votes cast, the bishop may consent, in her or his sole discretion, to the dismissal of the pastor by the congregation on the basis of such simple majority vote.

Report of the Committee of Reference and Counsel (continued)

Reference: 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, Section X, pages 8-10 (Section I, pages 7, 13, 17, 28); continued on *Minutes*, pages 284, 482, 548.

Bishop Anderson asked Ms. Brown to present to the assembly resolutions of appreciation. Motions were offered to thank Presiding Bishop Anderson, Vice President Butler, Secretary Almen, and Mr. Richard L. McAuliffe, treasurer of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. These resolutions were passed enthusiastically by voice vote and were accompanied by standing ovations. A resolution thanking the staff of the Evangelical Lutheran in America also was passed with applause.

Motion H: Resolution of Appreciation for Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.07.63

With great appreciation and gratitude we, the members of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly, on behalf of the members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, receive the report of Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson.

We are grateful to God for his wise and Gospel-centered leadership. We appreciate the way he models humility and dependence on the Holy Spirit for all of us. We have been blessed by his many gifts to our Church and the world these past four years he has served as our Presiding Bishop.

We are confident in his ability to lead us as a church of the great commission, bringing hope to God's world for a new century. God has given our bishop courage and foresight to help us identify and carry forward the Spirit's bequest of bringing Christ's Church together into a new millennium. At his urging, we paddle forth into the waters of deeper partnership with God's people around the globe.

We will support him and follow his leadership by:

- committing ourselves to work prayerfully to strengthen the leadership of our congregations, to faithfully and creatively make disciples, and to participate persistently, through all expressions of the Church, in partnerships that enhance our mission.**
- renewing our commitment to the seven initiatives our bishop has set before the Church.**
- redoubling our efforts to feed God's hungry children and to end hunger in God's world.**
- responding to God's call to make Christ known as the bright hope to all people as we step out in faith into the new century.**

**Motion I: Resolution of Appreciation for
Vice President Addie J. Butler**

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.07.64 We, the members of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, are grateful for the fine leadership and faithful dedication of Dr. Addie J. Butler in her service as vice president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for the past two years.

We appreciate her considerable contributions of time, talent, and treasure. She is a generous and accomplished leader who presides with distinction over the deliberations of the Church Council. In addition she is an avid ambassador for the ELCA in her travels and speaking across the country, a bridge builder, enabler, and witness for the faith. Her love of the church inspires us.

We recognize with thankfulness the service of Dr. Addie J. Butler.

**Motion J: Resolution of Appreciation for
Secretary Lowell G. Almen**

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.07.65 With great appreciation and gratitude we, the members of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly, on behalf of all members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, receive the report of the Rev. Lowell G. Almen, secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

We thank God for Secretary Almen's devotion to the work of our Lord and of this church, and specifically to the many and varied responsibilities of the Office of Secretary.

We are grateful for his leadership in lifting up both the heritage of our past and our hope for the future. We appreciate his creative and entertaining report, making alive for us this church's "warehouse of miracles," the ELCA archives, through images of the people, places, and events that are our heritage. We share with him the hope that God will

enable us to seize the opportunities of the future with faith and confidence. There can be miracles when we believe!

We thank him for:

- his dedicated attention to the work and details of the assembly;
- his unfailing wit and humor (and occasional smile), a much-needed interlude during long assembly sessions; and
- his caring concern for members, visitors, and guests of the assembly, alerting us to hazards like altitude sickness, diagonal intersection crossings, and crowded escalator landings.

We join with him in the insight that “there are mountains yet to be moved,” and commit ourselves to that task, with God’s help, in a new millennium!

**Motion K: Resolution of Appreciation for
Treasurer Richard L. McAuliffe**

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.07.66

We express deep appreciation to ELCA Treasurer Richard L. McAuliffe for the faithful performance of his duties.

We express gratitude for the clearness of his presentation of the financial report to the assembly. We feel that the clarity of the financial reports has helped elicit the confidence of synods, congregations, and members of the churchwide organization. This credibility has developed trust in the churchwide organization and has facilitated the growth of mission support.

We communicate sincere thankfulness that our treasurer performs his duties with fidelity and fiduciary responsibility. We also recognize the good stewardship that the Office of the Treasurer uses in the administration of the gifts presented to the churchwide organization from the synods and congregations.

And finally, we acknowledge the continued service of Treasurer McAuliffe as president and executive director of the Mission Investment Fund.

**Motion L: Resolution of Appreciation for the Staff
of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America**

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

EN BLOC

CA99.07.67

WHEREAS, we, the members of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America have gathered together in hope for a new century; and

WHEREAS, this assembly has accomplished the tasks set before us in an orderly fashion; and

WHEREAS, these tasks could not have been accomplished without the help and support of the staff members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America with their many and diverse gifts; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that we, the members of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, give thanks to God for those who work to help this church bring a message of hope for a new century by “Making Christ Known.”

Point of Personal Privilege

Bishop Donald H. Maier [Northwest Washington Synod] moved that the assembly reconsider its vote on †S.14.13.d. and *C09.05.d. He acknowledged being confused over which amendment he had been voting on.

MOVED;

SECONDED;

Yes—372, No—447

DEFEATED: To reconsider CA99.07.62.

Ms. Brown offered a resolution of thanksgiving to the Rocky Mountain Synod for its hospitality, which was adopted by the assembly with applause.

Motion M: Resolution of Thanksgiving

ASSEMBLY

ACTION

Voice Vote

CA99.07.68

WHEREAS, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has gathered in assembly in the mile-high city of Denver, Colorado; and

WHEREAS, after a week of discussion, debate, and decisions on issues that will affect the future of this church, we now prepare to return home knowing that God goes with each one of us. We acknowledge that it will be our responsibility to carry the message of this assembly to our congregations and our communities; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that we give thanks to God for our sisters and brothers in Christ and to the Rocky Mountain Synod for being such excellent hosts; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America give thanks to all who have worked so hard to ensure the smooth running of this assembly and who planned the Churchwide Assembly Festival; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly extend special thanks to Bishop Allan C. Bjornberg of the Rocky Mountain Synod, all our speakers and presenters, the local arrangements committee, the ELCA churchwide staff planning committee, the many subcommittees, and all the volunteers who have given so generously of their time; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly express its appreciation to Aid Association for Lutherans and Lutheran Brotherhood for their generous support of this assembly; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly express its gratitude to all those involved in the assembly worship: planners, participants, and musicians; we have been blessed as God's Word has been proclaimed and the Sacrament celebrated; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America pray for God's blessing on this assembly and for the gift of the Holy Spirit as we carry the decisions made at this assembly into the new century, and, that as a church, we will "Make Christ Known" as the bright hope to all people.

The Rev. Samuel D. Zumwalt [Southwestern Texas Synod] rose to a point of personal privilege, asking the assembly to remember in prayer those people along the Rio Grande Valley suffering from the hurricane.

The Rev. John E. Fahning [Minneapolis Area Synod] rose to a point of personal privilege to read into the record that a significant minority of this assembly was in grief. He said, "On Thursday morning at about 11:30 A.M. or 12 o'clock, it took ten seconds for the buttons to be pushed, and I saw the church that I thought I knew blown away. So, I would like to trust a good scribe, Lowell Almen, to transcribe the following: When Elijah suffered defeat after victory, he fled and sat down in the wilderness under a solitary broom tree, and asked that he might die. 'It is enough; now, O LORD, take away my life, for I am no better than my ancestors.' I would not know a broom tree if I saw one. I am going home to Minnesota. I do have a maple tree. When I get there, I am going to sit down under it, and I am going to read Psalm 115, verse 17: 'The dead do not praise the LORD, nor do any that go down into silence. But we will bless the LORD, from this time on and forevermore. Praise

the LORD!’ So some of us are scattered, like sheep without a shepherd, but we are not alone. We will learn to live with uncertainty, as with a friend, lost into Christ. Thank you.”

Bishop Anderson responded, “Thank you. And I would like to say to you, and to all of those who do not find it possible to support “Called to Common Mission,” that as I heard you speak, I have learned where your heart is. I know that you cherish your involvement in the Church, and I know that you envision a Church in which all its members, particularly its lay members, will have a greater and not a lesser role. I know you are eager to live and worship in a Church that pays more attention to mission than it does to structure, that you are ready to reach out even wider than we have as a church to other Christian churches as we find agreement with them in Word and Sacraments, and I thank you for being champions of these priorities. And I pledge to you to do all I can to achieve them.”

Ms. Barbara Wiedmann [Northeastern Ohio Synod] rose to a point of personal privilege, requesting publicity for the young adult who was raising money for congregations in prisons by bicycling across the United States.

Report of the Credentials Committee

Bishop Anderson called upon Secretary Almen for announcements. Secretary Almen presented the final report of the Credentials Committee, which stated that as of 8:00 A.M. on Sunday, August 22, 1999, there were 1,039 voting members, including the four officers registered for the sixth Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Announcement of the A.D. 2001 Churchwide Assembly

With the aid of a video showing a bus traveling from Denver to Indianapolis, Secretary Almen officially announced that the next regular Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will be Wednesday, August 8, through Tuesday, August 14, 2001, in Indianapolis, Indiana. Hosting the assembly will be the Indiana-Kentucky Synod.

Recess

Bishop Anderson once again thanked the assembly for its work and recessed the sixth biennial Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at 10:04 A.M. (Mountain Daylight Time) for closing worship.

The presiding minister for the Service of Holy Communion was Bishop Anderson. The assisting minister was Ms. Madelyn Herman Busse, a diaconal minister on the staff of the ELCA’s Rocky Mountain Synod. The preacher for the day was the Rev. John H. Thomas, president-elect of the United Church of Christ.

Adjournment

At the end of the service, following the singing of the hymn, “We All Are One in Mission,” the Order for the Closing of an Assembly was led by Bishop Anderson.

At 11:57 A.M., Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson declared the sixth Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America closed, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Exhibit A

Members of the Churchwide Assembly

Voting Members

Officers

Bp. H. George Anderson, *presiding bishop*
Ms. Addie J. Butler, *vice president*
Pr. Lowell G. Almen, *secretary*
Mr. Richard L. McAuliffe, *treasurer*

Alaska (1A)

Mr. H. Wayne Berg
Ms. Susie Delgado
Bp. Larry J. Jorgenson
Ms. Margaret Lowe
Pr. Obed E. Nelson

Northwest Washington (1B)

Pr. Carol A. Jensen
Pr. Julie M. Josund
Ms. Sherry Lou Kiefel
Pr. Peter Yung-Ming Lai
Mr. David G. Larsen
Bp. Donald H. Maier
Ms. Carol L. Matson
Ms. Jeanie A. McBee
Ms. Patricia A. Moylan
Mr. Forest J. Paulson
Mr. Rocky E. Piro

Southwestern Washington (1C)

Mr. Henry Bilderback
Pr. Lori J. Hoyum
Ms. Katherine Kempe
Mr. Matthew Nelson
Mr. Michael E. Niebauer
Ms. Georganne Robertson
Pr. Robert M. Ross
Ms. Debra Tertocha
Bp. David C. Wold

Eastern Washington-Idaho (1D)

Mr. Richard L. Bauer
Pr. Jaynan Clark Eglan

Mr. Wesley R. Johnson
Bp. Robert M. Keller
Ms. Jennifer Kleene
Pr. Glenn C. Petersen
Ms. Phylis Stromme
Ms. Diana Valdez
Ms. Dolores Watrous (8/16-8/17; 8/21-8/22)
Ms. Marian Zoesch (8/18-8/20)

Oregon (1E)

Mr. Paul Anderson
Ms. Barbara Brocker
Ms. Carolyn Cook
Pr. Katherine W. Hellier
Pr. Michael F. Keys
Mr. Stephen Palmer
Ms. Cynthia Stadsvold
Ms. Midori Suzuki
Bp. Paul R. Swanson

Montana (1F)

Ms. Gail M. Boveng
Ms. Debra Burditt
Pr. Jessica R. Crist-Graybill
Mr. Erik Engebretson
Mr. Ellis Hagen
Ms. Katherin A. Kelker
Pr. Richard R. Omland
Pr. David J. Ophus
Bp. Mark R. Ramseth
Mr. Arne E. Rosquist
Ms. Shirley K. Zimmerman

Sierra Pacific (2A)

Pr. Alice DeLaurier-O'Neil
Mr. Brian Farmer
Pr. Renee F. Geiger
Ms. Barbara Grosch
Ms. Greta G. Heinemeier
Ms. Ruth Hoffman
Pr. Lucy A. Kolin

Mr. Jerome Larson
Bp. Robert W. Mattheis
Ms. Maxine Morgan
Pr. Ruth M. Peterson
Mr. James D. Reyner
Mr. John Stout
Mr. Steve Troester
Pr. Michael D. Wilker
Ms. Mavis Zimmerle

Southern California (West) (2B)

Pr. Deborah A. Andersen
Pr. Dale E. Banke
Ms. Patricia B. Corpe
Bp. Paul W. Egertson
Mr. Stephen E. Ensberg
Mr. Raymond Fosse
Ms. Mary Froehlig
Ms. Marilyn Fursman
Ms. Shari Mims
Pr. Dean W. Nelson

Pacifica (2C)

Ms. Gwendolyn Byrd
Mr. John Ebel
Pr. Gloria H. Espeseth
Ms. Elba Figueroa
Bp. Murray D. Finck
Pr. James R. Hale
Ms. Peg Hites
Pr. David J. Krueger
Mr. George Murphy
Pr. Peter A. Pettit
Ms. Charon Schalge
Ms. June Welton

Grand Canyon (2D)

Ms. Rosemary Bennet
Mr. Duane Berglund
Ms. Tonya Cockram
Pr. Gerald M. Conrad
Pr. Joseph F. Irvin
Mr. George H. Johnsen
Pr. Sondra R. Krogstad
Mr. Fredric Lutz
Mr. Wesley Menke
Ms. Marion Sarver
Pr. Kimberly M. Sterner

Ms. Sharron Thomas
Bp. Howard E. Wennes

Rocky Mountain (2E)

Mr. Mark A. Betley
Bp. Allan C. Bjornberg
Pr. Aaron J. Couch
Pr. Nathan P. Doerr
Pr. Paul K. Erbes
Ms. Hanna G. Fida
Mr. Fernando Guzman
Pr. Daniel M. Hoeger
Ms. Clare Intress
Pr. Bruce A. Johnson
Ms. Reba L. Kiger
Ms. Janet L. Krakow
Ms. Arlene McCracken
Ms. Carol McDivitt
Pr. Mark R. McLagan
Mr. Richard Nehring
Mr. Richard L. Schwoebel
Mr. Richard H. Weber

Western North Dakota (3A)

Pr. John C. Amundson
Ms. Velma Amundson
Pr. Chris B. Anderson
Pr. Joel A. Brosten
Mr. John Combs
Bp. Duane C. Danielson
Ms. Alice O. Falkenstein (8/21-8/22)
Mr. Bernard Falkenstein
Ms. Arlene Knutson
Ms. Ilene Larson
Mr. Mike Molland
Mr. Ervin Mund
Mr. Martin Oen
Mr. Brett Sitz
Pr. James E. Weist
Pr. Joel L. Westby
Ms. Jan Zook (8/16-8/20)

Eastern North Dakota (3B)

Pr. Steven C. Berntson
Pr. Gerald I. Carlson
Ms. My Thi Nguyen Do
Mr. David Egbert
Pr. Brian L. Erickson

Mr. Mark G. Finstad
Bp. Richard J. Foss
Ms. Merle E. O. Freije
Ms. Lynette Kehler
Mr. DeWayne P. Larson
Ms. Avis P. Lowe
Pr. Harold E. Luecke
Mr. Dennis Nathan
Ms. JoAnn Nathan
Ms. Phyllis D. Olson
Pr. Mark S. Ostgarden
Ms. Edith E. Radig
Pr. Raymond C. Siegle
Mr. Larry Thiele
Pr. Bruce A. Vold
Ms. Eunice Vold

South Dakota (3C)

Ms. April Coyne
Bp. Andrea F. DeGroot-Nesdahl
Pr. Dennis H. Ellingsen
Ms. Doris Huseboe
Mr. Gary Jerke
Mr. David Kauppi
Mr. Verlyn Lindell
Pr. Margo M. Martens
Ms. Helen Miller
Mr. Dale Moeller
Pr. Donald H. Mohr
Ms. Eileen Raforth
Mr. Frank Slagle
Pr. Terrill G. Sorensen
Pr. Siri Beckmen Sorenson
Pr. Bruce H. Thalacker
Pr. Eldon H. Thurow
Mr. Burdette VanMeter
Ms. Colleen VanMeter
Mr. Richard Vasgaard
Pr. Marlin L. Wangsness
Ms. Lois Wiese

Northwestern Minnesota (3D)

Ms. Mary E. Amundson
Pr. Glenn M. Anderson
Mr. Arthur R. Boese
Ms. Regina A. Boese
Ms. Beverly Dahl
Pr. John R. Dalen

Pr. Gary R. Danielson
Ms. Julie Doerfler
Ms. Janis Eidsness
Mr. Mark C. Floding
Pr. James O. Gronbeck
Mr. Arthur J. Haug
Bp. Arlen D. Hermodson
Pr. Gregory E. Isaacson
Mr. Robert C. Lindstrom
Ms. Lindsey McCracken
Mr. Darol Melby
Mr. David E. Morken
Pr. Ann M. Newgard-Larson
Pr. Robin K. Nice
Pr. James R. Radatz
Ms. Patricia E. Swanson
Pr. John A. Wollenzien

Northeastern Minnesota (3E)

Pr. Judith C. Anderson-Bauer
Pr. Stephen P. Blenkush
Mr. Dennis Bush
Pr. Rebecca A. Ellenson
Ms. Mary Farmer
Mr. Ray Frisch
Pr. Lance E. Isaacson
Pr. Scott A. Jacob
Ms. Edith A. Johnston
Pr. Marlys A. Korman
Ms. Amy Loken
Mr. John Lyght
Ms. Janette Muller
Bp. E. Peter Strommen

Southwestern Minnesota (3F)

Mr. Iver Aal
Mr. Eddie J. Aliaga
Mr. Glen Bock
Pr. Daniel B. Carlson
Pr. Stephanie K. Frey
Ms. Kelly Halls
Pr. Lee D. Hallstrom
Ms. Doris Jacobson
Mr. Dennis Johnson
Ms. Donna Jo Kopitzke
Pr. Wayne D. Kopitzke
Ms. Barbara Larson
Mr. Scott Lemke

Mr. Steve Mooney
Pr. Harvey L. Nelson
Pr. J. Pablo Obregon
Mr. Paul Olson
Bp. Stanley N. Olson
Ms. Karen Pfeifer
Mr. Jared Ratzloff
Mr. Warren Schmalz
Ms. Geneva D. Steinbach
Pr. Charles K. Stewart
Pr. R. Mark Swanson
Pr. Gordon L. Syverson
Ms. Loretta Syverson
Mr. Gerald A. Winkelmann

Minneapolis Area (3G)

Pr. Karri L. Anderson
Ms. Renee Anderson
Ms. Debra Bjorkman
Pr. Judy A. Burgett-Winzig
Mr. Jeff L. Burrell
Ms. Eleanor Carlson
Ms. Kari Christianson
Ms. Sharon DeVries
Pr. Julie A. Ebbesen
Pr. John E. Fahning
Pr. Brian D. Fragodt
Ms. Kristine Gernes
Ms. Deann Gjenvick
Pr. Tania M. Hammer-Luken
Mr. Thomas Hanson
Pr. Roger D. Hardy
Pr. Stephen G. Haschig
Ms. Karen Jenkins
Ms. Amanda Johnson
Mr. Jay Johnson
Pr. Robert D. Johnson
Mr. Leu Lougiu
Pr. Scott B. Maxwell
Ms. Cathryn Towley Olson
Pr. Cedric J. Olson
Bp. David W. Olson
Mr. Neil G. Overby
Ms. Esther Paulsen
Mr. Dick Peterson
Pr. Lee E. Snook
Mr. James Sulerud
Mr. Joseph R. Thom

Ms. Sarah Toley
Pr. Rebecca L. von Fischer
Ms. Susan Weaver
Pr. Mark I. Wegener
Pr. Glen T. Wheeler
Ms. Jean Williams

Saint Paul Area (3H)

Ms. Rosanna N. Abanonu
Pr. Gary F. Anderson
Pr. Carl H. Buette-meier
Ms. Jill Chezik
Ms. Patricia A. Dunlop
Pr. Juan C. Fernandez-Bocangel
Pr. Don A. Fultz
Mr. Mark Gunsten
Bp. Mark S. Hanson
Ms. Diane Henning
Mr. Vatou Her
Ms. Vernita Kennen
Ms. Jean Knaak
Mr. Duane R. Koski
Mr. David Laden
Pr. Christine B. McClure
Pr. Raymond L. Mehl
Pr. Douglas J. Mork
Mr. Leo K. Nelson
Mr. David B. Olsen
Pr. Rolf E. Olson
Pr. Lynn J. Pagliarini
Ms. Lesley Rylander
Ms. Mary Helen Swanson
Ms. Janet E. Thompson
Pr. Kisten H. Thompson
Ms. Luella L. Zibell

Southeastern Minnesota (3I)

Mr. Ardell F. Brede
Ms. Mary Deters
Pr. Marian G. Eisenmann
Pr. Charles E. Espe
Ms. Shirley Gangstad
Mr. Bob A. Goldman
Ms. Janet Johnson
Ms. Letitia Kopperud
Pr. Natanael F. Lizarazo
Mr. Patrick L. Mansfield
Pr. William D. Meiers

Pr. Lloyd L. Menke
Ms. Cindy Nelson
Ms. Deborah Ann Norrie
Bp. Glenn W. Nycklemoe
Ms. Marilyn L. Peters
Pr. Mark M. Rydberg
Mr. Burton Svendsen
Ms. Judy Swanson
Pr. Dennis B. Timmerman
Pr. Norman W. Wahl
Pr. Douglas C. Wahlberg
Mr. Michael Winsell
Mr. Philip A. Wold

Nebraska (4A)

Mr. Larry G. Bates
Mr. Lyle Fodness
Pr. Mark A. Grorud
Mr. Gerald Gunderson
Pr. Raymond L. Hagberg
Ms. Marlene C. Hallstrom
Pr. Donald L. Hunzeker
Bp. Richard N. Jessen
Ms. Arlene Johnson
Mr. Gerald Johnson
Pr. Doyle G. Karst
Pr. Damon D. Laaker
Ms. Bonnie L. Larsen
Ms. Dorothy Lidberg
Ms. Judith J. Lindgren
Pr. David L. Nystrom
Pr. John L. Ross
Ms. Jolene Schauer
Ms. Valorie Sites
Mr. David L. Sloderbeck
Ms. Nancy Steele
Mr. Daniel B. Trout
Mr. Dean Wheeler
Ms. Louise Wheeler
Pr. John A. Williams

Central States (4B)

Ms. Melba Bangert
Pr. Daniel S. Breda Jr.
Pr. Thomas J. Clay Jr.
Ms. Patricia Dunavan
Mr. Peter Gaskamp

Mr. David Jahnke
Mr. Robert Johnson
Bp. Charles H. Maahs
Pr. Loren D. Mai
Ms. Nancy Mitchell
Ms. Johnie P. Nulan
Pr. Winston D. Persaud
Pr. Mary J. Schmidt
Pr. Jayne M. Thompson
Ms. Diane Wagner

Arkansas-Oklahoma (4C)

Ms. Bertha M. Dodson
Mr. Raymond Jackson Jr.
Pr. Richard P. Jebsen
Mr. Mark D. Keyl
Bp. Floyd M. Schoenhals
Pr. Joan L. Swander
Ms. Emma Young

Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana (4D)

Ms. Katherine Bandy
Ms. Tonda Freitag
Pr. James H. Hanson
Bp. Mark B. Herbener
Pr. Kevin S. Kanouse
Mr. Steven Kennedy
Mr. Owen Lokken
Ms. Tyna Oslie
Mr. Felix Wong

Southwestern Texas (4E)

Ms. Mary Adamson
Mr. Steven Bales
Bp. James E. Bennett
Mr. John E. Dellis
Pr. Luisa E. Hanson
Ms. Glenna Hartman
Mr. Mark S. Helmke
Pr. E. David Henry
Ms. Cynthia Hunt
Pr. Stanley J. Meyer
Mr. Frank H. Moeller
Ms. Billie Navarro
Mr. Charles R. Schwartz
Pr. August E. Wenzel
Pr. Samuel D. Zumwalt Jr.

(8/17-8/22)

Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast (4F)

Pr. R. Michael Aus Jr.
 Mr. James Bailey
 Mr. Timothy L. Barr
 Pr. Cynthia S. Beck
 Bp. Paul J. Blom
 Ms. Annette Citzler
 Pr. Espiridion Elizondo
 Ms. Judy Gerner
 Pr. James P. Hinkhouse
 Ms. Bettye J. Raschke
 Mr. Kurt Swanson

Metropolitan Chicago (5A)

Pr. Mary W. Anderson
 Mr. Raymond E. Bebee
 Ms. Cassandra Chandler
 Pr. Lawrence J. Clark
 Pr. Melody B. Eastman
 Ms. Darlene R. Erickson
 Mr. Douglas Felten
 Pr. Cynthia K. Hileman
 Ms. M. Gail Howard
 Ms. Cynthia A. Jurisson
 Pr. Paul M. Kopka
 Ms. Gretchen L. McDowell
 Mr. Richard Moen
 Bp. Kenneth R. Olsen
 Mr. Ivan A. Perez
 Mr. Robert Radtke III
 Pr. Michele L. Robinson
 Pr. Roger H. Schindel
 Ms. Josephine N. Schrader
 Ms. Dorothy M. Stein
 Pr. Roger E. Timm
 Mr. William Laddison Waldo
 Pr. Dayton A. Williams
 Mr. George Zage Jr.

Northern Illinois (5B)

Ms. Myrna Andersen
 Pr. Arthur C. Bergren
 Ms. Marie K. Darby
 Pr. Stacie R. Fidler (8/16-8/20)
 Ms. Jill Flickinger
 Pr. Janet H. Hunt (8/21-8/22)
 Pr. Linda A. Kersten
 Pr. Robert C. Kinnear

Ms. Nancy Lillevold
 Mr. Randall Mullin
 Mr. Charles Olson
 Ms. Leona Peterson-Spear
 Mr. John Prabhakar
 Mr. Robert Ramage
 Pr. Carl L. M. Rasmussen
 Ms. Marjorie Stewart
 Pr. David J. Ufkes
 Pr. Paul H. Wold
 Bp. Gary M. Wollersheim
 Mr. Russ Zeskey

Central/Southern Illinois (5C)

Pr. Kathryn D. Bielfeldt
 Pr. Ronald E. Brooker
 Ms. Letha A. Fields
 Ms. Judith A. Goldenstein
 Mr. Benjamin J. Hertenstein
 Ms. Elizabeth H. Kelley
 Pr. John W. Kelley
 Pr. Darby J. Lawrence
 Ms. Vicki J. Lawrence
 Ms. Deanna J. Osterbur
 Mr. John G. Satter
 Bp. Alton Zenker

Southeastern Iowa (5D)

Ms. Linda Danielson
 Pr. Brian W. Gentz
 Pr. Gerald E. Gjerde
 Pr. Julie K. Higgs
 Pr. Donald D. Hoornstra
 Pr. M. James Hougen
 Bp. Philip L. Hougen
 Ms. Lisa Jennison
 Mr. Lloyd Lockhart
 Mr. Bill Michaelson
 Pr. Ronald W. Mohr
 Pr. Dave A. Nerdig
 Mr. James Sievers
 Ms. Dorothy Singh
 Mr. M. S. Duleep Singh
 Mr. E. Charles Thulin
 Ms. Barbara J. Tobiason

Western Iowa (5E)

Ms. Donna Haack
 Mr. Allen Korslund

Pr. Lee O. Laaveg
Bp. Curtis H. Miller
Mr. Raymond E. Nielsen
Mr. David Olson
Ms. Shirley Olson
Pr. Eliezer Ortiz
Ms. Mary Rawson
Mr. Leroy L. Simonson
Pr. Barbara J. Spaulding
Pr. Connie S. Spitzack
Pr. Michael R. Stadie
Ms. Diane Vanderhoff
Ms. Jane M. Wallestad

Northeastern Iowa (5F)

Ms. Beverly L. Ager (8/21-8/22)
Pr. Charles D. Ager
Mr. Kenneth D. Blockhus
Pr. Michael L. Burk (8/20-8/22)
Ms. Rita J. Dudley
Mr. Wayne R. Garms
Pr. Marshall E. Hahn
Ms. Wilma E. Hartman
Ms. Connie S. Johnson
Mr. Robert A. Lindhart
Mr. Larry D. Miller
Ms. Linda K. Mork
Ms. Sue E. O'Brien
Pr. Phillip E. Olson (8/16-8/19)
Mr. Ernest W. Ramige (8/16-8/20)
Pr. Curtis C. Schneider
Ms. Joyce G. Schoulte
Pr. Beverly A. Short
Pr. Claudia W. Tessmer
Pr. Richard J. Thompson
Bp. Steven L. Ullestad

Northern Great Lakes (5G)

Pr. Stephen P. Cowen
Mr. Norman Hongisto
Pr. Jimalee Jones
Ms. Kay Lee
Mr. Paul Mattson
Mr. Ralph B. K. Peterson
Ms. Connie M. Schmidt
Bp. Dale R. Skogman
Ms. Sandra L. Wilkins

Northwest Synod of Wisconsin (5H)

Ms. Beverly Aschenbrenner
Ms. Phyllis J. Beastron
Pr. Gary J. Benedict
Bp. Robert D. Berg
Mr. Larry Blahauvietz
Mr. Donald Dietz
Pr. Gloria J. Friedrich
Ms. Kathy Fullarton
Pr. John R. Hanson
Mr. Paul Hinderlie
Pr. Barbara A. Koch
Ms. Velma Larson
Ms. Sharon Magelssen
Mr. Merle Michaelson
Ms. Grace Palm
Mr. Gary Preston
Pr. Keith E. Ruehlow
Mr. Robert Solberg
Pr. William M. Stewart
Pr. Ralph M. Thompson

East-Central Synod of Wisconsin (5I)

Bp. John C. Beem
Ms. Dixie Lee Benson
Pr. James A. Bump
Ms. Pamela Bump
Pr. Jennifer C. DeNetz
Mr. Daniel Eisch
Mr. John Emery
Pr. Victoria E. Fink
Mr. Paul Mogged
Ms. Stephanie A. Olson
Mr. Christopher N. Sands
Ms. Vivian Schutte
Pr. Brian H. Staude
Ms. Carolyn Stockbridge
Pr. William E. Sutlief
Pr. William E. Timm
Mr. Kenneth E. Walstrom
Ms. Deborah Zuehlke

Greater Milwaukee (5J)

Pr. Jennifer Johnston Arnold
Ms. Joyce A. Caldwell
Mr. Gerhard H. Fischer
Mr. John F. Gruber
Pr. John R. Gugel

Ms. Jeri Ann Jende
Ms. Mary Ellen Kiesner
Ms. Ellen T. Maxon
Ms. Mary Meyer
Pr. Barbara M. Rasmussen
Bp. Peter Rogness
Pr. Delbert E. Sailer
Mr. Michael Schmitz
Pr. Frederick Thomas-Breitfeld
Pr. Viviane Thomas-Breitfeld
Ms. Gloria Ware
Mr. William R. Wood
Mr. John L. Wosyk

**South-Central Synod of
Wisconsin (5K)**

Mr. Kevin Boatright
Pr. Thomas E. Boll
Mr. Mark Brellenthin
Pr. Mary L. Doreza
Mr. James Dorst
Bp. Jon S. Enslin
Ms. Christine L. A. Gantz
Ms. Gena L. Gilbertson
Mr. Robert Gorsuch
Pr. Rodney R. Hank
Pr. Joyce M. Heintz
Pr. Charles W. Koester
Ms. Sonya Swanson Lindquist (8/17-8/22)
Pr. Robert V. Moberg
Mr. Thomas L. Nall
Ms. Julie Nygaard
Pr. Constance Thomson Rehl
Ms. Lori Richardson
Ms. Lois Weiland
Ms. Leone Wichelt

La Crosse Area (5L)

Ms. Sylvia Attleson
Pr. Joel A. Bacon
Bp. April Ulring Larson
Mr. Ronald Lawrence
Mr. Shoua Lee
Mr. Douglas R. Myhre
Ms. Janet Williams
Mr. Marc S. Williams
Pr. Kris A. Zierke

Southeast Michigan (6A)

Pr. Rosanne M. Anderson
Ms. Cyndi Campbell-Jones
Ms. Doris Dunsmore
Ms. Betty Esters
Ms. Regina D. Jemison
Mr. Curtis W. Johnson
Pr. Scott R. McKinney
Ms. Barbara A. Miller
Ms. Earlene Reeder
Bp. Robert A. Rimbo
Pr. Christine C. Thompson
Mr. William G. Vance
Pr. Adolph A. Wachsmann III
Mr. George C. Watson

North/West Lower Michigan (6B)

Mr. Dennis Frank
Bp. Gary L. Hansen
Ms. Sue Kamens
Ms. Fran Koenig
Ms. Suzanne Lehto
Pr. Raymond E. Orth
Mr. Robert Pooley
Pr. Dennis E. Remenschneider
Ms. Pantipa Riggins
Pr. Julie E. Schneider-Thomas
Mr. Terry Speese
Pr. Walter F. Taylor Jr.

Indiana-Kentucky (6C)

Pr. Lowell L. Anderson
Pr. Deborah L. Conrad
Mr. Michael Franklin
Pr. Ronald M. Haseley
Ms. Mary Hudson
Ms. Sue Larson
Ms. Carol K. Matevia
Mr. Christopher J. Mehling
Mr. Martin Mielke
Mr. Mark Myrick
Pr. Stanley H. Peterson
Mr. Gerald Philpy
Ms. Judy Rehmel
Bp. James R. Stuck
Pr. James T. Swanson
Pr. Loren J. VanOort
Ms. Dawn Webb
Mr. Keith Wulff

Northwestern Ohio (6D)

Ms. Anjelita Avers
Pr. Daniel G. Beaudoin
Pr. Paul A. Bierlein
Mr. Eric Bjorlin
Mr. Michael Daniels
Pr. William B. Diehm
Mr. Richard Flock
Mr. Karl Gingrich
Mr. John Hiltner
Pr. Timothy J. Keeler
Ms. Sharon Krall
Bp. Marcus C. Lohrmann
Pr. Thomas A. Lyberg
Ms. Barbara A. Moellman
Mr. Scott Rankin
Ms. Beth Reichert
Pr. Joel H. Remmers
Ms. Charlotte Shaffer
Pr. Julianne D. Smith
Ms. Margaret Stellhorn
Mr. Karl Wiechers

Northeastern Ohio (6E)

Ms. Joan Albert
Pr. Philip A. Carl
Mr. Y. T. Chiu
Pr. June M. Fryman
Pr. David R. Genszler
Mr. Edward Gluck
Mr. Timothy E. Guenther
Mr. Richard P. Homrighausen
Ms. Linda C. Kempke
Mr. Joseph R. Malone
Pr. Timothy A. Mentzer
Bp. Marcus J. Miller
Ms. Jan Parkinson
Pr. Theodore H. Rust
Pr. Robert P. Sander
Ms. Christina Solis
Mr. Richard Spall
Pr. Robert E. Springer
Ms. Barbara Wiedmann

Southern Ohio (6F)

Pr. Janice A. Campbell
Mr. Scott M. Dillon
Pr. Larry A. Donner

Mr. Fred E. Freeberg
Ms. Marilyn R. Hedrick
Pr. Larry A. Hoffsis
Bp. Callon W. Holloway Jr.
Mr. Donald Huber
Mr. Kenneth Johnson
Mr. Lawrence Johnson
Ms. Laura Moore
Ms. Sarah C. Murphy
Ms. Ruth H. Murray
Pr. Randall W. O'Donnell
Ms. Martha Ogden
Pr. Roger D. Quay
Pr. William E. Saunders
Ms. Linda Schnittke
Pr. Deborah D. Steed
Mr. Thomas Taylor
Mr. Michael Werts

New Jersey (7A)

Ms. Lynn H. Askew
Pr. Frederick J. Bryant Jr.
Mr. Matthew Cimorelli
Pr. Bruce H. Davidson
Mr. Wayne Goerlich
Ms. Annemarie Hartner
Mr. Mark Hicks
Mr. Willis Hines
Ms. Gladystine Hodge
Mr. William C. Lee
Ms. Bessie Miley-Jones
Pr. Susan E. Nagle
Pr. Christine R. Regan
Bp. E. Roy Riley
Pr. Roger W. Spencer
Ms. Diane Stevens

New England (7B)

Ms. Dorothy Aalto
Ms. Josie Brown
Mr. Kenneth Brown
Pr. G. Scott Cady
Ms. Mildred Engberg
Mr. R. Guy Erwin
Ms. Betty Fairchild
Mr. David E. Harper
Ms. Beverly Isaksen
Bp. Robert L. Isaksen

Mr. Thomas Koch
Pr. Elizabeth M. Krentz-Wee
Pr. Alice K. Laird
Pr. John K. Stendahl
Ms. Nancy Stone
Pr. Rebecca P. Wegner

Metropolitan New York (7C)

Mr. Tony C. Aguilar
Ms. Sharon Banks
Pr. Christine L. Bohr
Bp. Stephen P. Bouman
Pr. Paul M. Britton
Mr. Hector Carrasquillo
Ms. Barbara Goetz
Mr. Fred Grumm
Ms. Mary B. Heller
Pr. William L. Hurst Jr.
Pr. John A. Jurik
Mr. John D. Litke
Mr. Paul E. Lumpkin
Ms. Florence Poeschke
Ms. Maria Ellena Prudencio
Ms. Carol B. Straub
Pr. James E. Sudbrock
Pr. Jerome D. Taylor
Mr. Hans H. Vogel

Upstate New York (7D)

Pr. M. Elaine Berg
Ms. Mary Lu Bowen
Ms. Wendy Carrier
Mr. Tim Gaige
Ms. Maureen Gensler
Mr. Terry Gensler
Pr. Paula J. Gravelle
Pr. Wesley L. Hamlin Jr.
Ms. Betsy D. Liljeberg
Bp. Lee M. Miller
Pr. Darlene B. Muschett
Ms. Helen Nelson
Mr. Luther D. Peterson
Mr. Bruce Redfoot
Pr. John P. Seltzer
Pr. Diane E. Wheatley
Ms. Martha Zenns

Northeastern Pennsylvania (7E)

Mr. James P. Barrett
Mr. Christopher J. Billig

Pr. Barbara A. Davis
Ms. Marlane E. Druckenmiller
Ms. Nancy H. Ebling
Ms. Elizabeth Elterich
Pr. Kurt E. Garbe
Mr. Wayne Getz
Pr. Joseph W. Hager
Ms. Linda Henne
Pr. David L. Hess
Pr. Darrell H. Jodock
Ms. Barbara A. Keener
Pr. Scott W. Lingenfelter
Mr. Charles Lusch
Pr. Bruce D. MacLaughlin
Ms. Karen S. Matthias-Long
Pr. Glenn D. Miller
Mr. Nelson Quiñones
Ms. Amy Reinsel
Ms. Susan Schellenberg
Mr. Ernest G. Siegfried
Pr. Glenn L. Simmons
Ms. Jane Ann Spohn
Bp. David R. Strobel
Mr. Nelvin Vos
Mr. Leonard Weiser
Pr. Harold S. Weiss
Ms. Melanie E. Werley
Mr. Lloyd Wertz
Mr. John Ziegler
Pr. Catherine A. Ziel
Pr. William E. Zimmermann

Southeastern Pennsylvania (7F)

Bp. Roy G. Almquist
Sr. Laura L. Bernardo
Pr. Barbara Berry-Bailey
Ms. Patricia A. Davenport
Mr. George Edwards
Pr. Suzan H. Farley
Mr. James M. Gant
Mr. J. Lawrence House
Pr. Rosa M. Key
Ms. Kathryn Kopf
Pr. Charles R. Leonard
Pr. Dyan M. LeVander
Mr. James Murphy
Ms. Elaine Reimet
Pr. John H. P. Reumann

Mr. Thomas A. Salter
Ms. Louise P. Shoemaker
Ms. Sharon Smith
Mr. Allan Thomas
Pr. R. Bruce Todd

Slovak Zion (7G)

Bp. Juan Cobrda
Pr. Wilma S. Kucharek
Ms. Laverne Sedory
Mr. Robert Sedory

Northwestern Pennsylvania (8A)

Ms. Nancy C. Fricke
Mr. Arthur L. Johnson
Ms. Bonita O. Karr
Pr. Arlene T. Schweitzer
Pr. James M. Seeley
Bp. Paull E. Spring
Ms. Susan A. Stewart
Mr. Robert G. Young

Southwestern Pennsylvania (8B)

Mr. Brack Barr
Ms. Sheila Barr
Pr. Kirk W. Bish
Pr. Richard W. Bonds-Krug
Mr. Nathan K. Brewer
Pr. Martha W. Clementson
Pr. William E. Deist
Ms. Andrea Dubler
Mr. Gene O. Fozard
Pr. William L. Hauser
Ms. Sunshine Keiser
Pr. Jonathan W. Linman
Pr. Heather S. Lubold
Ms. Barbara Marte
Bp. Donald J. McCoid
Mr. Barry L. Nelson Sr.
Ms. Barbara Ravenstahl
Mr. Edward W. Sites
Ms. Karen Thompson
Mr. David R. Zaccari

Allegheny (8C)

Ms. Alicia Anderson
Pr. Thomas G. Bruner Jr.

