

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WELS ADMINISTRATION

1850-1987

by Bradley E. Ragner

Church History
Prof. Westerhaus
14 May 1987

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library
11831 N. Seminary Drive. 65W
Mequon, Wisconsin

In past years our Synod has frowned upon any synod-wide organizations of groups of members united for a common purpose. The evils that might arise from such organizations have driven us to forego the blessings that could be enjoyed through such practical co-operation. Our rugged individualism has insisted that each pastor take care of his flock and every phase of the work in his flock. But we do not all receive the same gifts, we are not all endowed by our Creator with the same skills and abilities.(1)

On the floor of the 1957 Synod Convention, President Naumann--just recently elected--delivered the above speech in a plea that the Synod expand its Board of Education. In a sense they are hard words, from a man whose administration would mark the greatest development and expansion of Synod "bureaucracy" since the beginning of the original Wisconsin Synod in 1850 or the Joint Synod in 1917. Naumann looked at a maverick attitude in the Synod's pastorate, at their "rugged individualism", and told them that they had let their fear of some evil from administration get in the way of God's blessings. Was he right? Or was this new General President distorting synodical history and leading the Synod down a dangerous path to centralized authority and departure from God's Word?

Some people in our Synod--it may even be everyone in our Synod at one time or another--have feared administration. It was originally the intention of this author to document that wariness, to determine how it developed, where it came from, why it still exists, that is, if it exists. But how can anyone accurately, historically document an emotion that could rise from a thousand different springs? Was it a reaction to the frontier,

by congregations who learned to love their autonomy? Was it a reaction to authoritarian leaders in Prussia or other parts of America (such as Grabau and the Buffalo Synod)? Did it rise from individuals, from American independence, from problems which rose as untried administrations made mistakes? Was it a momentary misunderstanding or an attitude that is a trait? It would be impossible to trace, especially when such emotions rise and go, and since the people of the past cannot defend themselves and say, "It was just an outburst of the moment--that's not how I really feel."

But there is a certain amount of caution, of downright suspicion of administration, in our Synod. Dr. Gregory Jackson, a recent colloquy from the LCA, told me in a passing conversation that he noticed how in the Wisconsin Synod our people didn't just accept anything without question when it comes to administration. And you often hear in our circles, "If someone wants to serve in a certain position, you can bet he's not going to get it." We can be very leery about administration in the Wisconsin Synod.

Are such fears justified, however? We have seen other churches in the United States and elsewhere grow in size and administration. Suddenly they became heterodox. We have seen the Missouri Synod become more and more political in its administration, disabled by factionalism and compromise, paralyzed by men who cannot act until they have some kind of influence and power and who will not act even then for fear they will lose their influence and ability to do anything further. Will the same happen to us? Is fear an only tool God is using to

protect us?

A close look at the development of our administration will help us learn the answer. The weave of Synod reactions in convention, of the leaders in our administration, of historic events, and of our doctrine of church and ministry will show us if our fears of administration were/are justified or not.

SYNODICAL ADMINISTRATION:
THE FORMLESS YEARS--1850's to 1930's

The first years of our Synod's history didn't really have an administration, as most people think of administration. There weren't any full-time administrators. That shouldn't really surprise anyone. Who needs a full-time man when there isn't enough work for it? And who can afford one, either, when you have only 6 to 10 congregations, frontier congregations that can barely keep a pastor fed between two or three of them?

And yet there was organization. Muehlhaueser, Weinmann, Wrede and Meiss formed the Wisconsin Synod in Milwaukee in 1849/1850 with positions for President, Secretary and Treasurer.(2) Why? Before we assume that Muehlhaueser formed administration for administration's sake, think about what it took to be a frontier pastor in those days.(3) It was really self-less planning that made a man start administration. After all, if a frontier pastor died, how could he be sure that his congregation would be taken care of? How could he make sure that his successor taught Christ's sheep as he did? Some organization was the only way to insure the future, to insure doctrinal consistency, to train men

for the future. More than that, if Muehlhaueser wanted to spread God's Word farther into the frontier, and needed more men to do it, he really needed some kind of church organization to provide more manpower from within and to encourage more help from the mission societies of Germany, from without. Also, when several churches agree in doctrine and support the same ideals, it's foolish for every pastor to try to meet all those ideals (i.e. mission work in every part of Wisconsin) himself. A lot more can be done in God's kingdom when men divide up the responsibility. Organization and administration provide that.

Of course, once you start an administration, it's bound to grow. Muehlhaueser and the other pastors of 1850 formed the Wisconsin Synod because they wanted to spread God's Word more efficiently. As a result the church grew. And as it grew, the need for administration grew. Already by 1860, first president Pastor Muehlaueser stepped down from the presidency because the burdens of the office were "becoming more pressing year by year."(4)

Muehlhaueser's decision to step down says a great deal about our administration already in 1860. Admittedly, Muehlhaueser was not at the peak of his health (he left itinerant preaching for the parish back in 1848 because he became ill and realized he couldn't hack the hardships of the road anymore(5)). He had only seven years left on this earth when he resigned the presidency.(6) But he apparently left the presidency for other than personal concerns. His entire life was "an unselfish dedication of himself and all he had to the cause of the Gospel and of the needy."(7) Perhaps he no longer had the energy for

the presidency. But you have to wonder, if an energetic and dedicated man like Muehlhaueser couldn't handle the pressure of the presidency anymore, it must have become a rather time-consuming and stressful job.