Pr. Edward N. Corneilson
Pr. Jacquelyn M. DePhillips
Ms. Ruth C. Kistler
Mr. Larry Mazer
Mr. Randy Musser
Ms. Elizabeth Pile
Bp. Gregory R. Pile
Ms. Patricia Savage

Lower Susquehanna (8D)

Ms. Fae E. Appleby
Mr. Norman E. Barth
Ms. Debra K. Benner
Pr. Douglas Y. Boden
Mr. Jay L. Brenneman
Ms. Allison L. Carlson
Bp. Guy S. Edmiston
Mr. Ronald K. Good
Pr. Jack R. Hoffman
Mr. Frederick C. Kerr
Pr. Leonard R. Klein
Pr. Marie K. Krueger
Ms. Kathaleen Lilley
Ms. Deborah A. S. McClellan
Pr. Brian A. McClinton
Mr. Earl L. Mummert
Ms. Betty L. Myers
Ms. Dorothy K. Peterman
Ms. Sharon M. Ruff Richter
Pr. Patrick J. Rooney
Ms. Mary-Margaret Ruth
Mr. Kenneth W. Saylor
Mr. John Schwartz
Pr. Martha B. Sheaffer
Pr. Daniel M. Shutters
Mr. William O. Sowers
Pr. Kurt S. Strause

Upper Susquehanna (8E)

Pr. Peter S. Bergstresser
Ms. Emily DeWald
Pr. John E. Fenton
Pr. William S. Henderson
Ms. Shirley Jones
Ms. Betty Longfield
Bp. A. Donald Main
Ms. Cassandra L. Rishel
Ms. Neda K. Thierwechter
Mr. Eric Wertz

Delaware-Maryland (8F)

Ms. Susan K. Anderson
 Ms. Theda D. Blackwelder
 Mr. Raymond T. Brooks
 Ms. Waetina A. Coles
 Pr. Mark C. Dill
 Mr. Creighton R. Donnalld
 Pr. Muriel N. Heichler
 Ms. Mary Joanne Hudgins
 Pr. Mark A. G. Huffman
 Pr. Laura D. Ingersol
 Ms. Donna L. Kent
 Pr. Glenn E. Ludwig
 Bp. George P. Mocko
 Mr. David L. Osmundson
 Mr. William R. Price
 Pr. John R. Sabatelli
 Ms. Suzanna A. Sabol
 Mr. Richard J. Sherrill
 Pr. William G. Wallace

Metropolitan Washington, D.C. (8G)

Mr. Jasper Cummings
 Mr. Donald Gibbs (8/18-8/22)
 Ms. Shirley Gibbs
 Ms. Desiree Jessimy
 Mr. Harvey Knudson (8/16-8/18)
 Pr. Thomas A. Prinz
 Mr. Harold A. Sargeant
 Pr. Leah K. Schafer
 Bp. Theodore F. Schneider
 Mr. Dale E. Snyder

West Virginia-Western Maryland (8H)

Pr. James L. Caton II
 Bp. Ralph W. Dunkin
 Ms. Bonnie J. Earp
 Mr. George E. Friedline
 Mr. William Schillings
 Pr. Reinold Schlak Jr.
 Ms. Marjorie Ann Wolf

Virginia (9A)

Bp. Richard F. Bansemer
 Pr. James E. Baseler
 Mr. James E. Byerly
 Pr. Paul G. Gunsten
 Ms. Rebecca Guthrie
 Mr. Billy Smith

Ms. Judy Wagner St. Pierre
 Ms. Betty Wilson
 Mr. James F. Wilson
 Pr. Murray A. Ziegenfuss

North Carolina (9B)

Ms. Faith A. Ashton
 Mr. David Black
 Mr. Dale Blade
 Bp. Leonard H. Bolick
 Mr. Bachman Brown Jr.
 Ms. Sandra R. Cline
 Pr. Rachel L. Connelly
 Pr. Judith L. Copeland
 Pr. Stephen P. Gerhard
 Mr. Hunter Haith
 Pr. W. Douglas Kearney
 Mr. Jerry Koontz
 Ms. Carol LaHurd
 Pr. Richard C. Little
 Mr. Wayne C. Nelson
 Ms. Beth Shoffner
 Ms. Virginia G. Stackel
 Pr. Elizabeth J. Toler
 Ms. Bettye Wendt

South Carolina (9C)

Pr. James W. Addy
 Mr. Robert A. Addy
 Pr. Virginia S. Aebischer
 Ms. Catherine S. Boozer
 Ms. Patricia R. Crosby
 Bp. David A. Donges
 Mr. Raymond L. Hendrix Jr.
 Pr. W. Osborne Herlong Jr.
 Ms. Gloria D. Rast
 Mr. Jerry L. Richardson
 Ms. Stephanie M. Stoudemayer
 Mr. R. David Troutman

Southeastern (9D)

Mr. W. D. Alderfer
 Ms. Theo Belvin
 Pr. Kathryn I. Bradley-Love
 Mr. Robert Drakeford
 Pr. H. Julian Gordy
 Ms. Marie S. Harvey
 Mr. Monroe Herring

Ms. Beth Smith
Pr. Terri K. Stagner-Collier
Ms. Amanda J. Wahlig
Bp. Ronald B. Warren
Pr. John M. Weber

Florida-Bahamas (9E)

Pr. Edward R. Benoway
Pr. Sharon L. Dorr
Pr. Gilberto Falcon
Ms. Irene Flynn
Mr. Steven M. Hill
Ms. Cecelia Johnson
Pr. Wallace S. Kemp
Ms. Carla McGee
Ms. Louan Rathke
Mr. David Rhodes
Pr. Walter R. Riedel
Mr. James Rindelau
Mr. Allan Schweer
Mr. Joseph H. Sloss
Pr. Paul H. Summer
Bp. William B. Trexler
Ms. Eleanor von Taborsky
Mr. James Warren

Caribbean (9F)

Mr. Carlos Miranda
Pr. Graciela Rivera-Sanchez
Bp. Francisco L. Sosa
Pr. Robert G. Wakefield
Ms. Phyllis Wallace

Advisory Members

Ms. Linda J. Brown
Pr. Robert L. Dasher
Ms. Karen Dietz
Pr. Susan L. Engh
Mr. George E. Friedline
Pr. Franklin D. Fry
Ms. Sandra G. Gustavson
Mr. David F. Hagen
Ms. Ida Marie Hakkarinen
Pr. Kirkwood J. Havel
Mr. Donald G. Hayes
Pr. David K. Johnson
Mr. D. Mark Klever
Mr. Steven E. Koenig

Pr. Nadine F. Lehr
Ms. Eva Kiyutelluk Leonard
Pr. Mario C. Miranda
Pr. Philip L. Natwick
Pr. Fred S. Opalinski
Pr. Karen S. Parker
Mr. Carlos Peña
Ms. Beverly A. Peterson
Ms. W. Jeanne Rapp
Mr. Brian D. Rude
Mr. Dale V. Sandstrom
Mr. Robert S. Schroeder
Pr. Larry V. Smoose
Pr. Karen L. Soli
Pr. Sarah J. Stumme
Mr. J. David Watrous
Ms. Carol L. Weiser
Ms. Lily R. Wu
Ms. Sally Young
Pr. Nancy I. Amacher, *chair of the board*

*of the Division for Congregational
Ministries*

Pr. John G. Andreasen, *chair of the board
of the Division for Higher Education
and Schools*

Pr. Robert N. Bacher, *executive for
administration in the Office of the
Presiding Bishop*

Pr. Kirk W. Bish, *chair of the Nominating
Committee*

Ms. Catherine I. H. Braasch, *executive
director of the Women of the
Evangelical Lutheran Church in
America*

Pr. M. Wyvetta Bullock, *executive
director of the Division for Congre-
gational Ministries*

Pr. Julius Carroll IV, *chair of the board of
the Division for Outreach*

Ms. Joanne Chadwick, *executive director
of the Commission for Women*

Ms. Linda Chinnia, *president of the
Women of the Evangelical Lutheran
Church in America*

Ms. Ingrid Christiansen, *chair of the
board of the Division for Church in
Society*

Pr. Michael L. Cooper-White, *executive assistant to the presiding bishop in the Office of the Presiding Bishop*

Mr. Todd P. Engdahl, *chair of the board of the Publishing House of the ELCA*

Pr. Donald M. Hallberg, *executive director of the ELCA Foundation*

Mr. Frank R. Jennings, *chair of the board of trustees of the Mission Investment Fund*

Pr. Bonnie L. Jensen, *executive director of the Division for Global Mission*

Mr. John G. Kapanke, *president of the ELCA Board of Pensions*

Pr. Duane H. Larson, *chair of the advisory committee of the Department for Ecumenical Affairs*

Pr. W. Arthur Lewis, *chair of the steering committee of the Commission for Multicultural Ministries*

Pr. Richard A. Magnus, *executive director of the Division for Outreach*

Pr. Howard J. McCarney, *chair of the Committee on Appeals*

Pr. Charles S. Miller, *executive director of the Division for Church in Society*

Pr. Mark R. Moller-Gunderson, *executive director of the Division for Congregational Ministries*

Pr. Winston D. Persaud, *chair of the board of the Division for Global Mission*

Ms. Emma Graeber Porter, *chair of the Board of Trustees of the Board of Pensions*

Pr. Fred E. N. Rajan, *executive director of the Commission for Multicultural Ministries*

Ms. Hazel H. Reinhardt, *chair of the advisory committee of The Lutheran*

Pr. Marvin L. Roloff, *president of the Publishing House of the ELCA*

Ms. Myrna J. Sheie, *executive assistant to the presiding bishop in the Office of the Presiding Bishop*

Pr. W. Robert Sorensen, *executive director of the Division for Higher Education and Schools*

Mr. David D. Swartling, *chair of the board of trustees of the ELCA Foundation*

Pr. Ann M. Tiemeyer, *chair of the steering committee of the Commission for Women*

Pr. Edgar R. Trexler, *editor of The Lutheran*

Mr. Nelvin Vos, *chair of the board of the Division for Ministry*

Pr. Joseph M. Wagner, *executive director of the Division for Ministry*

Resource Members

Mr. Scott S. Fintzen, *associate general counsel*

Mr. Phillip H. Harris, *general counsel*

Mr. Kenneth W. Inskeep, *director of the Department for Research and Evaluation*

Mr. DeQuan C. Kuntu, *youth advisory member of the Church Council*

Pr. Lloyd W. Lyngdal, *assistant for federal chaplaincies in the Office of the Presiding Bishop*

Pr. Daniel F. Martensen, *director of the Department for Ecumenical Affairs*

Pr. Eric C. Shafer, *director of the Department for Communication*

Ms. Meghan Smith, *youth advisory member of the Church Council*

Ms. Else B. Thompson, *director of the Department for Human Resources*

Other Members

Presidents of Colleges and Universities

Mr. Loren J. Anderson, *Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Wash.*

Ms. Jennifer L. Broaten, *Midland Lutheran College, Fremont, Neb.*

Mr. F. Gregory Campbell, *Carthage College, Kenosha, Wis.*

Mr. Myrvin F. Christopherson, *Dana College, Blair, Neb.*

Mr. Joel L. Cunningham, *Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.*

Mr. Mark U. Edwards Jr., *St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.*
Mr. William V. Frame, *Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minn.*
Mr. Peter L. French, *Newberry College, Newberry, S.C.*
Mr. David M. Gring, *Roanoke College, Salem, Va.*
Mr. Gordon A. Haaland, *Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.*
Pr. Thomas L. Jolivette, *Waldorf College, Forest City, Iowa*
Mr. Ryan A. LaHurd, *Lenoir-Rhyne College, Hickory, N.C.*
Mr. Luther S. Luedtke, *California Lutheran University, Thousand Oaks, Calif.*
Mr. Lance A. Masters, *Thiel College, Greenville, Pa.*
Mr. Jon N. Moline, *Texas Lutheran University, Seguin, Texas*
Mr. Jack R. Ohle, *Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa*
Mr. Norman R. Smith, *Wagner College, Staten Island, N.Y.*
Mr. Axel D. Steuer, *Gustavus Adolphus College, St Peter, Minn.*
Mr. Arthur R. Taylor, *Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.*
Pr. Christopher M. Thomforde, *Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kan.*
Pr. Thomas W. Thomsen, *Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn.*
Mr. Baird Tipson, *Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio*
Mr. Richard L. Torgerson, *Luther College, Decorah, Iowa*
Mr. J. Thomas Tredway, *Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.*
Mr. Robert A. Ubbelohde, *Suomi College, Hancock, Mich.*
Pr. Robert L. Vogel, interim, *Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa*

Mr. Ronald J. Volpe, *Capital University, Columbus, Ohio*
Mr. Ralph H. Wagoner, *Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S.D.*

Presidents of Seminaries

Pr. Dennis A. Anderson, *Trinity Lutheran Seminary, Columbus, Ohio*
Pr. Darold H. Beekmann, *Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Gettysburg, Pa.*
Pr. James K. Echols, *Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, Chicago, Ill.*
Pr. Robert G. Hughes, *Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.*
Pr. Duane H. Larson, *Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa*
Pr. Timothy F. Lull, *Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Calif.*
Pr. H. Frederick Reisz Jr., *Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary, Columbia, S.C.*
Pr. David L. Tiede, *Luther Seminary, Saint Paul, Minn.*

Committees of the Churchwide Assembly **Memorials Committee**

Mr. Dale Blade
Ms. Sheila Barr
Pr. Martha W. Clementson
Pr. Gary R. Danielson
Ms. Patricia Davenport
Mr. D. Mark Klever
Mr. Christopher Mehling
Pr. Philip L. Natwick
Bp. Glenn W. Nycklemoe
Mr. Carlos Peña, *co-chair*
Ms. Beverly A. Peterson, *co-chair*
Ms. Mary Jane Schieve
Ms. Judy Wagner St. Pierre
Bp. Howard E. Wennes

Nominating Committee

Mr. Robert A. Addy
Mr. Robert L. Anderson
Pr. Kirk W. Bish, *chair*
Pr. James E. Braaten
Mr. Keith P. Brown
Pr. Thomas M. Carlson
Ms. Barbara J. Eaves
Pr. Cynthia A. Ishler
Ms. Mary R. Jones
Pr. George E. Keck
Ms. Dorothy K. Peterman
Ms. Barbara L. Price
Mr. Fred B. Renwick
Ms. Roberta C. Schott
Ms. Mary Ann Shealy
Pr. Susan E. Tjornehoj
Pr. Robert L. Vogel, *vice chair*

Committee of Reference and Counsel

Ms. Linda J. Brown, *co-chair*
Ms. Karen Dietz
Bp. Guy S. Edmiston
Pr. Franklin D. Fry, *co-chair* [Excused]
Mr. Fernando Guzman
Ms. Donna Haack
Mr. Donald G. Hayes
Mr. Mark Helmke
Bp. Mark R. Ramseth
Mr. Dale V. Sandstrom
Pr. Karen L. Soli
Pr. Walter F. Taylor Jr.
Ms. Lily R. Wu

Exhibit B

Report of the Elections Committee

First Ballot

Note: Those persons elected on this ballot are indicated in bold face print. The designation (PC/L) is used to indicate persons of color or whose primary language is other than English. An asterisk (*) indicates an incumbent eligible for reelection.

	VOTES	PERCENT
Church Council / Ticket 1 / Clergy / Reserved for Age 30 and Under		
A Pr. David N. Young, Cincinnati, Ohio 6F	446	49.1%
B Pr. Jonathan L. Eilert, Wooster, Ohio 6E	463	50.9%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	909	100.0%
Church Council / Ticket 2 / Clergy / Reserved for Synod 3F		
A Pr. Barbara I. Lundstad-Vogt, Pipestone, Minn. 3F	360	39.7%
B Pr. Diane "Dee" S. Pederson, St. Cloud, Minn. 3F	546	60.3%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	906	100.0%
Church Council / Ticket 3 / Clergy / Reserved for Synod 2D		
A Pr. Joseph L. Carucci, Surprise, Ariz. 2D	351	39.6%
B Pr. Kim R. Taylor, Tucson, Ariz. 2D	535	60.4%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	886	100.0%
Church Council / Ticket 4 / Clergy		
A *Pr. Kirkwood J. Havel, Midland, Mich. 6B	544	57.9%
B Pr. William R. White, Madison, Wis. 5K	395	42.0%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	940	100.0%
Church Council / Ticket 5 / Clergy		
A Pr. Michael G. Merkel, New Haven, Conn. 7B	450	48.2%
B Pr. William G. Moldwin, New Britain, Conn. 7B	271	29.0%
C Pr. Kevin S. Kanouse, Arlington, Texas 4D	213	22.8%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	934	100.0%
Church Council / Ticket 6 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Ellen T. Maxon, Hartland, Wis. 5J	520	58.9%
B Ms. Jill C. Flickinger, Freeport, Ill. 5B	362	41.0%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	883	100.0%

	VOTES	PERCENT
Church Council / Ticket 7 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Gail Olson, Stillwater, Minn. 3H	413	45.2%
B Ms. Janet Thompson, Eagan, Minn. 3H	500	54.8%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	913	100.0%
Church Council / Ticket 8 / Lay Female		
A *Ms. Linda J. Brown, Moorhead, Minn. 3D	601	65.1%
B Ms. Diane McNally Forsyth, Winona, Minn. 3I	322	34.9%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	923	100.0%
Church Council / Ticket 9 / Lay Male / Reserved for Synod 4C		
A Mr. Don J. Jones, Oklahoma City, Okla. 4C	431	48.9%
B Mr. Mark Buchheim, Tulsa, Okla. 4C	450	51.1%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	881	100.0%
Church Council / Ticket 10 / Lay Male		
A Mr. James C. Ellefson, Marshalltown, Iowa 5D	445	49.2%
B Mr. Karl D. Anderson, Neenah, Wis. 5I	460	50.8%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	905	100.0%
Church Council / Ticket 11 / Lay Male (PC/L)		
A Mr. Willard O. Williamson, Chicago, Ill. 5A	393	43.6%
B Mr. Ghassan "Gus" Khoury, Chicago, Ill. 5A	508	56.4%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	901	100.0%
Division for Congregational Ministries / Ticket 12 / Clergy		
A Pr. Melvin E. Amundson, Columbia, S.C. 9C	435	49.7%
B Pr. Robert H. Shoffner, Hickory, N.C. 9B	441	50.3%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	876	100.0%
Division for Congregational Ministries / Ticket 13 / Clergy		
A Pr. Jeffrey L. Schock, Latrobe, Pa. 8B	347	39.1%
B Pr. Steven Middernacht, Lewisburg, Pa. 8E	323	36.4%
C Pr. David P. Matevia, Michigan City, Ind. 6C	217	24.5%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	887	100.0%
Division for Congregational Ministries / Ticket 14 / Clergy		
A Pr. Steven T. Kruse, Scottsdale, Ariz. 2D	590	66.9%
B Pr. Richard O. Johnson, Grass Valley, Calif. 2A	291	33.0%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	882	100.0%

	VOTES	PERCENT
Division for Congregational Ministries / Ticket 15 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Fran Burnford, North Hollywood, Calif. 2B	339	36.8%
B Ms. Jeanne E. McCoskery, Missoula, Mont. 1F	257	27.9%
C Ms. Georganne W. Robertson, Olympia, Wash. 1C	223	24.2%
D Ms. Diana Bernklau, Tigard, Ore. 1E	102	11.1%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	921	100.0%
Division for Congregational Ministries / Ticket 16 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Martha A. Edwards, Yorktown, Va. 9A	206	22.7%
B Ms. Virginia A. Knueppel, Norcross, Ga. 9D	268	29.5%
C Ms. Patricia E. Swanson, Kennedy, Minn. 3D	237	26.1%
D Ms. Suzanna Sabol, Westminster, Md. 8F	198	21.8%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	909	100.0%
Division for Congregational Ministries / Ticket 17 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Robert F. Mueller, Wyoming, Ill. 5C	451	50.9%
B Mr. Shawn O. Brandon, St. Paul, Minn. 3H	432	48.8%
Invalid Ballots	3	0.3%
Total Ballots	886	100.0%
Division for Congregational Ministries / Ticket 18 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Paul E. Lumpkin, White Plains, N.Y. 7C	243	26.8%
B Mr. Michael E. Krentz, Emmaus, Pa. 7E	411	45.4%
C Mr. Ivan A. Perez, Chicago, Ill. 5A	251	27.7%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	906	100.0%
Division for Ministry / Ticket 19 / Clergy / Reserved for Region 4		
A Pr. Robert J. Karli, Austin, Texas 4E	381	42.4%
B Pr. Gordon D. Peterson Jr., Olathe, Kan. 4B	352	39.2%
C Pr. James H. Hanson, Winters, Texas 4D	165	18.4%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	898	100.0%
Division for Ministry / Ticket 20 / Clergy		
A Pr. Cheryl F. Meinschein, Orefield, Pa. 7E	286	30.8%
B Pr. Jean Bozeman, Newport News, Va. 9A	330	35.5%
C Pr. Heidi L. Hyland, Springfield, Ill. 5C	200	21.5%
D Pr. Theodore H. Rust, Smithville, Ohio 6E	112	12.0%
Invalid Ballots	2	0.2%
Total Ballots	930	100.0%
Division for Ministry / Ticket 21 / Clergy		
A Pr. Kathryn A. Kleinhans, Waverly, Iowa 5F	260	28.8%
B Pr. Mary P. Lund, Apple Valley, Minn. 3H	315	34.9%
C Pr. Darlene B. Muschett, Rochester, N.Y. 7D	177	19.6%
D Pr. Dennis R. Bolton, West Columbia, S.C. 9C	151	16.7%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	903	100.0%

	VOTES	PERCENT
Division for Ministry / Ticket 22 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Lynn H. Askew, New Brunswick, N.J. 7A	382	41.5%
B Ms. Ann G. Kohler, Baldwinsville, N.Y. 7D	231	25.1%
C Ms. Cynthia A. Jurisson, LaGrange, Ill. 5A	307	33.3%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	921	100.0%
Division for Ministry / Ticket 23 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Mary J. Mikulski, Harlan, Ind. 6C	392	45.4%
B Ms. Racine Forrest, Inglewood, Calif. 2B	254	29.4%
C Ms. Louise L. Litke, Huntington Station, N.Y. 7C	217	25.2%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	863	100.0%
Division for Ministry / Ticket 24 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Michael J. Root, Columbus, Ohio 6F	615	66.1%
B Mr. Billy "Bill" G. Smith, Stafford, Va. 9A	170	18.3%
C Mr. William J. Hornig, Prospect, Ky. 6C	145	15.6%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	930	100.0%
Division for Ministry / Ticket 25 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Richard J. Brynteson, Rockford, Ill. 5B	313	35.4%
B Mr. John E. Dellis, Seguin, Texas 4E	569	64.4%
Invalid Ballots	2	0.2%
Total Ballots	884	100.0%
Division for Outreach / Ticket 26 / Clergy		
A Pr. Bill G. Willms, Long Beach, Calif. 2B	190	20.9%
B Pr. J. Elise Brown, New York (Bronx), N.Y. 7C	562	61.8%
C Pr. Douglas T. Bertani, Auburn, Calif. 2A	157	17.3%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	909	100.0%
Division for Outreach / Ticket 27 / Clergy (PC/L) / Reserved for Female Clergy		
A Pr. Linda J. Smith, Ocean Park, Wash. 1C	412	47.4%
B Pr. Linda Boston, San Jose, Calif. 2A	454	52.2%
Invalid Ballots	3	0.4%
Total Ballots	869	100.0%
Division for Outreach / Ticket 28 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Ardith Senft, Phoenix, Ariz. 2D	473	54.4%
B Ms. Janet Okerman, Englewood, Colo. 2E	395	45.5%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	869	100.0%
Division for Outreach / Ticket 29 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Dorothy E. Hammer, Cannon Falls, Minn. 3I	414	48.8%
B Ms. Jan Weness, Adams, Minn. 3I	435	51.2%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	849	100.0%

	VOTES	PERCENT
Division for Outreach / Ticket 30 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Deborah R. Joncas, Newark, N.J. 7A	612	71.0%
B Ms. R. Ursula Schwartz, Lafayette Hill, Pa. 7F	250	29.0%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	862	100.0%
Division for Outreach / Ticket 31 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Ronald J. Solimon, Albuquerque, N.M. 2E	520	60.7%
B Mr. Godwin T. Lai, Honolulu, Hawaii 2C	336	39.2%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	857	100.0%
Division for Outreach / Ticket 32 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Richard L. Steuernagle, DuBois, Pa. 8C	320	36.9%
B Mr. James R. Judy, Greenville, Pa. 8A	355	41.0%
C Mr. Michael "Mike" E. Franklin, Carmel, Ind. 6C	192	22.1%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	867	100.0%
Division for Higher Education and Schools / Ticket 33 / Clergy / Reserved for Region 4		
A Pr. Mark A. Grorud, Fremont, Neb. 4A	291	33.3%
B Pr. David D. Daubert, Omaha, Neb. 4A	271	31.1%
C Pr. Jayne M. Thompson, Manhattan, Kan. 4B	310	35.5%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	873	100.0%
Division for Higher Education and Schools / Ticket 34 / Clergy		
A Pr. Mary J. Lundquist, Hartford City, Ind. 6C	352	40.2%
B Pr. Linda J. Kraft, Stafford Springs, Conn. 7G	523	59.8%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	875	100.0%
Division for Higher Education and Schools / Ticket 35 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Barbara M. Manthei, West Salem, Wis. 5L	413	48.6%
B Ms. Diane G. Scholl, Decorah, Iowa 5F	436	51.4%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	849	100.0%
Division for Higher Education and Schools / Ticket 36 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Jan Knutson, Thousand Oaks, Calif. 2B	403	46.5%
B Ms. Jennifer N. Peterson, New Braunfels, Texas 4E	464	53.5%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	867	100.0%
Division for Higher Education and Schools / Ticket 37 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Gay S. Steele, Columbus, Ohio 6F	511	59.5%
B Ms. Misato In, Columbus, Ohio 6F	345	40.2%

	VOTES	PERCENT
Invalid Ballots	3	0.3%
Total Ballots	859	100.0%
Division for Higher Education and Schools / Ticket 38 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Rod Schofield, Colorado Springs, Colo. 2E	382	44.2%
B Mr. Stephen P. Dinger, Tacoma, Wash. 1C	273	31.6%
C Mr. Philip P. Kerstetter, Edinboro, Pa. 8A	209	24.2%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	864	100.0%
Division for Higher Education and Schools / Ticket 39 / Lay Male (PC/L) /		
A Mr. Robert W. Drakeford, Tuskegee, Ala. 9D	396	45.5%
B Mr. Bolivar Roman, San Juan, Puerto Rico 9F	474	54.5%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	870	100.0%
Division for Church in Society / Ticket 40 / Clergy		
A *Pr. Robert E. Allen, Macon, Ga. 9D	393	43.2%
B Pr. James B. Martin-Schramm, Decorah, Iowa 5F	516	56.8%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	909	100.0%
Division for Church in Society / Ticket 41 / Clergy (PC/L)		
A Pr. J. Pablo Obregon, Willmar, Minn. 3F	519	58.6%
B Pr. Cherian C. Puthiyottil, Minneapolis, Minn. 3G	367	41.4%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	886	100.0%
Division for Church in Society / Ticket 42 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Rebecca P. Judge, Northfield, Minn. 3I	422	49.8%
B Ms. Ruth A. Henrichs, Ralston, Neb. 4A	420	49.6%
Invalid Ballots	5	0.6%
Total Ballots	847	100.0%
Division for Church in Society / Ticket 43 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Charlene Lipscomb, Parma, Ohio 6E	365	42.3%
B Ms. Eranthie Mendis, Chicago, Ill. 5A	236	27.4%
C Ms. Mary Lu Bowen, Vestal, N.Y. 7D	261	30.3%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	862	100.0%
Division for Church in Society / Ticket 44 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Mark A. Peterson, Minneapolis, Minn. 3G	332	37.6%
B Mr. Roger Gutmann, Des Moines, Iowa 5D	340	38.6%

	VOTES	PERCENT
C Mr. George S. Edwards, Philadelphia, Pa. 7F	209	23.7%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	882	100.0%
Division for Church in Society / Ticket 45 / Lay Male		
A Mr. James C. Banks, Tallahassee, Fla. 9E	256	29.1%
B Mr. Robert W. Tuttle, Washington, D.C. 8G	372	42.2%
C Mr. Len Weiser, Reading, Pa. 7E	253	28.7%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	881	100.0%
Division for Church in Society / Ticket 46 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Stewart W. Herman, Moorhead, Minn. 3D	483	56.6%
B Mr. Joel A. Zimbelman, Chico, Calif. 2A	369	43.2%
Invalid Ballots	2	0.2%
Total Ballots	854	100.0%
Division for Global Mission / Ticket 47 / Clergy		
A Pr. L. Paul Bartling, Seattle, Wash. 1B	412	46.7%
B Pr. Ronald L. Swenson, Denver, Colo. 2E	268	30.3%
C Pr. Edward V. DeVore, Johnstown, Pa. 8C	203	23.0%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	883	100.0%
Division for Global Mission / Ticket 48 / Clergy		
A Pr. Harvey L. Nelson, Litchfield, Minn. 3F	355	40.4%
B Pr. Lane Doerring, Laporte, Minn. 3I	228	25.9%
C Pr. Janice A. Campbell, Jackson Center, Ohio 6F	296	33.7%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	879	100.0%
Division for Global Mission / Ticket 49 / Clergy (PC/L)		
A Pr. Natanael F. Lizarazo, Decorah, Iowa 3I	524	58.6%
B Pr. Thomas W. Chen, Orange, Calif. 2C	370	41.4%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	894	100.0%
Division for Global Mission / Ticket 50 / Lay Female / Reserved for Region 1		
A Ms. Hermina Meyer, Kendrick, Idaho 1D	466	56.9%
B Ms. Elaine C. Rodning, Tacoma, Wash. 1C	352	43.0%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	819	100.0%
Division for Global Mission / Ticket 51 / Lay Female		
A Ms. S. Christine Mummert, Harrisburg, Pa. 8D	473	55.9%
B Ms. Sally J. Dempster, Annapolis, Md. 8F	372	44.0%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	846	100.0%
Division for Global Mission / Ticket 52 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Judy St. Pierre, Newport News, Va. 9A	527	62.6%
B Ms. Judy A. Fray, Madison, Va. 9A	315	37.4%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	842	100.0%

	VOTES	PERCENT
Division for Global Mission / Ticket 53 / Lay Male / Region 3 Reserved		
A *Mr. Terfassa Yadessa, St. Paul, Minn. 3G	631	74.0%
B Mr. Curtis Coates, Minneapolis, Minn. 3G	222	26.0%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	853	100.0%
Publishing House of the ELCA / Ticket 54 / Clergy / Reserved for Region 9		
A Pr. Richard F. Bansemer, Salem, Va. 9A	562	64.4%
B Pr. Frank R. Wagner, Juno Beach, Fla. 9E	310	35.6%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	872	100.0%
Publishing House of the ELCA / Ticket 55 / Clergy		
A Pr. Barbara R. Rossing, Chicago, Ill. 5L	495	54.5%
B Pr. Patricia J. Lull, Athens, Ohio 6F	412	45.4%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	908	100.0%
Publishing House of the ELCA / Ticket 56 / Clergy		
A Pr. Steven J. Knudson, Willmar, Minn. 3F	292	33.5%
B Pr. Gregory C. Moser, Sioux Falls, S.D. 3C	297	34.1%
C Pr. Edgar M. Krentz, Chicago, Ill. 5F	282	32.4%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	871	100.0%
Publishing House of the ELCA / Ticket 57 / Lay Female / Reserved for Region 2		
A Ms. Janice M. Bowman, Thousand Oaks, Calif. 2B	515	59.9%
B Ms. Mary Kallestad, Glendale, Ariz. 2D	345	40.1%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	860	100.0%
Publishing House of the ELCA / Ticket 58 / Lay Female		
A *Ms. Lois A. O'Rourke, Madison, Wis. 5K	415	49.3%
B Ms. Karen Albers-Sigler, Bloomsburg, Pa. 8E	426	50.7%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	841	100.0%
Publishing House of the ELCA / Ticket 59 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Frank R. Jennings, Seattle, Wash. 1B	278	31.8%
B Mr. Michael Carscaddon, Charlotte, N.C. 9B	287	32.9%
C Mr. R. Guy Erwin, New Haven, Conn. 7B	308	35.3%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	873	100.0%
Publishing House of the ELCA / Ticket 60 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Ralph J. Eckert, Dillon, Colo. 2E	258	30.4%
B Mr. John E. Rogan, Winter Park, Fla. 9E	247	29.1%

	VOTES	PERCENT
C Mr. James "Jim" Myers, Kailua, Hawaii 2C	344	40.5%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	849	100.0%
Board of Pensions / Ticket 61 / Plan Participants		
A Pr. Patricia L. Holman, Aurora, Colo. 2E	325	37.5%
B Ms. Karen (Shaaf) Southward, Columbus, Ohio 6F	345	39.9%
C Pr. Wesley L. Hamlin Jr., Jamestown, N.Y. 7D	196	22.6%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	866	100.0%
Board of Pensions / Ticket 62 / Plan Participants		
A Pr. Lawrence W. Wick, Woodstock, Ill. 5B	459	54.6%
B Pr. Jon R. Lee, Dallas, Texas 4D	379	45.0%
Invalid Ballots	3	0.4%
Total Ballots	841	100.0%
Board of Pensions / Ticket 63 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Jane C. Von Seggern, Atlanta, Ga. 9D	413	51.6%
B Ms. Cindy Jones, Silverton, Ore. 1E	386	48.3%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	800	100.0%
Board of Pensions / Ticket 64 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Anne C. Christopherson, Blair, Neb. 4A	383	47.6%
B Ms. Nancy J. Haberstick, Lincoln, Neb. 4A	422	52.4%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	805	100.0%
Board of Pensions / Ticket 65 / Lay Female (PC/L)		
A Ms. Sarah C. Murphy, Dayton, Ohio 6F	425	52.1%
B Ms. Mercy Tang-Tellez, Chicago, Ill. 5A	391	47.9%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	816	100.0%
Board of Pensions / Ticket 66 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Wm. Laddison Waldo, Oak Park, Ill. 5A	276	34.5%
B Mr. Bradley C. Engel, Burlington, Wis. 5J	313	39.1%
C Mr. Martin E. Mielke, South Bend, Ind. 6C	212	26.5%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	801	100.0%
Board of Pensions / Ticket 67 / Lay Male		
A *Mr. Jon Christianson, St. Paul, Minn. 3H	574	68.9%
B Mr. Harold J. Bergquist, Fairdale, N.D. 3B	259	31.1%

	VOTES	PERCENT
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	833	100.0%
Nominating Committee / Ticket 68 / Clergy		
A Pr. Clark K. Cary, Blue Earth, Minn. 3I	392	46.1%
B Pr. George F. Krempin, Green Bay, Wis. 5I	210	24.7%
C Pr. Darrel O. Lundby, Beaverton, Ore. 1E	247	29.1%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	850	100.0%
Nominating Committee / Ticket 69 / Clergy / Reserved for Region 8		
A Pr. Stephen R. Herr, Blairsville, Pa. 8B	401	50.0%
B Pr. Howard M. Ravenstahl, Pittsburgh, Pa. 8B	399	49.8%
Invalid Ballots	2	0.2%
Total Ballots	802	100.0%
Nominating Committee / Ticket 70 / Lay Female / Reserved for Region 4		
A Ms. Cheryl L. Hollich, Blue Springs, Mo. 4B	443	53.8%
B Ms. Linda Janssen Gjere, Omaha, Neb. 4A	380	46.2%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	823	100.0%
Nominating Committee / Ticket 71 / Lay Female / Reserved for Region 6		
A Ms. Margaret A. Messick, Zanesville, Ohio 6F	550	65.4%
B Ms. Charlotte L. Shaffer, Toledo, Ohio 6D	284	33.8%
Invalid Ballots	7	0.8%
Total Ballots	841	100.0%
Nominating Committee / Ticket 72 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Steven L. Knowles, Whitefish Bay, Wis. 5J	258	31.6%
B Mr. Walter J. Chossek, Shorewood, Wis. 5J	196	24.0%
C Mr. Christopher J. Mehling, Crestview Hills, Ky. 6C	193	23.6%
D Mr. Philip Schlachtenhaufen, Monona, Wis. 5K	169	20.7%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	817	100.0%
Nominating Committee / Ticket 73 / Lay Male (PC/L)		
A Mr. Carlos Peña, Galveston, Texas 4F	667	77.5%
B Mr. Edward Wang, Missouri City, Texas 4F	191	22.2%
Invalid Ballots	3	0.3%
Total Ballots	861	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 74 / Clergy		
A Pr. Paula J. Gravelle, Altamont, N.Y. 7D	507	61.1%
B Pr. Constance L. Mentzer, Canfield, Ohio 6E	322	38.8%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	830	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 75 / Clergy		
A Pr. Kevin C. Clementson, Pittsburgh, Pa. 8B	401	49.3%
B Pr. David G. Gabel, Traverse City, Mich. 6B	412	50.6%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	814	100.0%

	VOTES	PERCENT
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 76 / Clergy		
A Pr. S. Philip Froiland, Waverly, Iowa 5F	276	32.3%
B Pr. Dale R. Skogman, Marquette, Mich. 5G	579	67.7%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	855	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 77 / Clergy		
A Pr. Obed E. Nelson, Anchorage, Alaska 1A	652	80.3%
B Pr. Robert E. Slade, Harlingen, Texas 4E	156	19.2%
Invalid Ballots	4	0.5%
Total Ballots	812	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 78 / Clergy		
A Pr. Thomas J. Weber, Princeton, N.J. 7A	274	31.7%
B Pr. J. Christian Quello, Appleton, Wis. 5I	370	42.9%
C Pr. Jay C. Rochelle, Allentown, Pa. 7E	218	25.3%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	863	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 79 / Clergy		
A Pr. Synde Manion, Woodland Hills, Calif. 2B	434	54.9%
B Pr. Margaret "Peggy" Schultz-Akerson, Pasadena, Calif. 2B	355	44.9%
Invalid Ballots	2	0.2%
Total Ballots	791	100.0%
Committee on Discipline -Ticket 80 / Clergy		
A Pr. Robert C. Toso, East Grand Forks, Minn. 3D	346	42.2%
B Pr. Gary J. Woodruff, Southampton, Pa. 7F	474	57.8%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	820	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 81 / Clergy		
A *Pr. Vicki R. Hultine, Zumbrota, Minn. 3I	522	65.7%
B Pr. Rebecca M. Sogge, Brooten, Minn. 3F	272	34.2%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	795	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 82 / Clergy		
A *Pr. Eugene W. Beutel, Camp Hill, Pa. 8D	567	68.8%
B Pr. John M. Vought Jr., York, Pa. 8D	256	31.1%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	824	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 83 / Lay Female (PC/L)		
A Ms. Jennie Lightfoot, Burnsville, Minn. 3H	390	48.6%
B Ms. Ivonne M. Velazquez, San Juan, Puerto Rico 9F	411	51.3%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	802	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 84 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Deborah S. Yandala, Westlake, Ohio 6E	521	61.8%
B Ms. Carol L. Fleeger, Butler, Pa. 8B	321	38.1%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	843	100.0%

	VOTES	PERCENT
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 85 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Faith A. Ashton, Durham, N.C. 9B	522	62.4%
B Ms. Mary B. Heller, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 7C	313	37.4%
Invalid Ballots	2	0.2%
Total Ballots	837	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 86 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Mark N. Reed, Luray, Va. 9A	376	45.3%
B Mr. Robert F. Blanck, Orelan, Pa. 7F	312	37.5%
C Mr. John D. Litke, Huntington Station, N.Y. 7C	142	17.1%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	831	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 87 / Lay Male		
A Mr. D. Mark Klever, Dayton, Iowa 5E	554	68.3%
B Mr. Earl Branum, Chatfield, Minn. 3I	256	31.6%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	811	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 88 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Mark S. Helmke, San Antonio, Texas 4E	484	59.3%
B Mr. Walter D. Meyer, Englewood, Colo. 2E	332	40.7%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	816	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 89 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Ralph B. K. Peterson, Escanaba, Mich. 5G	422	53.6%
B Mr. Christopher P. Larson, Peoria, Ill. 5C	364	46.3%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	787	100.0%
Committee on Appeals / Ticket 90 / Clergy		
A Pr. Paul J. Joncas, Wayne Township, N.J. 7A	350	40.9%
B Pr. James E. Sudbrock, Mount Vernon, N.Y. 7C	505	59.1%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	855	100.0%
Committee on Appeals / Ticket 91 / Clergy		
A Pr. Reuben T. Swanson, Omaha, Neb. 4A	487	58.1%
B Pr. Paul M. Cornell, Colledgeville, Pa. 7F	351	41.9%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	838	100.0%
Committee on Appeals / Ticket 92 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Mary Alice Bjork, Salem, Ore. 1E	403	51.2%
B Ms. Carol D. Gaskamp, Wichita, Kan. 4B	384	48.8%
Invalid Ballots	0	0.0%
Total Ballots	787	100.0%
Committee on Appeals / Ticket 93 / Lay Male (PC/L)		
A Mr. William T. Billings, Dearborn Heights, Mich. 6A	340	42.1%
B Mr. Daniel W. Joy, Jamaica, N.Y. 7C	467	57.8%
Invalid Ballots	1	0.1%
Total Ballots	808	100.0%