A pastor in the mid to late 1800's would have enough to do, of course, trying to help all the wide-flung immigrants in Wisconsin and the ever increasing numbers along the lakeshore. But already in Muehlhaueser's administration, the president of our Synod had so much more to do than ordaining new pastors, as the original constitution stipulated.(8) The Wisconsin Synod was developing a doctrinal consciousness. Along with that came all the disciplinary cases and the dealings with other church bodies, including the Mission Societies which helped support our Synod. Muehlhaueser had come to America with rather free ideas of fellowship and confessionalism, but he had developed a stricter confessionalism while in the Wisconsin Synod(9)--the pressure on him in his dealings with his alma maters in Germany must have been tremendous. The presidency had become more than he bargained for.

This paper doesn't have to dwell on each president of our Synod's early years to get a picture of our administration, but Muehlhaueser as the first was singularly important. His actions and his attitude and his reasons for stepping down set the pattern for everyone after him. He seems to have viewed the presidency as a service to God's kingdom--not as a prestige. The Synod continued to re-elect him as president--for ten years in a

row, even though the constitution which he drafted demanded that "No one shall and can hold the office more than four successive years."(10)--because they recognized his valuable service.(11) They would not have re-elected him if he had been in it for the glory.

Bading and Reim seem to have followed Muehlhaeser's suit. Both worked hard and faithfully as presidents, always keeping in mind that their work was service to God. Reim later stepped down as president when the hint of a scandal (he was later exonerated) threatened to give the presidency a bad name.(12) He was more interested in serving God's people in the best way possible than in making a name for himself.

How anyone could think that there is anything bad about administration, when you look at these fine men, is mind-boggling. But then, this was the time of part-time presidents, men who gave the presidency a good name while working themselves into an early grave trying to be both a good pastor and a good administrator.

President Streissguth, apparently, was either more practical or less dedicated about the situation. In 1867 he urged a full-time president-visitor office, a man without any congregational responsibility. He urged a strong praesidium and more cooperation from the field. He didn't get it. Either the pastors and delegates of the Synod feared some kind of dictatorial power grab or they feared some kind of wallet grab. In either case the Wisconsin Synod stayed with part-time

presidents. Judging from what Professor Koehler says of Streissguth (p. 166), the president was more interested in running things efficiently. But there was a great deal of worry over more centralization and the dangers of it. When the Synod revised the constitution in 1868, they didn't listen to Streissguth. On the contrary, they expanded the responsibilities of the president, requiring him to visit all the congregations in the Synod, once every year if he could or "by and by".(13) Streissguth couldn't accept the response of the Synod and resigned in 1867. His subsequent resignation could have been the only way out for an overworked man or the angry reaction of a frustrated and embarrassed politician. It is impossible to tell. Some one might object that Streissguth was exaggerating the situation, after all, we got along without full-time presidents until 1959, and the Synod was a whole lot bigger then. But consider the responsibilities of a president in those early years. He was the chief fund-raiser, the chief communicator on inter-synodical levels, the one to deal with internal church problems--arguments, reformed practices, doctrinal deviations, opposition altars--the one to plan and carry out conferences, the one to send letters to the entire synod and to respond to queries from others, the chief promoter and supporter of schools, and the one to set up reisepredigers. Streissguth had all of this and the General Council German Hymnal Committee, too.(14) By 1959, when the Synod finally got a full-time president, there were lots of other people to take care of some of these responsibilities, or at least to share in them. Streissguth was probably justified

in his request. We needed a full-time administrator a long time ago.

That the Wisconsin Synod got along without one is probably the "fault" of men like John Bading. Before President Naumann he held the longest tenure of any president--26 years. His name is all over Koehler's and Fredrich's histories of the Synod. He served in some of the most difficult times for our Synod--during the Missouri State Plan fight and the Election Controversy and the break with the Mission Societies and the trying formation of the General Synod. His input was vital, his leadership our future. To think of what he must have sacrificed in his family and personal life and in his congregation for the sake of our Synod!

In these early years, the administration did not change much. In 1856, the vice-presidency was added so that someone could stand for Bading while he raised funds in Europe.(15) In the same year, Bading-Koehler-Reim-Sauer redrafted the constitution to expand the duties of member congregations to the Synod and of the Synod to the member congregations (in which they showed that the Synod was more there to serve the congregations and that congregations did not have to even listen to the Synod--the Synod was basically there "to provide for the member congregations, so they are supplied as soon as possible with a preacher").(16) In 1875, the Synod proposed striking the limitation of the president's tenure and allowing presidents to be re-elected as often as the people saw fit. It took until 1880 to pass the resolution, however.(17) But the topic didn't end there. Some were

concerned about promoting too much centralization of power, even with a part-time presidency. But the Synod realized, when she looked at her track record, that the men who served in her presidency were there to serve and not to rule.

TRANSITIONS TO FORM

While the Synod was still small and administration could be part-time without too much problem, no one really objected to administration. Everything was obviously done with the interest of the Gospel at heart. When the Synod expanded into the Federation and the 1917 Merger, however, the problems began.

During the Federation years, when the Wisconsin Synod was developing working ties with Michigan and Minnesota and Nebraska, things seem to have been pretty quiet. Each member of the Federation kept the same government she had had all along. The synods merely worked together on missions and education.(18)

This brings up another point. The formation of the Federation, and later the formation of the Joint Synod, was not just another building up of bureaucracy, either. The synods that formed both groups joined together because, on their own, they were having problems spreading God's Word and maintaining their own congregations. Wisconsin might have done well enough on her own, but in love for God's Word she decided to share what God had given her with the rest. Already in 1862, Wisconsin noticed that the Minnesota Synod was having problems reaching the many German immigrants in her frontier and that she didn't have enough

pastors or the funds to start a seminary of her own.(19) The Federation, with her superintendent of home missions and her president (both part-time), was there to support a unified and orderly use of God's gifts and God's message.

Inevitably, a merger was bound to take place. Historically, mergers have created as many problems as advantages (just look at the recent ELCA merger in the 1980's). But this merger in 1917 went well. Pastor Bergemann, president of the Wisconsin Synod, traveled over 20,000 railroad miles to assure everyone that the new organization would serve God well and was not just more administration for administration's sake.(20)

The problems started after the merger. The new constitution was ratified unchanged by the Allgemeine Synod committee in Saginaw. The Board of Trustees (which came into existence with the incorporation of the Synod in 1863-64) of the Wisconsin Synod was instructed and empowered to switch all the properties of the Wisconsin Synod over to the Allgemeine Synod. The Minnesota and Michigan Synods promised to take the proper steps toward incorporation as soon as the Nebraska Synod ratified the new constitution of the Allgemeine Synod.(21) Already, however, in 1919, a new constitution had to be ratified. Only nine pages long, the 1919 constitution describes a rather limited presidency, first and second vice-presidencies, office of secretary and secretary of doctrinal proceedings and a more defined board of trustees. The greater bulk of the constitution takes up the Synod's institutions, Northwestern Publishing House, home and foreign missions, support of sick and invalid pastors, and conventions. The

only reference to districts or district government merely lists what the seven districts are: N-Wisconsin, SE-Wisconsin, W-Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Nebraska, and Pacific Northwest. No mention is even made of district presidents. The Joint Synod left it up to the districts to set up their own type of government.(22) In many ways the Synod was not really ready for the needs of a large religious body (at least comparatively larger than what each smaller synod had been). Many questions went unanswered and unanticipated. And already in the same convention that passed the 1919 constitution, some were asking the Synod to change it again. The North and West Districts of Wisconsin wanted two teachers to join the four pastors and four laymen on the Board of Trustees.(23)

Sometime in the 1921-23 biennium the suggestion came before the Synod to make the presidency full-time. A study-committee, headed by John Brenner, looked into the desirability of full-time presidency and came back with a lengthy report:

This committee, chosen by the Synod in her last convention to bring advice concerning the question of a general president without a parish and, if found necessary, to make suggestions for the same, how the work load of the general president might of necessity be lessened so that he could maintain some supervision of a congregation, submits the following report to the honorable Synod:

There is an understanding of the presidency which has no basis in the Synod constitution, but is covered in part by the constitution. On the basis of this understanding, the presidency is to be the head of administration to the extent that all the strings of administration run together in his hand, so that the presidency is finally the one office of responsibility.

To that aim, the president should carry out personally the following:

1. Supervision of all district conventions.
2. Supervision of all meetings of administrative boards and the various committees.
3. Supervision of all institutions.
4. Handling of all affairs outside the Synod.
5. Handling of all affairs between districts.

Because of this, many demands--which have risen through custom or private interest--have made necessary some representation of the Synod for some official attendance or at least some active interest, at all possible ceremonies, celebrations, and other activities.

This understanding concerning the office of the president makes demands on his time and energy to the extent that he cannot, as pastor, oversee his congregation.

But Brenner and his committee responded to this memorial by saying:

We consider this understanding and its application to be false and indeed on the following reasons:

1. It came into being without any deliberation.
2. It developed out of business motives.
3. It does damage to a way of life that is supposed to be church oriented.
4. It is successful rather in the wordly way than in the spiritual way.

Then the committee explained at length each of the four points, saying that the Synod from the beginning never anticipated such an understanding, but as the Synod grew, the work-load increased and the cooperation of individuals in the Synod decreased so that the president's office had more to do. When the various synods

joined in 1917 and the presidency turned into a general presidency, this misunderstanding cropped up. Brenner and the committee said that this misunderstanding brought the ideas of power and money and prestige into the presidency, and they just didn't belong in an office which was more concerned with "das Hoehere". Going on, the committee said that our presidency should be more like Paul's and Luther's service--more concerned with ministerial-type service than "die bureaukratische Beschaeftigung" (the bureaucratic occupation). By taking on this idea of a president the Synod was selling off her life, alienating herself. Brenner and the others called on the Synod to get rid of this idea:

Therefore, it is better, that we bring a stop to the development of our administrative machinery at once, right here, and turn back to the beginning of its development....

Then the committee suggested ways of cutting back the power and the responsibilities of the president. Here Brenner and the committee really developed the authority of the Synod in convention by requiring the various boards to meet at least once a year in a business-like meeting in which the entire work of the Synod was decided and the recommendations of the Synod would be made. At this meeting the General Mission Board, a pastor and layman from every administrative committee, the trustees in their entirety, the general president and the district presidents would meet (this was the beginnings of the Synodical Council). There all the districts would have at least two representatives who could become current on the Synod work through reports and could immediately participate in the Synod work. Each committee, after

this meeting would have to submit a report to the general president. He would put together an easy to glance over report to the district presidents at least twice a year. They would pass on the reports to the visitation men and they would pass them on to the delegate conferences.