Second Ballot

	VOTES	PERCENT
Church Council / Ticket 5 / Clergy		
A Pr. Michael G. Merkel, New Haven, Conn. 7B	625	68.0%
B Pr. William G. Moldwin, New Britain, Conn. 7B	294	32.0%
Total Ballots	919	100.0%
Division for Congregational Ministries / Ticket 13 / Clergy		
A Pr. Jeffrey L. Schock, Latrobe, Pa. 8B	528	59.2%
B Pr. Steven Middernacht, Lewisburg, Pa. 8E	364	40.8%
Total Ballots	892	100.0%
Division for Congregational Ministries / Ticket 15 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Fran Burnford, North Hollywood, Calif. 2B	522	58.1%
B Ms. Jeanne E. McCoskery, Missoula, Mont. 1F	376	41.9%
Total Ballots	898	100.0%
Division for Congregational Ministries / Ticket 16 / Lay Female		
B Ms. Virginia A. Kneuppel, Norcross, Ga. 9D	483	55.9%
C Ms. Patricia E. Swanson, Kennedy, Minn. 3D	381	44.1%
Total Ballots	864	100.0%
Division for Congregational Ministries / Ticket 18 / Lay Male		
B Mr. Michael E. Krentz, Emmaus, Pa. 7E	555	64.5%
C Mr. Ivan A. Perez, Chicago, Ill. 5A	306	35.5%
Total Ballots	861	100.0%
Division for Ministry / Ticket 19 / Clergy / Reserved for Region 4		
A Pr. Robert J. Karli, Austin, Texas 4E	473	53.4%
B Pr. Gordon D. Peterson Jr., Olathe, Kan. 4B	412	46.6%
Total Ballots	885	100.0%
Division for Ministry / Ticket 20 / Clergy		
A Pr. Cheryl F. Meinschein, Orefield, Pa. 7E	397	43.6%
B Pr. Jean Bozeman, Newport News, Va. 9A	513	56.4%
Total Ballots	910	100.0%
Division for Ministry / Ticket 21 / Clergy		
A Pr. Kathryn A. Kleinhans, Waverly, Iowa 5F	397	44.3%
B Pr. Mary P. Lund, Apple Valley, Minn. 3H	499	55.7%
Total Ballots	896	100.0%
Division for Ministry / Ticket 22 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Lynn H. Askew, New Brunswick, N.J. 7A	544	58.0%
C Ms. Cynthia A. Jurisson, La Grange, Ill. 5A	394	42.0%
Total Ballots	938	100.0%
Division for Ministry / Ticket 23 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Mary J. Mikulski, Harlan, Ind. 6C	584	66.9%
B Ms. Racine Forrest, Inglewood, Calif. 2B	289	33.1%
Total Ballots	873	100.0%

	VOTES	PERCENT
Division for Outreach / Ticket 32 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Richard L. Steuernagle, DuBois, Pa. 8C	352	39.9%
B Mr. James R. Judy, Greenville, Pa. 8A	531	60.1%
Total Ballots	883	100.0%
Division for Higher Education and Schools / Ticket 33 / Clergy / Reserved for Region 4		
A Pr. Mark A. Grorud, Fremont, Neb. 4A	388	43.9%
C Pr. Jayne M. Thompson, Manhattan, Kan. 4B	496	56.1%
Total Ballots	884	100.0%
Division for Higher Education and Schools / Ticket 38 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Rod Schofield, Colorado Springs, Colo. 2E	570	65.9%
B Mr. Stephen P. Dinger, Tacoma, Wash. 1C	295	34.1%
Total Ballots	865	100.0%
Division for Church in Society / Ticket 42 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Rebecca P. Judge, Northfield, Minn. 3I	513	57.5%
B Ms. Ruth A. Henrichs, Ralston, Neb. 4A	379	42.5%
Total Ballots	892	100.0%
Division for Church in Society / Ticket 43 / Lay Female		
A Ms. Charlene Lipscomb, Parma, Ohio 6E	550	64.6%
C Ms. Mary Lu Bowen, Vestal, N.Y. 7D	301	35.4%
Total Ballots	851	100.0%
Division for Church in Society / Ticket 44 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Mark A. Peterson, Minneapolis, Minn. 3G	379	43.3%
B Mr. Roger Gutmann, Des Moines, Iowa 5D	497	56.7%
Total Ballots	876	100.0%
Division for Church in Society / Ticket 45 / Lay Male		
A Mr. James C. Banks, Tallahassee, Fla. 9E	279	32.4%
B Mr. Robert W. Tuttle, Washington, D.C. 8G	583	67.6%
Total Ballots	862	100.0%
Division for Global Mission / Ticket 47 / Clergy		
A Pr. L. Paul Bartling, Seattle, Wash. 1B	543	60.9%
B Pr. Ronald L. Swenson, Denver, Colo. 2E	349	39.1%
Total Ballots	892	100.0%
Division for Global Mission / Ticket 48 / Clergy		
A Pr. Harvey L. Nelson, Litchfield, Minn. 3F	538	59.8%
C Pr. Janice A. Campbell, Jackson Center, Ohio 6F	362	40.2%
Total Ballots	900	100.0%
Publishing House of the ELCA / Ticket 56 / Clergy		
A Pr. Steven J. Knudson, Willmar, Minn. 3F	392	45.3%
B Pr. Gregory C. Moser, Sioux Falls, S.D. 3C	473	54.7%
Total Ballots	865	100.0%

	VOTES	PERCENT
Publishing House of the ELCA / Ticket 59 / Lay Male		
B Mr. Michael Carscaddon, Charlotte, N.C. 9B	356	41.9%
C Mr. R. Guy Erwin, New Haven, Conn. 7B	493	58.1%
Total Ballots	849	100.0%
Publishing House of the ELCA / Ticket 60 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Ralph J. Eckert, Dillon, Colo. 2E	277	32.3%
C Mr. James "Jim" Myers, Kailua, Hawaii 2C	581	67.7%
Total Ballots	858	100.0%
Board of Pensions / Ticket 61 / Plan Participants		
A Pr. Patricia L. Holman, Aurora, Colo. 2E	375	43.1%
B Ms. Karen (Schaaf) Southward, Columbus, Ohio 6F	495	56.9%
Total Ballots	870	100.0%
Board of Pensions / Ticket 66 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Wm. Laddison Waldo, Oak Park, Ill. 5A	368	43.0%
B Mr. Bradley C. Engle, Burlington, Wis 5J	488	57.0%
Total Ballots	856	100.0%
Nominating Committee / Ticket 68 / Clergy		
A Pr. Clark K. Cary, Blue Earth, Minn. 3I	532	61.6%
C Pr. Darrel O. Lundby, Beaverton, Ore. 1E	331	38.4%
Total Ballots	863	100.0%
Nominating Committee / Ticket 69 / Clergy / Reserved for Region 8		
A Pr. Stephen R. Herr, Blairsville, Pa. 8B	494	58.6%
B Pr. Howard M. Ravenstahl, Pittsburgh, Pa. 8B	349	41.4%
Total Ballots	843	100.0%
Nominating Committee / Ticket 72 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Steven L. Knowles, Whitefish Bay, Wis. 5J	539	66.7%
B Mr. Walter J. Chossek, Shorewood, Wis. 5J	269	33.3%
Total Ballots	808	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 78 / Clergy		
A Pr. Thomas J. Weber, Princeton, N.J. 7A	385	43.4%
B Pr. J. Christian Quello, Appleton, Wis. 5I	503	56.6%
Total Ballots	888	100.0%
Committee on Discipline / Ticket 86 / Lay Male		
A Mr. Mark N. Reed, Luray, Va. 9A	546	62.4%
B Mr. Robert F. Blanck, Orelan, Pa. 7F	329	37.6%
Total Ballots	875	100.0%

Report of the Presiding Bishop

Part One

God chose to make known how great among the Gentiles are the riches of the glory of this mystery which is Christ in you the hope of glory (Colossians 1:27).

As we gather in Denver for the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the year 2000 will be only months away. For some people that prospect brings anxiety, but our assembly theme is an appropriately hope-filled one: "Making Christ Known: Hope for a New Century." Because of Jesus Christ, we wait with hope and expectation for a new century. Ever since the Apostle Paul, Christ's followers have spread that good news, committed to telling the world how God is making Christ known. That is the work of Christians of every century.

We are not new to the task. During the last biennium, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has been busy preparing for a new century. This report will sample some of those activities, especially for those of you who will be serving as voting members at the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

It is the responsibility of each churchwide assembly to review the work of the churchwide organization. An earlier mailing included the reports of ELCA churchwide units. Reading through those reports provides an overview of most of our ministries. As you read them, I hope you will join me in giving thanks to God for the faithful, committed, and highly creative staff who carry out these ministries both at home and overseas. Our church has been blessed with these faithful co-workers in the Gospel. Thanks be to God!

The words of the Great Commission (Matthew 28:18-20) can provide a framework for my own summary. They lead us into the heart of what it means to "make Christ known." Jesus said to the disciples, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you. And remember, I am with you always, to the end of the age."

Leadership: When Jesus commissioned his followers to go and teach, he defined a new kind of leadership. As they went into all the world as messengers of the good news, their task was certainly to lead—but to lead others to Christ. They were to be more like coaches than commanders. Their authority lay in their ability to bring people to Jesus, who was "the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6).

As churchwide staff visited with synodical representatives last year and listened for emerging issues, they heard, "Our biggest concern is leadership." Many needs were wrapped up in that one word. Where will we find enough ordained pastors to serve our congregations? How can we work with our emerging ethnic communities to identify and prepare leaders? What sort of preparation will best enable lay leaders in remote congregations or in congregations where there is no called pastor? How can we develop leaders with the mind of Christ (Philippians 2:5-8) who use their abilities for the good of all?

A church with strong rostered and lay leadership will be a church that is strong in mission. We know that our church has many persons with the gifts for leadership—those described as “faithful people who will be able to teach others” (2 Timothy 2:2). Some are already serving as leaders. Others, however, have not been identified. The job before us is not only to support the leaders we have and learn from them, but also to identify new leaders and help them to equip themselves and others to be even more effective in their leadership.

One obstacle for persons who decide to enter rostered ministry is the cost. Whenever I talk with recently ordained pastors they ask me, “What can be done to help our seminarians graduate without thousands of dollars of debt?” While seminaries raise scholarship money for their students in addition to receiving subsidies from the church at large and from synods, much of the cost of a theological education still falls on the students themselves. By action of the last churchwide assembly, the church has established the “Fund for Leaders in Mission” as an endowed scholarship resource available to seminarians. The fund is just getting started, but donors are being sought. The goal is to make it possible for students to graduate from seminary without carrying a burden of debt into their first parish—or beyond.

Much has been written about “clergy burnout” in the last few years. The ELCA and The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod are cooperating in a program for Ministerial Health and Wellness supported financially by Lutheran Brotherhood. The program provides prevention and promotes well-being and renewal for rostered leaders and professional church workers over the course of their ministries.

Ministry to and with our ethnic communities will require some innovative ways to prepare leaders. A consultation last year on “Leaders for Tomorrow: Strategic Directions for Leadership Development in the 21st Century” suggested adaptations to our typical certification process that could increase the stream of candidates. The Black Rostered Leadership Summit this summer is likely to offer additional ideas for preparation and support. Many fast-growing Asian-American and Hispanic communities are already beginning to produce pastors and lay leaders. Our healthy financial position will permit investment in these projects, and some synods have received grants to support their own innovations in leadership development.

Discipleship: Jesus’ commission to “make disciples” describes a ministry that moves from baptism into obeying Christ’s commands. That vital connection between liturgy and life is what constitutes discipleship.

The growing number of adult baptisms in this church challenges us to incorporate these new believers into the life and work of the Body of Christ. The congregation introduces members into the way our faith shapes our choices and decisions. Seekers become disciples. All of us, of course, need encouragement to “continue in Christ’s word” (John 8:31) throughout life. We know that our members have abundant gifts, resources, and commitment. We also know that members look for direction and learning to provide for life-long growth in faithfulness, witness, and service.

Among the new resources for this process are: “Welcome to Christ,” resources for the adult catechumenate; “Life Together,” a church school curriculum for all ages that ties the weekly lectionary to daily life; and “Splash! The Ripples of the Baptized,” a creative way to focus congregational life around the ministry of the baptized.

At the churchwide assembly, you will begin to hear about “Call to Discipleship,” a major year-long (2000-2001) program for congregations. It is designed to help us become “doers

of the word, and not merely hearers who deceive themselves” (James 1:22). The Call to Discipleship will encourage us to pray frequently, study Scripture diligently, worship regularly, serve for the sake of others, give freely, tell others often, and pass on the faith. What better way could there be to begin life in a new century?

The ELCA Identity Project is another way to “go into all the world and make disciples.” This public media evangelism project is designed to help congregations become better known in their communities through print, television, and radio. Many congregations are already using the “Go Public” kits to reach out locally, and in some areas they are cooperating with their synod and our Department for Communication in sponsoring regional TV spots. A special web site, www.sharingfaith.org, has been set up to support this project and to help viewers and readers move from seekers to disciples.

Support for the spread of the Gospel is very strong. In 1998, churchwide mission support—that portion of offerings that goes toward the work of the church at large—exceeded our projections and reached its highest-ever level of almost \$67 million! Our total income approached \$82 million, not including World Hunger receipts of nearly \$13 million. Income exceeded expenditures by \$1.2 million.

These extra dollars have been put to work for expanded outreach. Some of this added funding matches the commitment of Aid Association for Lutherans to the ELCA Identity Project in public evangelism; more funds are being provided to the divisions for Outreach and Global Mission to support additional missionaries and mission developers and to fund more fully “In the City for Good,” anti-racism training, and some additional activities flowing from the churchwide Initiatives. We also have been able to use some reserves to prepay part of the Lutheran Center mortgage and thus free up more dollars for mission in future years.

Most exciting to me is the action of the Church Council that \$3 million be made available to expand our church’s ministry with and among the poor. We are currently working with synods to determine where both funds and volunteer hands can strengthen our outreach, giving attention to needs and opportunities for serving the poor. As we remember the poor “out there” in society, we also must be mindful of those among our own retired pastors and their survivors whose minimal pension accrual generates income below the poverty level. Additional dollars from this “second-mile giving” plan will increase the Special Needs Retirement Fund in order to stimulate added giving and enable increased pension subsidy for these low-income retirees.

Reports from this year’s synodical-churchwide consultations indicate continued strong synodical commitments to sustain, and in some cases, expand partnership in 2000 and the years beyond. To our bishops and synodical staffs, synod council members, our rostered leaders and congregational council members, I extend a heartfelt word of appreciation. All that we have is a gift from God. Thanks to all for growing in generosity, sharing God’s gifts with partners throughout this church, with our partner churches around the world, and with those in the global community who stand in need of our support and outreach!

Partnership: When Jesus commissioned his followers to go and baptize and teach, he also assured them that they would not be alone on this mission. He told them to remember that “I am with you always, to the end of the age” (Matthew 28:20).

Through the years we have discovered that our Lord is present both spiritually and physically in the ministry of fellow Christians. No part of the Church stands alone; we need each other if we are to be faithful to the mission God has entrusted to us. We do that by

listening to each other, learning from each other, and sharing what is at the core of our faith and our hope. The biblical image of a body with many members (Romans 12) envisions a flow of action that is neither “top down” nor “bottom up.” It is truly among the parts.

We are able to respond to God’s mission through a wide variety of partnerships and cooperative activities among congregations, synods, the churchwide organization, and many agencies and institutions. Much of the work is done through interconnections, some of which are formal, but many of which are not. The strong partnerships that result from these interconnections strengthen our mission as a church and provide for exciting, effective ministries throughout the world.

Congregations are beginning to learn from each other through conversations on the Internet. It is no longer necessary for a good idea to travel to Chicago and win approval before being distributed through this church. Now questions about evangelism, worship, software, insurance, youth programs, and catechetical programs go out every day and receive a host of practical responses, the “best practices” of our congregations. The LutherLink network is being upgraded to improve connections, and we are looking at other ways to take advantage of the partnerships made possible by electronic communication.

Conferences and Events

The ELCA Summit on Youth held earlier this year is another model for partnership. The summit was an historic event blending—for the first time—a complex variety of networks, including youth leaders, camps, colleges, schools and seminaries, social service agencies, para-church groups, and the Council of Synodical Presidents of the Lutheran Youth Organization (LYO). The 800 people who gathered combined excellent presentations, lively music, energy, and a commitment to celebrate youth ministry and explore opportunities for the future. Imagine a strategy that would match the faith development of young people step by step through their adolescent and post-adolescent years! The strategy would draw on the resources of all the groups and institutions that were represented. That was the “next step” that participants were considering as they left the meeting.

The list of partnership events is long and energizing, including: the “Congregations for the 21st Century” conferences on evangelism; global mission events in the biennium in Wisconsin, New York, California, Puerto Rico, Indiana, Florida, and Nebraska; and countless “servant events” for youth. Some, like the youth summit, draw large numbers of people to annual events. Other churchwide and regional events include smaller numbers of people, but participants indicate an appreciation for the opportunity to gather across synodical lines to share ideas, learn, worship, build community, and have fun. Along with strong networks and deep relationships, events provide powerful settings for mission-powered action throughout the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Rural Ministry

The position of director for rural ministry resources and networking represents a new collaboration between churchwide divisions and members throughout the country. Ms. Sandra LeBlanc will coordinate the work of several divisions in addressing the special needs of rural and small-town people. She will be assisted by an advisory board drawn from all parts of the nation. Strong and generous mission support has enabled us to inaugurate this work with a full-time position instead of the part-time staffing originally projected.

Lutheran Disaster Response

Lutheran Disaster Response is an example of a partnership that reaches into the lives of people devastated by disaster. In the 1997-99 biennium, the ELCA has been present in the aftermath of a record number of disasters, including floods, hurricanes, tornados, fires, and violence. Through this partnership, Lutherans are there from the first days of a crisis through the rebuilding efforts, which sometimes take years. We are present in many ways: through prayer, financial support, volunteer efforts, and the effective and efficient partnerships created by social service agencies, synods, and churchwide staff. The generous response of our members makes it possible for the ELCA to act wherever disaster strikes around the world. The "Millions for Mitch" campaign is a reality! The campaign, which began in response to the devastation of Hurricane Mitch, has received more than \$2.5 million. Whether a disaster is close to home or in places far away, such as Central America or Kosovo, we can be assured that Lutherans are present. And, by God's grace, Lutherans will respond whenever—and wherever—disaster may strike again.

Full Communion Relationships

Partnerships extend beyond our own church family. On October 4, 1998, we celebrated our new full communion relationship with the Reformed Churches in an inspiring joint worship service at Rockefeller Chapel in Chicago. The 1997 Churchwide Assembly's approval of A Formula of Agreement with the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the United Church of Christ, and the Reformed Church in America is truly a "new thing" in the life of this church. Many of our synodical bishops report deeper levels of conversation with counterparts of the other churches. The Alaska and Northern Illinois Synods have issued invitations to Presbyterian and UCC pastors to serve ELCA parishes. Here and there congregations are beginning joint projects with a Presbyterian, Reformed Church in America, or United Church of Christ congregation down the street or across town. I recently listened in on a meeting of communication executives from the four church bodies, and I sensed their excitement as they discovered that one of the other groups had already tackled a common problem and could furnish resources to the rest. The question, "What can we do together to advance Christ's mission?" has become the driving force in these conversations.

Ecumenical Partnerships

One of the places where our relationship with the Reformed churches has been helpful is in dealing with the current transitions in the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA. As the organization reaches its fiftieth year it has initiated a process of evaluation and planning. The ELCA is fortunate in having Bishop Jon Enslin of the South-Central Synod of Wisconsin serving on the NCCC Executive Board, and former bishop the Rev. Will Herzfeld, now on the staff of the Division for Global Mission, serving as chair of the key Church World Service and Witness Unit Committee. These leaders have been supported in their efforts by colleagues from our partner churches, and the possibility of coordinated action has been substantially increased.

Another dimension of partnership with fellow Lutherans has been through the creation of a regional office of the Lutheran World Federation for North America. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada (ELCIC) is also a member of the LWF, and we have had a good working relationship with the ELCIC throughout our history. However, the contacts have been informal, which sometimes leads to neglected opportunities. Through partnership with

the LWF and the ELCIC we now have a full-time regional officer in the person of the Rev. Arthur E. Leichnitz, a citizen of Canada, whose office is at the Lutheran Center in Chicago. He is an effective interpreter of the work of the LWF and is available for presentations in congregations and synods. He is also helping us find ways to bring the resources of the LWF to bear on ministry needs in North America.

We celebrated global partnerships during this biennium, too. The eighth General Assembly of the World Council of Churches, held in Harare, Zimbabwe, last December, was a marvelous gathering of the people of God from every corner of this globe! It was a joy and a privilege to represent this church along with the others in our delegation, which included Secretary Lowell Almen, Bishops Andrea DeGroot-Nesdahl and Robert Isaksen, Ms. Kathy Magnus, Ms. Liz Canino, Pr. Jan Flaaten, Mr. Arthur Norman, and Pr. Daniel Martensen. Ms. Jennifer Nagel, Mr. Stephen Padre, and Mr. Vance Robbins attended as stewards. The World Council of Churches, like the National Council of the Churches of Christ, is engaged in a process of reassessing its structure. On the one hand it wants to reach out to Roman Catholics and Evangelicals, and on the other it is having difficulty spanning internal tensions between Eastern and Western culture. But in worship, at least, the power of a globe-spanning fellowship becomes palpable. The beating of drums and the lifting of voices praising God in a hundred languages or more repeatedly ushered us into the sense of adoration captured in many of the Psalms. Mr. Arthur Norman was elected to the Central Committee and former ELCA Vice President Kathy Magnus was re-elected to the committee, so we have a direct link to the ongoing discussions and planning.

The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod

Since assuming this office, I have yearned for the day when we move beyond a state of impasse in relations with The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod. Despite the sharp rhetoric from St. Louis in response to our ecumenical initiatives and full communion agreements, I am hopeful that a new day is dawning. The LCMS convention last summer issued a call for substantive theological conversations with the ELCA regarding key issues that divide us as Lutherans in the United States. LCMS President Alvin Barry and I have met and have proposed a series of theological conversations involving ten representatives appointed by each church body. The ELCA Church Council has approved this discussion panel. The semi-annual talks will begin in June 1999 and will alternate between Chicago and St. Louis. My hope is that the approach will go beyond differences to explore ways in which a common Lutheran witness is possible. The first two topics for discussion will be “Lutheran identity in a post-modern society” and “the ELCA ecumenical agreements.” Other topics include “the nature of the church and ecumenical activity” and “the authorization of sacramental ministries for congregations without pastors.” Statements about the meetings will be jointly prepared by the secretaries of the two church bodies.

Churchwide Initiatives

Work continues on the seven “Initiatives for a New Century” that were created by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly. A more complete report on the initiatives is printed in Section IV of this Pre-Assembly Report.

Initiatives-related projects and emphases are increasingly taking hold. The Initiatives are serving as a reference point for planning in congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization. Several synods have carried out extensive planning processes around the

Initiatives. In the Northwest Synod of Wisconsin, for example, the fall stewardship effort challenged each congregation to plan with an eye toward the Initiatives; a composite report has been prepared by the synod.

A new approach to planning surfaced through one of the Initiatives: “asset-mapping” concentrates on the gifts that congregations, institutions, and members of this church bring to mission opportunities. Resources and training events will equip many leaders throughout this church to employ this perspective in planning.

This spring’s events in Littleton, Colorado, and the daily tragedies affecting children in many other places underscore the importance of the “Safe Haven” project, one of the emphases of Initiative 5 being introduced at this assembly. It is the result of efforts to help children—the theme of the fifth initiative. When even the schools become places of violence, it is more necessary than ever for the Church to offer children the assurance that there is a place where they will be safe from harm. The goal is to have every ELCA congregation learn about the needs of children in its community, commit—or recommit—to being a safe haven, and advocate for the most vulnerable in our society. It can be our positive contribution to a complex social problem.

Items on the Churchwide Assembly Agenda

We still have work to do! As we gather in Denver to act on behalf of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, there are several action items for us to consider. Each of these items is part of our mission together as the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Social Statement on Economic Life. Social statements provide a means for the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to address concerns that affect all of God’s creation. They offer counsel to our members, and they inform this church’s public witness.

The proposed social statement on economic life, “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All,” has been in development for five years. It comes for consideration by the churchwide assembly after a coordinated process which included listening posts, study materials, a first draft, and the final draft. If adopted by the assembly, this will become the ELCA’s seventh social statement.

“Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All” presents an opportunity for this church to plan and strategize about money and its use. It can be seen as a beginning, but not the final word, toward addressing a concern that is difficult for a church that is predominantly middle class. It contains basic principles and factual information that can inform our dialogue and shape our actions as we respond to the biblical mandates to care for the poor. I believe that this statement, if adopted by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly, can have a profound effect on the daily decisions of our members. In addition, it will give us a more solid foundation for advocacy and action on behalf of the economically disadvantaged.

Election of an Editor. Pr. Edgar R. Trexler’s tenure as editor of *The Lutheran* magazine has spanned 21 years and two church bodies, the Lutheran Church in America (1978-1987) and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (1988-1999). “Trex” leaves behind a strong legacy of pastoral and professional journalism. As the first editor of *The Lutheran* in the ELCA, he has set the standard and shaped the character of its relation to this church. Under his leadership, *The Lutheran* has won recognition within the religious publishing world and leads all similar periodicals in circulation.

As we bid farewell to Trex and his excellent leadership of *The Lutheran*, it will be the responsibility of this assembly to elect a new editor. In accordance with the ELCA constitution, one person will be nominated by the advisory committee for *The Lutheran* in consultation with the presiding bishop and the ELCA Church Council. Election requires approval by a majority of the voting members.

Ecumenical Proposals. This churchwide assembly will have the opportunity to discuss and make decisions that will shape the ELCA's relationship with The Episcopal Church and the Moravian Church in North America. These proposals are like the action taken at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly in connection with four churches of the Reformed tradition. Voting members are asked to decide whether this church should move into relationships of "full communion" with these two additional church bodies.

The term "full communion" is not familiar to everyone. "Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America," a policy statement approved by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly, uses the following definition:

For the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the characteristics of full communion are theological and missiological implications of the Gospel that allow variety and flexibility.... They will include at least the following...:

1. a common confessing of the Christian faith;
2. a mutual recognition of Baptism and a sharing of the Lord's Supper, allowing for joint worship and an exchangeability of members;
3. a mutual recognition and availability of ordained ministers to the service of all members of churches in full communion, subject only but always to the disciplinary regulations of the other churches;
4. a common commitment to evangelism, witness, and service;
5. a means of common decision making on critical common issues of faith and life;
6. a mutual lifting of any condemnations that exist between churches.

Moravian Church

"Following our Shepherd to Full Communion" comes to this churchwide assembly as a recommendation for a full communion relationship with the Moravian Church in North America. I have referred to the Moravians as our "cousins" because they are closely related to Lutherans historically and doctrinally. Although their membership in the United States is concentrated in a few areas, the Moravians are a world-wide communion. Some of their overseas churches are members of the Lutheran World Federation.

The Episcopal Church

"Called to Common Mission" is a "Lutheran Proposal for a Revision of the *Concordat of Agreement*." After the *Concordat of Agreement* failed to pass at the last Churchwide Assembly, the voting members approved resolutions calling for discussion, dialogue, educational resources, and "...a revised proposal for full communion." "Called to Common Mission" is the revised document presented for consideration by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

The Committee to Create Lutheran-Episcopal Educational Opportunities (CLEO) has made available a helpful collection of resources and teaching materials to further prepare us for the decision on "Called to Common Mission." Our Department for Ecumenical Affairs

has placed resource materials on a Web site, www.elca.org/ea/ccmintr.html, which represent various viewpoints in the debate. My thanks to bishops and synodical leaders who once again set aside time for dialogue and discernment in the course of assemblies this spring.

Judging from the new energy and mission possibilities that were created by our previous agreement with the Reformed churches, I believe that “Following our Shepherd” and “Called to Common Mission” can strengthen our ability to meet the challenges of the next century.

Budget Proposal. Each Churchwide Assembly approves a budget proposal for the next biennium. The budget presented for your review and approval reflects plans, dreams, and priorities for the future. In response to the call from my office for a comprehensive review of present budget priorities and future needs and opportunities, key leaders spent the 1999 Valentine’s Day weekend in a labor of love. The budget review consultation was marked by thorough preparation, careful attention to missional as well as financial matters, and the spirit of visionary leadership.

The new financial proposal does not represent a significant shift in priorities. It seeks to maintain the relative leanness of the churchwide organization’s staffing and administrative costs. In that way, the projected increase in mission support and other income can be devoted directly to program needs.

Thanks

Our church has been blessed with committed and creative leaders. It is a joy to work with a few of them in the daily operation of my office. I have excellent colleagues in the officers of this church: Vice President Addie J. Butler, Secretary Lowell G. Almen, and Treasurer Richard L. McAuliffe. In addition, I am thankful for those who assist me as members of my staff: Pr. Robert N. Bacher, the executive for administration; my assistants Pr. Michael L. Cooper-White and Ms. Myrna J. Sheie; my assistant for administration Ms. Patricia A. Hoyt; and our administrative staff Ms. Nancy L. Vaughn and Ms. Vickie A. Johnson. In addition, special thanks to my former assistant, Ms. Lita Brusick Johnson. This whole church will now benefit from her ability as the director for ELCA World Hunger and Disaster Appeals.

And so from one small slice of time—just two years in two thousand—it is clear that God continues to make known the riches of Christ in our midst. Through projects and budgets, votes and transitions, congregations and synods, we can see the Body of Christ engaging the realities of life today, and so we have hope for a new century.

Part Two

This is our last churchwide assembly in the twentieth century. As our pastoral letter on the millennium suggests, it is a good time to look back and marvel at the work that God has done among us in the last hundred years. In fact our ancestors did exactly the same thing as they crossed the threshold into this century. The 1901 edition of *The Lutheran Almanac* carried the following description of the “Nineteenth Century in a Nutshell”:

This century received from its predecessors the horse; we bequeath the bicycle, the locomotive, and the motor car.

We received the goose quill and bequeath the typewriter.
We received the scythe and bequeath the mowing machine.
We received the tallow dip; we bequeath the electric light.
We received the beacon signal fire; we bequeath the telephone and wireless telegraphy.

At the end of our own century we could add to each of those material legacies. We bequeath space travel, computers, combines, nuclear power, and the Internet—to name a few.

Sometimes, these inventions have directly benefitted the Church. Take the Internet. One of our church's initiatives has been to "Witness to God's Action in the World." The possibilities of the Internet have led us into innovative outreach projects like the ELCA Web site and its offshore cousin, "www.sharingfaith.org" where seekers are welcomed and introduced to Jesus Christ. Although the Web site is new, it is already attracting thousands of visits. Internet technology has also given our youth a new way to communicate. They have created their own Web site and online magazine. But the biggest benefit of the Internet is that it allows congregations to talk to each other and to exchange ideas directly. They can ask one another, "What are you planning for Lent this year?" "Which software package works best for parish records?" "Any new evangelism ideas?" We have been upgrading our national church party line—LutherLink—to make both internal communication and access to the wider Internet more affordable.

Technology has done wonders for us, but what spiritual legacies can we bequeath to the future? Our century has not learned much about ending war or eradicating poverty. Today the Church is much less confident about bringing in the Kingdom of God than it was a hundred years ago.

From Cooperation to Full Communion

Yet we do have something to pass on. We have discovered how to come together despite differences in the church. We did it in the mergers of many national traditions into this Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. And most blessed of all, we have incorporated an increasing variety of races, nationalities and cultures into this one church. Now we are reaching out to other confessional families.

The experience of the Christian Church in this century has paralleled our Lutheran story. In brief, Christians in America inherited cooperation, and we are bequeathing full communion. At the beginning of this century, the boldest minds envisioned church cooperation built on occasional conferences, such as the great International Missionary Conference of 1910. The success of this project and others led to more permanent structures—councils of churches—like the World Council of Churches, and the National Council of the Churches of Christ, both now celebrating their fiftieth anniversaries. Again, these conciliar movements generated new levels of understanding, and that in turn led to efforts at organic union across denominational lines. The Evangelical and Reformed Church, and later the United Church of Christ are evidence of that most complete level of unity. However, the most ambitious of those attempts, a project started in 1960 to bring eight Protestant denominations together, has not come to fruition. Instead, a new concept, "full communion" has emerged.

We Lutherans have been leaders in this phase. Our 1991 statement on ecumenism makes full communion our goal. However, implementing that goal has been a little like swimming.

One of my granddaughters had a hard time learning to swim. She used to sit at the edge of the swimming pool, watching the other children splash, pleading for a ride on my shoulders. She didn't feel entirely safe, even in the shallow end of the pool. Not long ago she took swimming lessons, and now she thinks the whole pool belongs to her. She is at home in lakes as well and has no trouble joining in water games with the other kids; But when I take her to the ocean, the old fear comes back. The vastness of the sea and the unfamiliar waves are still scary. Despite the encouragement of her uncles, who show her how much fun it is to ride the waves, she still clings to me. Of course oceans and swimming pools are both dangerous, but experienced bathers know their limits. They don't let the dangers spoil the thrill of swimming.

Our ecumenical experience has been like that. For a long time we tested the water with our neighbors from the Reformed tradition, trying a few joint worship services locally, and working on civic projects together. Then two years ago we "took the plunge" and entered into full communion with the Reformed Church in America, the United Church of Christ, and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). I am happy to report that this relationship has been qualitatively different from the friendly contacts we had before. It is the difference between being friends and being part of the family. My written report, mailed to you earlier [Part 1], describes full communion's initial benefits to our shared mission endeavors.

At this assembly we will have the chance to launch out on new relationships. We have established our kinship with one branch of the reformation family. By approving full-communion relationships with the Moravian and Episcopal churches we will expand the family circle to recognize more clearly our other historic roots in pre-reformation Christianity. No other church body has ever had this possibility to link together so many branches of Christendom. What a bridge we could be!

In the Episcopal agreement, we will need to do some things differently—differently for us, but no different from what other Lutherans in the world have been doing for a long time. And, it could make a big difference in our witness to the world. Jesus told us that unity among Christians helps the world to believe. What better way to fulfill our continuing theme of "Making Christ Known"? What a step forward into a new millennium!

From Parallel Universes to a Joint Declaration

I am glad that this century, which began with Lutherans and Roman Catholics living in parallel universes, will end with a "Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification." It used to be that we defined ourselves by how we were different. They went to parochial schools; most of us went to public schools. They had chasubles, acolytes, and incense; we had hymns, ushers, and English. They knelt; we stood. They didn't eat fish on Fridays; we didn't dance on Fridays [or on any other day]. As one book title has it, "They glorified Mary; we glorified rice." We believed we were saved by faith; and that they believed they were saved by good works. The practices and the slogans kept us apart.

Over the last decades our relationship has improved. Worship practices in both traditions have changed. Theological dialogue has dug behind the slogans. We have discovered agreement on the creeds and an emerging consensus on the doctrine of justification. We will celebrate that consensus here later in this assembly. A formal signing of the "Joint Declaration" will take place on October 31st in Augsburg, Germany. Significant differences remain, but we enter the new millennium with good reasons for hope.

From Enlightenment to Accompaniment

One of the great paradigm shifts of the century just closing is the way we view the spreading of the gospel. In brief, we inherited enlightenment, we bequeath accompaniment.

At the beginning of this century Christians in America envisioned bringing the world to Christ in one generation. Many dedicated missionaries went all over the world, bringing the light of the Gospel to peoples who had never heard of Jesus Christ. While they did not accomplish the goal in one generation, the Gospel did take root. Churches organized with indigenous leaders. We first called them “younger churches,” then “sister churches.” They took over the mission of outreach and became salt and light in their own cultural setting. A century ago, nine out of ten Christians lived in Europe and North America. Now more than 60 percent—approaching two-thirds—live in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

This last year mission support dollars from congregations exceeded our expectations, so we had the happy opportunity to put those dollars right to work at home and around the world. One of the projects we supported was suggested by Lutherans in Palestine, who operate schools among Palestinians in Bethlehem and other cities of the West Bank. Listen to Bishop Munib Younan of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan describe what they are doing.

[A videotape greeting from Bishop Younan was played for the assembly.]

This is “accompaniment”—listening to churches around the world describe their mission and then asking “How can we help?” Many of our synods are doing the same thing with companion synods overseas. For instance, scores of young missionary volunteers have responded to the church in Slovakia’s call for English teachers. They are helping as that church seeks to win Slovak youth after a generation was lost to communism.

And now the “enlightenment” is shining the other way, as people return with glowing reports of the spiritual power they have felt radiating from countless corners of the globe. Christ is indeed the hope of the world.

From Rugged Individualism to a Global Economy

We can make one other contribution to the spiritual legacy of this century. It is related to the new economic realities. This century inherited rugged individualism. We bequeath a global economy.

Just as the economic scene has broadened, so has our concern for persons within society. At the turn of the century Lutherans focused primarily on helping needy individuals. Congregations banded together to found homes for orphans and the aged. Gradually our circle of concern broadened as we began to work with community agencies of all sorts. A few years ago I compared the budgets of congregations from several regions of our country, and I discovered that the biggest change in expenditures over the past 25 years had been their greater commitment to community social ministry. They had moved from Christmas baskets to food pantries, shelters, crisis centers, and advocacy. Lately, the churchwide initiative to “Help the Children” is stimulating other sorts of community ministry. You will be hearing more about the centerpiece of this initiative, the congregational “Safe Haven” project, during this assembly. Already there are scores of congregations around the church that have started this process. And there are literally thousands more that are becoming “islands of hope” by providing early childhood education, day care, and after-school tutoring.

But the widening circle of mercy doesn’t stop with local communities. On an even broader scale, the devastation of wars around the world drew us into larger projects, such as

refugee resettlement and World Hunger. We have now made World Hunger a special concern for 25 years. It is heartening to know that the proportion of people living in hunger worldwide has actually declined in that period. It means that hunger does respond to action, and I am glad to tell you that action is stepping up. This anniversary year, thanks to your giving, we are ready to distribute half a million more dollars than last year. Yet the need is still there. Every day 31 thousand children under five in developing countries die, and hunger causes half those deaths. That's one child dying from hunger for every breath we take, day and night.

And the sad fact is that our generosity and concern have not kept up with the globalization of the economy. In many respects we are still acting like the wealthy individualists of the last century, who were also willing to give to charity. Global problems like hunger and debt will require more than our surplus cash. They require us to face our own complicity in their existence. How do our consumption patterns contribute to these global problems? What does the Lord require of us in this situation? We will be listening for answers to this question as we consider memorials on international debt and on economic life. What a gift it would be if we who inherited a century of exploitation and greed could pass on a legacy of "sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all."

In Conclusion

I have been bold to share with you my own views on the matters that are coming before this assembly. But at this point my role changes. Now it is time for you to pick up the conversation and decide what we will do with the gifts we have inherited and what legacy we will leave to the next millennium. My role is now to step back and see that your collective wisdom is shared. When I resume the chair, I cease to be advocate and become referee. And I would add that I trust your judgment. I believe that the same Spirit we invoke to guide our decisions will also guide the church as it receives those decisions.

"I pray that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give you a spirit of wisdom and revelation...so that...you may know what is the hope to which he has called you, what are the riches of his glorious inheritance among the saints, and what is the immeasurable greatness of his power for us who believe..." [Ephesians 1: 17-19].

Exhibit D

Report of the Secretary

With Hope for a New Century

Miriam sings the song. She sings a song of the plight of the Hebrew people in the Exodus. She sings the song at a crucial point in that story. At least, as the story is told in the animated movie, “The Prince of Egypt.”

Miriam sings:

Many nights we’ve prayed
With no proof anyone could hear
In our hearts a hopeful song
We barely understood...¹

And then comes the refrain:

There can be miracles
When you believe
Though hope is frail
It’s hard to kill...²

When I first heard the words of that song by Stephen Schwartz, I took from my pocket a scrap of paper. On that paper in the darkness of a studio viewing room, I scribbled those words, “Though hope is frail, it’s hard to kill.... There can be miracles when you believe...³”

I was watching an early version of the movie, “The Prince of Egypt.” I was seeing it in a viewing room at the DreamWorks studio. Along with many others, I had been asked to comment on the development of that project. I was asked for advice, first, in the movie’s very early stages of production. Then, later, I viewed the project when the sound track and animation were more complete. The task was fascinating for me, not least for the opportunity to reflect deeply on that retelling of the story of the Exodus.