Finally, Brenner and the rest suggested that, if the reduced work load still proved too much for the president, the Synod could help support an assistant pastor for the congregation (at the congregation's discretion) and any clerical help he might need.(24)

Assuming that Brenner and his men were correct--that there was some worldly misunderstanding about the office of the president--it was a good thing that the Synod did not elect a full-time president at this time. But were they really correct? Is it so worldly to have a president who represents the Synod at all kinds of meetings? What is a president if he is not a representative? Admittedly, there could be a danger, especially if the man looked at the office as one of prestige. But was there a precedent for that?

The present president, Pastor Bergemann, could hardly have been proof for the committee's findings. He may have had the attitude that "when he was right, he was right no matter what", but everything he did was motivated with concern for spreading the Gospel of God with an evangelical understanding.(25) He was president for twenty-four years (counting his years before the merger), and all that time he tried to influence the Synod with

his evangelical approach.(26) Far from being a dictator, it was President Bergemann who "began an innovation by having the various committees and treasurers present their reports in advance of the sessions."(27) Rather than consolidate power in his own hands, he appointed a committee in 1912 to study how the pre-merger Wisconsin Synod could divide itself into four districts and have some autonomy within each. He initiated, at the 1919 convention of the Joint Synod, the delegate conferences by urging that delegates hold one-day conferences after the sessions and that they report the decisions of the Synod at them. Even before Brenner and his committee presented their findings to the convention in 1923, President Bergemann saw to it that the "Reports and Memorials" were printed up and sent out to the delegates before the convention--something no one had ever done before.(28)

With all due respect to Pastor Brenner (who himself later became president of the Joint Synod in 1933) and his committee, it is difficult to see how they could ever have assumed the things they did about the development of the presidency. Of course, the committee said that the alleged misunderstanding existed within some people's minds, not in the President's mind. Some people, however, might suspect that there was some hedging about a full-time presidency and that the committee found an excuse for denying a full-time presidency. Developments in the church's administration give no indication whatsoever that any misunderstanding ever existed. Some people might have looked at men like Muehlhaeuser and Bading and Bergemann and, feeling proud of our

presidents, might have put them on a pedestal. Such feelings could easily have been done away with with a little instruction. It was not necessary to use them as excuses for maintaining a part-time presidency. The track record of the Synod presidents certainly didn't justify the action. Just the same, the situation may have been a blessing in disguise. The committee did make the Synod realize that the President did need help and that he was doing a great deal. They did deal with the situation. The Synod also took time to study administration and develop convictions about its usefulness in God's kingdom. As long as the presidency remained in the congregations, no one could claim that our administration had lost sight of the people.

In the 1920's, that was a crucial point. In the 1920's and early 1930's a trend of anti-bureaucracy seemed to be on the rise. Already in the same convention as Brenner's committee reported, a memorial came from the Western Conference of the Dakota-Montana District,

Laut des Berichtes sind nur Pastoren und Laien aus Wisconsin in den Board of Trustees gewaehlt worden.

Da es nur dann allgemeine Zufriedenheit geben wird, wenn jeder Distrikt repraesentiert ist, denn wir wollen keine taxation without representation, wollen wir, die Westliche Konferenz des Dakota-Montana-Distrikts hiermit gegen zukuenftige Wahlen dieser Art energisch protestiert haben. (29)

The memorial then requested that each district be allowed to elect one or more candidates to the Board of Trustees, and that in convention one Trustee would be elected from each district so that each district would have a representative to speak

for it. The memorial also asked that the Board of Trustees then elect an executive board from its numbers to carry to conclusion the ends of the Board.(30) The memorial was made a resolution and passed.

What concerned the Western Conference of Dakota-Montana went deeper. When the Protestant Controversy hit the Wisconsin Synod in 1926 and the years that followed, the Synod experienced a tremendous attack on its administration. It did not strike the Synod President so much, however. It hit the district presidents.

The district presidents were a new development for the people of the Synod, especially in the state of Wisconsin. While the various synods were still in the 1892 Federation, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin and Nebraska all had presidents. When the merger formed the Joint Synod in 1917, the administrative set-ups in Minnesota, Michigan and Nebraska could easily switch over to district administrations. Those districts could look on their district presidents in much the same way they did their former synodical presidents. But not Wisconsin. Wisconsin didn't think about districting itself until Bergemann suggested studying it in 1912 (cf. above). District presidents were rather new. There was nothing about them in the Synodical Constitution. All districts did not treat the office of district president the same way in their district constitutions. It wasn't until 1935 that the Synod pounded out what the duties of the Conference of Presidents were to be and proposed the duties of the district presidents in their districts.(31) The Synod in convention spent

another four years to grind out a model district constitution that gave some consistency to the district presidents' service.(32)

The result of all this was a terrible disregard for the district presidents. For a long time congregations did not really trust the district presidents who brought them call lists. The congregations thought "that there had to be something wrong with them or the district president wouldn't have put them on the call list."(33) During the 1920's and early 30's there was a great deal of lampooning of the district presidents.(34) It is likely in Wisconsin that people who were used to dealing with a state-wide general president did not appreciate having to talk to someone whom they thought was an underling, an upstart level of bureaucracy. What was meant to promote greater action on the "grass-roots" level may have been perceived as a barrier to democracy: when people could go directly to the president with their problems, they felt more involved; now they had to go through the DP's. Proceedings in the late 1920's show a number of attempts by people to go over the district's head to the Synod and the president. President Bergemann was asked to fill the chair in the special conventions in the Western Wisconsin District(35) and in 1927 a number of pastors asked the Synod in convention to discipline and investigate certain acts of the Western Wisconsin District officials.(36) The Synod, too, took some flack when she refused to upstage local officials and suggested that the appellants and the district officials form a joint committee to investigate the matter.(37) It was a tough time for

the Synod administration.

Perhaps it's just as well, though. God used the troubles of history to help preserve our church in its administration. "The Protestant Conference brought it about that the offices of district president and president were conceived as offices of service and not of prestige."(38) When those men saw what they had to go through as district presidents and as president, they had to say, "I'm not in this for the bucks or the power. I'm in this for God."

Two other things developed during the early years of our Synod that insured the dedication of our administration. One was money, or rather the lack of it. Just as the newly formed Joint Synod was starting to define the administration more clearly, the Depression struck. With a massive debt from 1920's building projects, the Synod was suddenly forced to cut back. The Board of Trustees made two huge 20% cuts in salaries, wages and rents for institutions and administrative departments effective November 1, 1931 and November 1, 1932. The Board came under heavy fire for what some called over-centralized, high-handed actions. The Board could only say that they didn't want to do it, but "it was a matter of live or die for the Synod."(39)

What the Board lost in criticisms the rest of the administration gained in respect. They took the two 20% cuts and lived with it. The people of the Synod could see that the people who served them were not in it for the money. They were there to serve. It is probably no small credit to them that at this time memorials started streaming in, requesting more administration. But more

of that later.

More important than money in the development of our administration, the Wisconsin Synod Doctrine of Church and Ministry played a crucial part in administration at this time and set a stage for development in the years to come.

Our doctrine of church and ministry first woke up in the early 1900's. In 1899 a Missouri Synod congregation in Cincinnati, Ohio ran into problems when, without due cause, it excommunicated a man. He appealed to the synod officials and won out over the congregation. But the congregation refused to back down. The Missouri Synod suspended the congregation and its pastor. When the congregation asked to come into the Wisconsin Synod, a debate arose about the ethicalness (and rightness) of one synod taking in the excommunicated member of another synod. "Some were willing to receive [the pastor and his congregation] immediately. Others opposed this procedure on the grounds that synodical discipline is church discipline and must be respected by all sister synods until it can be shown that it had been in error in one respect or another." (40) The professors of our seminary, August Pieper, John Schaller and J.P. Koehler went to the Scriptures and found that

1. In the New Testament Scriptures the Church is never anything else but the Communion of Saints;
2. To this Church, as to holy people, the Lord has given the keys, not to an ecclesiastical institution as such;
3. The Church can be recognized with certainty by its preaching of the Gospel;
4. The synod has the essential marks of the

Church;

- A. The name "synod" already indicates this,
- B. Its constituting elements are the local congregations, represented first of all by Christians,
- C. It preaches the Gospel for its God-given purposes,
- D. It originated not from human counsel, but through the work of the Holy Ghost.(41)

Professor Pieper then stated that synods then have the power and the obligation to use the keys on their members and that "if exercised in accordance with the Word of God, [it] is not invalid as the practice of discipline because of the representative character of the synod, but is binding before God...."(42)

This is extremely significant. The Seminary professors, through August Pieper's articles in the Quartalschrift and through the Thienessville Theses in 1932, were saying that a synod was as much God's church as a local congregation and that a man in administration was as much a member of the public ministry as a local parish pastor. Before 1910, "they didn't have to give much thought to it, because all the synodical officers were parish pastors."(43) The administrators didn't look at the presidency or anything else as "putting on another hat". On the contrary, "they just had an added duty, and they would not have taken on any duty that was not for the welfare of the church."(44) But as the Synod grew, the added duties took up more and more time. It became increasingly difficult for a president to take care of his parish. Now, when it came time to increase administration, the

Wisconsin Synod might have rationalized some kind of full-time presidency--as the Missouri Synod did--without any real basis in the ministry, but there would undoubtedly have been opposition, cries of "centralization of power" and "ungodly", just as Brenner's committee feared in 1923. Professor Lawrenz, who grew up in this era and entered the ministry during the time of the Thienesville Theses and who was a colleague of August Pieper's at the Seminary, spoke of the influence of the Doctrine of Church and Ministry on the development of our administration:

If we did not know that we were regarded as a church at the synod meeting, we might be tempted to do something that we won't do if we are very conscious that we are functioning as Christ's church and that everything that we do must be in the interest of the ministry of the keys, and if all our executives did not feel that they are in the public ministry [we would have problems]. So, if our doctrine of the church and ministry is the true doctrine, it certainly must be a great help.(45)

It was a great help. Without this understanding of service in God's kingdom, without this idea of broad church principles and administrative public ministry, the Wisconsin Synod might never have gone for full-time administrators. Ever since Streissguth's suggestion in 1867 she had balked, even though the Minnesota Synod had a full-time president in 1915 before the merger.(46) But the publication of the Thienesville Theses on the Doctrine of Church and Ministry, in 1932, opened the door to a biblical full-time administration. Things worked slowly, but we'll see now that the Synod was about to go into second gear.