Miriam sings,

We were moving mountains
Long before we knew we could...

¹ Words and music composed by Stephen Schwartz © 1997 SKG Songs (ASCAP).

² Schwartz © 1997 SKG Songs.

³ Schwartz © 1997 SKG Songs.

There can be miracles

When you believe....⁴

As indicated at the movie's start, the tale told in "The Prince of Egypt" is adapted from the biblical story. It is not a line-for-line recounting of Scripture.

Even Miriam's song must be considered in context. If pulled from that context and tested as a theological statement by itself, the song may be problematic. We quickly see that. After all, the miraculous work of God does not depend on us. As Luther taught us, "I cannot by my own understanding or effort believe in Jesus Christ my Lord...but the Holy Spirit has called me through the Gospel...."

Yet, in believing, our eyes may be opened to the miracles that are before us. Oh yes,

There can be miracles

When you believe.

Though hope is frail

It's hard to kill....⁵

We can see that demonstrated and practiced again and again throughout our history as a church. We are shaped by our heritage. We have received gifts from the past. We can be grateful for those gifts. At the same time, however, we are led forward in hope. We journey with hope-filled confidence. We walk even into a new century. We embark with courage on the third Christian millennium.

Indeed, to understand more clearly the past is to be guided to care about the future. To understand the past also may lead us, and even free us, to make wise decisions for the future.

Both the past and the future shape our life as a church. And I can report to you that both the past and the future also give form to my work as secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

If we looked this afternoon at the listing of the responsibilities of the secretary of this church, one of the items we would find is the duty to care for the archives and official records of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Maybe for many people, the word, archives, conjures up images of dusty shelves—shelves filled with row upon row of boxes, boxes packed with old letters and musty documents and bewildering records of all sorts.

But within the archives of our church, we really discover a warehouse of miracles. Or at least the record of miracles.

We find...

...the tale of vision,

...the story of courage,

...the documented history of leadership,

...real signs of hope,

...the pilgrimage of faith recounted.

⁴ Schwartz © 1997 SKG Songs.

⁵ Schwartz © 1997 SKG Songs.

We find minutes, tapes, reports, correspondence, films, and artifacts of those who have gone before us—people who have gone before us in meetings such as this one as well as in events and other occasions that even now shape our life as a church.

- In the decades now past, we find stories of wise risk and visionary commitment.
- In the decades now past, we find leaders who could see beyond the present moment to the mission into which God was leading the church.
- In the decades now past, we find accounts of those who sought to serve not their own personal wishes or narrow desires or parochial prejudices but who were committed to the well-being of the church beyond them.
- In the decades now past, we find the record of prayer, and hope, and courage, and, most significant of all, we find a spirit of churchliness for the sake of the Gospel,
 - a spirit of churchliness that guided people in witness to Christ and in service in Christ’s name.
 - a spirit of churchliness that motivated them to treasure and seek to understand the past, even as they walked with confidence and hope into the future.

As Professor James Nestingen of Luther Seminary in St. Paul has said, “Heritage deals with the past and the claims made by the past upon us. Hope considers the future.” In the documents of our church, we find evidence of both profound heritage and grand hope, even that hope that enables us to embrace with confidence the prospect of a new century.

For example, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the decision of our predecessor church bodies to establish the Hunger Appeal. On assembly floors such as this, folk who came before us responded with vision and courage. They stepped forward in pursuit of new miracles. Because they dared to be guided by God’s Spirit, what happened? Fewer people go to bed hungry now than in 1974. That is true, in spite of the fact that the population of the world has grown since that time by more than two billion people. The records and stories are found in the archives, the records and stories of what has happened in this past quarter century, including the gathering from members and congregations of our church of some \$200 million to fight hunger in our world. Oh yes, the tale of miracles is found on those archival shelves.

When we consider the whole scope of the materials and documents that we find in the archives, we also discover something else about our history, something that we actually may wish to forget. Even so, to tell the truth—the whole truth—we must admit to this painful fact: The record of the past was not always or invariably a shiny one. Sometimes the archival materials reveal other things—less than noble things. Sadly, we also can find evidence of pettiness in the past. We can find examples of shortsightedness or selfishness. We even can see instances of vindictiveness or cowardice in the face of opportunity. We find a few terrible examples of the propagation of lies and of vicious characterizations of people with whom individuals disagreed.

The evidence shows that sometimes a few of those who went before us focused only on themselves or only on the present moment. They allowed themselves to be trapped by their own historical myopia. Thereby they missed the miracles in the grand drama of the pilgrimage of faith.

As indicated in the 1999 Pre-Assembly Report, I have devoted significant attention in the past biennium to the archives. The decision of the Village of Rosemont in Illinois to seek

the building that had served as the archives and record center for 11 years sent us in search of other facilities. We had to move; we had no choice.

[The following narrated a videotaped presentation.]

As of this summer, the Archives and Records Center of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America are in a 17,000-square-foot building in the Chicago suburb of Elk Grove Village. The building is located about 20-minutes northwest of the Lutheran Center, the churchwide office in Chicago.

The content of the building is precious. Within the archives, vivid reminders of both the gifts of the past and the promise of hope for the future are found in abundance.

In what once was a facility used by a printing plant, we have relocated, after careful planning, the work areas and related resources for the chief archivist, the director for archives administration, and the small staff who care for and provide services related to the official records of our church. Space for researchers also exists in the new facility.

Yet as you may know, we not only faced the moving of the archives in this 1997-1999 biennium. We also witnessed a major change in location for one of our churchwide units—namely, the publishing house.

The move of the publishing house and the move of the archives, in a small but significant way, became intertwined. Let me explain the connection. In the new location of the archives in suburban Chicago, we find reminders of the historic building that once housed a church office and the church publishing house in Minneapolis.

For nine decades in this 20th century, a church office was located in buildings between Fourth and Fifth Streets in downtown Minneapolis. Those buildings housed the office in Minneapolis of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, established through a merger in 1917, and later The American Lutheran Church of 1960. They also served as the site of the publishing house of those church bodies.

When the Publishing House of the ELCA moved to a new location two years ago, a service of thanksgiving was held at the close of that old, historic site on Fifth Street.

At that service, the capsule in the cornerstone of the building constructed in 1953 on Fifth Street in Minneapolis was opened. In the capsule, we found a copy of the Articles of Incorporation and General Constitution of the former Evangelical Lutheran Church. In addition, there were two Bibles in that time capsule—one in English and the other in Norwegian.

I thought as I looked at those Bibles that if we were to pack that kind of capsule today, we would need to put in Bibles not only in English and Norwegian. We would need Bibles in German, Swedish, Finnish, Danish, Slovak, Spanish, Mandarin, Hmong, Inupiat, Navajo, Arabic, Amharic, Swahili, Korean, Japanese, Vietnamese, and other languages as well—about three dozen of them. We would need to do so to reflect the actual scope and practice of congregations throughout the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Such a collection of Bibles would dramatize the marvelous diversity woven into the beautiful tapestry of our church.

Preserved from the chapel in the Minneapolis building were wood panels and the altar. They were transported to the archives. They serve both as a reminder of the gifts of the past but also as testimony to hope for the future.

And on the altar, we find a reminder of another place. Now standing on that altar is the granite base and the cross that were part of the Lutheran church office for many decades at

231 Madison Avenue in New York, first in the United Lutheran Church in America and later in the Lutheran Church in America.

This painting also came to the archives from the chapel in that New York office.

Obviously crucial for the archives and records center, of course, are the rows of shelves that house the precious documents—documents that tell the story of Lutherans in North America not only throughout this 20th century but reaching back into earlier eras as well.

For the records on paper, some are loose. Others are bound into volumes. Some are hand written. Many are printed. But we find more than only paper records. There are many other types of materials. We also find precious documentation in such things as photographs, negatives, films, sound recordings, and video recordings.

Many people assume, and rightly so, that the churchwide archives and records center of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America contain the papers and documents of church officials over the years. This is true.

The papers and documents of presidents and bishops of the predecessor churches are prominent in the collection. Such materials include those of the late Reverend Dr. Franklin Clark Fry and the late Reverend Dr. Fredrik Axel Schiotz. They both were national and international leaders in the 20th century. They also both became presidents of the Lutheran World Federation. The papers and documents in the archives include those of former President Robert Marshall and of the late President Kent Knutson, of the Reverend Dr. James Crumley of the Lutheran Church in America and of Presiding Bishop Emeritus David Preus of The American Lutheran Church. We have a few materials from the late Reverend Dr. William Kohn and the Reverend Dr. Will Herzfeld of the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches. Records from these people as leaders in predecessor church bodies are extremely valuable.

Under ELCA policy, all letters and documents related to official duties that are prepared by church leaders or received by such leaders by merit of their office belong to this church. Such letters and documents become part of our historical record. They are not to be filed selectively nor are they to be sifted or destroyed. For the ELCA era, therefore, many of the official papers of the first ELCA churchwide bishop, Herbert W. Chilstrom, are already on file. Further, the early papers of Presiding Bishop George Anderson also are available.

The secretaries of the church are represented not only by documents, but also by such things as numerous incorporation papers of the predecessor bodies and even in a collection of official seals.

As you know, congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America are charged with maintaining their own records. The churchwide archives, however, inherited many microfilm copies of parish records. These are preserved with great care.

The life, work, and ministry of congregations are highlighted through hundreds of anniversary histories and photographs. Records related to the development of parish education and worship and music materials also are preserved. Among the latter are the records for the various commissions that created hymnals—the hymnals with which many of us grew up. The black, the blue, the brown, the red, and the green hymnals are all there.

The stories of the planting of congregations throughout the country can be found in many types of records. Perhaps among the most interesting may be a large collection of architectural plans for congregations. We see through them how our worship space has evolved over the decades of the 20th century.

Even films from past decades demonstrate the profound commitment to mission that is a part of our heritage. See, for example, the following excerpt from a film about mission outreach in the southwest. We see in it how our predecessor church bodies sought to reach out to the shifting population of the country. They did so with diligence in the years of great change following World War Two.

The film was produced and narrated in 1948 by Pastor H. K. Rasbach. He then was serving Hope Congregation in Hollywood.

California at that time was growing at a rate of 1000 people a day, a rapid rate of growth for that time. In the eight years between 1940 and 1948, California accounted for one-third of the population growth of the entire United States of America. A sense of urgency for planting new congregations to serve people in California and elsewhere in the southwest is reflected clearly in this film segment. At the same time, the film offers a nostalgic peak back into images now a half century old: [Film excerpt].

To describe briefly the large and diverse collections of the archives is a challenge. That is especially true in relation to global-mission efforts.

In addition to the official correspondence and reports, we find in the archival collection papers of missionaries. Such collections include, for instance, the papers of Dr. Anna Sarah Kugler. She was a missionary in India from 1883 until her death in 1930. In her collection are daily diaries that contain notes on her medical practice. We also find a copy of the Gospel of St. Matthew in the Telegu language.

The efforts and programs of the Women of the ELCA and its many predecessor organizations are well-documented. We see that some of the earliest fund-raising efforts for global-mission work, for instance, involved the use of thank-offering boxes by the women's organizations. These and other artifacts related to those early years have been preserved.

Other records include statistical information on church membership dating back to the 19th century. Biographical information is preserved on rostered leaders of the church collected throughout the decades. Such biographical materials fill 29 filing cabinets. In addition, thousands of photographs of individual rostered persons and other leaders are on file.

The archives and record center also contain much evidence of the mission of mercy of the ELCA and its predecessors, including support for hospitals and homes, as well as for national and international relief efforts.

In regard to international work, the ELCA archives serves as the official repository for Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service and Lutheran World Relief.

In addition, the records that describe the studies and discussions that led up to the official social statements of the ELCA and predecessors are on file.

From the Helen Knobel Archives of Cooperative Lutheranism, now in the care of the ELCA archives, records exist of the earliest inter-Lutheran unity efforts in North America. We find the documents of the first American, inter-Lutheran agency, the National Lutheran Council. It was founded at the time of World War I. The council included the churches now all merged into the ELCA. In addition there are records of international inter-Lutheran activities that led to the founding of the Lutheran World Convention in the 1920s. Documentation on the formation in 1947 of the Lutheran World Federation also is part of the collection.

We find records related to all the various ecumenical dialogues. Among those records, the building blocks can be found in the process that resulted in the adoption in 1997 of A Formula of Agreement, that historic relationship of full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and three Reformed churches.

Documents from the five-year Study of Ministry of the ELCA and the Study of Theological Education are on file at the archives. Similar studies conducted in past decades also are located there. We can find the documents in the study by the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. that led to approval in 1970 of the ordination of women to the pastoral ministry.

Extensive records related to ministry for college and university students exist. Those records include the historical development of the Lutheran Student Movement and its predecessors dating back to the 1920s.

Important for the archives are the copies of The Lutheran and its many predecessor periodicals, both in the English language and other languages. Among those publications are copies of the Lutheran Standard dating from the 1860s as well as the old Lutheran Observer.

Even my hand-written notes of meetings of the Commission for a New Lutheran Church the commission that prepared in the 1980s for the formulation of the ELCA can now be found in the archives. The notes may be helpful, at least to someone who can read my writing.

[The videotape presentation ended at this point in the report.]

We have a warehouse full of miracles. We have an archives and records center that contain within them marvelous stories of vision and courage and hope. We have documented our healthy and vibrant heritage as Lutherans in North America.

But that collection may be only a source of some historical fascination for a few if we refuse to learn from our past, if we refuse to be instructed by our whole experience as Lutherans in North America. For that heritage is broad and deep and long. As testimony to the fact, this year marks the 350th anniversary of the oldest congregation in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America namely, First Lutheran Congregation in Albany, New York.

With our vibrant heritage as Lutherans in North America, with our marvelous heritage as part of the Lutheran communion of churches throughout the world, with our place of witness within the whole Church of Jesus Christ, God is now calling us to stretch. God is calling us to grow. God is calling us to venture forth in mission and outreach into a new era. God is calling us to move ahead for the sake of the salvation of the world.

We have been shaped by our past. Yes. Now we have the opportunity to be lead forward in hope.

There are miracles to be seen when we believe. There are possibilities for faithful witness in a new century, possibilities greater than perhaps our forebears even dared to dream.

Will we listen? Will we learn? Will we venture forth? Will we go with courage? Will we journey with marvelous hope into a new century?

God is calling. There are mountains yet to be moved.

Exhibit E

Text of the “Tucson Resolution” of the Conference of Bishops

Action of the Church Council

The Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, at its April 10-12, 1999, meeting took the following action (CC99.04.25):

To receive the action of the Conference of Bishops concerning “Called to Common Mission” [below], and to transmit the resolution as information to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Conference of Bishops’ Resolution (CB99.03.06)

RESOLVED, that the Conference of Bishops affirm the following understandings of “Called to Common Mission”:

- A. The Conference of Bishops understands that “Called to Common Mission” contains:
1. no requirement that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America must eventually adopt the three-fold order of ministry. Rather, “Called to Common Mission” recognizes that the present understanding of one ordained ministry in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, including both pastors and bishops, may continue in effect;
 2. no requirement that ELCA bishops be elected to serve as synodical bishops for life. Rather, they will continue to be elected and installed for six-year terms, with eligibility for re-election, subject to term limits, where applicable;
 3. no defined role for the presiding bishop or synodical bishops after their tenure in office is completed;
 4. no requirement that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America establish the office of deacon, nor that they be ordained;
 5. no requirement that priests of The Episcopal Church will serve congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America without the congregation’s consent;
 6. no requirement that the Ordinal (rules) of The Episcopal Church will apply to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;
 7. no commitment to additional constitutional amendments or liturgical revisions other than those presented to the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly (ELCA constitutional provisions 8.72.10-16.; 9.21.02.; 9.90.-9.91.02.; 10.31.a.9.; 10.81.01., and parallel provisions in synodical and congregational constitutions); and further

- B. The Conference of Bishops has the expectation that:
1. ordinations of pastors will continue to be held at synodical worship services and in congregations, as is the present pattern;
 2. the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will continue to receive onto the roster of ordained ministers, without re-ordination, pastors from other traditions, some of whom will not have been ordained by a bishop in the historic episcopate;
 3. following the adoption of "Called to Common Mission," if someone who has been received onto the roster of ordained ministers of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America who was not ordained into the pastoral office in the historic episcopate is elected bishop and installed, he or she will be understood to be a bishop in the historic episcopate;
 4. lay persons may continue to be licensed by the synodical bishop in unusual circumstances to administer the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion as is the present practice of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;
 5. "Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline of Ordained Ministers" will apply to priests of The Episcopal Church and ordained ministers of the Reformed churches serving ELCA congregations [under continuing resolution 8.72.E98.b.¹, "...to live in a manner consistent with the ministerial policy of this church."];
 6. the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is not in any way changing its confessional stance that, "For the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments" (Augsburg Confession, Article VII);
 7. The Episcopal Church accepts fully, and without reservation, present Lutheran pastors and bishops who are not in the historic episcopal succession;
 8. priests of The Episcopal Church and ordained ministers of the Reformed churches will not be asked to subscribe personally to the Confession of Faith of the Lutheran Church as their personal faith. They will be expected to recognize the agreement in faith of the churches and to preach and teach in a manner consistent with the Lutheran Confessions;
 9. the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America receives the historic episcopal succession as a sign of and service to the continuity and unity of the Church and in no way as a guarantee of the faithful transmission of the faith;
 10. future decisions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America on matters of common concern will be made in consultation with churches with whom a relationship of full communion has been declared, but these decisions will not require their concurrence or approval;
 11. future Churchwide Assemblies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will be free to make whatever decisions they deem necessary after mutual consultation on matters related to full communion;
 12. the joint commission [to which reference is made in "Called to Common Mission"] will have no authority over the appropriate decision-making bodies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America or The Episcopal Church; and

¹ Renumbered by the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as churchwide bylaw 8.72.15.b.

13. pastors of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will continue to preside at confirmations.

Development of the Resolution

This text was first developed in the Western Iowa Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to inform the conversation related to “Called to Common Mission” at that synod’s 1999 Synod Assembly in regard to the potential implementation of “Called to Common Mission” within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The Rev. Curtis H. Miller, bishop of the Western Iowa Synod, submitted the text to staff members in the Department for Ecumenical Affairs of this church to confirm the accuracy of the statements made in the text. Similarly, consultation was conducted with staff members in the Office for Ecumenical Affairs of The Episcopal Church who likewise affirmed that the text is an accurate interpretation of “Called to Common Mission.”

Bishop Miller presented the document to the members of the Conference of Bishops at the March 3-9, 1999, meeting. The Conference of Bishops voted (CB99.03.06), without audible dissent, to affirm the contents of the text. The action of Conference of Bishops was provided as an exhibit for the report of the Conference of Bishops to the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at its April 1999 meeting. The resolution was received by the Church Council and transmitted “as information” to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly (CC99.04.25).

In a separate action at that same meeting, the Church Council voted to recommend that the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America amend “Called to Common Mission” (CC99.04.41):

To recommend to the Churchwide Assembly the addition of the following sentence at the end of paragraph three of “Called to Common Mission:”

In adopting this document the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and The Episcopal Church specifically acknowledge and declare that it has been correctly interpreted by the resolution of the Conference of Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, adopted at Tucson, Arizona, March 8, 1999.

Inter-unit Response to Synodical Memorials on the Ordination, Consecration, and Commissioning of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons

1997 Churchwide Assembly Action [CA97.06.28]

The 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America considered memorials from the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod and the Sierra Pacific Synod on the ordination of gay and lesbian persons and requested [CA97.06.28] that “. . . a status report on the learnings of these conversations be brought through the Church Council to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.”

In April 1998, the Executive Committee of the Church Council voted to concur with a recommendation by the Division for Ministry, the Division for Church in Society, the Division for Outreach, the Division for Congregational Ministries, and the Commission for Women that a “bundled” report in response to these synodical memorials be brought to the Church Council in April 1999.

A common introduction was prepared by an inter-unit staff team. This introduction was received and reviewed by the board of each of the churchwide units involved and serves as an introduction to the separate responses from several of the units. The introductory statement includes five points that are suggested as important considerations that this church should keep in mind as it continues conversation on the place of homosexual persons in the life of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The separate responses from the units involved also are provided. Some of these reports respond directly to the question of the possible ordination, consecration, and commissioning of such persons while other reports deal with different aspects of how this church relates to gay and lesbian persons.

At the April 10-12, 1999, meeting of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the council voted:

To receive the inter-unit response to the memorials from the Sierra Pacific Synod and the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod;

To request the secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to convey the inter-unit response and individual unit reports to the Sierra Pacific Synod and the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod, as the response to their 1997 ELCA Churchwide Assembly memorials; and

To transmit the response as information to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as a response to the memorials from the Sierra Pacific Synod and the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod.

Introduction

In April 1998, the Executive Committee of the Church Council voted to concur with a recommendation—brought by the Division for Church in Society, the Division for Ministry, the Division for Outreach, the Division for Congregational Ministries, and the Commission for Women—that a “bundled” report of activities in regard to homosexuality, described in

greater detail in attachments to this inter-unit response, be brought to the Church Council for transmittal to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly. This report is provided in fulfillment of the request of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly [CA97.06.28], which is cited in full in the "Appendix."

The churchwide units of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, working together on this area of ministry, share these observations and convictions:

First, this church's engagement in the matter of homosexuality is not about "insiders" and "outsiders." The baptized members of this church include both homosexual and heterosexual persons. Several of our reported activities have sought to take this fact into account by including gay and lesbian people in conversation.

Second, the task of engagement touches core matters of personal identity. Homosexuality has raised a myriad of challenging questions. Beneath the surface of questions lie deeply held religious beliefs, moral convictions, and powerful emotions. Among our members there are a multitude of responses toward homosexual persons and homosexuality in general. Some members feel that the church is abandoning centuries of traditional understanding of sinful behavior. Other members feel tension between their beliefs and their experience. Still other members believe that an injustice is being done. All this is happening in our church.

Third, the same task of engagement is multifaceted. Changing and differing understandings of homosexuality touch the Church's mission and ministry in a variety of ways, as reflected by this inter-unit report. Examining what the Bible and our theology say is an *educational* and *foundational* task. Welcoming gay and lesbian people to full participation in the life of this church is a *missional* commitment. There are *pastoral* and *moral* issues such as discrimination, hate crimes, "loving the sinner but hating the sin," the acceptance of committed same-sex relationships, and the experiences of families, friends, and care-givers of gay people. Finally, the possible ordination of gay and lesbian people who live in a committed same-sex relationship is an *institutional* question in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. These facets are both theoretical and personal. Engagement with these issues cannot be resolved by dealing on one level in isolation from others.

Fourth, there is no arbitrarily set timetable for concluding the discussion. We await a time of clearer understanding provided by the Lord of the Church and, in the meanwhile, pray for the Holy Spirit's guidance and work to the best of our ability. Those who wish the issues resolved quickly one way or the other should not interpret the absence of a "schedule" as foot dragging. On the one hand, assumptions ingrained in the culture of the Church and of society are not likely to change quickly. On the other hand, the Church's commitment to justice and mercy will not allow the issues to be ignored.

And fifth, this church needs to continue to engage the matter of homosexuality in deliberate, thoughtful, and prayerful ways. Why? Challenging issues pose more than difficult questions that lead to differences of opinion. They have the capacity to call forth what lies at the very heart of the way people understand life and what shapes their behavior. Engaging homosexuality can help the Church to understand anew the Gospel that lies at the core of its existence. It can help the Church to value anew significant aspects of the Church's teaching, and it can help the Church to commit itself anew to its mission. This moment in the life of the Church is not one that the Church has chosen, nor has it been determined simply by the agenda of certain groups. This can be a "teaching moment" offered by God and, therefore, the Church need not be afraid to take up the task. Drawing upon its God-given abilities of

fairness, understanding, wisdom, patience, creativity, and trust in the Lord of the Church, this church can face this hour with confidence.

Response and Report from the Division for Church in Society

The 1997 Churchwide Assembly voted [CA97.06.28]:

To affirm the work of the Division for Church in Society as it assists this church to explore models of conversation and continuing moral deliberation that can serve this church in its commitment to continuing dialogue on issues related to human sexuality, including homosexuality; and

To request that a status report on the learnings of these conversations be brought through the Church Council to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

These excerpted sections of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly's action [*the full text is printed in the Appendix of this report*] describe the course of action which this division has taken in the past biennium, namely, fostering models of conversation and moral deliberation. Moreover, they indicate the role the Division for Church in Society has played in its work on homosexuality: *assisting* this church to carry out its vocation to be God's people in society by engaging this issue.

As this 1997 action suggests, work by the Division for Church in Society was already under way by the time of the Churchwide Assembly. In 1995, the Church Council, in a meeting prior to the 1995 Churchwide Assembly, encouraged "continued exploration by the Division for Church in Society of these issues [related to human sexuality], including further development of study resources in cooperation with other churchwide units, ELCA-related seminaries, colleges and universities, and social ministry organizations" (1995 Reports and Records: Minutes, page 666). A few days later, the 1995 Churchwide Assembly resolved to "urge that work continue unabated on resolving the church's position on homosexuality" (1995 Minutes, page 675).

In light of these actions the division, in consultation with the Office of the Presiding Bishop, in spring 1996, began considering ways to help this church discuss homosexuality. The approach selected was to form an *ad hoc* committee to consider the possible goals, scope, audience, methodology, and timeline of a deliberative process.

Committee carries out assignment

The committee, consisting of representatives from the Conference of Bishops, one college and one seminary, Faith and Life Forum, Lutherans Concerned, the Office of the Presiding Bishop, and other churchwide units, met for the first time in August 1996. The committee worked with the assumption that these discussions would not be connected to the development of church policy on homosexuality, that they would include gay and lesbian people, that a primary concern would be "bridge building" among people who hold diverse points of view, and that a report describing methods and resources would be produced. Because it was working in uncharted waters, the committee decided to try several approaches aimed at somewhat different audiences, videotape the approaches, and meet again to select the best methods to recommend.

Beginning in spring 1997, eight discussions were conducted. Through the Center for Church and Society at Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia, a disputation or theological and ethical debate was held in April 1997 with opposing points of view presented by Drs. Gilbert Meilaender and Paul Jersild. A panel discussion component included a representative of Lutherans Concerned and Bishop Richard Bansemmer of the Virginia Synod. Approximately 90 persons attended. In October 1997, the Commission for Women conducted a discussion

with a group of 15 lesbian and straight women. Faith and Life Forum, an independent Lutheran organization focusing on ministry in daily life, organized two conversations—one in November 1997 in Columbia, South Carolina, and the other in December 1997 at Muhlenberg College in Allentown, Pennsylvania. Seventy persons attended the first and fifty the second. Both of these events followed a similar format that included biblical presentations, panel discussions that included gay people, small-group discussions, and time for individual reflection. In February 1998, 35 students from three seminaries (Trinity Lutheran Seminary in Columbus, Ohio, Wartburg Theological Seminary in Dubuque, Iowa, and Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago) were connected by video conferencing for a day's reflection on homosexuality that included biblical and social-scientific presentations, gay and lesbian speakers, and panel and small-group discussions. Finally, in the winter and spring of that year, three congregations in the Central States Synod experimented with a multi-session methodology developed by a task force of the synod.

All conversations were characterized by civil, safe, well-informed, and inclusive discussions and were well-received by the persons in attendance. The events varied considerably, including a differing balance in perspective from one event to the next.

These eight events were reviewed in April 1998 at the second meeting of the *ad hoc* committee. The evaluation of the test conversations included the following: 1) models of moral deliberation will vary according to the objectives of a particular event; 2) at the beginning of events, there need to be guidelines for conversation; 3) this church should seek its unique contribution in the discussion of homosexuality, and materials need to make clear why this church is doing this; 4) ensuring balance of points of view in presentations and in audience is one of the greatest challenges conversations on homosexuality face; 5) there is a need to witness to what we already know and believe in terms of justice; 6) conversation needs to be placed in a spiritual framework which speaks to the questions, What does it mean to be a Christian community? and How is it possible to be a community in the midst of diversity?; and 7) this is going to be a lengthy process.

The *ad hoc* committee completed its assignment by offering suggestions for a resource to assist congregations to talk about homosexuality.

Assisting congregations

In the summer of 1998, staff of the Division for Church in Society began work on a resource to assist congregational discussion of homosexuality. The resource would be aimed at an audience with basic to intermediate levels of understanding of the subject, would give significant attention to methods and resources for organizing and carrying out conversation, but also would provide short essays on several important sub-topics. It would seek to do this in a way that lifted up what the Church teaches as well as challenges to that teaching. The printed material would be accompanied by a videotape of several presentations. A first draft was completed in fall 1998, with production of "Talking About Homosexuality) A Guide for Congregations" planned for spring 1999. In addition to this resource focused on homosexuality, the division also is working on a resource on moral deliberation of a more general nature, with expected production in June 1999.

Assisting synods

In October 1998, the Division for Church in Society held a consultation of representatives from synods that have committees that relate to gay and lesbian people and the topic of homosexuality. The purposes of the consultation were: 1) to review the above-

described congregational resource; 2) to share what synods are doing; and 3) to allow other churchwide units to explain their current activities. Sixteen synods were represented. It was clear that the work of synods varies from beginning stages of facilitating discussion to long-established and active committees. Once more, the division sought to *assist* the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to carry out its vocation to be God's people in society by engaging this issue.

Assisting churchwide units

In addition to its work to assist congregations and synods, in the past biennium the Division for Church in Society has attempted to offer assistance to other churchwide units as they have worked on the matter of homosexuality. The division has asserted that the moral and social dimensions of homosexuality—the normal scope of much of the division's work—need to be part of other units' work, whether their attention be focused on outreach, leadership, education, or some other aspect of this church's ministry. The specific focus of other units, in turn, has enriched the work of the Division for Church in Society.

Conclusion

Small but important steps have been taken in the past two years to support the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as it carries out its vocation as God's people in society by engaging the subject of homosexuality. Many more steps remain. To the extent that it is called upon by this church and to the degree that its resources permit, the Division for Church in Society will continue to serve all expressions of this church in the future as it has during the past two years.

Response and Report from the Division for Ministry

In response to the action of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly, the Division for Ministry has sought to incorporate the issue raised by the synodical memorials related to the ordination of non-celibate gay and lesbian persons¹ into its on-going responsibilities related to standards for rostered ministries. That responsibility relates specifically to the document, "Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America," which was adopted by the Church Council in October 1990, and to the subsequent document, adopted in 1993, related to rostered lay ministry. The 1990 document's stated purpose is "to express the high value and importance that the ordained ministry of Word and Sacrament has in the life of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America" ("Vision and Expectations," page 3).

The responsibility of the Division for Ministry is to "develop, in consultation with the Conference of Bishops, ecclesiastical standards for the admission of persons to and continuation of persons on the rosters" of ordained ministers, commissioned associates in ministry, and consecrated deaconesses and diaconal ministers.

Related to the issue of the ordination of non-celibate gay and lesbian persons, the document, "Vision and Expectations" states, "Single ordained ministers are expected to live

¹ The language of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly refers to homosexual persons living in a same-sex relationship. In this report the reference to "non-celibate gay or lesbian persons" should be understood to mean persons of the same gender living in a committed relationship of sexual intimacy.

a chaste life. Married ordained ministers are expected to live in fidelity to their spouses, giving expression to sexual intimacy within a marriage relationship that is mutual, chaste, and faithful. Ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships” (page 13).

This last sentence of the section on sexual conduct in “Vision and Expectations” elicited the synodical resolutions leading to the action of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly. However, the issue of the exclusion of non-celibate gay and lesbian persons from the official rosters of this church is related not to the “Vision and Expectations” document but to the policy statement, “Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,” adopted by the Church Council in 1989. This policy document states that “practicing homosexual persons are precluded from the ordained ministry of this church.” The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America thus has as its official policy a prohibition of non-celibate gay and lesbian persons serving in the rostered ministries of this church. Should the ELCA determine to change this policy then both the “Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline” document and “Vision and Expectations” would need to be rewritten to express this change.

The Division for Ministry is committed to interpret the standards for rostered ministry clearly and fairly, and to engage in reflection and conversation concerning any potential change in those standards. For example, the Division for Ministry works with synodical candidacy committees to assist them in interpreting the expectations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America concerning those who seek to serve within one of the rostered ministries of this church, including matters related to sexual conduct. The Division for Ministry also has participated in discussions of this issue within the Conference of Bishops.

As a part of its task to listen carefully to those within this church who disagree with present policy, the Division for Ministry has participated in several national forums and discussions related to the participation of gay and lesbian persons in the life of this church. In 1997, staff of the Division for Ministry participated in the Knutson Conference on the vocation and ministry of gay and lesbian persons in church and society entitled “The Gifts We Offer - The Burdens We Bear,” and in 1998, the “Here I Stand” conference which was a forum to study the issue of gay and lesbian ordination in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The Division for Ministry also has participated in conversation and dialogue with members of “Lutherans Concerned” and “Lutheran Lesbian and Gay Ministries,” both of which are organizations advocating for an increased role for gay and lesbian persons in the life of this church. In 1998, staff of the division heard first-hand about how removal from the roster of ordained ministers affected the life and ministry of a non-celibate lesbian, as they listened to her share her concerns with members of a synodical candidacy committee.

The Division for Ministry has assisted the Division for Church in Society in its development of the resource, *Talking About Homosexuality: A Guide for Congregations*, and has worked with that unit, together with the Division for Congregational Ministries, the Division for Outreach, and the Commission for Women in an inter-unit response and report to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

In 1998 and 1999, board members and staff of the Division for Ministry engaged in substantial background reading and devoted time on the agenda of board meetings for discussions of homosexuality, including the possible ordination of non-celibate gay and lesbian persons. During these sessions board members and staff reflected on their biblical and theological understandings of homosexuality (“moral deliberation”) and conversed with

persons who are openly gay or lesbian (“models of conversation”). The March 1999 meeting focused on the issue most relevant to this division, whether or not the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America should admit non-celibate gay or lesbian persons to the official rosters of this church. Board members and staff listened to a panel of persons including ELCA members who support the present policy and ELCA members who seek its change. In these conversations within the division there has been a commitment to listen respectfully to one another.

From these and other conversations it appears that for various reasons there are many within this church who are reluctant to speak on this issue. Some who may support the position of this church believe they may be perceived as being uncaring toward gay and lesbian persons. Others may want to advocate change but are hesitant to speak because of their positions of responsibility and leadership within this church. It is important to recognize that there are a variety of deeply held beliefs and opinions related to this issue within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and that all should be invited to join in the process of moral deliberation and conversation without fear of being ignored or chastised.

The Division for Ministry is participating in conversations with our ecumenical partners about their policies and practices related to this issue. These ecumenical partners, who have widely different approaches to this issue, have acknowledged that conversations with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will be helpful to them as well.

The Division for Ministry is aware that there is no shared understanding among the members of this church in regard to how same-gender relationships should be understood or acknowledged. Indeed, there are those who believe the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America must take the time to think together on the larger issue of human sexuality before it can begin to address the matter of homosexuality. Among the many issues that confront our society and the Church, this is one of the more hurtful and divisive. Some believe it is necessary for this church to seek a common understanding regarding same-gender relationships of sexual intimacy and the blessing of same-sex unions before addressing the question of ordaining non-celibate gay or lesbian persons.

The Division for Ministry is not proposing a change in the standards for rostered ministry related to non-celibate gay or lesbian persons. The division, however, is committed to a process of continuing study, personal reflection, and conversation on the ecclesiological and pastoral dimensions that would be involved in either continuing the present policy or in changing it.

The Division for Ministry is aware of the deep level of anxiety and anguish felt by many members, whether heterosexual or homosexual, lay or rostered, male or female, young or old, as this church addresses this concern. Persons have been denied approval for rostered ministry or have left rostered ministry because of their unwillingness or inability to commit themselves to the requirements of this church related to gay and lesbian persons. Even as this church considers and reflects on this multi-faceted issue, it is important to acknowledge and respond to the pain and distress that this policy has caused in the lives of some of its members, and to reach out in care and compassion for those who have been adversely affected.

At this moment in time, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is being called to reflect on our understanding of the Gospel, of rostered ministries in the life of this church, and on God’s creative and redeeming presence in our world. The Division for Ministry believes that ELCA members must pray for the guidance of the Holy Spirit and work to the

best of our ability to continue to engage the issue of human sexuality and the participation of gay and lesbian persons in the life of this church. This is a time neither to act precipitously nor to withdraw from the sometimes discomfiting experience of looking anew at our inherited tradition and past understandings.

The Division for Ministry offers a model of intentional, extended conversation within the household of God in which all participants, as members of the family, are honored for their beliefs and viewpoints. These beliefs and viewpoints may find their primary point of reference in the biblical witness, the theological tradition of the Church, or personal experience. Those who are uncertain, those who challenge, those who defend—all should be within the discussion as the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America faithfully and conscientiously studies this issue. This is not an issue which should be bound by an arbitrary timetable. It is rather an issue that should draw us into a discerning conversation within the community of this church. It calls upon this church to continue to trust in the mercy of God and to depend on the guidance of God's Holy Spirit. Then we may be led to discern a pathway which enables the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to say together "it seems good to the Holy Spirit and to us" (Acts 15:28).

The board of the Division for Ministry recommends:

That the board of the Division for Ministry commits the division to provide strong leadership in the discerning conversations of this church about homosexuality and the inclusion of gay and lesbian persons in our common life and mission, and conveys this report to the Church Council for presentation to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

Response from the Division for Outreach

An operational principle of the Division for Outreach is to provide leadership to this church in reaching out with the Gospel in ways that honor the context of the communities in which congregations serve. In that spirit, new congregations and ministries have been developed in a variety of communities and in a variety of styles and languages.

In concert with that principle and with this church's commitment to care for all God's people, the board of the Division for Outreach, on May 12, 1996, adopted a resolution, "To encourage the staff of the Division for Outreach to engage in dialogue with our lesbian sisters and gay brothers to discuss and explore outreach options to the lesbian and gay communities." The board further stated, "Having had these dialogues, the board will encourage the staff to develop outreach strategies to lesbian and gay people...either with new ministries or through existing congregations."

This resolution built upon ELCA Churchwide Assembly actions in 1991 [CA91.7.51] and 1995 [CA95.6.50], declaring that "gay and lesbian people, as individuals created by God, are welcome to participate fully in the life of the congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America," as well as an open letter from the Conference of Bishops on March 11, 1996, which said, "We call upon all our pastors, as they exercise pastoral care, to be sensitive to the gifts and needs of gay and lesbian members. We urge our congregations to reach out to all God's people with the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

In fulfillment of the resolution of the board of the Division for Outreach, an eight-person inter-unit staff study team was appointed in April 1997. Over the next 18 months, the team planned and conducted its work. On-site visits were made to 16 congregations located throughout the United States hospitable to gay and lesbian persons. A report of the hospitality

study's findings and recommendations for action by the Division for Outreach were presented to and adopted by the board of the Division for Outreach on October 10, 1998. Following discussion of the report with the ELCA Conference of Bishops in March 1999, the report and recommendations are now available for study and division implementation.

In addition, division staff have participated over the past year in the inter-unit working group of churchwide staff involved in issues related to homosexuality. Through that venue, the division's hospitality study has become part of this inter-unit "bundled" report to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly. The action of the board of the Division for Outreach, on March 13, 1999, responded to a section in the introduction to this bundled report:

The board of the Division for Outreach is concerned with the language contained in this document which reads: "We await a time of clearer understanding provided by the Lord of the Church and, in the meantime, pray for the Holy Spirit's guidance and work to the best of our ability."

We believe that this church must lead in matters of the Great Commission and that God has already spoken that all people are equal in God's reign. Through the eyes of Jesus, there are no distinctions and there is no need to await a clearer understanding in seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Our God has already spoken!

An executive summary follows of the "Report on Congregational Hospitality to Gay and Lesbian People," which was prepared by the Hospitality Study Team of the Division for Outreach and was adopted by the board of the Division for Outreach on October 10, 1998:

A. Observations from congregational visits

1. Signs of welcoming: Gay and lesbian visitors look for tangible clues to the congregation's openness, hoping to see visible signs that this congregation will be a "safe place." These signs of welcome include:
 - a. Visible signs, like a framed mission statement, a notice on an outside sign, or an announcement in the worship bulletin;
 - b. Encouraging an intentionally welcoming attitude and environment, which could include practicing good hospitality techniques like greeting all visitors, affirming the gifts of all individual members, and offering their facilities to community gay and lesbian support organizations; and
 - c. Clergy and lay leaders modeling hospitality in their words and actions.
2. Leadership: Both lay and clergy leaders are critical throughout a congregation's journey towards openly welcoming gay and lesbian people.
 - a. Pastoral leadership is critical during a congregation's decision-making or deliberation process.
 - b. Lay leaders are often instrumental in initiating the conversations and then in advocating for a public statement of welcome to gay and lesbian people.
 - c. Strong leadership does not mean circumventing normal congregational decision-making or deliberation processes.
 - d. Both clergy and lay leaders in congregations emphasized the need to care for all members pastorally in the midst of potentially painful conversations.
3. The journey) the process of becoming welcoming: Being welcoming is a journey or a process rather than an end product.