TRANSITIONS IN ATTITUDES:
THE DEVELOPMENT YEARS--MID-1930'S TO MID-1950'S

The Wisconsin Synod never was one to jump into things. Back in 1877, when the Missouri Synod pushed for a mass-merger within the Synodical Conference, the Wisconsin Synod could see advantages, but did not immediately leap into the fray. She could have avoided a lot of inter-synodical wranglings that way, but when the Missouri Synod tried to push through the State-Synod plan and pull the Wisconsin Synod into the administrative jurisdiction of Missouri, Wisconsin said,

The Synod asserts that it is ready for such an amalgamation into a state synod of Wisconsin, as soon as the possibility is precluded that this state synod might as a district attach itself to an existing synod and thereby lose its separate identity and independence.... The Synod asserts that it cannot view any such attachment to an existing general synod either as commanded in God's Word or as essentially necessary for true unity and profitable and advantageous for our congregations.(47)

Wisconsin didn't just go in for anything because the idea was popular. C.F.W. Walther was furious and accused our Synod of an ungodly attitude. But Wisconsin did not mean to prevent unity; she was just cautious when it came to administration. And in this case she was justified in her skeptical attitude:

If Wisconsin flouted anything, it was not the Holy Spirit and his work of unifying the brethren but rather an overstress of one kind of synodical structure by a synod that would in time become the strongest advocate of local congregation supremacy over any synodical structure.(48)

It seems unbelievable that the Wisconsin Synod, a group of Christians who balked at administration, that they would turn

down an administration that put the grass-roots congregations on a pedestal. But our Synod wasn't necessarily in favor of congregational autonomy. She started her administration years before because alone the congregations couldn't accomplish much. The Wisconsin Synod wasn't against administration when she was sure that it was good for God's kingdom and for her people. But when administration seemed questionable, she was dead set against it. "Cave!" was Latin for "beware of new administrative developments", for the Wisconsin Synod.

All this proves that our Synod did not just jump into administration. Perhaps she pulled back at administration developments because of fear of centralization or because of the cost involved or because it didn't seem practical at the time. We have seen, however, that in the early 1900's and into the 1930's a certain trust of church government was developing. The admirable attitude of our professors and administrators during the hardships of the Depression's early years and the publishing of the Doctrine of Church and Ministry showed that administration could function in a God-pleasing, trustworthy way. The Synod was ready to take a look at full-time administration.

As you read earlier, the mid-30's saw the first real descriptions of the office of district presidents. The English draft of the Synodical Constitution, in 1933, paved the way by including the DP's under Article VII on Supervision of Doctrine and Practice.(49) But people had begun to consider more developments in the Synod. In the same year, Mr. O. Ruedebusch memorialized the Synod to beef up the Board of Trustees with the power to act

authoritatively during the biennium on finances, especially in emergencies. He suggested that they "be given a full time salaried committee of three thoroughly experienced, consecrated and trustworthy men"--an ordained minister, a layman with practical bookkeeping experience and knowledge of accounting, and another laymen with practical experience and broad knowledge in financing.(50) The memorial suggested that this board of three, called the Auxiliary Co-ordination Board, should have power to adjust salaries, regulate mission and institutional activities, make contracts, purchase supplies, maintain synodical property, engage necessary clerical, and "in every undertaking be held responsible to Synod."(51)

Ten years earlier the Convention probably would have dismissed the proposal altogether as originating in "business-like thinking". In the 30's (whether out of concern for the financial situation of the Synod or the Doctrine of Church and Ministry), the committee and convention gave remarkable attention to the Ruedebusch Memorial. The committee's consideration of Ruedebusch's suggestion is particularly eye-opening:

While suggestions made in the memorial might not in every detail appear to be in conformity with the policies and considerations that have heretofore governed Synod in matters of financial administration--since, for example, the author had assumed that the authority of the Board of Trustees extended eo ipso in an unlimited manner into all fields of synodical activity, and there may be other inaccuracies as to the conception of synodical government,--it is nevertheless the belief of your committee that the memorial will serve to inaugurate such a revision in our administrative policy as to result beneficially for Synod under present

conditions and bring about more efficient stewardship.

Your committee is well aware of the danger of extreme tendencies, particularly in times like the present. On the one hand, there is the attempt to maintain at all costs and without due consideration of economic difficulties the entire program of Synod's work; on the other, there is the tendency during frantic times simply to resort to the nearest way out of the difficulty, namely by cutting down to the barest minimum, without giving proper forethought to the danger of curtailing vital branches of activity.

The committee makes this plea at the outset: Let no one assume that the Ruedebusch Memorial is intended to be radical or revolutionary in its aims, although its effects are to be far-reaching. The program therein suggested is by no means intended to be a departure from the mind and spirit and brotherly consideration which must at all times be the governing principle within the Church; nor is the Board therein advocated to be an autocratic body whose dealings and findings would be dictatorial in nature. It is evident that a thoroughly Christian spirit must at all times be the motive from which all its acts proceed and that it must have the present and ultimate welfare of the Kingdom of God as well as that of congregations and individuals at heart.

The committee further realizes the extreme difficulty of placing this matter before Synod in so complete and convincing a manner that the project will find immediate and general support. The committee urges, however, that the matter be thoroughly considered from every possible angle with the view of finding an arrangement which would bring about the change considered necessary and result satisfactorily. (52)

With that, the convention listened to the committee and gave the memorial to the Board of Trustees for consideration and to the various districts for discussions at their conventions in 1934. (53) In 1935 the Board of Trustees reported on their study of the Ruedebusch Plan. They saw that the plan was a sincere

effort to solve the Synod's financial problems, that it would centralize control and administration in the Synod, and that it would improve communication and eliminate waste in the Synod. Still, they rejected the plan, for pretty much the same reasons as Brenner's committee rejected a full-time presidency in 1923. But an attitude change can be seen developing here. The Ruedebusch Plan did present a drastic change for the Synod--you would expect them to put it aside. But you would not expect the Board to hint that someday the Synod could accept such a change:

[We object to the plan because of] The present sentiment of many pastors and communicant members which does not seem to favor such control. Any method or system to be effective requires whole-hearted cooperation on the part of the Synod's members.(54)

Of course, attitudes had not changed so much. The Board did see "the danger of centralized authority to the spiritual growth of the church as evidenced by history" was a reason to object to the plan.(55) For the most part, however, their reasons were more practical: what will we do with these men if they don't get re-elected? how do we know that business acumen will guarantee success in the Church?(56) There was a change in the church's attitude toward administration.