- a. Many welcoming congregations encountered similar experiences on their journey towards hospitality. Often, the initial conversations were initiated by gay and lesbian members already in the congregations.
- b. Education is a critical component of the welcoming process. Congregations on the journey to becoming welcoming can benefit by investing time in both bibliographic resources and people resources so that congregation members have a chance to overcome powerful stereotypes and misconceptions.
- c. The journey to becoming welcoming is ongoing and does not end after a congregation or a council decides to be openly welcoming to gay and lesbian people.

B. Some implications of being welcoming

Congregations that make public statements about welcoming gay and lesbian people often encounter some unexpected consequences of their actions. We observed that welcoming congregations:

1. Already knew how or have learned to address conflict more productively;
2. Find that hospitality towards gay and lesbian people also means hospitality towards other potential members who have felt marginalized in other congregations.
3. Often eventually engage in conversations about other gay and lesbian issues in the Church, such as performing blessing ceremonies and the question of the ordination of gay and lesbian people;
4. Find themselves the recipients of the varied gifts and talents of gay and lesbian members;
5. Find that their members gain a deeper understanding of the Gospel.

C. Recommendations

In support of the call for hospitality to gay and lesbian persons by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, affirmed by the 1995 Churchwide Assembly, and by the bishops of this church in an open letter in March 1996, and as a result of the findings of the 1998 study by the Division for Outreach of 16 congregations involved in ministry with gay and lesbian people, it is recommended that:

1. The Division for Outreach develop and distribute to all division-related congregations and ministries under development a resource on congregational welcoming to gay and lesbian people;
2. All training events sponsored by the Division for Outreach include sensitization to and encouragement for congregational invitation and hospitality to gay and lesbian persons;
3. The Division for Outreach continue to participate in inter-unit conversations on ministry with gay and lesbian people;
4. A staff report be submitted at the fall 2000 meeting of the board of the Division for Outreach that evaluates the progress in the congregations related to the Division for Outreach in becoming welcoming and that provides an update on congregations visited in the 1998 project;

5. The board of the Division for Outreach formally express deep appreciate to those involved in this study.

Response and Report from the Division for Congregational Ministries

RESOLVED, that the board of the Division for Congregational Ministries has received and reviewed the inter-unit introduction and this unit's specific report pertaining to Churchwide Assembly action [CA97.06.28] on the topic of homosexuality, and hereby conveys the inter-unit introduction and the unit's report to the ELCA Church Council for presentation to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

The Division for Congregational Ministries has not engaged in any specific activity related to issues of homosexuality in this church beyond conversations with other units. However, the board of the Division for Congregational Ministries did receive and affirm the following resolution from the board of the Lutheran Youth Organization at its February 27-March 1, 1998, board meeting.

At the spring 1998 meeting, the board of the Lutheran Youth Organization, after much prayer and deliberation, passed the following motion:

The board of the Lutheran Youth Organization seeks a partnership with all members of the ELCA, particularly with clergy, laity, theologians, and church officials, as we pursue a dynamic, interactive, and open and welcoming ministry with gay, lesbian, and bisexual young people, and exclude the possibility of a pre-gathering for gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth to precede the triennial ELCA Youth Gathering.

Response of the Commission for Women

The 1995 Churchwide Assembly voted to affirm that "gay and lesbian people, as individuals created by God, are welcome to participate fully in the life of the congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America." At the October 1995 meeting of the steering committee of the Commission for Women, it was decided to begin to educate the commission staff and its steering committee by reviewing the literature, reviewing videos, and inviting lesbian women to be in dialogue with the steering committee. The question that was addressed was, "What does it mean to be a hospitable church to lesbian women?"

Meeting in October 1996, the steering committee of the Commission for Women directed the staff to gather resources and information to support creating a climate of hospitality for lesbian women.

In support of the Churchwide Assembly resolution to the Division for Church in Society, the Commission for Women became a site for a model of dialogue and moral deliberation at the October 1996 meeting. The Commission for Women convened a meeting of the women of the steering committee, in dialogue and moral deliberation with eight lesbian women. The women told their personal stories and struggled with the language of "moral deliberation." The meeting was videotaped and the outcome was that the Commission for Women shared this material with the Division for Church in Society.

The Commission for Women also offers its support of groups engaged in similar dialogues and of individuals through consultation with gay and lesbian persons and their families. This is done because the constitution instructs the Commission for Women to "...realize the full participation of women; to create equal opportunity for women of all

cultures.” The Commission for Women continues to encourage that policies and practices be developed for full involvement and the elimination of attitudes and practices that “divide, discriminate and oppress.”

Appendix

Ordination of Openly Gay and Lesbian Persons

The following material was presented to the 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

! Sierra Pacific Synod (2A) [1997 Memorial]

WHEREAS, “Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,” adopted by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at its October 1990 meeting, includes the following paragraph in Section III:

Sexual conduct. The expectations of this church regarding the sexual conduct of its ordained ministers are grounded in the understanding that human sexuality is a gift from God and that ordained ministers are to live in such a way as to honor this gift. Ordained ministers are expected to reject sexual promiscuity, the manipulation of others for the purpose of sexual gratification and all attempts of sexual seduction and sexual harassment, including taking physical or emotional advantage of others.

Single ordained ministers are expected to live a chaste life. Married ordained ministers are expected to live in fidelity to their spouse, giving expression to sexual intimacy within a marriage relationship that is mutual, chaste, and faithful. Ordained ministers who are homosexual in self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships.

WHEREAS, Luther taught, and the Augsburg Confession, Article 23, affirms that requiring clergy to be celibate is not God’s intention for the Church; and

WHEREAS, some research in the physical and psychological sciences offers evidence that homosexuality goes beyond “self-understanding” to the core of the being of an individual; and

WHEREAS, as long as homosexual persons are denied the right to marry, we believe it to be unfair to enforce a standard for their conduct that is based on marital status; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that this Assembly memorialize the 1997 Churchwide Assembly to remove from “Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America” the sentence which reads, “Ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships”; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Assembly direct the Sierra Pacific Synod Council to forward to the Church Council’s Executive Committee for proper referral and disposition under the bylaws and continuing resolutions of this church the proposal that the following sentence be removed from “Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America”:

Ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships.

! Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod (8G) [1996 Memorial]

WHEREAS, the ELCA has been unable to reach a consensually recognized statement on human sexuality and is not likely to have an approved statement in the near future; and

WHEREAS, the ELCA documents which preclude the ordination of openly lesbian and gay candidates for ministry were developed without churchwide debate and without the benefit and guidance of an official church statement on human sexuality; and

WHEREAS, Martin Luther in both the 95 Theses and at the Diet of Worms (“...unless I am convinced by Scripture and clear reason, I cannot recant...”) makes it very clear that we are to use Scripture and good reasoning as norm and standards of our Christian life together; and

WHEREAS, former Bishop Herbert Chilstrom urged the 1995 Churchwide Assembly to refer to Acts 15 and the actions of the Council of Jerusalem and its decision, inspired by the Gospel and good reasoning, to open church membership to the uncircumcised; and

WHEREAS, Presiding Bishop George Anderson and Conference of Bishops Chair Charles Maahs, in their March 1996 "Open Letter from the Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America," quoted affirmatively the 1991 and 1995 Churchwide Assembly declarations that "gay and lesbian people, as individuals created by God, are welcome to participate fully in the life of the congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America"; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod memorialize the Churchwide Assembly to use the Gospel and good reasoning to fulfill the promise of full participation in the Church, by removing all written impediments in ELCA documents to the ordination of otherwise qualified openly gay and lesbian candidates who are committed to lifelong, faithful relationships.

! Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod (8G) [1997 Memorial]

WHEREAS, "Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline of Ordained Ministers," approved in its present form by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at its December 1993 meeting, includes the following paragraph in b.4):

Sexual Matters. The biblical understanding which this church affirms is that the normative setting for sexual intercourse is marriage. In keeping with this understanding, chastity before marriage and fidelity within marriage are the norm. Adultery, promiscuity, the sexual abuse of another, or the misuse of counseling relationships for sexual favors constitute conduct that is incompatible with the character of the ministerial office.

Practicing homosexual persons are precluded from the ordained ministry of this church; and

WHEREAS, "Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America," adopted by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America at its October 1990 meeting, includes the following paragraph in Section III, The Ordained Minister as Person and Example:

Sexual conduct. The expectations of this church regarding the sexual conduct of its ordained ministers are grounded in the understanding that human sexuality is a gift from God and that ordained ministers are to live in such a way as to honor this gift. Ordained ministers are expected to reject sexual promiscuity, the attempts of sexual seduction and sexual harassment, including taking physical or emotional advantage of others. Single ordained ministers are expected to live a chaste life. Married ordained ministers are expected to live in fidelity to their spouses, giving expression to sexual intimacy within a marriage relationship that is mutual, chaste, and faithful. Ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual relationships; and

WHEREAS, Luther taught and the Augsburg Confession, Article XXIII affirms that requiring clergy to be celibate is not God's intention for the church; and

WHEREAS, some research in physical and psychological sciences offers evidence that homosexuality goes beyond "self-understanding" to the core of the being of an individual; and

WHEREAS, as long as homosexual persons are denied the right to marry, we believe it to be unfair to enforce a standard for their conduct that is based upon marital status; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that this assembly memorialize the 1997 Churchwide Assembly to remove from "Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline" the sentence which reads, "Practicing homosexual persons are precluded from the ordained ministry of this church."; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this assembly also memorialize the 1997 Churchwide Assembly to remove from "Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America" the sentence which reads, "Ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships."; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this assembly memorialize the 1997 Churchwide Assembly to instruct that the necessary changes to the ELCA constitution, bylaws, and other governing documents be made to support and effect these changes.

Background Information Provided to the 1997 Churchwide Assembly

The following information prepared by the Division for Ministry provided background material that assisted members of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly to respond to the memorials of the Sierra Pacific Synod and the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod:

1. "Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America" and "Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline of Ordained Ministers": Their Use and Relationship.

The document, "Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America," was adopted by the Church Council of the ELCA at its October 1990 meeting, "as a statement of this church." The council authorized its distribution to the congregations, ordained ministers, candidacy committees and seminaries of this church. The purpose of this document is "to express the high value and importance that the ordained ministry of Word and Sacrament has in the life of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America" ("Vision and Expectations," page 3).

"Vision and Expectations" followed the document, "Definition and Guidelines for Discipline of Ordained Ministers," which was adopted by the Church Council on November 19, 1989. The purpose of this document is to "describe the grounds for which ordained ministers may be subject to discipline according to the practice of this church" (page 3). Both "Vision and Expectations" and "Definition and Guidelines" deal with a wide range of matters related to rostered persons and this church's expectation of them.

The relationship and sequence of these two documents are important. "Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline of Ordained Ministers" was adopted one year prior to "Vision and Expectations" and states that "practicing homosexual persons are precluded from the ordained ministry of this church" (page 4). In the "Vision and Expectations" document, the sentence related to homosexual persons states: "Ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships." This sentence was recommended for inclusion by the Conference of Bishops so that the language of the latter document would be consistent with the language of the former.

It is the responsibility of the Division for Ministry to "develop, in consultation with the Conference of Bishops, ecclesiastical standards for the admission of persons to and continuation of persons on the rosters" of ordained ministers, associates in ministry, deaconesses, and diaconal ministers (*Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions* 16.11.B95.1.). Any change to the text of "Vision and Expectations" would be the responsibility of the Division for Ministry, reviewed by the Conference of Bishops, and adopted by the Church Council. Similarly, the Committee on Appeals has the responsibility to "establish definitions and guidelines, subject to approval by the Church Council, to enable clear and uniform application of the grounds for discipline" (churchwide bylaw 20.71.11.).

"Vision and Expectations" is used by candidacy committees of this church to indicate what the expectations of this church are related to ordained ministry so that candidates understand what is expected of them when they enter ordained ministry. It is also a statement of the conduct expected while candidates are in the process of preparing for service, in seminary, and in internship. "Definitions and Guidelines" is the basis for disciplinary action of ordained ministers serving within this church. Thus the issue of "openly gay and lesbian persons" serving in the ordained ministry of this church is not only related to "Vision and Expectations," but the standards by which an ordained minister is subject to the disciplinary process of the ELCA (as stated in "Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline").

2. Possible Study of the Issue of Ordination Policy Concerning Homosexual Persons

At its October 1990 meeting, the Church Council took the following action: "To refer the resolution of the Sierra Pacific Synod Assembly on a possible study of the issue of ordination policy concerning homosexual persons to the Division for Ministry for a recommendation, following consultation with the bishop of this church and the Conference of Bishops, on a process for responding to the Sierra Pacific Synod's request; and to request that a report from the Division for Ministry be provided at the April 1991 meeting of the Church Council on a proposed process."

At the April 1991 meeting of the Church Council, a report was received that had been approved by the board of the Division for Ministry, after consultation with the Conference of Bishops and the Office of the Bishop. This report stated that the existing policies of the ELCA ("Vision and Expectations" and "Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline") clearly preclude the ordination of practicing homosexual persons. The report also indicated that, while study was done in the predecessor bodies of this church related to this issue, this had not been done in the ELCA. It referred to the two studies then under way, the Study of Ministry and the Study of Human Sexuality, and indicated that these would "bear upon the issue of this church's practice regarding the ordination of homosexual persons."

The Division for Ministry recommended "that a study of this church's policy regarding the ordination of homosexual persons be undertaken through the Division for Ministry" following the completion of the two studies of ministry and sexuality.

The Church Council subsequently adopted the following resolution:

To consider engaging through the Division for Ministry in a study of this church's policy regarding the ordination of homosexual persons after the reports of the Study of Ministry and the Study of Human Sexuality are completed, and to request that a report be made to the 1995 Churchwide Assembly.

3. Subsequent Action of the Church Council Related to "Vision and Expectations"

At the November 1995 meeting of the Church Council, the following motion was made by a council member:

To direct the Division for Ministry to review and possibly revise or recommend deletion of the following sections of the policy document, "Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America," specifically those sentences on page 13 of that document that read, "Single ordained ministers are expected to live a chaste life," and "Ordained ministers who are homosexual in their self-understanding are expected to abstain from homosexual sexual relationships;" and

To direct the Division for Ministry to report on this matter at the April 1996 meeting of the Church Council.

This motion was defeated.

4. Current Use of the "Vision and Expectations" Document in Candidacy

At the March 1997 meeting of the board of the Division for Ministry, action was taken to adopt the "Guidelines for the Use of Vision and Expectations in the ELCA Candidacy Process." These guidelines affirmed the use of the document in both endorsement and approval decisions of candidacy committees and described its use in the new entrance phase of candidacy.

5. Message on Human Sexuality or Social Statement on Human Sexuality

In dealing with the timeline for the possible development of a statement on human sexuality, the Church Council reported to the 1995 Churchwide Assembly that:

...a proposed social statement on human sexuality will not be available for consideration by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly and that any decision related to the scheduling of a possible social statement on human sexuality will not be made until after the 1997 Churchwide Assembly, following further churchwide study and discussion.

The 1995 Churchwide Assembly took several actions relating to the ELCA's discussion of human sexuality (including the possibility of the development of a social statement on this topic), not all of which were in agreement with each other. At its November 1995 meeting, the Church Council clarified that this church would not revisit the issue of a possible statement on human sexuality until after the 1997 Churchwide Assembly.

Plans to develop a "message of concern," however, continued. At the November 1996 meeting of the Church Council, the document, "Sexuality: Some Common Convictions," was adopted "as a Message of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America." In the discussion, staff of the Division for Church in Society noted that the matter of homosexuality was not addressed in this message because the intent of the document is to comment only on areas of agreement throughout this church on matters related to human sexuality.

6. Process of Moral Deliberation

As part of its response to the actions taken by the 1995 Churchwide Assembly in its discussion of human sexuality, the Church Council affirmed in November 1995:

That—within the context of and consistent with the response of the bishop of this church and the Conference of Bishops to the request of the 1995 Churchwide Assembly for "words of prayer and encouragement" to gay and lesbian persons—appropriate efforts related to issues of hospitality and justice will be undertaken by staff of the Division for Church in Society.

The Division for Church in Society prepared a plan for a process for moral deliberation in the ELCA on the subject of homosexuality, beginning in 1997. Several assumptions informed this process. First, there was no intent to connect this deliberative process with the development of ELCA social policy on homosexuality. The learnings and relationships from this deliberative process could eventually contribute to ELCA policy, but there was no intent to tie together the deliberative process and any future policy development. Second, this process of moral deliberation was to be biblically, theologically, and confessionally informed; insights from the social sciences and personal experience would contribute to this process. Third, the process was to be safe and civil for all involved. Fourth, the process was intended to define terms and provide accurate information to the participants. Fifth, bridge-building among members of the ELCA who hold diverse and sometimes polarized opinions on matters relating to homosexuality was a primary concern. Reports describing methods and resources used and any conclusions that the process groups believe merit sharing throughout this church would be made available through the Division for Church in Society.

Based on these assumptions, several "pilot projects" were carried out in 1997. These models and their deliberative methodologies were to be evaluated, and recommendations were prepared in 1998. The following were settings for the conversations: the Center for Ethics at Roanoke College in concert with the Virginia Synod (for clergy); the Central States Synod (for congregations); a Faith and Life Form to be held in the western United States (for self-selected laity who attend as interested individuals); Trinity Lutheran Seminary (for

faculty and students of colleges and seminaries); and the Commission for Women (conversations with lesbians).

At its March 13-15, 1997, meeting, the board of the Division for Ministry expressed:

...its strong affirmation of the strategies being undertaken by the Division for Church in Society to promote moral deliberation within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America regarding this church's views and policies on homosexuality; and further, states the commitment of this division, especially because of its responsibility for recommending standards for rostered ministries, to be an active participant in the development and use of models for conversation and continuing moral deliberation on this sensitive and important subject.

Rationale of the 1997 Memorials Committee

The Memorials Committee recognizes that the proposed change in practice concerning the ordination of gay and lesbian persons cannot be separated from the wider discussion in this church concerning human sexuality. The committee also acknowledges the concern expressed through these memorials that "Vision and Expectations" and "Definitions and Guidelines" single out a particular behavior, not mentioning specifically others that could be similarly named.

However, the past discussion of the draft statement on human sexuality revealed the depth of division within this church and the need to continue discussion within the Church on this matter, which touches the lives of so many persons. The activities described above complement local initiatives throughout the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America that are seeking to find new ways to talk about the issue of homosexuality, within the context of this church's commitment to welcome gay and lesbian persons, to value the gifts they bring to this church, and to stand with them in the protection of their civil rights.

Given this process and lacking a new ELCA social statement on human sexuality, the Memorials Committee does not recommend endorsement of the action called for in the memorials of the Sierra Pacific Synod and Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod.

Action of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly

The 1997 Churchwide Assembly approved, upon recommendation of the Memorials Committee, the following [CA97.06.28; *1997 Reports and Records: Minutes*, page 773]:

To acknowledge the concerns that are expressed in the memorials of the Sierra Pacific Synod and the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod on the ordination of gay and lesbian persons) concerns that are part of the context of this church's ongoing dialogue relating to human sexuality;

To decline to take action at this assembly to make the changes in church policy and practice requested by these memorials;

To refer these memorials instead to the Division for Ministry as the division carries out its responsibility for recommending standards for rostered ministries and as it participates in the development and use of models for conversation and continuing moral deliberation on this sensitive and important subject;

To affirm the work of the Division for Church in Society as it assists this church to explore models of conversation and continuing moral deliberation that can serve this church in its commitment to continuing dialogue on issues relating to human sexuality, including homosexuality; and

To request that a status report on the learnings of these conversations be brought through the Church Council to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

The ELCA Study of Ministry: A Review of its Effects Six Years Later

BACKGROUND

The 1993 Churchwide Assembly approval of the Study of Ministry directed the Division for Ministry to prepare a report for the 1999 Churchwide Assembly reviewing the effects of the study's recommendations. The ELCA Church Council, at its April 1999 meeting, requested that the Executive Committee receive the report and transmit it to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

At its May 1999 meeting, the Executive Committee voted:

To receive the report "The ELCA Study of Ministry: A Review of its Effects after Six Years" from the Division for Ministry; and

To transmit the document to the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly as information.

The ELCA Study of Ministry: A Review of its Effects After Six Years

At the request of the Constituting Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America a five-year Study of Ministry was initiated by the Division for Ministry. A special task force was appointed in 1988 and completed its work in a report to the Churchwide Assembly in 1993. The final report of the Task Force on the Study of Ministry was received and the recommendations of that task force were adopted by the 1993 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America [CA93.06.17]. The final recommendations of that study follow:

To direct the Division for Ministry to review the effects of the recommendations of the Study of Ministry adopted by the 1993 Churchwide Assembly and, as part of its ongoing work, report its findings to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly; and

To direct the Division for Ministry to report to the Churchwide Assembly no later than 1999 any implications that ecumenical agreements may have on the ordained and or the diaconal ministry of this church.

This brief report is a review of the effects that the Study of Ministry has had on the ELCA. The report is not a detailed listing of actions taken by the Division for Ministry and others in response to the recommendations of the Task Force on the Study of Ministry, although some such accounting will be included here. The focus of this report is rather to answer the question: What difference has the Study of Ministry and its recommendations made to the ongoing life and ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America? It is an important question to consider, because the recommendations of the task force are wide-ranging and have, indeed, contributed substantial new elements to the life of our church. The headings of the following report coincide with the major recommendations of the Study of Ministry as acted upon by the 1993 Churchwide Assembly.

The Ministry of the Baptized

The ministry of the baptized was the foundational concept of the Study of Ministry. The recommendations of the study requested the Division for Ministry, the Division for

Congregational Ministries, and many other partners in the Church to work together “to further develop this church’s commitment to encourage all baptized members to understand, be equipped for, and live out their ministries in the world and in the Church.” As requested by the 1993 Churchwide Assembly, reports on the ministry of the baptized have been made to the 1997 and 1999 Churchwide Assemblies.

What have been the effects of the recommendations related to the ministry of the baptized? The emphasis upon the ministry of the baptized has affected much of the work of the Division for Ministry, including the development of the division’s mission statement. Two major resources for congregations, focusing upon the ministry of all the baptized have been developed: *Connections: Faith and Life*, and *Splash! Ripples of the Baptized*. Many materials produced by the Division for Ministry and by other churchwide units and offices reflect the strong central theme of the ministry of the baptized. The social statement, “Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All,” produced by the Division for Church in Society, strongly emphasizes the impact of economics and wealth upon the daily life ministries of all God’s people. Adult catechumenate resources and “The Use of the Means of Grace, a Statement on the Practice of Word and Sacrament” from the Division for Congregational Ministries, also reflect a strong emphasis upon the ministry of the baptized. The video series, “Mosaic,” and *The Lutheran* magazine continue to include more profiles of persons living out their daily-life ministries than was the case before the Study of Ministry. The seminaries, as they develop continuing education and adult enrichment courses, are putting more emphasis on equipping the baptized for their ministries in the Church and in the world with more courses for lay persons and a focus on the role of rostered leaders in supporting the ministry of the baptized.

The Division for Ministry believes that the effects of the study recommendations related to the ministry of the baptized have made a significant difference in the elevation of this foundational concept to a place of prominence in the life and thinking of the ELCA.

Diaconal Ministry

The establishment of diaconal ministry as a new fourth roster of leaders in the ELCA is perhaps the most significant new development from the Study of Ministry. As the task force worked it determined a need for a new cadre of rostered leaders with special responsibilities for bridging the ministries of the Church and the ministries of the world: to be witnesses for the faith in the world and to be interpreters of the world to the community of faith. As a direct result of the recommendations of the Task Force on the Study of Ministry, a new roster of diaconal ministers has begun to develop in our church.

The Eastern Cluster of Lutheran Seminaries was assigned responsibility to develop the diaconal ministry core curriculum and field experience guidelines, and to conduct annual diaconal ministry formation events. These events began at the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, in July 1995 and have continued each summer. As of the 1999 Churchwide Assembly more than 150 candidates will have participated in the two-week long formation event. To date 25 diaconal ministers have been consecrated and are serving in ministries that seek to bridge the gap between Church and world. These diaconal ministries are available to meet the changing needs for rostered leadership as the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America reaches out in new ways to minister in Christ’s name to our culture. There is every expectation that the number of diaconal ministers will continue to grow. Thus, the effects of this new group of rostered leaders holds great promise for our church as together we engage the changing ministry needs of the new millennium.

Deaconess Community

The recommendations of the Task Force on the Study of Ministry included ending the “frozen” roster status of the Deaconess Community, and authorizing the consecration and rostering of qualified persons to serve as deaconesses in the ELCA. The effects of this action have been to rejuvenate the Deaconess Community and to encourage its substantial long-range planning regarding the place of the Deaconess Community in the future life this church. The Deaconess Community made a significant decision in 1998 to move its central offices from Gladwyne, Pennsylvania, to the Chicago area, and to expand the retreat and outreach ministries of the community. Significant new promotional and recruitment efforts have been initiated by the Deaconess Community with the result that since 1993 an average of 15 candidates have been in preparation with the community each year and a total of 14 new deaconesses have been consecrated for service.

Associates in Ministry

The recommendations of the Task Force on the Study of Ministry include concerns for how the newly established diaconal ministers roster would relate to the established roster of ELCA associates in ministry. One direct result of the recommendations of the Study of Ministry is that associates in ministry, deaconesses, and diaconal ministers now serve under official calls and have voice and vote in synod assemblies.

The Division for Ministry has sought to strengthen the relationship between associates in ministry, diaconal ministers, and deaconesses, and to interpret this relationship to the ELCA. Five special consultations have been held regionally and churchwide with representatives of these rostered groups to seek to understand just how the associate in ministry, deaconess, and diaconal ministry rosters can best relate to one another. These consultations have revealed that though there is some lack of distinctiveness in areas of service among these rosters, there is a significant difference in perspective and self understanding within each lay ministry roster. In the years ahead, the Division for Ministry will seek to continue to clarify the gifts of each of the rostered lay ministries and to assist them in becoming even more useful in the witness of this church.

Pastors

The Study of Ministry affirms the ordained ministry of Word and Sacrament, as it was practiced in the predecessor church bodies, that ordination commits the person “to present and represent in public ministry on behalf of this church its understanding of the Word of God, proclamation of the Gospel, confessional commitment, and teachings.” Special emphases of the Study of Ministry regarding the ministry of Word and Sacrament include pastoral care, speaking for justice, and ministry on behalf of the poor and oppressed. The Division for Ministry continues to support the ordained pastoral ministry of Word and Sacrament, essential for the life of the Church and world, as it is carried out together with all baptized believers and rostered lay ministers.

Bishops

The Study of Ministry recommendations declare that the ministry of bishops is understood to be an expression of pastoral ministry. The bishop is distinguished by having

responsibility to provide oversight for ordained and other ministers, by giving leadership to the mission of this church, and in strengthening the unity of the Church. Constitutions have been amended to reflect the bishops' responsibilities for pastoral and oversight matters, as well as administration. Terms of office for bishops have been extended from four to six years, with synods establishing term limitations if they so desire. Membership in the Conference of Bishops is limited to those serving in office. As with pastors, the recommendations of the task force related to bishops do not alter in substance the role of bishops in the life of this church that were in place prior to the Study of Ministry.

Flexibility for Mission

The Study of Ministry included recommendations to provide for greater flexibility in the use and deployment of rostered and lay leaders. This flexibility is understood to be in the service of the mission of this church. The first recommendation related to flexibility for mission is that of non-stipendiary ministry.

Non-stipendiary ministry in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America is understood to be service as a rostered minister (ordained or lay) without regard to compensation. Pastors and rostered lay persons who are able, for a variety of reasons, to serve without normal compensation are thus providing needed ministry. The policy developed by the Division for Ministry enables a Synod Council to extend a letter of call for non-stipendiary service in response to a clearly defined need for such a ministry. A letter of call for non-stipendiary ministry also must be approved by the Conference of Bishops. At present 17 ordained ministers, two deaconesses, and one associate in ministry serve in non-stipendiary ministries in the ELCA.

Another significant component of the Study of Ministry's recommendations for flexibility in mission was the strategy of "licensed" or synodically authorized ministry. The Division for Ministry, in consultation with the Conference of Bishops, developed a policy to provide pastoral or diaconal leadership by an authorized lay person when needs exist within a synod that exceed those which can be provided by rostered leaders. This strategy has been useful in a variety of settings across the ELCA, including remote rural settings and ministries within ethnic specific communities.

The key to the effective service of this cadre of ministry leaders has been the decision by the Division for Ministry to develop broad guidelines of preparation, supervision, and accountability but to place responsibility for these lay ministers entirely within the synod that authorizes their ministry. Thus, these "authorized ministers" are not rostered within the ELCA, and are not "called" by a congregation. They are identified, trained, and supervised by the synodical bishop and a designated synodical committee. To date 40 synods have utilized this strategy for their mission outreach and congregational ministries.

The final recommendation of the Study of Ministry was to expand the provisions related to on-leave-from-call. The primary issue involved with on-leave-from-call was how this church might continue to recognize rostered ministers who are not serving under call but who wish to remain on the roster and to return to called ministry at a later date. The Division for Ministry and the Conference of Bishops developed a more flexible process that recognizes legitimate reasons why a rostered minister might not be able to serve under a letter of call. Such reasons include, for example, graduate studies or parenting.

The granting of on-leave-from-call is not automatic nor the right of the rostered person but is granted by a Synod Council on the basis of how the rostered minister's gifts and

abilities can continue to contribute to the ministry and mission of the ELCA. On-leave-from-call status is given on an annual basis, normally renewable up to three years. However, because circumstances may warrant extending this status beyond three years, provision was made so that a rostered person may remain on-leave-from-call for up to six years.

In each of these three categories, the Study of Ministry's recommendations—acted upon by the Division for Ministry, the Conference of Bishops, and the Church Council—have resulted in a more flexible, adaptable service by ordained ministers of Word and Sacrament, associates in ministry, deaconesses, and diaconal ministers, as well as authorized lay persons, in a variety of congregational and other ministry settings. The flexibility for mission envisioned by the Study of Ministry has indeed expanded ministry resources within the ELCA.

Cooperation with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada

As directed by the recommendations of the Study of Ministry, the Division for Ministry has engaged in periodic consultation on major areas of ministry with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada. These areas include substantial discussions related to diaconal ministry, deaconesses, bishops, clergy sexual abuse, candidacy, and many other areas of common concern. Learnings from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada regarding these issues have greatly benefitted the work of the ELCA and vice-versa.

Implications of Ecumenical Agreements

The final recommendation related to the Study of Ministry came as an amendment from the 1993 Churchwide Assembly floor: “that the Division for Ministry report to the Churchwide Assembly no later than 1999 any implications that ecumenical agreements may have on the ordained and or diaconal ministry of this church.”

The 1997 action by the Churchwide Assembly approving the *Formula of Agreement* established a new relationship of full communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the Reformed Church in America, and the United Church of Christ.

Since the 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Division for Ministry, the Conference of Bishops, and other units of this church have assisted the ELCA in developing guidelines for the availability of clergy among denominations with which the ELCA is in full communion. This policy was adopted by the Church Council in April 1998. It will apply not only to the three Reformed churches with which the ELCA is now in full communion, but also with any other subsequent denominations with which full communion relationships may be established. These guidelines allow for pastors of full-communion partner denominations to serve in ELCA ministries in three different capacities: occasional service, extended service, or transfer of roster status. The policy deals with other issues related to availability of clergy, including pension, medical insurance, accountability, and pastoral care.

The Division for Ministry staff and other churchwide staff have met with representatives of the partner denominations in the Reformed churches on six occasions to discuss the development of this document and other ministry issues. The possibilities for shared ministry in many areas continue to develop with these churches. The recommendations of the Study of Ministry have provided a secure base for the exploration of cooperative, yet distinct, ministries with our ecumenical partners.

Conclusion

It is evident that in a number of key areas related to the rostered ministries of this church the Study of Ministry has had very useful effects. The Study of Ministry in concert with its companion study, the Study of Theological Education, has had a formative influence on the shape and direction of ministry in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. While there is much work and refinement yet to be done in defining and adjusting the ministries of this church, the recommendations of the Task Force on the Study of Ministry have been serviceable and faithful. Their effects have been beneficial to the ELCA in the intervening years since the recommendations were adopted by the 1993 Churchwide Assembly.

The ELCA Study of Ministry: Ministry in Daily Life—A Call to Action

BACKGROUND

The following recommendation of the Church Council was adopted by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America [CA97.05.20]:

To receive the report of the Division for Ministry on ministry in daily life; and

To affirm the following recommendations of the “Call to Action: Ministry in Daily Life”:

1. *Teach the Faith for Living the Faith*

To recommend that all persons, congregations, synods, churchwide units, and agencies who shape documents, resources, or events on Lutheran identity, include in their work an explicit and forceful presentation of the concept of ministry in daily life with relevant and concrete suggestions for living the faith.

2. *Develop Leaders for the Next Century*

A. To direct that the Division for Ministry and the Conference of Bishops—at the time of the next revision or reprinting of manuals, standards, guideline, and policies¹ used in the selection and approval of candidates, first-call theological education, mobility, and the call process in congregations—ensure that such documents reflect a strengthened understanding of the ministry of all people and the role of the ministry of Word and Sacrament in strengthening that ministry.

B. To urge providers of theological education to keep in the forefront of their work the intent of the Study of Theological Education to make theological education accessible to a broader spectrum of people, especially those who are not seeking a church occupation but desire to explore their faith and reflect theologically on their ministries in the world.

3. *Strengthen One Another in Mission*

A. To direct the Division for Congregational Ministries and Division for Ministry to develop study documents, methods, and materials that foster a strong positive relationship between clergy and laity, in order to combat clericalism and anti-clericalism, so that lay and ordained persons may work together in a full and equal partnership that allows both to fulfill their roles in God’s mission.

B. To encourage all expressions of the church and all ministry settings to involve laity in decision-making roles, in order to include the witness, wisdom, experience, and expertise from the worlds of business, education, law, and health care, and the voices of people who are unemployed, retired, and young.

C. To direct the Division for Congregational Ministries to develop processes, models, and resources that make it possible for congregations to organize for and practice the principle of honoring the ministry of all members in the world.²

4. To authorize that the Division for Ministry monitor this church’s progress in achieving stated goals, with a report on this progress to be made at the 1999 Churchwide Assembly.

1 Such documents include: The Candidacy Manual, First-Call Theological Education Program Practices Organizer, Mutual Ministry Committee Manual, Mobility Information Packet for Rostered Persons, Congregational Profile, and Guidelines for the Call Process in the Congregations.

2 New models might lead to creative ways of addressing such questions as: How might this orientation to ministries in the world change the way congregations call leaders, spend money, construct buildings, and organize their work? How would congregations relate to members who participate minimally in the life of the congregation, but who consider themselves religious and are actively engaged in the world as faithful people?

Progress Report

This is a *progress* report precisely because a biennium is only a nanosecond in terms of time needed for “integrating the emphasis on the ministry of the baptized into the life of this church in and through its various expressions . . . but especially through congregations” (Study of Ministry, Recommendation 2).

Recommendations serve to draw the attention of the church to issues and actions that need to be taken seriously for growth to occur, and are often doorways to more challenges and possibilities. The 1997 Churchwide Assembly recommendations are no exception, especially given the fact that their vision is church-transforming and requires a changed perspective on how to carry forth the ministry of the Church.

Progress is a relative thing. One could say that more progress has been made in the last five years in terms of a deeper understanding of the centrality of the priesthood of all believers to the Church, than in the five hundred years since Martin Luther set about to explain what he thought that phrase meant. At the same time, one could say that very little progress has been made, given the possibility of the increased power of the Church when it fully understands and activates the foundational theological concept of sending members into the world as God’s creative and redeeming Word to all the world.

With no criticism or apology for what has not been accomplished, the Division for Ministry reports on what we have learned in the process of noting progress. Some learnings relate to the intent of the recommendations, some to serendipitous and Spirit-driven activity that is occurring across the Church as a result of a new sensitivity to gifts and vocation. There are many indications of change and hopeful seeds of change that can grow into strong plants as the years pass.

This is not a typical progress report. Rather, it is intended to engage the reader, as a member of the Church, in the ongoing and long-term conversation to explore and express our theology related to the renewed discovery of the centrality of the priesthood of all believers in our church.

Recommendation 1 (Teach the Faith for Living the Faith) was so global in its scope and enthusiasm, that it was not possible to monitor it fully. What we did observe were changes that are consistent with the intent of the recommendation to include in all of the work of the Church “an explicit and forceful presentation of the concept of ministry in daily life with relevant and concrete suggestions for living the faith.” The following are examples:

**It’s A Good Time to Be the Church*, by Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson (especially pages 60-70);

*The study on economic life *Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread*, engaged people in ongoing discussion about the impact of economics and wealth upon their daily life journey.

**Welcome the Christ*, adult Catechumenate resources and the sacramental practices statement, *The Use of the Means of Grace*, connect the Church’s worship to the recognition of the role of faithful persons in the world.

**Mosaic*, the video magazine of the ELCA, and *The Lutheran*, include more profiles of people living out their ministries in their places of work, community, and home.

Examples such as these, and others, represent a shift in our common understanding of where and how the ministry of the Church occurs. They remind us that at the center of our

self-understanding is the conviction that everything we do has religious meaning. We do not cut ourselves off from the world around us, but rather engage in it fully.

In the future, as we teach the faith for living the faith, resources will be needed for new member classes, lifting up the ministry of the baptized, along with other important Lutheran doctrines, biblical understandings, confessions, and creeds. Being invited into the priesthood of all believers, rightly understood and articulated, may be one of the most exciting aspects of membership in this church.

Recommendation 2a: Changes or additions have been noted in the following documents:

**Candidacy in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*—this manual for rostered persons roots ministry in the call of all baptized persons, some to public ministry in this church and some to ministries in the world according to their gifts and abilities for ministry.

**Life-Long Learning and Development for Faithful Leaders*, a vision and strategy document focusing on continuing education for rostered persons in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, expands the vision for continuing education to the engagement of all the baptized in learning and growing together in mission and ministry.

Some key documents still need work in emphasizing the centrality of the priesthood of all believers. For example:

**The Personnel Information Form and Congregational Profile* (still in the revision process) contain no language lifting up the pastor's role in strengthening the ministry of all the baptized. The Availability for Call Form contains change in the right direction.

*Mutual ministry committee resources need to be revised to reflect and suggest action consistent with the goals of the *Life-Long Learning Document*.

Recommendation 2b is based on a clear imperative of the 1995 Study of Theological Education in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. An increasing number of Christians not pursuing Church occupations are seeking opportunity for intellectual exploration of the faith and theological reflection and conversation on their ministries in the world. As stated in the theological education study, "Their faith and ministry could be enhanced if, in addition to congregationally based adult education, they had access to programs of theological education at an advanced level. Such programs would have to relate to their ministries in the world and be adaptable to the demands of their primary commitments to family and/or work."

Life-Long Theological Education Partners (seminaries, continuing education centers, etc.) are providing theological education for a broader range of persons, even if intended primarily for use in service within the Church. Early movement in that direction includes electronic distance learning efforts such as:

* **Fisher's Net**, a delivery system supporting high quality online theological education for degree-oriented students and life-long learners and the learning centers that serve them.

* **Partners in Distance Learning Resources**, which attempt to provide more substantial material for people seeking a deeper discussion about faith and life.

Recent Lilly Endowment Grants will make it possible for some seminaries to create programs for youth and young adults as they discern their call—whatever it may be and wherever it may take them—and engage in theological education for vocation.

Recommendation 3a. and 3c. In looking at ways to foster strong positive relationships between clergy and laity, there are several resources which provide ways for lay and clergy to study and work together as full and equal partners:

**Connections: Faith and Life* is a visit to the worlds God is creating and redeeming today and throughout history. It is a visit to the homes, workplaces, neighborhoods, and places of recreation and volunteer activity where God is at work through the lives of group members.

**Splash! Ripples of the Baptized* is a Growth in Excellence in Ministry continuing education resource and a cooperative project of the Commission for Multicultural Ministries, Division for Congregational Ministries, and Division for Ministry. *Splash!* provides a unique opportunity for congregations to look differently at the way they organize for, and practice, the principle of honoring the ministry of all members in the world, and being a community of support for that sending out into the world. Early reports about *Splash!* indicate that in congregations, it has brought a noticeable difference in sermons that are being preached, in adult education, in small groups organized around occupations or life issues, and in sensitivity to the whole life of the person in the pew.

**Smart Living*, this biennium's stewardship materials, encourage celebrating "the ways you are living for others, with family and friends, at school, at work, with people you like and people you do not. Look into your life." *Smart Living* expands the old images of stewardship as money and gives it new life for all of life.

**Growth in Excellence in Ministry* covenants for continuing education for rostered persons also have provided opportunity for lay and clergy to work together on congregational priorities.

Recommendation 3b. Throughout the history of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, more and more lay persons have been included in decision-making roles (e.g. boards, commissions, councils, committees). We will benefit further from the continuing inclusion of the witness, wisdom, experience, and expertise from all the vocations represented by ELCA members.

A progress report would be incomplete without mention of the worldwide explosion around the concept of the ministry of the laity. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America not only joins with like-minded people in other denominations and independent organizations here in the United States through the Ecumenical Coalition on Ministry in Daily Life, but connects around the world with activity geared to providing places for laity to see where and how in their lives they are *already* being the Church. The Church is in the world in the person of each of us: being a citizen, being a fisherman, being a farmer, being a homemaker, being retired, being a geneticist, being a secretary. That is the Church, connected across class, age, gender, ethnicity, and geography.

The Division for Ministry commits itself to continue to monitor our progress together, to be diligent advocates for long-term conversation, and to work with partners to influence the entire Church in the unfinished integrating of "the emphasis on the ministry of the baptized into the life of this church" (Study of Ministry).

"Report" conjures up images of getting a grade. Members of the Ministry in Daily Life Advisory Group who contributed to this report give the Church a "good progress" award, and raise the following questions for this church's attention as we look together at the future of the ministry of the baptized in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America:

Vocation

- How will young people be honored equally as they discern their vocation, whether called to construction work or public ministry?
- How will persons preparing for public ministry best honor the ministries of all as mutual?

Congregational Life

- As we call pastors and other staff to our congregations, how should they be held accountable (in partnership with other members) for balancing institutional maintenance with nurturing the public life ministries of all members?
- As congregations look at themselves differently in order to address the realities of upcoming generations and social conditions, how can they be faith communities which recognize and send one another to their primary context for ministries—outside the walls of the Church?

Listening to the World

- Where and when is it important for the Church to include and engage the voices and gifts of people in the worlds of business, law, government, media, science and technology, so that as we make institutional decisions we better understand the world in which we minister?

Educating for Living the Faith

- As we seek to educate society about the uniqueness of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, and teach the faith to seekers, how will we guarantee that alongside our unique contributions about Scripture and doctrines, we are clear that the ministry of all believers is lifted up?
- Where will faithful people find substantive theological education and conversation that will provide an arena for reflecting on their day-to-day ministry?

Institutional Awareness

- Because institutional documents determine and perpetuate policy and practice, how will they be written and revised to lift up mutuality of ministry, as well as move toward full and equal partnership between lay and clergy that enables all to fulfill their role in God's mission?
- How will this church carry out its constitutional vision of a people "called and sent to bear witness to God's creative, redeeming, and sanctifying activity in the world" (ELCA constitution, "Statement of Purpose," 4.01.)?

Upon recommendation of the board of the Division for Ministry, the Church Council, at its April 1999 meeting, adopted the following resolution (CC99.04.30):

To receive the progress report on "Call to Action: Ministry in Daily Life;" and

To transmit the progress report as information to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Exhibit H

Final Report on Ministry with and among Persons with Disabilities

The Final Report of the Comprehensive Study of Ministry with and among Persons who are Deaf and Persons with Disabilities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America represented the response of the Division for Church in Society to several memorials and resolutions on this subject referred to the division by the Church Council and the Office of the Presiding Bishop. The referred memorials and resolutions include:

Two resolutions on ministry with persons with disabilities received from voting members at the 1997 Churchwide Assembly, upon recommendation of its Committee of Reference and Counsel, were approved by the assembly in principle and referred to the Church Council for a recommendation for action to be brought to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly [CA97.06.71]; the Church Council at its November 1997 meeting referred this action of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly to the Division for Church in Society to be included in its comprehensive review of churchwide activities supporting persons with disabilities (CC97.11.91);

A resolution of the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod was forwarded to the ELCA Church Council for consideration and action; the Church Council at its August 1997 meeting referred the resolution on protecting the rights of persons with disabilities to the Division for Church in Society for a report and possible recommendations to the Church Council (CC97.8.61i);

A memorial of the Southeastern Minnesota Synod to the 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America concerning the placement of deaf ministries within the churchwide structure was referred by the Churchwide Assembly to the Office of the Presiding Bishop for report to the Church Council; subsequently the Office of the Presiding Bishop requested the Division for Church in Society to include this subject in its comprehensive review of churchwide activities supporting persons with disabilities.

Due to the comprehensive nature of the study required to respond to these referrals, it was not possible for the Division for Church in Society to meet the original request for a report and recommendations to the April 1998 Church Council meeting. With the study completed, the board of the Division for Church in Society received and approved the report and recommendations at its September 24-26, 1998, meeting, and voted to transmit with its full support the report and recommendations to the ELCA Church Council. Further, the board requested that the Church Council transmit the report to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly as the response to the resolutions referred by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly [CA97.06.71]; that the report serve as the response to the resolution received by the Church Council from the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod; and that the report serve as the response to the memorial from the Southeastern Minnesota Synod as referred to the Office of the Presiding Bishop by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

In November 1998, the Church Council voted (CC98.11.68):

To approve the report and recommendations contained in *The Final Report of the Comprehensive Study of Ministry with and among Persons who are Deaf and Persons with Disabilities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*;

To transmit the report as information to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly as the response to the resolutions on disability ministries from Mr. Kane and Ms. Keiser, which were referred to the Church Council by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly.

To request the Office of the Secretary to convey the report and recommendations to the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod as the response to its resolution on protecting the rights of persons with disabilities forwarded to the Church Council, and to the Southeastern Minnesota Synod as the response to its memorial on deaf ministry referred to the Office of the Presiding Bishop by the 1997 Churchwide Assembly.

The Comprehensive Study of Ministry with and among Persons who are Deaf and Persons with Disabilities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA)

Preamble

In adherence with the Church Council referral of the resolution (calling for the study of a churchwide commission for people with disabilities) from the 1997 Churchwide Assembly to the Division for Church in Society (DCS), the original charter of the Comprehensive Study of Ministry with and among Persons who are Deaf and Persons with Disabilities was to address Disability Ministries. During the study process, the important distinction between Disability Ministries and Deaf Ministry was reinforced. Although the body of this report and recommendations is written from the perspective of the original charter charged to the Division for Church in Society, the intention of the staff and board of the Division for Church in Society, and study participants is to be inclusive of the above distinction throughout the report and recommendations.

Section I - Background

A. Impetus for the Comprehensive Study of Ministry with and among Persons Who are Deaf and Persons with Disabilities

The 1997 Churchwide Assembly adopted a resolution directing the Church Council to: review the work of ministry with people with disabilities that has occurred over the last ten years in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; study the possibility and need for establishing a churchwide commission for people with disabilities; and bring a recommendation back to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly for action.

At their November 1997 meeting, the Church Council referred this resolution, known as the "Commission" Resolution, and the accompanying "Representation" Resolution to the Division for Church in Society (DCS) and requested a report for the April 1998 Church Council meeting. The previous July [1997], the position of director for disability ministries in the Division for Church in Society became vacant, resulting in the routine practice of evaluating the position before hiring a new director. The combination of the Church Council's referral of the "Commission" Resolution to the Division for Church in Society and the vacant position of the director for disability ministries resulted in the Division for Church in Society hiring a coordinator for social justice education to conduct the Comprehensive Study of Ministry with and among Persons who are Deaf and Persons with Disabilities.

In addition to the "Commission" and "Representation" Resolutions, a request from a memorial on deaf ministry from the 1997 Churchwide Assembly and a synodical resolution to the Church Council were included in the study. At the August 13-14, 1997, meeting, the Church Council referred a resolution, entitled "Protecting the Rights for Persons with Disabilities," to the Division for Church in Society and requested a report and possible recommendations for the April 1998 Church Council meeting. At the 1997 Churchwide Assembly, the Memorials Committee recommended referral of the request of the memorial of the Southeastern Minnesota Synod, concerning the placement of the deaf ministry within the churchwide structure, to the Office of the Presiding Bishop. In December 1997, the Office of the Presiding Bishop requested the Division for Church in Society to include the issue in the study.

Realizing that the study would take longer to conduct than the deadline of April 1998, the Division for Church in Society and the Office of the Presiding Bishop brought progress reports to the April 1998 meeting of the Church Council and asked to bring the final report to the November 1998 meeting. The Church Council approved the extension to November 1998.

In December 1997, staff of the Division for Church in Society launched the study process by preparing an outline and defining the goals. The goals of the study were:

- (1) to respond definitively to the memorials and resolutions;
- (2) to develop a future plan of action, encompassing both function and structure, for the ELCA churchwide disability ministries and to give consideration to a collaboration with the plans of action of the three Reformed Churches and The Episcopal Church; and
- (3) to evaluate and describe our partnerships within the Division for Church in Society (DCS) and with the other churchwide units, including but not limited to, Division for Outreach (DO), Women of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (WELCA), Commission for Multicultural Ministries (CMM), Division for Ministry (DM), Division for Congregational Ministries (DCM), Office of the Secretary, and Office of the Presiding Bishop.

B. Advisory Committee, Consultants, and Questionnaires

The Division for Church in Society looked to three groups to provide advice and counsel for the study. They were the advisory committee, the consultants, and the persons who received the individual, network, and synod disability committee questionnaires.

The board of the Division for Church in Society appointed a ten-member advisory committee comprised of persons knowledgeable about the many aspects of disabilities and the church's ministry with persons with disabilities. The advisory committee included a synodical disability team member, a representative from the ELCA Church Council, and a representative from each of the five networks, namely the Lutheran Network on Mental Illness/Brain Disorders (LNMI), the Definitely Abled Advisory Committee (DAC), the Lutheran Developmental Disabilities Coalition (LDDC), the ELCA Braille and Tape Ministry, and the Evangelical Lutheran Deaf Association (ELDA). The advisory committee members were: Ms. Marge Christensen, Mr. Stewart Govig, Mr. Donald Hayes, Mr. Jeff Kane, Ms. Mandy Kent, Ms. Linda Larson, Ms. Alice Meints, Mr. Felix Mercado, Mr. Robert Radtke, and Pr. Duane L. Steele

As part of giving advice and counsel, the advisory committee members formed two subcommittees: Resolutions and Pastors and Congregations. The Resolutions subcommittee

focused on the “Representation” and “Protecting the Rights for Persons with Disabilities” Resolutions and the deaf ministry memorials; and the Pastors and Congregations subcommittee evaluated and reported on ELCA churchwide practices pertaining to persons with disabilities for worship, education, the call and candidacy process, training for rostered persons and lay leaders, and architectural accessibility. The advisory committee met twice, and the subcommittee members corresponded by telephone and e-mail between the first meeting in January 1998 and second meeting in May 1998. At the second meeting, the advisory committee proposed and voted on their recommendations.

The consultants were ten churchwide staff persons from the following units: the Office of the Presiding Bishop, the Office of the Secretary, the Division for Ministry, the Division for Congregational Ministries, the Division for Outreach, the Commission for Multicultural Ministries, the Women of the ELCA, the Department for Synodical Relations, the Department for Human Resources, and the Department for Communication. Staff of the Division for Church in Society met individually with each consultant and met twice collectively with the consultants.

With assistance from the Department for Research and Evaluation, staff of the Division for Church in Society developed three questionnaires: the Individual, Synod Disability Committee, and Network. The questionnaires evaluated the past performance and invited input on the future focus for the ELCA churchwide disability ministries. Staff of the Division for Church in Society sent Individual Questionnaires to 1200 people who have indicated an interest or expertise in disability ministries and received 450 responses.

Each of the five networks received a Network Questionnaire, and staff of the Division for Church in Society received responses from four of the networks. Each of the thirteen Synod Disability Teams received a Synod Disability Committee Questionnaire, and staff of the Division for Church in Society received responses from nine of the Synod Disability Teams.

C. Experience of Ecumenical Partners

In the course of the study, the DCS staff made contact with persons in other church bodies who address disability ministries. The following facts were learned.

1. The Episcopal Church

The Rev. Canon Brian Grieves, director of peace and justice ministries

The Episcopal Church has discontinued its disability ministries program. Staff of that church welcomed continued conversations, but they are unable to commit to work on disability ministries. That church funds agencies that work with persons with various disabilities, but provides no direct services.

2. United Church of Christ (UCC)

The Rev. David Dunham, consultant, issues of disability

Since 1977, the United Church of Christ has sponsored a seven-member National Committee on Persons with Disabilities through the UCC’s American Missionary Association. Currently, the National Committee is working on up-dating their publications, including their Access Sunday materials for the second Sunday in October; conducting an employment study for pastors who are persons with disabilities; and creating task forces within their conferences. (Conferences are similar to ELCA regions. Associations are similar to ELCA synods).

3. Reformed Church in America

The Rev. Jeff Japinga, director of congregational services, minister for education and faith development

The Reformed Church in America welcomes the ELCA's effort to contact them regarding disability ministries. Although the Reformed Church in America has no assigned disability ministries staff, disability ministries are considered to be very important, and the Reformed Church in America invites further information regarding other denominations' work on disability ministries.

4. Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

The Rev. Helen Locklear, associate for social welfare organizations and the executive director of the Presbyterian Health, Education, and Welfare Association

In the Presbyterian Church, disability ministries occurs through the affiliated Presbyterian Health, Education, and Welfare Association. The association, a membership organization, consists of a number of networks. The Presbyterians for Disability Concerns (PDC), the network for ministry with persons with disabilities, distributes Christian education resources inclusive of persons with disabilities and produces the PDC newsletter.

5. The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod (LCMS)

The Rev. Rodney Rynearson, counselor for deaf mission, Board for Mission Services

The Rev. David Andrus, counselor for blind mission, Board for Mission Services

The Rev. Carl Toelke, director for social ministry organizations, Board for Human Care Ministries

The Rev. Bruce Hartung, director for health ministries, Board for Human Care Ministries

The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod deploys responsibility for disability ministries throughout its churchwide structure. The Board for Mission Services hosts the Ministry to the Blind and the Ministry to the Deaf. The Board for Human Care Ministries is responsible for ministry with persons with developmental disabilities and ministry with persons with mental illness.

Celebrating its 75th year, the LCMS Ministry to the Blind produces large print and braille materials through the efforts of two staff persons and 1,000 volunteers. In addition to the production of braille materials, the Ministry to the Blind encourages LCMS congregations to be inclusive of persons who are blind and facilitates leadership development workshops for persons who are blind.

The Ministry to the Deaf supports 59 deaf ministry congregations and 130 congregations who provide sign language interpreters. Through the International Lutheran Deaf Association, LCMS raises funds for innovative projects to share Jesus with more persons who are deaf. The LCMS is providing theological extension services combining seminary classes in American Sign Language and correspondence classes to initiate the first class of seminarians who are deaf. The LCMS sponsors two deaf ministry churches in Ghana and last year established five more.

As for the Board for Human Care Ministries, ministry with persons with developmental disabilities occurs through the LCMS social ministry organizations. The LCMS Michigan District task force has served as the source of ministry with persons with mental illness. Two

pastors from the Michigan District task force are members of the Lutheran Network on Mental Illness–Brain Disorders Steering Committee.

D. Timeline of the Comprehensive Study

From December 1997 to June 1, 1998, the Division for Church in Society conducted the information gathering phase of the study as follows:

1. In December 1997, staff of the Division for Church in Society recruited candidates for the advisory committee, and the board of the Division for Church in Society appointed the advisory committee members.
2. On January 23-25, 1998, the advisory committee met for their first meeting. Committee members elected to serve on one of two subcommittees: Resolutions and Pastors and Congregations.
3. Beginning in February and continuing through March 1998, staff of the Division for Church in Society met individually with the consultants.
4. Beginning in March 1998, staff of the Division for Church in Society contacted a staff person from The Episcopal Church, the United Church of Christ, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Reformed Church in America, and The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod to discuss each denomination’s disability ministries program and potential for collaboration.
5. On March 6, 1998, questionnaires were sent to thirteen synod disability teams, the five disability ministries networks, and 1200 individuals who have indicated an interest or expertise in disability ministries.
6. On March 29, 1998, staff of the Division for Church in Society met collectively with the consultants.
7. On May 1-3, 1998, the advisory committee met for their second meeting.
8. On May 14, 1998, staff of the Division for Church in Society met collectively for a second time with the consultants.

From June 1, 1998, to September 11, 1998, the Division for Church in Society drafted the report and its recommendations.

1. Staff of the Division for Church in Society prepared an outline of the report on April 1, 1998, and an initial draft of the report on May 1, 1998.
2. Staff of the Division for Church in Society met with Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson on July 1, 1998, to discuss the report and its recommendations.
3. Staff of the Division for Church in Society sent the final report and its recommendations to the division’s board on September 11, 1998, for the board’s September 24-26, 1998, meeting.
4. The final report was submitted to the Church Council in November 1998.

E. The History of Disability Ministries and Deaf Ministry

1. Pre-merger Disability Ministries’ Work

Corresponding to the United Nations General Assembly’s proclamation of 1981 as the International Year of Disabled Persons, two of the three predecessor church bodies of the

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) affirmed churchwide ministry with persons with disabilities in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Both The American Lutheran Church (ALC), based in Minneapolis, and the Lutheran Church in America (LCA), headquartered in New York, brought forth fruitful ministries with persons with disabilities. The ALC's ministry with persons with disabilities began as a ministry with the deaf, known as Ephphatha, in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. In the late 1970s, Ephphatha moved to Minneapolis and became a nationally recognized ministry of The American Lutheran Church. Ministry with the blind, consisting of the production of braille and audiotaped materials, also joined Ephphatha. Around 1983, the ALC transformed Ephphatha from a ministry with persons who are deaf and who are blind to a ministry with all persons with disabilities, known as the ALC Ephphatha Services, Ministry with Persons with Disabilities.

Ephphatha prospered under the director, Pr. Lawrence Bunde. Pr. Bunde's work focused on the production of braille and tape materials and deaf ministry. From 1983 until the creation of the ELCA, Ms. Melodee Lane Rossi worked as the program specialist for disability ministries. Ms. Rossi created a curriculum for persons with developmental disabilities in partnership with Augsburg Publishing House and ministered with persons with chronic mental illness and their families. Other staff between 1983 and the merger included Mr. Larry Foreman who worked on public relations and fund-raising, and Ms. Karen Hoppe who was the brailist.

Ms. Rossi launched a series of activities to reach out to persons with mental illness and their families. She found that pastors who have been out working in parish ministry appreciate the importance of possessing the skills and knowledge needed to minister with persons with disabilities and their family members. As a result, she developed a week-long continuing education class to provide training about mental illness to rostered persons through Kairos, the continuing education program at Luther Seminary in St. Paul, Minnesota. She worked on the founding of the St. Louis based Pathways to Promise, an interfaith organization reaching out to those who have mental illness and producing mental illness ministry resources. In 1987, Mr. Foreman and Ms. Rossi created a video "A Place to Come Back To" for persons with mental illness and their families.

Ms. Rossi developed the concept of networks for ministering with persons with disabilities in the former ALC, laying the foundation for the current ELCA's structure and activities in disability ministries. She gathered persons with disabilities in networks for consultation and to develop leadership among the members. A mental illness and a developmental disabilities network are the two she created.

While the predominant focus in the ALC was on programming, the focus in the Lutheran Church in America was on Christian education. In 1979, Ms. Carolyn Schmidt, secretary for exceptionality, became the first LCA staff person with a portfolio responsible for work with persons with disabilities. Requests for Christian education materials for persons with mental retardation from the LCA Metropolitan New York Synod and LCA Upper New York Synod propelled the creation of her position.

Ms. Schmidt developed a congregational resource, "Tips for Congregations Working with Disabled Persons." The "Tips for Congregations" began as a single information sheet for Sunday school teachers and in 1980, in preparation for the 1981 International Year of Disabled Persons, expanded into a Christian educators guide for children and adults with disabilities.

Shortly before the creation of the ELCA in 1988, Ms. Schmidt produced an adaptation for persons with mental retardation and learning disabilities of the newly designed LCA confirmation materials. She contracted with four people to write the adaptation, maintaining

a fourth-grade reading level for children with learning and developmental disabilities. The material written on each page of the adaption corresponded with the material written on each page of the initial text. The purpose of the corresponding pages was to dispel the fact that there were two different books. Using the corresponding pages allowed the confirmation instructor to say, "Please turn to page 25," and every confirmation student would be able to turn to page 25. Ms. Schmidt had hoped to develop workshop training to accompany the adaption, but the merger occurred shortly after the books were distributed.

Ms. Schmidt participated in the National Council of the Churches of Christ (NCC) Task Force on Developmental Disabilities and Committee on Ministry with People who are Deaf or Hearing Impaired. In addition, Ms. Schmidt started two communication and networking efforts which continue in the current disability ministries' structure: synodical task forces and a disability ministries' newsletter.

2. Disability Ministries and Deaf Ministry in the ELCA

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America's (ELCA) disability ministries and deaf ministry are woven throughout the expressions of this church: the churchwide organization, the synods, and the congregations. In the churchwide organization, disability ministries and deaf ministry occur through many units. The Division for Church in Society has the primary responsibility for the churchwide disability ministries program and is charged by the ELCA constitution "to assist the [ELCA] in inclusive ministry with and among persons with disabilities." The Division for Church in Society also is assigned as the lead unit for deaf ministry in accord with Church Council actions. The division enjoys partnerships with the Division for Outreach, Women of the ELCA, the Division for Congregational Ministries, the Commission for Multicultural Ministries, the Division for Ministry, and the Office of the Presiding Bishop in accomplishing the tasks involved with disability ministries and deaf ministry. The churchwide program shares a partnership in the work of the ELCA's disability ministries and deaf ministry with the networks, congregations, synodical disability committees, and the National Council of the Churches of Christ Committee on Disabilities and Deaf Ministries Committee.

During the 1991 restructuring of the churchwide organization, the Division for Social Ministry Organizations (DSMO) and the Commission for Church in Society combined to create the Division for Church in Society. Prior to 1991, the DSMO carried out the work of disability ministries.

Ms. E. J. Lugo served as the director for disability ministries from 1988 to 1989, and Mr. Dennis Busse worked as the director from 1990 to 1997. During the interval between Ms. Lugo and Mr. Busse, Ms. Ruth Reko, currently the director for staff and board development and the associate director of Lutheran Services in America, provided staff support and hired the Rev. Frederick K. Neu as the disability ministries consultant. As with a number of other churchwide staff positions in the early years of the ELCA, the director for disability ministries began as a full-time position decreased to a half-time position, and ended in 1997 as a quarter-time position.

3. ELCA Disability Ministries Networks

The networks are organized on behalf of people with specific disabilities, and these networks are the Lutheran Network for Mental Illness/Brain Disorders (LNMI), the Braille and Tape Ministry, the Definitely Abled Advisory Committee (DAC), and the Lutheran Developmental Disabilities Coalition (LDDC). Mr. Busse's vision for a decentralized approach, the influence of past joint efforts with The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod, and

churchwide assembly resolutions regarding ministry with persons with disabilities affected the decision to concentrate the work of the churchwide disability ministries on the networks.

Mr. Busse moved away from the ALC and LCA's tradition of a centralized system of providing all resources for disability ministries from the churchwide offices. Based on the belief that persons with disabilities, their family members, and professionals in the various disability fields are much better able to serve as resources to the synods and congregations, his vision was to develop networks of persons to carry out the most important disability ministries' work. As a result, disability ministries became a funding and leadership development source for the networks and synodical disability committees.

Mr. Busse began working shortly before the LCMS and ELCA Task Force on Disabilities meeting was held in St. Louis on February 26 and 27, 1990, to determine the feasibility of further joint ministry efforts, previously carried out through the Commission on Ministry with the Handicapped. Since 1980, the ELCA, its predecessor church bodies, and the LCMS have cooperated in ministry with persons with disabilities. The former Lutheran Council in the USA, composed of the four Lutheran church bodies, established the Commission on Ministry with the Handicapped at its annual meeting on May 13 and 14, 1980. In January 1981, the commission members changed the name to the Lutheran Commission on Ministry with Disabled Persons. In operation from 1980 to 1987, the commission's initial focus was preparation for the Lutheran participation in the International Year of Disabled Persons and ministry with persons with mental retardation and with sensory challenges. In December 1987, the commission completed its work and recommended that the ELCA and the LCMS create a vehicle, similar to the commission, to coordinate their separate efforts to minister with persons with disabilities. Discussions to renew joint efforts began in March 1988.

The participants of the February 1990 meeting advanced the commission's recommendation for continued joint efforts, and after the meeting, staff of the Division for Church in Society began preparations by recruiting persons with disabilities to serve on a joint committee. At the May 15, 1990, meeting in St. Louis, the LCMS and ELCA participants decided upon the structure: one staff person from the LCMS and one from the ELCA to serve as co-chairpersons of a small steering committee, the Interfaith Working Group on Ministries with Persons with Handicapping Conditions. The steering committee would oversee the work of disability-specific working groups, namely seven committees representing seven different groups of persons with disabilities: deaf, blind, mentally retarded, mentally ill, physically challenged, learning disabled, and environmentally disabled. On June 16, 1990, the first and only steering committee meeting was held in Chicago. Although the steering committee was abandoned after the June 1990 meeting, the concept of disability-specific working groups paved the way for the future of the ELCA's churchwide disability ministries.

ELCA Braille and Tape Service

In January 1988, the former Division for Social Ministry Organizations—in partnership with Augsburg Fortress, Publishers—began a braille and tape service. The service continued the taping and braille work of Ephphatha Services, a ministry of the former American Lutheran Church, and the taping service of the Lutheran Resource Center for the Visually Handicapped of the Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod of the former Lutheran Church in America.

The service makes available to persons with visual and other physical disabilities certain ELCA publications, curricula, and other printed materials either in braille or on audiotapes.

The Lutheran, *Lutheran Woman Today*, and *Christ in Our Home* are offered on audiotape. *The Lutheran Women Today* Bible study is available in braille. Volunteers assist with the preparation of these materials. Individual requests are made available on audiotape and in braille.

Since March 1989, the former division board, the board of the Division for Church in Society, and staff have sought alternative methods to fund the service. Over several years, staff developed a plan to hire a consultant to solicit individual donations and to seek grants from foundations. Beginning in May 1998, the Division for Church in Society contracted with the Rev. Duane Steele as the ELCA braille and tape ministry consultant.

Lutheran Network on Mental Illness/Brain Disorders (LNMI)

In 1993, staff of the Division for Church in Society formed the pan-Lutheran LNMI to address the concerns of the memorials regarding mental illness ministry brought to the 1989 and 1991 Churchwide Assemblies. Staff of the Division for Church in Society structured LNMI to be led by a steering committee. The steering committee then coordinated a network of synodical contacts and congregational resource persons. The synodical contact persons were charged to become agents of education, acceptance, support, understanding, and healing for those with mental illness and those affected by the mental illness of others. The initial goal was to find one contact person per synod. After recruiting synodical contact persons, the steering committee hosted a leadership training conference for the synod contacts on October 7-9, 1994, in Minneapolis. Forty-five persons representing 31 ELCA synods and three LCMS districts attended. After 1995, the maintenance of the synodical contact person network has declined.

Beginning in 1996, LNMI initiated the first national All-Lutheran Candlelighting for Mental Illness to mark the beginning of Mental Illness Awareness Week in October. LNMI members were asked to encourage their congregation to host at their worship service a candlelighting to light a candle and say a prayer for the mentally ill and their families. Each year, the LNMI steering committee prepares and distributes worship resources for the candlelighting. The All-Lutheran Candlelighting has continued through 1997 and 1998.

The LNMI steering committee produced newsletters and a video "A Challenge and Opportunity for God's People." The steering committee's greatest unmet need is to provide training for rostered persons about ministry with persons with mental illness and their family members.

Lutheran Developmental Disabilities Coalition (LDDC)

Formed in 1996, the Lutheran Developmental Disabilities Coalition is headed by the representatives from the major affiliated social ministry organizations serving persons with developmental disabilities. LDDC hosts pan-Lutheran conferences addressing the spiritual needs of persons with developmental disabilities. On September 22-24, 1995, LDDC held "Woven Together in Christ" Conference on Spiritual Care for Persons with Developmental Disabilities in Milwaukee, Wis., and on May 3-4, 1997, in Chicago, the "Spark Plug" Reunion and Renewal Conference. Both staff of social ministry organizations and lay leaders participate in planning the conferences. On October 9-11, 1998, in Omaha, Neb., a Spiritual Life Conference on Ministry with Persons with Developmental Disabilities, sponsored by LDDC, was held.

Definitely Abled Advisory Committee (DAC) and the Definitely Abled Youth Leadership Event (DAYLE)

The Division for Congregational Ministries, under the Department for Youth Ministries, has hosted four DAYLE gatherings: 1988 (San Antonio), 1991 (Dallas), 1994 (Atlanta), and 1997 (New Orleans). The purpose of DAYLE is to act as a network and to facilitate full participation and leadership development for youth with disabilities at the ELCA Youth Gathering. DAYLE is held for the three days prior to the Youth Gathering; at the 2000 Youth Gathering, however, it is expected that DAYLE will be held between the two five-day Youth Gatherings. DAYLE originally was named the Differently Abled Youth Leadership Event, but in 1997, it was changed to the Definitely Abled Youth Leadership Event. At the 1997 DAYLE, participants came believing that they could not participate in church activities and leadership because of their disability, and the participants left DAYLE not wanting to leave and asking to take on more. Elections for the Definitely Abled Advisory Committee (DAC) were held at the 1997 DAYLE, and every single DAYLE participant ran for one of the DAC positions.

At its 1997 convention, the Lutheran Youth Organization (LYO) created the Definitely Abled Advisory Committee (DAC) with the purpose of lifting up the concerns of youth with disabilities. DAC consists of a chairperson, a secretary, a DAC representative to the LYO board, and a LYO board representative to DAC. The Department for Youth Ministries of the Division for Congregational Ministries has contracted with Ms. Mandy Kent to serve as the adult advisor to DAC. In February 1998, DAC met in Chicago and established their goals: to increase awareness of DAYLE and to facilitate disability awareness training. In attaining these goals, DAC sponsored disability awareness training at the March 1998 meeting of the LYO board, and DAC has produced a video resource, "A Place of Grace," for synods and congregations to increase awareness about DAYLE.

4. ELCA Deaf Ministry

The ELCA churchwide organization makes a distinction between the needs of culturally deaf persons and hard-of-hearing persons. The primary language of culturally deaf persons is American Sign Language (ASL); and the primary language of persons who are hard-of-hearing is English. Many persons who are deaf desire not to be identified as a disability group as they are limited only in communication with hearing persons. The deaf ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America serves culturally deaf persons. The Division for Church in Society recognizes this distinction in its work and considers the needs of hard-of-hearing persons as an accessibility issue.

Deaf ministry is a partnership of three units: the Division for Outreach, the Commission for Multicultural Ministries, and the Division for Church in Society as the lead unit. The Division for Outreach addresses the needs of the deaf ministry congregations; the Division for Church in Society facilitates the Evangelical Lutheran Deaf Association (ELDA); the Commission for Multicultural Ministries assists the deaf community in becoming full partners and participants in the life of this church by reviewing ELCA policies and practices related to the deaf community, monitoring program directions, and assisting in developing strategies and plans. The three churchwide units coordinate their efforts through inter-unit meetings. The Division for Church in Society has contracted with Ms. Beth Lockard, M.Ed., mission developer for Christ the King Deaf Lutheran Church, as the ELCA deaf ministry consultant. Ms. Lockard acts as a liaison with Evangelical Lutheran Deaf Association and consults with the Division for Outreach in regard to deaf ministry congregations.

In 1995, the board of the Division for Outreach developed a Strategy for Deaf Ministries to guide its actions in working with synods and congregations, and to support and encourage self-sufficiency of deaf ministry congregations. Prior to the board's adoption, the deaf community and the board of the Evangelical Lutheran Deaf Association reviewed the strategy. The strategy emphasizes that the Division for Outreach seeks out deaf ministries that are partnerships, strategic, and based on Word and Sacrament, and does not financially support sign language interpreters at hearing congregations.

As a part of the consultations with members of the deaf community, the ELCA conducted a deaf ministry survey in May 1993. The survey participants listed their priorities: to employ pastors who are deaf; to equip all synods with a TTY 800 number; to provide leadership training for deaf people by deaf people; and to establish an ELCA Department for the Deaf. The survey identified the ideal deaf ministry as independent; employing a pastor who is deaf; sponsoring its own mission projects; and tailoring worship and Christian education materials to persons who are deaf, not translated from materials intended for a hearing congregation.

Another unit, assigned as a deaf ministry partner by the ELCA Church Council actions, is the Division for Higher Education and Schools. The Department for Schools in the Division for Higher Education and Schools, in collaboration with The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod, relates to Mill Neck Manor School for the Deaf in New York. In the mid-1970s, Congress passed Federal Law 94142 requiring free and appropriate education for children with disabilities and children who are deaf. Since the 1980s, with the availability of free public education for students who are deaf, Lutheran schools for the deaf have focused on ministries with students with disabilities. In addition, several ELCA colleges and universities offer courses in American Sign Language and prepare students for careers in special education.

Deaf Ministry Memorials

The current ELCA deaf ministry structure results from the deaf ministry memorials brought to the 1989, 1991, and 1993 Churchwide Assemblies. At the 1989 Churchwide Assembly, the Metropolitan Chicago Synod memorialized the churchwide organization to remove ministry with the deaf from the former Division for Social Ministry Organizations and to place the ministry within the Commission for Multicultural Ministries. The 1989 Churchwide Assembly referred this matter to the Commission for Multicultural Ministries and the Division for Social Ministry Organizations, in consultation with the ELCA Church Council.

Upon the recommendation of the two units, and following consultation with the deaf community, the Church Council affirmed at its April 1991 meeting that: persons who are deaf are to be viewed as having a unique culture with its own language (American Sign Language); the Division for Congregational Ministries, Division for Ministry, Division for Outreach, the Division for Higher Education and Schools, the Commission for Multicultural Ministries, and the Division for Church in Society share churchwide responsibility for deaf ministry; a multi-unit approach to deaf ministry is necessary because deaf issues touch the responsibilities of these various units; and to coordinate these efforts, the Division for Church in Society is to serve as the lead unit.

The 1993 Churchwide Assembly referred to the Church Council a similar memorial, which requested the deaf community to be one of the communities served by the Commission

for Multicultural Ministries. The Church Council, having reviewed this matter again, reaffirmed its 1991 position, and the board of the Division for Church in Society approved this recommendation in 1994. This action was reported to the 1995 Churchwide Assembly.

Evangelical Lutheran Deaf Association (ELDA)

In August 1990, the Lutheran Church Workers with the Deaf (LCWD), a gathering of ten ministers who work with persons who are deaf in ELCA parishes, met at Luther Northwestern Theological Seminary in St. Paul, Minn., to share ideas about deaf ministry in the ELCA. The ministers decided to hold annual meetings and to include their congregational members. As a result, LCWD hosted their second annual meeting, with attendance from congregational members, at Carthage College in Kenosha, Wis., on August 16-18, 1991.

At the 1992 LCWD meeting in Pennsylvania, ELCA members who are deaf voted to form a new ELCA organization, the Evangelical Lutheran Deaf Association (ELDA). ELDA appointed board members and chose to continue the annual meetings, later changed to biennial meetings. At the June 17-20, 1993, ELDA retreat, "Worship: Rejoice and Sing Sign," held in Minneapolis, hearing persons no longer led the sessions, but the retreat was a signed event and translated for the hearing. ELDA biennial retreats continue with the 1998 ELDA Retreat on August 13-16 at the Mount Olivet Retreat Center in Farmington, Minn.

Along with ELDA, the National Council of Churches Deaf Ministries Committee has provided a rich source of leadership development and fellowship for the ELCA's deaf ministry. Prior to 1991, representatives from the various denominations participating in the NCC Deaf Ministries Committee were mostly hearing persons. Starting in 1991, the Deaf Ministries Committee staff asked denominations to send representatives who are deaf and hard-of-hearing persons. Currently, Ms. Beth Lockard serves as the NCC coordinator for the Deaf Ministries Committee.

5. Synodical Disability Teams

At the 1991 Churchwide Assembly, several synods memorialized the ELCA to develop synodical disability teams. The teams would assist congregations in their efforts to include persons with disabilities in all aspects of congregational life. The memorials used the term *team*, rather than *committee*, with the expectation that synods would be able to create a synodical disability team without a demand upon synodical staff for direct support. Some synods set up the team to report to a formal synodical committee such as the Social Ministry Committee. To promote synodical disability teams, a Synod Disability Team Leaders Conference was planned for October 21-23, 1994, but was canceled in March 1994 due to decreased funding at the ELCA.

Although approximately 13 synods have synod disability teams, these teams have served as a source of immense energy and commitment for disability ministries. Activities of the teams have included synodical assembly displays, synodical assembly workshops, on-site assistance to assembly voting members with disabilities, recognition of accessible congregations, architectural accessibility surveys of the churches in a synod, inclusion brochures sent to congregations in a synod, disability awareness Sunday materials and activities, family retreats, summer camp access for persons with disabilities, presentation of synodical resolutions and memorials, on-site architectural accessibility consultations, and identification of persons with disabilities to serve in leadership roles.

6. History of Funding

In October 1990, the former Division for Social Ministry Organizations (DSMO) voted to combine The American Lutheran Church's endowment and money from the ELCA restricted gifts given on behalf of persons with disabilities to establish the ELCA's Ephphatha Endowment. The Ephphatha Endowment provides approximately \$12,000 to \$15,000 of interest per year. This interest is placed into the Ephphatha Fund, a restricted fund, and designated for ELCA disability ministries. In 1994, the board of the Division for Church in Society established a minimum of \$50,000 to be held at any time in the Ephphatha Fund. Staff for disability ministries use the money from the Ephphatha Fund to support the programmatic work of the ministry. Staff's salary, travel, and other nonprogrammatic costs for disability ministries are not paid from the Ephphatha Fund.

7. History of Churchwide Assembly Memorials and Resolutions Pertaining to Persons with Disabilities

Prior to 1997, the Churchwide Assembly acted upon five groups of memorials pertaining to persons with disabilities. They are the 1989 and 1991 memorials regarding mental illness ministry, the 1991 memorials regarding synodical disability teams, the 1989 memorial regarding inclusivity for persons with disabilities, and the 1991 memorials regarding closed captioning. In addition to these memorials, the board of the Division for Congregational Ministries reviewed and transmitted to the ELCA Church Council for the council's April 1995 meeting a resolution regarding the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The resolution had been adopted by the 1994 convention of the Lutheran Youth Organization (LYO). The Church Council also has considered numerous actions regarding inclusivity concerning hiring policies, insurance benefits, and rostered persons.

A 1989 Churchwide Assembly memorial called upon the churchwide organization, through the former Division for Social Ministry Organizations (DSMO), to assist congregations in become more welcoming places for persons with mental illness and their families. The DSMO responded to the Memorials Committee that:

...all churchwide materials developed by the predecessor church bodies relating to mental illness were critically examined...and would be updated and/or republished by the Division for Social Ministry Organizations as resources permit. In 1990, the division plans to have a staff person devoting half time to our church's ministry with persons with mental illness. A chief responsibility of this staff position will be to assist congregations, synods, social ministry organizations, and the churchwide organization in this important aspect of mission through new program development and education, and to facilitate the ELCA's participation in ecumenical and inter-faith endeavors related to mental health.

In 1991, the ELCA convened a Lutheran network during the annual meeting of the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI) conference, and two synods memorialized the ELCA about the needs of persons with mental illness and their families. The Division for Social Ministry Organizations responded to the memorials by continuing the efforts started by the 1989 memorials.

In 1989, the Northeastern Iowa Synod memorialized the ELCA to "consider relevant sections of the ELCA constitution and bylaws in order to include persons with disabilities." The Memorials Committee referred the memorial to the Church Council to find appropriate ways to enhance inclusion for persons with disabilities in consultation with the former Division for Social Ministry Organizations, now the Division for Church in Society. As a result, the DSMO staff sponsored "Celebrate the Challenge," a churchwide Consultation on Ministry with Persons with Disabilities held in February 1991 in Chicago. Approximately

130 persons participated in the three-day consultation. The consultation highlighted the talents and gifts of ELCA members advocating for an enhanced ministry with persons with disabilities. In response to the 1989 memorial, the ELCA Church Council recommended declining specific legislative representation for persons with disabilities at their April 1991 meeting. The Church Council also forwarded the Lutheran Youth Organization (LYO) board's March 1991 request to include persons with disabilities in the constitutional definition of inclusivity.

In 1991, the Nebraska Synod submitted a resolution to the ELCA Church Council to encourage full participation of persons with disabilities in this church. The Church Council transmitted to the Nebraska Synod the action taken by the 1991 Churchwide Assembly on the memorials in regard to synodical disability teams.

In 1991, several synods memorialized the ELCA to develop a closed captioning policy. The response to the Memorials Committee stated that the former Commission for Communication, now known as the Department for Communication, was completing an analysis of closed captioning, and then would set a policy for closed captioning.

Section II—A Vision and Strategic Response

A. The Values of the ELCA's Disability Ministries

Inclusion occurs when the Gospel moves people's hearts to welcome all God's people. Inclusion comes alive in the body of Christ through architectural, attitudinal, physical, and intellectual access for all to the Church's community, worship, activities, witness, and leadership. Inclusion invites all God's people to grow in personal dignity, experience the gift of diversity, and share in the call for mutual respect and love. When God's Spirit enables the body of Christ to dare new avenues of hospitality with our neighbors, all involved become empowered as a result.

1. Disability ministries proclaim the unique culture and language, American Sign Language (ASL), of those of us who are persons who are deaf and recognize the distinction between ELCA churchwide deaf ministry and disability ministries. We look to those of us who are persons who are deaf to identify our community's values, and where appropriate, deaf ministry incorporates the values stated below. We consider the needs of those of us who are persons who are hard-of-hearing as an accessibility issue.