At the same time, there were definite indications of changing attitudes in the Synod. In 1933 the School Committees asked for an executive secretary(57) and, after deferring it to committee for study, the Synod okayed it in 1935. In fact, the committee reported, "your committee feels very keenly the necessity of an executive secretary and urgently requests that an executive secretary be granted (emphasis the committee's)."(58) The Synod

realized,

Inspite of its best efforts to do as much as possible of the work which is expected of the proposed executive secretary, your committee has been able to do only a small part of that work. The work expected of the executive secretary can be done efficiently only by a man who can devote his entire time to this work.

The main burden of the work, which rests upon the secretary of the executive committee of the School Committee, requires so much of his time that it leaves him little time for his other work. The large amount of correspondence alone requires so much time that he cannot continue this work without neglecting, in a certain degree, the work to which he has been called by his congregation. (59)

In the same year, 1935, the General Mission Board asked for an executive committee of three (two pastors and a layman) "to act for and in place of the General Mission Board between the sessions of the General Board and [to] attend any and all meetings for which officers of the Synod might otherwise desire the counsel of the General Mission Board." (60) They got it. The Synod also set up a Board for General Support of retiring pastors and widows and their children. (61) The Synod was beginning to realize the need for Boards and executive committees in areas that could have been handled by individuals years before.

In 1937 the Synod made the Board of Support permanent and placed one representative from each district on it. (62) The convention also clarified the duties of district presidents in calls and vacancies (63) and made the English Version of the Synodical Constitution the official version for the Synod, expanding the

authority of the president in filling vacancies during the biennium and dealing with supervision of doctrine.(64) The Board of Trustees asked that the Synod rescind its resolution (1935) to expand a Custodian of Funds Committee, and instead asked for a Trust Funds Committee. They got it.(65)

In 1939, attitudes starting developing on district, as well as general synodical, levels. On the synodical level, against the suggestion of President Brenner, the Synod in convention resolved to limit members of the General Mission Board to one office in the Joint Synod (they were retaining a resolution of 1925).(66) The Mississippi Valley/SW Conference suggested that the Synod get a full-time editor for the Synod's magazines at this time, to improve and promote them within the Synod--only to have their memorial ignored in favor of less expensive but in the long-run ineffectual suggestions.(67) The Board of Trustees was thanked for inspiring confidence in them throughout the Synod,(68) and the Convention sought to maintain the Board of Trustees representation in the Synod as it was: an equal presence of pastors and laymen.(69)

The Synod in 1939 seemed to be holding back on any development in administration on a synodical level. But the indications were there: within the Synod people were perceiving a need for more administration and they were interested in having it, even if the Synod in general was still leery of it.

At the same time, people were starting to look at district administration. The 1939 Convention saw the acceptance of a

clarified District Constitution.(70) The Arizona Mission churches and Colorado Missions appealed to the Synod for some district status because "the experience of a quarter of a century proves the present absentee administration unsatisfactory... [and] the experience of all other church bodies in Arizona show local administration to have been most suitable, and necessary to successful expansion...."(71) When the Synod refused district status and gave them General Missionaries, instead, to carry on mission expansion,(72) the Pacific Northwest suggested that at least they could make the General Missionaries responsible to the Mission Boards of those districts instead of to some far away board of the mother-districts. The Synod referred the matter to the General Mission Board.(73)

The Synod didn't seem to move or change much in 1939. But change was in the wind. It was only a matter of time.

1941 saw only the second draft of the Constitution for Districts(74) and the creation of district mission boards.(75) But it shows that the Synod was looking for ways to solve the problems of a growing church. Inevitably, some growth in administration had to take place. And the Synod showed understanding in creating a form of local government that could help mission districts grow while they still were not able to function as full-fledged districts. They also gave these missions representation at the meetings of the General Mission Board through the Pastor-Chairman and a lay member of their local mission boards.(76)

In 1945, the developments in the Synod administration started coming to a head. With the augmenting and clarifying of the district presidents' roles in the late-30's and the increasing work-load of the Board of Trustees and the constant expansion of the Synod, new needs in administration started cropping up.

Suddenly, secretarial help for administrators was a must. Two congregations in Winona memorialized the Synod for the sake of the executive secretary of the School Board and the president of the Synod and the district presidents. The matter was dropped when the convention found that it "was already provided for by Synod, no further action was deemed necessary."(77) Apparently, however, the officials (or some of them) had not really been using the help they had every right to.

Confusion was breaking out between various Synod officials, too. The Synodical Constitution left people wondering just who was in charge of supervision of doctrine and practice--the president or the DP's?(78) Communication breakdowns were occurring between the district education boards and the Synodical Board for Education.(79)

Certain people (including notably President Brenner) saw that the set-up of our Board of Trustees put an ever-expanding Synod at risk every time new elections came up (every six years) because no one man could succeed himself. Districts had to alternate pastor-layman in their elections for the sake of "equal representation". There was no continuity of experience in the Board of Trustees. As President Brenner put it, "The removal at one time

of the most experienced members would mean a break in the continuity of the work."(80) To top it all off, the General Mission Board, swamped with home missions in a quickly expanding synod, asked for a full-time secretary of home missions.(81)

All of these things--the need for secretarial help, the confusion over supervision of doctrine and practice, the lack of communication between boards, the continuity of the Board of Trustees and the need for a secretary of home missions--all of these the 1945 convention either referred to committee or tabled under the assumption that the system provided for that.