2. The ELCA's churchwide disability ministries are a ministry "with" people and not a ministry "for" or "to" people. Often, one focuses on what one can do for a person with a disability; instead, we look to the talents and gifts that we who are persons with disabilities bring to the Church.

3. Disability ministries empower persons who have a special commitment to be the leaders of the ministries.

4. Disability ministries call upon the body of Christ to be a hospitable Church for those of us who are persons with disabilities and our family members. In striving to be a hospitable Church, our attention focuses on attitudinal barriers that are as much of a hindrance as architectural barriers. Architectural access is the means by which we, who are persons with disabilities, enter our church buildings and use the physical facilities. Attitudinal barriers, intentional and unintentional beliefs, work to deny our full participation in our church's worship, Christian education, and activities. We desire full participation through our own uniqueness, talents, and individual needs, not by meeting able-bodied standards.

5. As a part of attitudinal access, disability ministries use affirming language, looking to the person first. For example, we use the words "persons with disabilities," instead of "disabled persons."

6. Disability ministries strive for consistency in policy, staff leadership, and funding.
7. Disability ministries strive to be holistic and integrated throughout the ELCA churchwide organization and other expressions of this church, namely the synods and congregations.
8. Disability ministries seek gender, cultural, and racial diversity in our leadership and participation.
9. Disability ministries function to unify the networks and synodical disability teams.
10. Disability ministries invite ecumenical partnerships whenever possible.

B. Division for Church in Society's Recommendations

The Division for Church in Society would like to thank the advisory committee, the consultants, the synodical disability teams, the networks, and all of the individuals who responded to the questionnaire for their input. The Division for Church in Society has taken very seriously the responses we have received and have based our recommendations upon the many participants' advice.

The first four items and item ten of this section of recommendations contain our response to the resolutions and memorials from the 1997 Churchwide Assembly and the ELCA Church Council. The other items contain recommendations which were developed in the course of the Comprehensive Study.

1. Deaf Ministry Memorials¹

The Division for Church in Society recommends that, along with the entire churchwide organization, the division lift up the unique culture and language of deaf persons (American

1 Southeastern Minnesota Synod (3I)

WHEREAS, at present Deaf Ministry does not have sufficient support from the ELCA on a national level; and

WHEREAS, the former American Lutheran Church had a national Ephphatha office which helped fund several churches/ministries throughout the U.S.; and

WHEREAS, when the three Lutheran church bodies became the ELCA, Deaf Ministry was not included under the "disability" part of the Church in Society Division; and

WHEREAS, this has resulted in the closing of ministries with the deaf throughout the ELCA, depriving many hearing impaired people of the grace of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and

WHEREAS, closed captioning videos or signing, curriculum adapted for the deaf, recommendations for building design that facilitate ability to see a speaker, for lip reading or for signing are ways the ministry of Jesus Christ can be made more accessible; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Southeastern Minnesota Synod memorialize the ELCA Churchwide Assembly to set up a national office for ministry with the deaf under the Division for Outreach as a multicultural ministry; therefore be it further

RESOLVED, that the Southeastern Minnesota Synod memorialize the ELCA to include hearing impairment as an accessibility issue in the design of church programs and structures under the Division for Church in Society.

Metropolitan New York Synod (7C)

WHEREAS, American Sign Language (ASL) is not only the language of the Deaf Community in America, but part of their heritage and a source of pride in their culture; and

WHEREAS, American Sign Language is recognized as a foreign language by the Board of Regents of the State of New York and others with respect to second language requirements for high school graduation, and by over 70 colleges and universities including Harvard, Yale, Georgetown, Brown, MIT, the State University of New York and the University of Minnesota as a foreign language for college admissions; and

WHEREAS, linguists and other language specialists have acknowledged that ASL meets the requirements necessary to qualify as a distinct language; and

WHEREAS, the implied intent of the sections of the constitutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Women of the ELCA referring to committee membership and delegate body diversity which references "persons whose primary language is other than English is to include persons of differing cultures and to make the church more inclusive; and

WHEREAS, Women of the ELCA at both the Second and Third Triennial Conventions affirmed their support of a constitutional change which would include ASL as a "Language other than English in issues with respect to committee memberships and delegates but was informed that the Women of the ELCA Constitution must be parallel to the Constitution of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and

WHEREAS, Metropolitan New York Women of the ELCA at its convention held September 21, 1996, adopted a resolution requesting the Metropolitan New York Synod of the ELCA to memorialize the church for constitutional change; and

WHEREAS, some congregations of Metropolitan New York Synod have Deaf Ministries which seek to include Deaf persons in the total life of the church; and

(continued...)

Sign Language); the division renew its deaf ministry inter-unit partnership with the Division for Outreach and the Commission for Multicultural Ministries; the division distinguish in its structure and budget deaf ministry as separate from disability ministries; and the primary responsibility for deaf ministry should remain with the Division for Church in Society. The following recommendations are also inclusive of Deaf Ministry where appropriate as determined by persons who are deaf.

2. "Representation" Resolution²

The Division for Church in Society recommends that the ELCA Nominating Committee should strive to ensure that at least one member of all churchwide boards, steering committees, advisory committees, and the church council be a person with a disability; the Division for Church in Society should recruit persons with disabilities to be included on the list which is annually submitted to the Office of the Secretary of the ELCA and forwarded to the Nominating Committee; and the Division for Church in Society should seek out an opportunity to meet with the Nominating Committee to discuss inclusivity of persons with disabilities in churchwide leadership positions.

1 (...continued)

WHEREAS, inclusion of American Sign Language as an acceptable language in the definition of the constitution's references to "primary language other than English" would not mandate the inclusion of members of the Deaf community, but rather make them eligible for inclusion in a group of persons whose culture and language differs from the majority; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Metropolitan New York Synod of the ELCA memorialize the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for constitutional change to insert American Sign Language in its definition of language other than English.

Virginia Synod (9A)

WHEREAS, American Sign Language (ASL) is not only the language of the deaf community in America, but part of their heritage and a source of pride in their culture; and

WHEREAS, linguists and other language specialists have acknowledged that ASL meets the requirements necessary to qualify as a language; and

WHEREAS, because of difficulties in communication and other different issues, the deaf community is a unique and special community; and

WHEREAS, there are congregations in the ELCA whose main mission is to minister to the deaf community; and

WHEREAS, Women of the ELCA recognizes the deaf community as a unique culture and American Sign Language as a language other than English; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Virginia Synod, ELCA, recognize the deaf community as unique culture and American Sign Language as a language other than English; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Virginia Synod provide for American Sign Language at Virginia Synod assemblies and other synod events whenever indication of such need arises; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Virginia Synod communicate this action to the ELCA for review and further action.

2 Upon the recommendation of its Committee of Reference and Counsel, the 1997 Churchwide Assembly took the following action:

To approve in principle the following resolutions regarding persons with disabilities:

(1) Submitted by Ms. Sunshine B. Keiser [Southwestern Pennsylvania]:

WHEREAS, persons without disabilities generally are not aware or do not understand the challenging realities faced each and every day by persons with disabilities; and

WHEREAS, the voice of persons with disabilities is not adequately represented in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and

WHEREAS, the board of the Lutheran Youth Organization is the only churchwide board to provide a seat for persons with disabilities; and

WHEREAS, there are seats provided for persons of color and/or persons whose primary language is other than English on all churchwide councils, committees, boards, or other organizational units, but not for persons with disabilities; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the 1997 Churchwide Assembly strongly encourage that at least one person with a disability be included on all churchwide councils, committees, boards, or other organizational units. . . .

and

To request that the Church Council bring a recommendation for action to the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly.

3. Resolution on “Protecting the Rights for Persons with Disabilities”³

The Division for Church in Society recommends that the division’s Department for Studies prepare a document that interprets and applies extant ELCA social policy and guides the practice of the ELCA and its public witness regarding persons with disabilities (“Policies and Procedures of the ELCA for Addressing Social Concerns,” Sphere 4).

4. “Commission” Resolution—Calling for a Commission for Persons with Disabilities⁴

The Division for Church in Society’s recommendations in regard to this resolution are included under the recommendations on structure.

5. Pastors—Call process for pastors who are persons with disabilities and the candidacy process for seminarians who are persons with disabilities

In February 1992, three clergy who are persons with disabilities, in partnership with the Division for Church in Society and the Division for Ministry, created the Working Group on Disabilities—Seminaries and Candidacy to produce a printed resource with suggestions for congregational call committees, synodical candidacy committees, and seminary and synodical staff members regarding rostered persons who are persons with disabilities. Drafts of the printed resource were completed. The expectation was to expand the project to include a network of rostered persons who are persons with disabilities to serve as mentors to seminarians and other clergy who are persons with disabilities.

Mindful of the initial progress of the Working Group on Disabilities—Seminaries and Candidacy, the Division for Church in Society recommends that the efforts of the working group should resume; the printed resource should be completed; and the Division for Church in Society should renew its partnership with the Division for Ministry and the Department

3 Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod (8G)

WHEREAS, we read that those with vision impairments and those who could not walk were welcomed by Jesus in the temple where he healed them; and

WHEREAS, we believe that discrimination on the basis of one’s abilities is always sinful and without justification, and that its price can never be justified by some other cause; and

WHEREAS, God has called us to a kingdom in which all persons stand on the one ground of His grace and call in Christ Jesus our Lord; and

WHEREAS, God requires us to deal with each other on that basis now in equal opportunities for education, health care, employment, housing and recreation; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Metropolitan Washington D.C., Synod in assembly encourage all members of our congregations to heed the New Testament vision so that, like Jesus himself, we welcome persons with disabilities into the community of Christ, reach out to those with disabilities providing opportunities for them in our society for employment, health care, education, shelter and any other civil rights extended to all Americans; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Metropolitan Washington D.C., Synod in assembly direct the secretary of the synod to forward this resolution to the Church Council for consideration and possible action to discern when to support and when to confront society’s cultural patterns, values, and powers concerning disabilities.

4 Submitted by Mr. Jeffrey L. Kane [New England Synod]:

WHEREAS, persons without disabilities are not generally aware or do not understand the challenging realities faced each and every day by persons with disabilities; and

WHEREAS, the voice of persons with disabilities is not adequately represented in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America nor are people with disabilities full partner or participants with equal opportunity within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Churchwide Assembly direct the Church Council to:

- Review the work of ministry with people with disabilities that has occurred over the last ten years in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; and
- Study the possibility and need for establishing a churchwide commission for people with disabilities; and
- Bring a recommendation back to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly for action.

and

To request that the Church Council bring a recommendation for action to the 1999 ELCA Churchwide Assembly.

for Synodical Relations to sponsor the working group and to participate in continued efforts to ensure equal opportunity employment for persons with disabilities as ELCA rostered persons.

6. Training for Seminarians, Rostered Persons, Churchwide Staff, and Lay Leaders

The Division for Church in Society recommends that the division—in partnership with the Office of the Presiding Bishop (for churchwide staff), seminary presidents and deans (for collegial conversations about seminaries), the Division for Ministry (for continuing education programs and clinical pastoral education), and the Conference of Bishops (for congregations, lay leaders, rostered persons, and synodical structure)—should nurture a commitment for inclusive ministry with persons with disabilities as an holistic approach to mission. Ongoing educational and training opportunities are essential for this church’s inclusive ministry with persons with disabilities.

7. Congregations—Education and Worship

The Division for Church in Society recommends that:

- using the division’s database as one resource, the Division for Church in Society should develop a communication plan in collaboration with the Department for Communication including a definition of the target audiences of disability ministries;
- the Division for Church in Society, in partnership with the Division for Congregational Ministries (DCM), should select, promote, and distribute Disability Ministries resources and Christian education materials which are inclusive of persons with disabilities;
- the Division for Church in Society and the Division for Congregational Ministries should seek out resources already available from the National Council of the Churches of Christ Committee on Disabilities, Pathways to Promise, and our ecumenical partners;
- bi-annually a half-page insert listing resources on disability ministries and Christian education materials should be included in “Seeds for the Parish;”
- one disability ministries newsletter, including inserts for the networks which currently produce newsletters with assistance from the Division for Church in Society, should be produced in print and on audiotape;
- in partnership with the Division for Congregational Ministries education and evangelism team, the Division for Church in Society should develop a workshop for the Christian Education Network on how congregational members can locate and use Christian education materials that are inclusive of persons with disabilities;
- the Division for Church in Society should develop a plan for enhanced use of the Internet to communicate the work of disability ministries; and
- the Division for Church in Society should invite the Division for Congregational Ministries and Women of the ELCA to work collaboratively in the areas of worship, Christian education, and evangelism pertaining to ministry with persons with disabilities.

8. Congregations—Building Accessibility

The churchwide organization supports congregations and synods as they address architectural accessibility. Therefore, the Division for Church in Society recommends that no different course of action on behalf of the churchwide organization should be taken because sufficient printed resources regarding building accessibility exist; the Division for Outreach mandates that construction and renovation sponsored by ELCA loans must comply with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements; and the Division for Outreach

makes available to congregations building consultants who have expertise in ADA requirements.

9. Congregations–Definitely Abled Youth Leadership Event (DAYLE)

The Division for Church in Society recommends that the Division for Church in Society should seek a more active partnership with the Department for Youth Ministries of the Division for Congregational Ministries.

10. Disability Ministries and Deaf Ministry Structure

On the basis of the 1998 Comprehensive Study of Ministry with and among Persons who are Deaf and Persons with Disabilities, and in response to this church's history, and memorials and resolutions pertaining to this ministry, the Division for Church in Society recommends that:

- the Division for Church in Society should employ a full-time director for disability ministries;
- a small advisory committee with rotating membership serving as the intersection for the networks and synodical disability teams should be created;
- the Division for Church in Society should seek to strengthen its mutual engagement with the National Council of the Churches of Christ Committee on Disabilities (One result of the Division for Church in Society's conversations with the three Reformed Churches and The Episcopal Church is the potential to share information and disability ministries resources. The NCC Committee on Disabilities provides the opportunity for the sharing to occur. The three Reformed Churches and The Episcopal Church participate in the NCC Committee on Disabilities.);
- the Division for Church in Society should seek a closer partnership with The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in the work of disability ministries;
- the Division for Church in Society should strengthen its relationship with the synod disability teams;
- deaf ministry, representing persons who are culturally deaf, should be separated from disability ministries within the structure of the Division for Church in Society; and
- the Division for Church in Society should contract with a part-time deaf ministry consultant.

C. Implementation Priorities

In 1999, the staff of the Division for Church in Society proposes to implement the following priority recommendations:

1. the structure of disability ministries and deaf ministry;
2. regarding education and worship, focusing on the development of the communication plan, the selection and distribution of disability ministries resources and Christian education materials that are inclusive of persons with disabilities, producing the bi-annual half-page insert in "Seeds for the Parish" and the disability ministries newsletter; and
3. the recommendation regarding training for seminarians, rostered persons, churchwide staff, and lay leaders.

The other recommendations in this report will be implemented as soon as resources permit thereafter.

Exhibit I

Report: Director for Rural Ministry Resources and Networking

BACKGROUND

The 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, having received memorials from the Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod and the Western North Dakota Synod related to rural ministry, took the following action [CA97.06.38]:

To reaffirm the commitment to ministry in small-town and rural settings that was set forth by the 1993 Churchwide Assembly;

To express deep appreciation for the ongoing and faithful work of synods, congregations, and their members who do ministry in small town and rural settings;

To express appreciation for the counsel, support, consultants, and resources that support small town and rural ministries, which have been provided by synods, synodical outreach committees, and churchwide units;

To refer the request for a rural ministries "desk" (found in the memorials of the Western North Dakota Synod and Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod) to the Division for Outreach, as it works for increased churchwide coordination of the activities that support small-town and rural ministry;

To encourage the Division for Outreach, as part of its ongoing work, to consult with persons who minister in small towns and rural settings and with staff members of other churchwide units, and to develop with them a plan for improving the coordination and effectiveness of those ministries;

To develop a plan for establishing a rural and small town ministries "desk" at the ELCA churchwide office. This plan shall be presented to the Church Council for action no later than at its spring 1998 meeting; and

To request that the Secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America convey this report and the Church Council's response to the Western North Dakota Synod and Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod.

+ + +

A consultation on this matter was convened by the Division for Outreach on February 26-27, 1998. The consultation prepared an extensive list of recommendations related to rural ministry. The report of the consultation indicated that these recommendations would have a significant impact on the Division for Outreach, Division for Congregational Ministries, Division for Church in Society, and Division for Ministry. Those recommendations also would have significant budgetary implications for the churchwide organization.

In response to the report on the consultation, the Church Council voted in April 1998 (CC98.04.11):

To request the Division for Outreach to bring to the November 1998 meeting of the Church Council a report and recommendation on staffing for rural ministry;

To request that this report be developed in consultation with the Division for Congregational Ministries, the Division for Ministry, the Division for Church in Society, and the Office of the Presiding Bishop; and

To request that the Office of the Presiding Bishop, in consultation with the Church Council's Budget and Finance Committee, review this report and recommendation prior to the Church Council's November 1998 meeting.

At the November 1998 meeting of the Church Council, the following report was received.

Response of the Division for Outreach, Division for Ministry, Division for Congregational Ministry, and Division for Church in Society

By action of the Church Council in April 1998, the Division for Outreach was given the responsibility of working with a broad group of persons from the Lutheran Center and from small town and rural settings to respond to the resolution.

A consultation was held in February 1998 of 20 persons, including small town and rural practitioners; assistants to bishops who work with small town and rural ministry; a representative of the Conference of Bishops; a seminary representative; and staff from the Office of the Presiding Bishop, the Division for Church in Society, the Division for Congregational Ministries, the Division for Ministry, the Division for Outreach, the Commission for Women, and the Commission for Multicultural Ministries. Participants were broadly representative of the interests of small town and rural ministry. That consultation recommended that a full-time executive staff person be in place by February 1, 1999, with a budget of \$200,000 for support staff, meetings of a steering committee, and program.

On June 1, 1998, unit executives and staff currently working on small town and rural ministry met to respond to the consultation recommendations. After hearing the history of the ELCA's response to small town and rural ministry, and after discussion of the consultation recommendation, the multi-unit group came to the following areas of agreement.

Areas of Agreement

- To be faithful to both the resolution and to the consultation of February 1998, a full or part-time person should be assigned the tasks related to the concept of a "rural desk." The most important of these tasks will be interpretation of issues and concerns related to small town and rural ministry and churchwide coordination of services to small town and rural settings.
- An essential part of the response to the resolution should be the creation of a standing advisory committee including bishops or persons recommended by the Conference of Bishops, representatives of at least the four churchwide divisions, a representative of a social ministry organization, a seminary dean, and up to six rural practitioners. This standing advisory committee could inform this church on the current realities of life in small town and rural communities in their broad diversity, and encourage and assist all expressions of this church in developing appropriate responses to serve the strengthening of ministry in these areas.
- Funding for the "rural desk" from churchwide unit budgets is extremely limited. It is agreed that the churchwide units would provide in-kind support through travel cost for staff to the standing committee, but that the dollars will need to come from outside of existing budgets.
- There is a need to package the resources available for small town and rural ministry so they may be clearly understood and readily accessed by persons in the field.
- Because of past history and current involvement through the Small Town and Rural Ministry Team, the location of the "rural desk" should be in the Division for Outreach.

- If the Division for Outreach houses the “rural desk,” there would need to be a clear designation of point persons from the partner units, strongly supported by these units, as they respond to rural ministry issues and concerns. The “rural desk” needs to be seen as a partnership between several units at the Lutheran Center and other expressions of this church.

Strategic Approach

As the group discussed the proposed “rural desk,” it was agreed that to begin, it would be desirable to start with a part-time staff person and the standing advisory committee, expecting that their first work might well be in the areas of interpretation and coordination, and that further development would come after experience over time as the staff person and advisory standing committee develop consensus on the needs that were to be addressed. The group asked the question of whether this kind of approach could assist this church in comprehensive planning across unit lines as to how the whole church responds to the significant rural segment of this church. Such a process could assist this church to examine where we are going as a church in small town and rural ministry and how it is that we would holistically plan to arrive at that future.

Since the June 1998 meeting, a note of urgency has been added to this proposal as new reports indicate a growing crisis, especially in rural mid-America, that may be even more severe than the rural crisis of the early 1980s. This proposal could significantly assist this church to respond to the critical concerns of many of the ELCA congregations and members.

Proposal

In response to the deeply-felt need of a specific contact at the Lutheran Center for small town and rural ministry, it is proposed that a one-half time staff person at an approximate cost of \$35,000, with at least a one-half time support staff at a cost of approximately \$17,000, be placed in the Division for Outreach beginning February 1, 1999. In addition, it is proposed that up to \$23,000 be allocated for development and operation of a standing advisory committee that would meet at least twice per year for a period of at least 24 hours and, more likely in the early stages, 48 hours, to assess conditions in small town and rural ministry and to propose to the appropriate expressions of the church actions that would empower and strengthen ministry in small town and rural settings.

It is proposed that funding for this response to the “rural desk” resolution come from new dollars designated by the Church Council.

+ + +

Division for Outreach Report to the Church Council on 1997 Churchwide Assembly Resolution on Establishing a “Rural Desk”

On February 26-27, 1998, a consultation sponsored by the Division for Outreach was held at the Lutheran Center to review the resolution and develop a recommendation for the April 1998 meeting of the ELCA Church Council. The consultation included rural practitioners, churchwide staff including the Small Town and Rural Team of the Division for Outreach, a representative of the seminary and rural institute community, and a bishop serving a synod with a substantial rural constituency. Participants reviewed the 1993

Churchwide Resolution on Rural Ministry, the report of the Harvest of Wisdom Consultation held as a follow-up to the 1993 resolution, and reports from churchwide units on the programs and services provided for small town and rural ministry.

Overview

In considering the 1997 Churchwide Assembly resolution [CA97.06.38], the consultation reviewed current programs and activities and also considered the history of this church and its predecessor bodies. The consultation determined the following:

1. There is a lack of coordination among the churchwide units as they develop programs and services for small town and rural congregations and communities.
2. There is a failure to communicate adequately to small town and rural congregations, ministries, and communities the programs and services that have been developed for this context.
3. Small town and rural clergy and lay leaders over a number of years have identified several needs and changes within this church to strengthen ministry in small town and rural ministry. Some progress has been made on a number of issues but some have either been inadequately addressed or ignored. Among these are a reporting system that takes seriously the reality of multiple point parishes, educational materials designed for use in small town and rural settings, and the need to equip laity for ministry in their congregations and communities.

Values

The consultation identified these values that underlie the response of this church to the needs and opportunities of small town and rural ministry.

We value:

- ! A church that articulates a theology of hope through the cross of Christ.
- ! A church that values, affirms, and uplifts small town and rural ministry.
- ! A church that values the diversity of the small town and rural context, hears and responds to unique gifts, opportunities, and needs.

Vision

Based on these values, the consultation is presenting a holistic vision for the ELCA that provides for ministry in small town and rural communities:

VISION FOR SMALL TOWN AND RURAL MINISTRY

As the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (congregations, synods, and churchwide expression), we will be empowered by the Gospel of Jesus Christ to change lives and communities in small town and rural areas.

Desired Outcomes

From the values and vision, the consultation came to a consensus on the following desired outcomes. The consultation believes that a Director for Small Town and Rural Ministries is necessary to achieve them.

Leadership: *Desired Outcome*

Congregations and communities will be sustained and energized by clergy and laity with a commitment to small town and rural ministry. These leaders will be adequately equipped and trained for ministry in their context.

Communication: *Desired Outcomes*

Congregations, ministries, and their leaders will be adequately informed of the programs and services available to them.

A churchwide system that fosters true dialogue so that small town and rural leaders have their voices heard and know that the churchwide expression hears.

Coordination: *Desired Outcome*

A churchwide expression that has a planned and coordinated approach to rural ministry. All churchwide units will take responsibility for small town and rural ministry. Churchwide units will work together for the benefit of small town and rural ministry. The churchwide expression will identify and develop a strategic approach to issues and concerns that are not being addressed.

Advocacy: *Desired Outcomes*

A churchwide expression that hears and responds to the cries for justice from small town and rural communities.

A churchwide expression that challenges and equips its small town and rural congregations and leaders to work for justice.

Community: *Desired Outcome*

A church that is an active partner in building, sustaining, and supporting healthy rural and small town communities.

Some Possible Implementation Strategies

The consultation discussed a variety of strategies and actions that could assist this church in achieving the desired outcomes. There was insufficient time for the participants to develop a consensus on the most effective methods. The strategies listed below represent some possible activities that could be coordinated by the Director for Small Town and Rural Ministries and are provided for information purposes only.

Leadership: *Some suggested implementation strategies*

- ✓ Broaden theological education by extension for lay and rostered leadership.
- ✓ Further develop First-Call Theological Education and Continuing Education to strengthen leadership for small town and rural settings. (*A high percentage of new pastors who come from urban and suburban areas are assigned to congregations in small town and rural settings.*)

Communication: Some suggested implementation strategies

- ✓ A “catalog” of the resources, programs, and services provided by the churchwide organization, including names and descriptions of persons and units providing them.
- ✓ Broaden the scope and readership of “STaRlights” (“Small Town and Rural Highlights” published by the Division for Outreach) and other ELCA publications.
- ✓ A person in the churchwide organization to whom people can direct their ministry joys, concerns, and questions.
- ✓ Listening posts on an annual basis held regionally to determine directions and priorities for ELCA rural ministry.
- ✓ Publications, videos, and conferences designed to share new approaches to small town and rural ministry including new models for synodically authorized ministries and cooperative arrangements.
- ✓ Programs to link small town and rural congregations by computer.

Coordination: Suggested implementation strategies

- ✓ Developing a coordinated churchwide plan for rural ministry.
- ✓ Choose three to five yearly or multi-year emphases with assignments to appropriate units.

Advocacy: Suggested implementation strategies

- ✓ Develop an additional staff position in the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs to coordinate this church’s response to critical rural issues such as the farm bill.
- ✓ Consultations and events designed to focus on economic justice from a rural perspective to provide opportunities for the whole church to listen to rural voices.

Community: Suggested implementation strategies

- ✓ Several strategies are outlined in the report of the Harvest of Wisdom Consultation.

Systems Changes

The Rural Desk Consultation also noted several issues related to reporting raised by the Harvest of Wisdom Consultation and other conversations with small town and rural leaders that have been inadequately addressed such as:

- ✓ A call document for rostered leaders that allows for the insertion of more than one calling entity to reflect the reality of multiple point parishes.
- ✓ A congregational reporting system that recognizes the complexities and realities of multiple point parishes.
- ✓ A mechanism such as a steering committee comprised of rural practitioners to inform the work of the churchwide expression.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE CONSULTATION

As the consultation met to consider the 1997 Churchwide Assembly resolution on staffing for rural ministry, it became clear that a director for small town and rural ministry

is needed to coordinate and respond to ministry in small town and rural contexts. Therefore, the consultation makes the following recommendation:

1. Director for Small Town and Rural Ministry:

- ▶ That an executive staff position entitled Director for Small Town and Rural Ministry be created and implemented February 1, 1999;
- ▶ That the staff position be housed in the Division for Congregational Ministries¹;
- ▶ That funding be assigned to the Division for Congregational Ministries, the Division for Outreach, the Division for Ministry, and the Division for Church and Society with other units of the churchwide structure also required to provide funding;
- ▶ That the Director for Small Town and Rural Ministry convene a steering committee comprised of three bishops or their representatives to be recommended by the Conference of Bishops, four representatives from the primary funding churchwide units, a seminary dean, and six rural practitioners (three rostered and three lay members). All members of the steering committee to be appointed to serve for three-year terms by the ELCA Office of the Presiding Bishop;
- ▶ That the Director for Small Town and Rural Ministry convene an interunit staff team comprised of the executive directors of those units providing funding and other churchwide staff as deemed desirable by the team;
- ▶ That full time support staff be assigned to the Director for Small Town and Rural Ministry;
- ▶ That an initial budget of \$200,000 be allocated for support of the Director for Small Town and Rural Ministry, support staff, and the costs of travel, meetings, and publications;
- ▶ That the Director for Small Town and Rural Ministry coordinate and oversee the response of this church to the 1993 Resolution on Rural Ministry, the 1995 Harvest of Wisdom Consultation, the 1997 Churchwide Resolution on Staff for Rural Ministries, and the 1998 Consultation on a Rural Desk.

The consultation spent some time on the following concept but was unable to develop a good consensus related to its viability so it is further recommended:

2. Commission for Contextual Ministry

- ▶ That the ELCA Church Council explore the possibility of establishing a new commission for contextual ministry in the year 2001 to be staffed by two executive positions, the Director for Small Town and Rural Ministry and the Director for Urban Ministry supported by two full-time support staff.

+ + +

¹ The consultation did not reach a strong consensus on where the position should be housed. Other options would be to house the position in the Division for Outreach or to create a shared staff position between the Division for Outreach and the Division for Congregational Ministries.

At the November 1998 meeting, the Church Council discussed the report on rural ministry and took the following action (CC98.11.65):

To modify the response of the Division for Outreach, Division for Ministry, Division for Congregational Ministries, and Division for Church in Society to create a rural desk; to provide for full-time staffing; and to affirm this response, as modified, as a response to the action of the 1997 ELCA Churchwide Assembly Memorial on "Churchwide Staff for Rural Ministries" [CA97.06.38].

At the same meeting, the Church Council acted to provide for the full-time position (CC98.11.64):

To establish a full-time position within the Division for Outreach, with funding to be determined by the Office of the Presiding Bishop within the \$81.3 million spending authorization for [fiscal] 1999.

The Church Council, at the November 1998 meeting, also adopted this resolution (CC98.11.56):

FARMERS IN CRISIS

WHEREAS, foreign economic problems have reduced substantially U.S. farm exports in recent years; and

WHEREAS, severe weather conditions in the Red River Valley of the North during the past five years and a major drought in 1998 in Texas and Oklahoma have adversely affected agricultural income in those regions; and

WHEREAS, depressed market prices for many commodities, some of which are the lowest since the 1940s, have reduced income below the cost of production in many circumstances; and

WHEREAS, the costs of crop production have increased at the same time that a declining share of the food dollar is retained by farmers; and

WHEREAS, decreases in the number of family farms have occurred in some areas; and

WHEREAS, lending institutions are unable or are reluctant to provide needed financing for ongoing farm operations; and

WHEREAS, unintended consequences of the 1996 Congressional farm-programs reforms have jeopardized the existence of many communities and their farms; and

WHEREAS, a rural desk has been established in the churchwide office to respond to these concerns; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that we call upon all expressions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, in the light of these circumstances, to listen, learn, and pray with and for people and their future in America's rural communities and their farms; and be it further

RESOLVED, the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America call upon the Administration and Congress to:

1. Acknowledge the severity of the plight of farmers;
2. Enact measures to restore some security for those in greatest need;
3. Begin immediately to re-examine policy changes that may have played a role in causing the present crisis; and
4. Take such steps as may be necessary to forestall further critical farm losses; and be it further

RESOLVED, that federal and state governments be encouraged to provide "beginning farmer loans and grants" in response to situations of need; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the appropriate units of the ELCA churchwide organization prepare materials to interpret for members the scope of the farm crisis affecting so many Lutherans and others and to indicate ways in which people may help meet this crisis.

At the Church Council's April 1999 meeting, Ms. Sandra A. LaBlanc, an associate in ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in Des Moines, Iowa, was introduced as the director for rural ministry resources and networking.

Exhibit J

Appeals Process

Review of Process Related to the Committee on Appeals

The 1997 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America voted [CA97.02.05]:

To request that, in accordance with its continuing review of the discipline process, the Church Council review, without prejudice, the appellate function in this church's disciplinary process either by its Legal and Constitutional Review Committee or by a process designed by such committee and approved by the Church Council;

To request that such review include consultation with the Conference of Bishops and the Committee on Appeals;

To authorize the Church council to act on recommendations resulting from this review, if any, by amending the Rules of the Committee on Appeals (ELCA 20.61.) and Rules Governing Disciplinary Proceedings (ELCA 20.21.16.) or by making recommendations for constitutional or bylaw revisions to the Churchwide Assembly; and

To request the secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to convey to the Metropolitan New York Synod the outcome of this review.

The action was taken in response to a 1997 memorial from the Metropolitan New York Synod. The memorial said:

WHEREAS, the constitution, bylaws and continuing resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America provide that the process of discipline governing ordained ministers, persons on other official rosters, and congregations shall assure due process and due protection for the accused, other parties and this church;

WHEREAS, "due process" is defined in these documents to include the right to be treated with fundamental procedural fairness and "fundamental procedural fairness" is defined in these documents to include "impartiality of the committee, which considers the charges" and "the right to be treated in conformity with the governing documents of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America";

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan New York Synod assembly duly elected its six members of the Committee on Discipline in accordance with the constitution and by-laws of this church;

WHEREAS, the Churchwide Assembly duly elected its 36 members of the churchwide Committee on Discipline in accordance with the constitution and bylaws of this church;

WHEREAS, the Discipline Hearing Committee in the Matter of the Disciplinary Proceedings Against the Reverend Aubrey N. Bougher was convened in the Metropolitan New York Synod and carried out its deliberations in accordance with the constitution and by-laws of this church;

WHEREAS, this duly constituted and conducted Discipline Hearing Committee was unanimous in its determination that Pastor Bougher should not be removed from the clergy roster of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;

WHEREAS, the constitution and bylaws of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America provide, concerning the appeal of a discipline hearing committee's decision, that "the discipline hearing committee's Determination must be sustained if reasonable people can disagree as to its propriety, and further specifically state that "the committee's Determination may not be reversed simply because the Committee on Appeals, had it been the discipline hearing committee, would have reached a different conclusion";

WHEREAS, on appeal the Committee on Appeals found that "the Discipline Hearing Committee's Determination in the matter of the Reverend Aubrey Bougher was one with which no reasonable person, acting objectively, could agree";

WHEREAS, the nine persons, four men and five women, serving on the Discipline Hearing Committee were six churchwide elected members and three elected from this synod; and included among their numbers four pastors, two of whom were women and another who is an eminent teacher and theologian of the church, also several persons presently on or retired from the staffs of their synods and others in or retired from responsible professional secular employment, all nine of whom could not fairly be presumed to be unreasonable, biased or lacking objectivity in the absence of convincing specific evidence;

WHEREAS, the Committee on Appeals has reversed the decision of the discipline hearing committee and removed Pastor Bougher from the clergy roster of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America without providing convincing evidence of how and why the nine duly elected and selected members of this committee acted unreasonably;

WHEREAS, the Committee on Appeals bases its decision almost completely on its own unique definition of "reasonable" and on its own identification of the purpose of the Committee on Appeals, neither of which can be found in any of the governing documents of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;

WHEREAS, many reasonable people familiar with the facts of this case, in addition to all nine of the members of the discipline hearing committee and two members of the 11 member Committee on Appeals itself, do in fact agree with the determination that Pastor Bougher should not be removed from the clergy roster of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;

WHEREAS, the decision of the Committee on Appeals represents an abuse of its discretion and undermines the confidence of ordained ministers, persons on other official rosters, and congregations in the fundamental procedural fairness of the disciplinary processes of this church; and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America says that the decision of the Committee on Appeals is always final and that nothing further can be done about its decision; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Metropolitan New York Synod memorialize the ELCA Churchwide Assembly to request that a task force be formed to review the function of the ELCA Committee on Appeals and its "due process" and that a report be made to the Church Council with recommendations, if any, for procedural and constitutional reform.

Background information was provided to the voting members of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly as follows:

The Memorials Committee chose not to make any determination on the particular case to which the memorial of the Metropolitan New York Synod refers. The committee notes that the Churchwide Assembly has received the report of the Committee on Appeals on this case (*1997 Pre-Assembly Report*, Section II, pages 35-40).

However, the RESOLVED clause of the memorial urges the review of the function of the Committee on Appeals, with report to be made to the Church Council with recommendations, if any, for procedural or constitutional reform. Because this RESOLVED clause can be considered apart from the WHEREAS clauses without either endorsing or adopting those clauses or without attempting to detail inaccuracies, if any, in the WHEREAS clauses, the Memorials Committee chose to address this alone.

The following information helped to shape the recommendation of the Memorials Committee. At every one of the Churchwide Assemblies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, significant revisions in some aspect of the disciplinary process have been considered and adopted. In 1989 Rules for the Committee on Appeals and the process for removal of synod officers were approved. In 1991 major revisions were made clarifying the role and function of the consultation committee, providing for the hearing officers, clarifying the hearing process, extending the right of appeal to accusers, and providing for appellate review of substance as well as procedural aspects of Discipline Hearing Committee decisions. In 1993, the discipline process for ordained ministers was extended to associates in ministry, consistent with the Study for Ministry recommendations. In 1995, an alternative process for lesser offenses was introduced and provisions for stays of Discipline Hearing Committee decisions pending appeal was approved.

In addition, other aspects of the disciplinary process have been reviewed by the Church Council following action by the Churchwide Assembly requesting review. [See Review of burden of proof (CA93.08.109 and CC94.04.11).]

The discipline process is continually under review. The issue is not whether, but how, the continuing review of this church's disciplinary process should be undertaken, specifically with regard to the appellate function. In this regard, it should be noted that all prior revisions in the disciplinary process made or recommended by the Church Council have been based upon recommendations of its Legal and Constitutional Review Committee. In formulating recommendations, this committee has always first sought the advice and counsel of the Conference of Bishops.

The Legal and Constitution Review Committee of the Church Council studied materials related to such a review of the appeals process at its meeting in November 1997. Subsequent

to the committee's report, the Church Council, at its November 1997 meeting, voted (CC97.11.92):

To affirm a review by the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee of the Church Council of the appellate function in this church's disciplinary process in consultation with the Conference of Bishops, the Committee on Appeals, and the hearing officers in disciplinary cases that have been appealed;

To request that the chair of the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee work with staff of the Office of the Secretary in the implementation of the consultation processes; and

To request that a report be provided on the results of the review at the April 1998 meeting of the Church Council.

The Legal and Constitutional Review Committee, with the assistance of the Office of the Secretary, undertook the requested review of the appellate process and sought advice from the Conference of Bishops, the Committee on Appeals, and the hearing officers who have chaired discipline hearing committees where the committee's determinations have been appealed to the Committee on Appeals.

The Conference of Bishops delegated to its Committee on Liaison with the Church Council (the Advisory Bishops) the authority to respond on behalf of the Conference of Bishops to the request of the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee of the Church Council concerning the review of the appellate function in this church's disciplinary process. The Advisory Bishops met twice, in March 1998 and April 1998, to review this matter. The Advisory Bishops advised the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee that the appellate function as it now exists is a necessary, appropriate, and effective step in this church's disciplinary process. No major revisions to this process are required in the opinion of the Advisory Bishops.

The Legal and Constitutional Review Committee also received advice and opinions concerning the appellate process from the three officers of the Committee on Appeals and from one of the three hearing officers whose decisions had been appealed.

At the April 1998 meeting of the Church Council, the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee reported concerning the ongoing work regarding the review of the process for appeals in disciplinary cases. The committee outlined provisions in the governing documents, the history in this church relative to the appeal of discipline decisions, and the history of some of the predecessor church bodies' decisions on matters of discipline. The committee was continuing to receive comments from the Conference of Bishops through the advisory bishops, from discipline panel hearing officers, and from the officers of the Committee on Appeals.

The Legal and Constitutional Review Committee further reported in April 1998 that the comments received did not seem to indicate the need for dramatic changes in the appellate process.

After the committee's report, the Church Council voted (CC98.04.19):

To receive the report from the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee that the review of the appeals process in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, as requested by action of the 1997 Churchwide Assembly [CA97.02.05], is under way; and

To acknowledge that the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee plans to bring a completed report of the review and possible recommendations related to this review to the November 1998 meeting of the Church Council.

At the November 1998 meeting, the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee again reported that it had reviewed the appellate process and had received advice from each of the

three groups identified by the Church Council. After considering the advice received and completing its own deliberations, the committee concluded that the process of appeals is functioning properly and is a sufficient and required part of this church's disciplinary process. No revisions to Chapter 20 of the *Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America* concerning appeals are currently required or recommended.

At its April 1999 meeting, the Church Council voted (CC99.04.20):

To receive the report of the Legal and Constitutional Review Committee concerning the review of the process for appeals to the Committee on Appeals in discipline cases under Chapter 20 of the *Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*;

To request the secretary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to convey the committee's report to the Metropolitan New York Synod as the response to the 1997 memorial; and

To transmit the report as information to the 1999 Churchwide Assembly as the response to the 1997 memorial.

ELCA Governing Documents

Index

1999 Churchwide Assembly

Reports and Records:

Assembly Minutes

List of Assembly Actions

CA99.01.01: Adoption of the Rules of Organization and Procedure	13
CA99.01.02: Adoption of the Order of Business	37
CA99.03.03: Safe Haven for Children	186
CA99.03.04: Use of Lutheran World Relief Coffee	190
CA99.03.05: Youth Violence	192
CA99.03.06: Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign	277
CA99.03.07: Persecution of Christians	280
CA99.03.08: Military Expenditures and Economic Conversion	285
CA99.03.09: Economic Crisis in Rural America	293
CA99.03.10: Older Adult Ministry	296
CA99.04.11: Action on full communion with the Moravian Church	301
CA99.04.12: Action on full communion with The Episcopal Church	378
CA99.04.13: Election of the Rev. David L. Miller as editor of <i>The Lutheran</i> magazine	407
CA99.05.14: Adoption of social statement "Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All"	427
CA99.05.15: <i>En Bloc</i> amendments to constitutions and bylaws of the ELCA	445
CA99.05.16: Constitution and bylaw amendments related to full communion	461
CA99.05.17: Constitution and bylaw amendments removed from the <i>en bloc</i> resolution	467
CA99.05.18: Constitution and bylaw amendments removed from the <i>en bloc</i> resolution	471
CA99.05.19: Call for development of a social statement on health care	477
CA99.05.20: Repudiation of Hate Groups	483
CA99.05.21: Implementation of 2000 Congregations Program	485
CA99.06.22: Theme of the A.D. 2001 Churchwide Assembly	486
CA99.06.23: Response to the Drought Crisis	491
CA99.06.24: Response to synodical resolutions regarding "Called to Common Mission"	509
CA99.06.25: Results of the First Common Ballot	517
CA99.06.26: 25th anniversary celebration and recommitment to the World Hunger Appeal	528
CA99.06.27: Response to synodical resolution regarding the Ordination of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons	545
CA99.06.28: 2000-2001 Budget Proposal	547
CA99.06.29: Response to a request for a study of the Ordination of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons	549
CA99.06.30: Concerns about Stip Mining	551
CA99.06.31: Support of Conference of Bishops' decision not to convene in South Carolina	552
CA99.06.32: Non-Rostered Clergy	555
CA99.06.33: Abortion	560
CA99.06.34: <i>En Bloc</i> action on certain memorials	560
CA99.06.35: Bishops' Common Understanding of "Called to Common Mission"	562
CA99.06.36: Bishops' Relational Agreement	564
CA99.06.37: Lutheran-Moravian Relations	568
CA99.06.38: Lutheran-Jewish Relations	569
CA99.06.39: Leuenberg Agreement	570
CA99.06.40: Peace-Nonviolence	581
CA99.06.41: United States War Matériel	583
CA99.06.42: U.S. Navy Operations in Vieques, Puerto Rico	586
CA99.06.43: Workfare (Work Programs)	588
CA99.06.44: Economic Justice	591
CA99.06.45: Immigration	595
CA99.06.46: Health Benefits	596
CA99.06.47: Nursing Home Care	598
CA99.06.48: Equalization of Medical Costs	600
CA99.06.49: Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	602
CA99.06.50: Lutheran Vespers	603
CA99.06.51: Rights for Associate Members in ELCA Congregations	604
CA99.06.52: Synod Assembly Franchise for all Conference Chairs	605
CA99.06.53: Representational Principles	608
CA99.06.54: Union and Federated ELCA Congregations	608
CA99.06.55: Spanish-Speaking Heritage	610
CA99.06.56: Visiting the Holy Land	612
CA99.06.57: Educational Materials regarding Homosexuality	614
CA99.06.58: Tax Issues in Congregations	615
CA99.06.59: Independent Sports Leagues	616
CA99.06.60: Constitution and bylaw amendments removed from the <i>en bloc</i> resolution	618
CA99.06.61: Results of the Second Common Ballot	622
CA99.06.62: Defeat of amendments to †S.14.13.d. and *C9.05.d.	627
CA99.06.63: Acclamation of the Presiding Bishop	628
CA99.06.64: Acclamation of the Vice President	629
CA99.06.65: Acclamation of the Secretary	629
CA99.06.66: Acclamation of the Treasurer	630
CA99.06.67: Acclamation of the Churchwide Staff	631
CA99.06.68: Resolution of thanksgiving	631

Topical Index

1997 Churchwide Assembly	
action on <i>A Concordat of Agreement</i>	59, 162, 371
action on constitutional provisions enabling	
the sharing of clergy	462
action on <i>In the City for Good</i>	480
action on the “Help the Children” Initiative . . .	183, 184
action on the “Joint Declaration on the	
Doctrine of Justification”	472
action on the ordination of	
gay and lesbian persons	409
action on the statement on sacramental practices . . .	262
2000 Congregations Program	186
synod resolution regarding implementation	
of the 2000 Congregations Program	483
2000-2001 Budget Proposal	
final debate and action	546
first presentation	150
2001 Churchwide Assembly	
announcement of	633
call for a progress report on the	
2000 Congregations Project	485
call for report on changes which result from	
“Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All”	423
call for report on Youth Violence	192
expiration of parenthetical clause in †S11.03.	458
synodical resolution related to the	
2001 Churchwide Assembly theme	485
2003 Churchwide Assembly	
call for a progress report on the development	
of a social statement on health care	475
Abortion	555
Acclamation of,	
Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson	628
Secretary Lowell G. Almen	629
Staff of the Evangelical Lutheran	
Church in America	631
Treasurer Richard L. McAuliffe	630
Vice President Addie J. Butler	629
Adjournment	633
Adult ministries	294
Advisory members of the Churchwide Assembly	
Chairs of unit boards and committees	647
Church Council	647
Executive directors of churchwide units	647
Agenda Committee	
members of	35
Allegheny Synod (8C), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Lutheran-Moravian Relations	564
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Almen, Secretary Lowell G.	
acclamation of	629
report to the Churchwide Assembly	201
<i>see</i> Office of the Secretary	
Amendments to <i>Constitutions and Bylaws</i>	
of the <i>Evangelical Lutheran Church in America</i>	
4.03.c.	445
7.11.01.	446
7.31.11.	446
7.31.15.	446
7.52.11.a.	446
7.52.13.	447
8.71.	448
8.72.	448
8.72.10.	448
8.72.11.	448
8.72.12.	449
8.72.13.	450
8.72.14.	467
8.72.15.	471
8.72.16.	450
9.21.02.	451
9.90.	451
9.91.	451
9.91.01.	452
9.91.02.	453
10.31.a.9)	461
10.81.01.	461
13.70.	454
13.71.	454
17.31.	454
17.31.01.	455
17.61.04.	456
20.21.07.	456
20.21.08.	458
20.21.12.	459
†S8.12.c.	461
†S8.15.	461
†S8.32.	456
†S11.02.	457
†S11.03.	457
S14.03.	456
†S14.13.d.	618
*C6.05.g.1	457
*C6.05.h.2	457
*C9.05.d.	618
C9.20.	451
C9.21.	451
*C20.02.	459
defeated amendment to †S.14.13.d and *C9.05.d.	627
<i>en bloc</i> amendments	445
related to full communion	459
American Lutheran Church, The (ALC)	
introduction of former presiding bishops of	
ELCA predecessor church bodies	408
Anderson, Presiding Bishop H. George	
acclamation of	628
concluding remarks	632
report to the Churchwide Assembly	39
<i>see</i> Office of the Presiding Bishop	
Appeals Process, review of process related to the	
Committee on Appeals	745
Associate members, rights in ELCA congregations	603
Associates in Ministry	
additions to roster of, 1997-1998	238, 253
removals from roster of, 1997-1998	240, 253
Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches (AELC)	
introduction of former presiding bishops of	
ELCA predecessor church bodies	408

Augsburg Fortress, Publishers	
<i>see</i> Publishing House of the ELCA	
Bible Study	156, 298, 391, 478
Bishop of this church	
<i>see</i> Office of the Presiding Bishop	628
Bishops' Common Understanding	
of "Called to Common Mission"	561
Bishops' Relational Agreement	563
Bloomquist, the Rev. Karen L., address by	127
Board chairs, executive directors, and directors of	
churchwide units, introductions	624
Board of Pensions	
CA 99.06.25: Elections to Church Council,	
churchwide boards, and committees	518
CA 99.07.61: Elections to Church Council,	
churchwide boards, and committees	623
Equalization of Medical Costs	598
Health Benefits	595
introductions	625
Nursing Home Care	596
Brunett, the Most Rev. Alexander J., address by	472
Budget Proposal	
<i>see</i> 2000-2001 Budget Proposal	
Butler, Vice President Addie J.	
acclamation of	629
report to the Churchwide Assembly	37
<i>see</i> Office of the Vice President	
Bylaws	
<i>see</i> Amendments to constitutions and bylaws	
<i>see</i> <i>Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing</i>	
<i>Resolutions of the ELCA</i>	
Cabinet of Executives	
Older Adult Ministry	297
"Called to Common Mission"	
address by	
the Rev. C. Christopher Epting	61
the Rev. Martin E. Marty	58
the Rev. Nancy M. Curtis	66
the Rev. Norman W. Wahl	63
Church Council recommendation to amend	351
discussion with the drafting team	69
final debate and action	349
final text of the full communion agreement	378
general discussion	157
introduction of	42
period for questions and answers	69
presentation by the drafting team	58
proposed text	48
response to the action on full communion	388
synodical memorials	492
Call to Discipleship	282
Canada, Evangelical Lutheran Church in (ELCIC)	
greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	444
Caribbean Synod (9F), memorials on	
Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign	198, 277
Lutheran-Moravian Relations	564
Spanish-Speaking Heritage	609
U.S. Navy Operations in Vieques, Puerto Rico	583
Category 1a: Regarding "Called to Common Mission"	492

Category 1b: Bishops' Common Understanding	
of "Called to Common Mission"	562
Category 1c: Bishops' Relational Agreement	564
Category 1d: Lutheran-Moravian Relations	568
Category 1e: Lutheran-Jewish Relations	569
Category 1f: Leuenberg Agreement	570
Category 2a: Peace-Nonviolence	581
Category 2b: Youth Violence	190
Category 3: Economic Crisis in Rural America	286
Category 4a: United States War Matériel	583
Category 4b: U.S. Navy Operations in	
Vieques, Puerto Rico	586
Category 5: Workfare (Work Programs)	588
Category 6a: Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign	193, 274
Category 6b: Economic Justice	591
Category 7: Immigration	595
Category 8: Persecution of Christians	277
Category 9: Abortion	555
Category 10: Health Benefits	595
Category 11: Nursing Home Care	596
Category 12: Equalization of Medical Costs	598
Category 13: Lutheran Men in Mission	600
Category 14: Lutheran Vespers	602
Category 15: Older Adult Ministry	294
Category 16: Rights for Associate Members	
in ELCA Congregations	603
Category 17: Synod Assembly Franchise	
for all Conference Chairs	604
Category 18a: Non-Rostered Clergy	553
Category 18b: Representational Principles	605
Category 18c: Union and Federated	
ELCA Congregations	608
Category 18d: Spanish-speaking Heritage	609
Category 19: Visiting the Holy Land	610
Category 20: Ordination of Non-Celibate	
Gay and Lesbian Persons	509
Category 21: Educational Materials on Homosexuality	612
Category 22: Tax Issues in Congregations	614
Category 23: Independent Sports Leagues	616
Category 24: Use of Lutheran World Relief Coffee	188
Central States Synod (4B), memorials on	
"Called to Common Mission"	492
Lutheran-Moravian Relations	564
Peace-Nonviolence	570
Central/Southern Illinois Synod (5C), memorial on	
"Called to Common Mission"	492
Children	
Safe Havens Initiative	173
Chilstrom, the Rev. Herbert W.	
introduction of former presiding bishops of the	
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	408
Chinese Lutheran Church, Honolulu, Hawaii	
presentation of church window	519
Church Council	
CA 99.06.25: Elections to Church Council,	
churchwide boards, and committees	517
CA 99.07.61: Elections to Church Council,	
churchwide boards, and committees	622
Church in Society	
<i>see</i> Division for Church in Society	
Church Window, presentation to Chinese Lutheran Church,	
Honolulu, Hawaii	519

Churchwide board and committee chairs	
introductions	624
Churchwide directors	
introduction of director for rural ministry	
resources and networking	532
introduction of the director for the	
Fund for Leaders in Mission	533
introductions	624
Churchwide <i>Initiatives for a New Century</i>	
Help the Children	173, 183
Teach the Faith	282
Citzler, Ms. Annette, address by	128
Clergy	
Non-Rostered Clergy memorial	553
<i>see</i> Ordained Ministers	
Clergy, sharing with ecumenical partners	
<i>see</i> 1997 Churchwide Assembly	
Coffee	
synodical memorial on the use of	
Lutheran World Relief Coffee	188
College Corporation Meetings	284
Commission for Multicultural Ministries	
introductions	624
Peace–Nonviolence resolution	570
Commission for Women	
conversations related to gay and lesbian persons	409
introductions	624
Committee of Reference and Counsel	482
members of	35
Motion A: Military Expenditures	
and Economic Conversion	285
Motion B: Repudiation of Hate Groups	482
Motion C: Implementation of 2000	
Congregations Program	483
Motion D: Theme of the A.D. 2001	
Churchwide Assembly	485
Motion E: Response to the Drought Crisis	486
Motion F: Proposed Study of the Ordination	
of Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons	548
Motion G: Concern about Strip Mining	549
Motion H: Resolution of Appreciation for	
Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson	628
Motion I: Resolution of Appreciation for	
Vice President Addie J. Butler	629
Motion J: Resolution of Appreciation for	
Secretary Lowell G. Almen	629
Motion K: Resolution of Appreciation for	
Treasurer Richard L. McAuliffe	630
Motion L: Resolution of Appreciation for	
the staff of the ELCA	631
Motion M: Resolution of Thanksgiving	631
Motion N: Support of Conference of Bishops'	
Decision not to Convene in South Carolina	551
Committee on Appeals	
CA99.06.25: Elections to Church Council,	
churchwide boards, and committees	519
review of process related to the	
Committee on Appeals	745
Committee on Discipline	
CA99.06.25: Elections to Church Council,	
churchwide boards, and committees	518
CA99.07.61: Elections to Church Council,	
churchwide boards, and committees	623

Committees of the Churchwide Assembly	
Agenda Committee	35
Credentials Committee	10, 41, 132, 633
Elections Committee	491, 516, 622
Local Arrangements Committee	35, 36
Memorials Committee	188, 274, 285, 492, 553
Minutes Committee	35
Nominating Committee	41
Reference and Counsel Committee	284, 482, 548, 628
Staff Planning Committee	35
Worship Committee	35
Communication	
<i>see</i> Department for Communication	
<i>communio in sacris</i>	42
Concern about Strip Mining	549
<i>Concordat of Agreement</i>	
<i>see</i> 1997 Churchwide Assembly	
Confederate battle flag, motion on	551
Conference Chairs, Synod Assembly franchise	604
Conference of Bishops	
Bishops' Common Understanding	
of "Called to Common Mission"	561
Bishops' Relational Agreement	563
Exhibit E: Text of the "Tucson Resolution"	686
support for decision not to meet in South Carolina	551
Congregational Ministries	
<i>see</i> Division for Congregational Ministries	
Congregational Statistics	
additions to roster of, 1997-1998	251
change of synodical relationships	252
congregations received, removed, consolidated,	
disbanded, merged, and withdrawn.	244
removals from roster of, 1997-1998	251
Congregations	
Tax Issues	614
Union and Federated	608
<i>Constitutions, Bylaws, and Continuing Resolutions of the</i>	
<i>Evangelical Lutheran Church in America</i>	749
amendments removed from <i>en bloc</i>	461, 617, 625
proposed amendments	445
<i>see</i> Amendments to constitutions and bylaws	
Conversations related to gay and lesbian persons	409
final debate and action on synod memorial	537
synod memorial regarding the ordination of	509, 537
Credentials Committee	
Exhibit A: Assembly Members	635
determination of a quorum	10
members of	35
presentation of the roll of voting members	34
report of	10, 41, 132, 633
Crumley, the Rev. James R.	
introduction of former presiding bishops of	
ELCA predecessor church bodies	408
Curtis, the Rev. Nancy M., address by	66
Deaconesses	
additions to roster of, 1997-1998	243, 253
removals from roster of, 1997-1998	243, 253
Deaf ministries	173
Debt forgiveness	274
Decade for a Culture of Nonviolence	581

“Definitions and Guidelines for Discipline”	509, 510, 515, 542, 705
Delegates see Voting Members of the Churchwide Assembly	
Department for Communication introductions	625
Department for Ecumenical Affairs address by the Most Rev. Alexander J. Brunett	472
“Called to Common Mission”	42
proposed text	48
<i>communio in sacris</i>	42
final debate and action on “Called to Common Mission”	349
“Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”	299
final text of “Called to Common Mission”	378
“Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”	304
“Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”	132
general discussion of “Called to Common Mission”	157
“Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”	270
interim Eucharistic sharing	42
introductions	625
“Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification”	472
Leuenberg Agreement	569
Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue I (1969-1972)	42
Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue II (1976-1980)	42
Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue III (1983-1991)	42
Lutheran-Jewish Relations	568
response to the action on full communion with The Episcopal Church	388
the Moravian Church	348
Department for Human Resources and Management Services introductions	625
Department for Research and Evaluation introductions	625
Department for Synodical Relations introductions	625
Determination of a quorum	10
Diaconal Ministers additions to roster of, 1997-1998	244, 253
Directors of churchwide units	624
Disabilities and Deaf Ministries Exhibit H: Final Report on Ministry With and Among Persons with Disabilities	717
report on	173
Discipleship	282
Division for Church in Society CA 99.06.25: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	518
CA 99.07.61: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	623
conversations related to gay and lesbian persons	409
Economic Crisis in Rural America	293
introduction of social statement on economic life	116
introductions	624
Peace-Nonviolence	570
Persecution of Christians	279, 280
proposed social statement on health care	474
Report on Disabilities and Deaf Ministries	173
Response to the Drought Crisis	486

Women and Children Living in Poverty, report on	281
Workfare (Work Programs)	586
Youth Violence	192
Division for Congregational Ministries CA 99.06.25: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	517
CA 99.07.61: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	623
Call to Discipleship	282
Conversations related to gay and lesbian persons	409
Economic Crisis in Rural America	293
introductions	624
Peace-Nonviolence	570
Repudiation of Hate Groups	482
Response to the Drought Crisis	486
Youth Violence	192
Division for Global Mission CA 99.06.25: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	518
CA 99.07.61: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	623
introductions	624
Peace-Nonviolence	570
Division for Higher Education and Schools CA 99.06.25: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	518
CA 99.07.61: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	623
introductions	624
Peace-Nonviolence	570
World Hunger Appeal	530
Division for Ministry CA 99.06.25: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	517
CA 99.07.61: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	623
conversations related to gay and lesbian persons	409
introductions	624
Ministry in Daily Life	532
Report on the Study of Ministry—Six Years Later	533
Tax Issues in Congregations	615
Division for Outreach 2000 Congregations Program	186
CA 99.06.25: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	517
CA 99.07.61: Elections to Church Council, churchwide boards, and committees	623
conversations related to gay and lesbian persons	409
Economic Crisis in Rural America	293
introductions	624
Tax Issues in Congregations	615
Drought Crisis, motion on	486
East-Central Synod of Wisconsin (5I), memorials on “Called to Common Mission”	492
Non-Rostered Clergy	553
Peace-Nonviolence	570
Eastern North Dakota Synod (3B), memorials on “Called to Common Mission”	492
Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign	198, 277
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600
Peace-Nonviolence	570

Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod (ID), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Equalization of Medical Costs	598
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Economic Conversion and Military Expenditures	285
Economic Crisis in Rural America	286
Economic Justice	589
Economic life, introduction of social statement	116
Ecumenical Affairs	
<i>see</i> Department for Ecumenical Affairs	
Educational materials regarding homosexuality	612
ELCA Cabinet of Executives	
<i>see</i> Cabinet of Executives	
ELCA Foundation	
Fund for Leaders in Mission	533
introductions	625
ELCA Hunger Appeal	
<i>see</i> World Hunger Appeal	
ELCA Presiding Bishop	
<i>see</i> Office of the Presiding Bishop	
Elections	
editor of <i>The Lutheran</i> magazine	405
Exhibit B: Report of the Elections Committee	651
First Common Ballot distributed	409
report of the First Common Ballot	491, 516
report of the Second Common Ballot	622
Second Common Ballot distributed	516
<i>En Bloc</i> action on certain memorials	560
Category 1b: Bishops’ Common Understanding	
of “Called to Common Mission”	561
Category 1c: Bishops’ Relational Agreement	563
Category 1d: Lutheran–Moravian Relations	564
Category 1e: Lutheran–Jewish Relations	568
Category 1f: Leuenberg Agreement	569
Category 2a: Peace–Nonviolence	570
Category 4a: United States War Matériel	582
Category 4b: U.S. Navy Operations in	
Vieques, Puerto Rico	583
Category 5: Workfare (Work Programs)	586
Category 6b: Economic Justice	589
Category 7: Immigration	591
Category 10: Health Benefits	595
Category 11: Nursing Home Care	596
Category 12: Equalization of Medical Costs	598
Category 13: Lutheran Men in Mission	600
Category 14: Lutheran Vespers	602
Category 16: Rights for Associate Members	
in ELCA Congregations	603
Category 17: Synod Assembly Franchise	
for all Conference Chairs	604
Category 18b: Representational Principles	605
Category 18c: Union and Federated	
ELCA Congregations	608
Category 18d: Spanish-speaking Heritage	609
Category 19: Visiting the Holy Land	610
Category 21: Educational Materials	
on Homosexuality	612
Category 22: Tax Issues in Congregations	614
Category 23: Independent Sports Leagues	616
Episcopal Church, The	
<i>see</i> Department for Ecumenical Affairs	
Epting, the Rev. C. Christopher,	
address by	61
response to the action on full communion	389
Equalization of Medical Costs	598
Eucharistic sharing, interim	
<i>see</i> Department for Ecumenical Affairs	
Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada (ELCIC)	
greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	444
Executive directors	624
Exhibit A: Members of the Churchwide Assembly	635
Exhibit B: Report of the Elections Committee	651
Exhibit C: Report of the Presiding Bishop	666
Exhibit D: Report of the Secretary	679
Exhibit E: Text of the “Tucson Resolution” of the	
Conference of Bishops	686
Exhibit F: “Inter-unit Response to Synodical	
Memorials on the Ordination of Non-Celibate	
Gay and Lesbian Persons	689
Exhibit G, Part 1: Study of Ministry:	
A Review of its Effects Six Years later	706
Exhibit G, Part 2: Study of Ministry:	
Ministry in Daily Life—A Call to Action	712
Exhibit H: Final Report on Ministry With	
and Among Persons with Disabilities	717
Exhibit I: Report: Director for Rural Ministry	
Resources and Networking	737
Exhibit J: Appeals Process: A Review of Process	
Related to the Committee on Appeals	745
Federal Chaplains	
greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	621
Federated and Union Congregations	608
Financial Statements (audit reports)	
ELCA 1996-1997	77
ELCA 1997-1998	89
Mission Investment Fund 1996-1997	102
Mission Investment Fund 1997-1998	109
Florida-Bahamas Synod (9E), memorials on	
Rights for Associate Members in Congregations	603
Synod Assembly Franchise	
for all Conference Chairs	604
“Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”	
address by	
the Rev. R. Burke Johnson	348
the Rev. Robert E. Sawyer	141
the Rev. Ronald A. Rinn	140
discussion with the drafting team	143
final debate and action	299
final text of the full communion agreement	304
general discussion	270
introduction of	132
period for questions and answers	143
presentation by the drafting team	140
response to the action on full communion	348
Former presiding bishops, introductions of	408
Foundation	
<i>see</i> ELCA Foundation	
Full communion agreements	
<i>communio in sacris</i>	42
final debate and action on	
“Called to Comm on Mission”	349
“Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”	299

final text of	
“Called to Common Mission”	378
“Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”	304
general discussion of	
“Called to Common Mission”	157
“Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”	270
interim Eucharistic sharing	42
introduction of	
“Called to Common Mission”	42
“Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”	132
Leuenberg Agreement	569
proposed text of “Called to Common Mission”	48
response to the action on full communion with	
The Episcopal Church	388
the Moravian Church	348
Fund for Leaders in Mission	
introduction of director	533
Gay and Lesbian Persons	
final debate and action on synodical memorial	537
general discussion of the ordination	
of gay and lesbian persons	513, 534
Ordination of Non-Celibate	
Gay and Lesbian Persons	509
report of conversations	409
Global Mission	
<i>see</i> Division for Global Mission	
Governmental Affairs	
<i>see</i> Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs (LOGA)	
Grand Canyon Synod (2D), memorial on	
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Greater Milwaukee Synod (5J), memorial on	
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Greetings from:	
Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada (ELCIC)	444
Federal Chaplains	621
Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod, The (LCMS)	444
Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS)	479
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	548
Lutheran Services in America (LSA)	157
Lutheran World Federation (LWF)	520
National Council of the Churches	
of Christ in the U.S.A. (NCC)	408
Reformed churches	481
Rocky Mountain Synod	10
Women of the Evangelical Lutheran Church	
in America (W/ELCA)	281
World Council of Churches (WCC)	407
Hate groups, repudiation of	482
Health Benefits	595
Health care, proposed social statement on	474
Hearings	154
Help the Children	173
<i>see</i> 1997 Churchwide Assembly	
Herzfeld, the Rev. William L.	
introduction of former presiding bishops of	
ELCA predecessor church bodies	408
Higher Education and Schools	
<i>see</i> Division for Higher Education and Schools	
Hispanic heritage	609
Holy Land, visiting the	610
Homosexuality, educational materials on	612
Human Resources	
<i>see</i> Department for Human Resources	
and Management Services	
Hunger Appeal	
<i>see</i> World Hunger Appeal	
Hunger Bowl design winners	283
Immigration	591
Implementation of 2000 Congregations Program	483
<i>In the City for Good</i> urban strategy	480
Independent Sports Leagues	616
Indiana-Kentucky Synod (6C), memorial on	
Older Adult Ministry	294
<i>Initiatives for a New Century</i>	
Call to Discipleship	282
Safe Haven for Children	173
Interim Eucharistic sharing	42
International debt forgiveness	274
Interunit report on homosexuality	
conversations related to gay and lesbian persons	409
Israel, visiting	610
Jewish relations	
<i>see</i> Lutheran-Jewish Relations	
Johnson, the Rev. R. Burke, address of	348
“Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification”	472
address by the Most Rev. Alexander J. Brunett	472
Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign	193, 274
La Crosse Area Synod (5L), memorials on	
Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign	198, 277
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Use of Lutheran World Relief Coffee	189
Latino heritage	609
Legal and Constitutional Review Committee	
proposed amendments to	
constitutions and bylaws	445
proposed amendments to constitutions and	
bylaws removed from the <i>en bloc</i> resolution	462
Leuenberg Agreement	569
Local Arrangements Committee	36
members of	35
Lower Susquehanna Synod (8D), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Health Benefits	595
Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign	198, 277
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600
<i>Lutheran</i> magazine	
<i>see</i> <i>The Lutheran</i> magazine	
Lutheran Church in America (LCA)	
introduction of former presiding bishops of	
ELCA predecessor church bodies	408
Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod, The (LCMS)	
greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	444
Lutheran World Relief	529
Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS)	
greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	479
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600
greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	548
synodical memorials of support	600

Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs (LOGA)	
U.S. Navy Operations in Vieques, Puerto Rico	583
Workfare (Work Programs)	586
Lutheran Peace Fellowship	
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Lutheran Services in America (LSA)	157
World Hunger Appeal	530
Lutheran Vespers	602
Lutheran World Federation (LWF)	
greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	520
World Hunger Appeal	529
Lutheran World Relief (LWR)	529
Lutheran World Relief Coffee	188
Lutheran Youth Organization (LYO)	
Youth Violence	192
Lutheran–Episcopal Dialogue I (1969–1972)	42
Lutheran–Episcopal Dialogue II (1976–1980)	42
Lutheran–Episcopal Dialogue III (1983–1991)	42
Lutheran–Jewish Relations	568
Lutheran–Moravian Relations	564
Lutheran–Roman Catholic Dialogue	472
“Mahtomedi Resolution”	492
Marshall, the Rev. Robert J.	
introduction of former presiding bishops of	
ELCA predecessor church bodies	408
Marty, the Rev. Martin E., address by	58
Mc Auliffe, Treasurer Richard L.	
acclamation of	630
report to the Churchwide Assembly	76
<i>see</i> Office of the Treasurer	
Medical costs, equalization of	598
Memorials Committee	
Category 1a: “Called to Common Mission”	492
Category 1b: Bishops’ Common Understanding	
of “Called to Common Mission”	561
Category 1c: Bishops’ Relational Agreement	563
Category 1d: Lutheran–Moravian Relations	564
Category 1e: Lutheran–Jewish Relations	568
Category 1f: Leuenberg Agreement	569
Category 2a: Peace–Nonviolence	570
Category 2b: Youth Violence	190
Category 3: Economic Crisis in Rural America	286
Category 4a: United States War Matériel	582
Category 4b: U.S. Navy Operations in	
Vieques, Puerto Rico	583
Category 5: Workfare (Work Programs)	586
Category 6a: Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign	193, 274
Category 6b: Economic Justice	589
Category 7: Immigration	591
Category 8: Persecution of Christians	277
Category 9: Abortion	555
Category 10: Health Benefits	595
Category 11: Nursing Home Care	596
Category 12: Equalization of Medical Costs	598
Category 13: Lutheran Men in Mission	600
Category 14: Lutheran Vespers	602
Category 15: Older Adult Ministry	294
Category 16: Rights for Associate Members	
in ELCA Congregations	603
Category 17: Synod Assembly Franchise	
for all Conference Chairs	604

Category 18a: Non-Rostered Clergy	553
Category 18b: Representational Principles	605
Category 18c: Union and Federated	
ELCA Congregations	608
Category 18d: Spanish-speaking Heritage	609
Category 19: Visiting the Holy Land	610
Category 20: Ordination of Non-Celibate	
Gay and Lesbian Persons	509
Category 21: Educational Materials	
on Homosexuality	612
Category 22: Tax Issues in Congregations	614
Category 23: Independent Sports Leagues	616
Category 24: Use of Lutheran World Relief Coffee	188
<i>en bloc</i> action on certain memorials	560
members of	35
Message on Immigration	595
Metropolitan New York Synod (7C), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600
Workfare (Work Programs)	586
Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Synod (8G), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Lutheran–Moravian Relations	564
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Military expenditures, motion on	285
Miller, the Rev. David L.	
election as editor of <i>The Lutheran</i> magazine	407
Mining, motion on	549
Ministry	
<i>see</i> Division for Ministry	
Ministry in Daily Life	
report on	532
Minneapolis Area Synod (3G), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Peace–Nonviolence	570
United States War Matériel	582
Minutes Committee, members of	35
Mission Investment Fund (MIF)	
financial statements 1996–1997	102
financial statements 1997–1998	109
report of	101
Missouri Synod	
<i>see</i> Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod, The (LCMS)	
Montana Synod (1F), memorial on	
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600
Moore, the Rev. Gladys G., address by	129
Multicultural Ministries	
<i>see</i> Commission for Multicultural Ministries	
NAACP boycott of South Carolina	
Conference of Bishops’ meeting	551
National Conference of Roman Catholic Bishops	
greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	472
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (NCC)	
greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	408
Naval Operations in Vieques, Puerto Rico	583
New England Synod (7B), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Lutheran–Jewish Relations	568
Lutheran–Moravian Relations	564
Spanish-Speaking Heritage	610

New Jersey Synod (7A), memorial on	
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Noko, the Rev. Ishmael, address of	366
Nominating Committee	
CA99.06.25: Elections to Church Council,	
churchwide boards, and committees	518
CA99.07.61: Elections to Church Council,	
churchwide boards, and committees	623
members of	35
report of	41
Non-Rostered Clergy	553
Nonviolence	570
North Carolina Synod (9B), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Nursing Home Care	596
Peace–Nonviolence	570
North/West Lower Michigan Synod (6B), memorial on	
Immigration	591
Northeastern Iowa Synod (5F), memorials on	
Bishops’ Common Understanding	
of “Called to Common Mission”	561
Bishops’ Relational Agreement	563
Immigration	591
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Northeastern Minnesota Synod (3E), memorial on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod (7E), memorials on	
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600
Union and Federated ELCA Congregations	608
Northern Great Lakes Synod (5G), memorial on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Northern Illinois Synod (5B), memorial on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Northern Texas–Northern Louisiana	
Synod (4D), memorials on	
Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign	198, 277
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600
Nursing Home Care	596
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Northwest Synod of Wisconsin (5H), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign	198, 277
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600
Northwest Washington Synod (1B), memorials on	
Lutheran–Moravian Relations	564
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod (8A), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Leuenberg Agreement	569
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600
Youth Violence	190
Nursing Home Care	596
Office of the Presiding Bishop	
acclamation of	628
concluding remarks	632
Exhibit C: Report of the Presiding Bishop	666
report to the Churchwide Assembly	39
synodical resolution related to the	
theme of the 2001 Churchwide Assembly	485

Office of the Secretary	
acclamation of	629
additions to the roster of	
associates in ministry 1997-1998	238
deaconesses 1997-1998	243
diaconal ministers 1997-1998	244
ordained ministers 1997-1998	211
congregations received, consolidated,	
disbanded, merged, or withdrawn	244
Exhibit C: Report of the Secretary	679
removals from the roster of	
associates in ministry 1997-1998	240
deaconesses 1997-1998	243
ordained ministers 1997-1998	226
report to the Churchwide Assembly	201
rosters and statistics	252
Tax Issues in Congregations	615
Office of the Treasurer	
acclamation of	630
financial statements 1996-1997	77
financial statements 1997-1998	89
report to the Churchwide Assembly	76
Office of the Vice President	
acclamation of	629
report to the Churchwide Assembly	37
Older Adult Ministry	294
Ordained Ministers	
additions to roster of, 1997-1998	211, 252
removals from roster of, 1997-1998	226, 252
Ordination of gay and lesbian persons	509, 537
final debate and action on synodical memorial	537
general discussion	513, 534
report of conversations related to	
gay and lesbian persons	409
Oregon Synod (1E), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Organization of the Churchwide Assembly	
adoption of the Order of Business	37
constitution of Assembly Committees	35
introduction of the Parliamentarian	36
roll of Voting Members	34
Other members of the Churchwide Assembly	
presidents of colleges and universities	648
presidents of seminaries	649
Outreach	
<i>see</i> Division for Outreach	
Pacifica Synod (2C), memorial on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Parliamentarian, introduction of	36
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Perry, the Rev. David W.,	
response to the action on full communion	389
Persaud, the Rev. Winston D., address by	126
Persecution of Christians	277
Poverty	
<i>see</i> Women and Children Living in Poverty	
Presidents of ELCA colleges and universities	648
Presidents of ELCA seminaries	649
Presiding Bishop	
<i>see</i> Office of the Presiding Bishop	

Preus, the Rev. David W.	
introduction of former presiding bishops of	
ELCA predecessor church bodies	408
Proposed social statement on health care	474
Proposed study of the Ordination of	
Non-Celibate Gay and Lesbian Persons	548
Publishing House of the ELCA	
CA99.06.25: Elections to Church Council,	
churchwide boards, and committees	518
CA99.07.61: Elections to Church Council,	
churchwide boards, and committees	623
introductions	625
Puerto Rico, naval operations in	583
Quasi-committee of the whole for general discussion of	
“Called to Common Mission”	157
“Following our Shepherd to Full Communion”	270
“Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All”	391
Ordination of Non-Celibate	
Gay and Lesbian Persons	513, 534
Quorum, determination of	10
Quotas	
<i>see</i> Representational Principles	
Reference and Counsel Committee	
<i>see</i> Committee of Reference and Counsel	
Reformed Churches	
greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	481
Relational Agreement among Bishops	563
Report of	
Church Council	37
conversations related to gay and lesbian persons	409
“Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification”	472
Ministry in Daily Life	532
Mission Investment Fund (MIF)	101
Presiding Bishop	39
Secretary	201
Study of Ministry—Six Years Later	533
Treasurer	76
Urban Strategy	480
Vice President	37
Young Adult Convocation	552
Youth Convocation	477
Representational Principles	605
Repudiation of Hate Groups	482
Research and Evaluation	
<i>see</i> Department for Research and Evaluation	
Resource members of the Churchwide Assembly	
churchwide staff	648
youth advisory members of Church Council	648
Retiring bishops, acknowledgment of	620
Rights for Associate Members	
in ELCA Congregations	603
Rinn, the Rev. Ronald A., address by	140
Rocky Mountain Synod (2E)	
greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	10
Rocky Mountain Synod (2E), memorial on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Roman Catholic Church	
<i>see</i> Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue	
Rosters and statistics	252
Rules of Organization and Procedure, adoption	11

Rural ministry resources and networking	
Economic Crisis in Rural America	293
Exhibit I: Report: Director for Rural Ministry	
Resources and Networking	737
introduction of director	532
Sacramental practices statement	262
Safe Haven for Children	
report on	173
Saint Paul Area Synod (3H), memorial on	
Independent Sports Leagues	616
Sawyer, the Rev. Robert E., address by	141
Secretary	
<i>see</i> Office of the Secretary	201
Sierra Pacific Synod (2A), memorials on	
Ordination of Non-Celibate Gay	
and Lesbian Persons	509, 537, 545
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Social statement on economic life	
continued debate	397
final debate and action	416
final text of “Sufficient, Sustainable	
Livelihood for All”	428
general discussion	391
introduction of	116
proposed text	117
Social statement on health care, proposed	474
South Dakota Synod (3C), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Economic Crisis in Rural America	289
Lutheran Vespers	602
South-Central Synod of Wisconsin (5K), memorial on	
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Southeastern Iowa Synod (5D), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Southeastern Minnesota Synod (3I), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Tax Issues in Congregations	614
Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod (7F), memorial on	
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Southeastern Synod (9D), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Lutheran-Moravian Relations	564
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Southern California (West) Synod (2B), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Educational Materials on Homosexuality	612
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Southwestern Minnesota Synod (3F), memorials on	
Abortion	555
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Peace–Nonviolence	570
Southwestern Pennsylvania Synod (8B), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Representational Principles	605
Southwestern Texas Synod (4E), memorial on	
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600
Southwestern Washington Synod (1C), memorials on	
“Called to Common Mission”	492
Peace–Nonviolence	570

Spanish-Speaking Heritage	609	Upstate New York Synod (7D), memorials on	
Sports leagues, independent	616	Economic Justice	589
Staff Planning Committee		Peace–Nonviolence	570
members of	35	Urban Strategy	
Stained glass window, presentation to		report on	480
Chinese Lutheran Church, Honolulu, Hawaii	519	<i>Use of the Means of Grace</i>	
Steering committee chairs	624	sacramental practices statement	262
Strip mining, concern about	549	Vice President	
Study of Ministry		<i>see</i> Office of the Vice President	
progress report on Ministry in Daily Life	712	Vieques, Puerto Rico	
report on	533	U.S. Navy operations in	583
“Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All”		Violence against young people	190
address by Ms. Annette Citzler	128	Virginia Synod (9A), memorial on	
address by the Rev. Gladys G. Moore	129	“Called to Common Mission”	492
address by the Rev. Karen L. Bloomquist	127	“Vision and Expectations: Ordained Ministers in the	
address by the Rev. Winston D. Persaud	126	Evangelical Lutheran Church in America”	
adoption	427 414, 509, 510, 515, 534, 542, 693, 700, 702	
continued debate	397	Visiting the Holy Land	610
final debate and action	416	Voting Members of the Churchwide Assembly	635
final text	428	Wahl, the Rev. Norman W., address by	63
general discussion	391	War Matériel	582
introduction	116	West Virginia–Western Maryland Synod (8H), memorial on	
proposed text	117	“Called to Common Mission”	492
response to the action on this social statement	444	Western Iowa Synod (5E), memorials on	
Synod Assembly Franchise for all Conference Chairs ..	604	“Called to Common Mission”	492
Synod Memorials		Jubilee 2000: USA Campaign	198, 277
<i>see</i> Memorials Committee		Western North Dakota Synod (3A), memorial on	
<i>see</i> name of synod		“Called to Common Mission”	492
Synodical Relations		Women	
<i>see</i> Department for Synodical Relations		<i>see</i> Commission for Women	
“Talking about Homosexuality—A Guide		Women and Children Living in Poverty	
for Congregations”	546	report on	281
Tax Issues in Congregations	614	Women of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	
Teach the Faith	282	(W/ELCA)	281
Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod (4F), memorials on		introductions	625
Older Adult Ministry	294	Peace–Nonviolence	570
Persecution of Christians	279, 280	Work Programs (Workfare)	586
<i>The Lutheran</i> magazine		Workfare (Work Programs)	586
election of editor	405	World Council of Churches (WCC)	
introductions	624	greetings to the Churchwide Assembly	407
Theme of the A.D. 2001 Churchwide Assembly	485	World Hunger Appeal	
Thomas, the Rev. John H., address by	166	25th anniversary celebration and recommitment	521
Treasurer		Hunger Bowl design winners	283
<i>see</i> Office of the Treasurer		Worship Committee	
Trexler, the Rev. Edgar R.		members of	35
acclamation of	406	Year of Education for Nonviolence	581
“Tucson Resolution” of the Conference of Bishops		Young Adult Convocation	
Exhibit E: Text of the “Tucson Resolution”	686	report of	552
U.S. Navy operations in Vieques, Puerto Rico	583	Youth Convocation	
Union and Federated ELCA Congregations	608	report of	477
Unit directors	624	Youth Violence	190
United States War Matériel	582		
Upper Susquehanna Synod (8E), memorials on			
“Called to Common Mission”	492		
Lutheran Men in Mission (LMM)	600		