It has been said that our Synod, at least until the 1960's, has had a "crisis action" attitude.(82) We didn't do anything until we absolutely had to. Nothing came up on the convention floor until something went wrong. Developments in administration didn't come until the work-load was so enormous, the demands so great, that even the decisions that were finally made weren't enough to get the job done. We have seen already requests for a full-time president in 1867 and 1923--refused!--and other requests for more full-time workers pushed off because the Synod didn't think it needed it at the time. There is some admiration to wanting to study things before you make a rash decision. But we will find that the decisions the Synod pushed off here in 1945, she continued to push off until things came terribly close to disaster in the 50's and the Synod was almost totally unprepared for the situation she found herself in, in the early 60's.

If people are still afraid of administration, perhaps they should take a look at how our administration developed and ask themselves, "Would I have liked the alternatives?" Centralization may prove dangerous in some instances, but what about the uncontrolled, unserved, unplanned growth of a church without administration?

1947 brought little development. The Synod did attempt to deal with the lack of continuity by providing an executive chairman for the Board of Trustees, a chairman separate from the representatives of the districts, a chairman who could succeed himself in elections in convention.(83) The Synod was trying to deal with the situation, but the answer to the problem would prove to be only a token answer in the years to come.

In this same convention the Publishing House (which is accountable to the Synod for the materials it prints and the profits it makes) asked for an executive secretary of publications and an assisting committee to help him. They didn't get him.(84)

In 1947 there were also a number of changes in the constitution to be made.(85) Every time a new position was created, a new duty was added to the Board of Trustees or the Synodical Committee or anyone else, changes had to be made in the constitution. These changes were starting to pile up, with no one re-doing and republishing the constitution. No one was reviewing the constitution, either, to make sure that this growing administration actually worked together.

President Brenner knew how it worked, however.

President Brenner had been president since 1933. The Synod had not re-elected President Bergemann, possibly because they blamed him for the huge debt the Synod had following the stock market crash in '29.(86) Brenner's election surprised no one. He was a dedicated man who had shown a knack for liquidating debts. He was just the man for the job.(87) "He did not desire office, but when he was elected to an office, he accepted it as a duty to the synod and he performed that duty with energy, without neglecting his congregation. He simply put in more hours...."(88) Not only did he put in more hours, he put in money, too. Although he could have used Synod money to subsidize secretarial help, he used volunteers or his children or did it himself. He never had a secretary. And he paid for most postage out of his own pocket.(89)

A man like that was probably the best thing that happened to our Synod's administration during the turbulent Depression years. We needed someone like Brenner, with convictions(90) and with frugality, to impress upon our people that this office was there to serve and not to rule. Brenner also had a great deal of respect for laymen, and in conventions he showed just how important they were by giving them due respect on the floor. He never rebuked a layman, even when he was out of line, although he did not scruple to rebuke someone like an administrator or professor who should have known better. He would hold on to his convictions, unless he was proved wrong or unless the body in convention did not support his position on an issue--then he

would back up that person or position as if the opinion were his own.(91) He was a good president.

Brenner had some very strong opinions about the presidency.

His position regarding the synod presidency was also well known. He maintained the policy: Kein Praeses ohne Amt. He felt that every president ought to be in the active ministry to be in touch with the joys and sorrows, the problems and battles of the active parish ministry. A president ohne Amt would soon lose touch with the "grassroots" of church life. President Brenner dreadfully feared a growing, top-heavy synodical structure because of the natural temptation to speak von oben herab, i.e., to dictate from "headquarters". If this were permitted to happen, he felt that the constituency of synod would soon lose control, and pure orthodoxy would consequently suffer.(92)

No one can blame Brenner for loving the parish. He was a good pastor. He was made for the parish. His attitude toward laymen, the parish, and the presidency probably maintained the standard set by Muehlhaeuser and Bading and the others. He was a good example for future presidents and a good picture for our people to see. It is debatable whether his opinion about full-time presidency and crumbling orthodoxy was correct, but he was the man for the time. His opinions about administration and his hard work and self-sacrifice probably delayed for years the development of our administration, however. When he finally did step down from the presidency in 1953, his health was crumbling; he remained in the parish for only a few more years (June 1958), and he died on 30 September, 1962.(93) He had worked faithfully, slavishly in the presidency for twenty years, as the Synod exploded in size and territory. When a new man came into the presidency, he had quite an adjustment to make. Brenner had

provided a transition that delayed the presidency in his service, but probably hastened it when he retired.

Of course, in 1949, Brenner had seven years to go before he would retire. Ironically, in the 1949 convention, Brenner himself, who worked so hard and opposed a full-time presidency, had to admit that he didn't have enough time. Vital inter-synodical problems were not covered. President Brenner had to ask the district presidents and professors at the Seminary to do much of the investigating and to report the findings to him. He excused himself to the convention,

The reports are in my hands, some of them for quite a time, but the volume of work that had to be done has made it impossible to give them due attention and study. This will, however, be done in the near future.(94)

As the the work-load of the Synod grew inevitably larger, various ways to handle the administration cropped up. In 1949, the General Mission Board, perhaps frustrated at not getting an executive secretary for home missions, suggested that they divide the GMB into three advisory boards, a Home Board (the GBHM), a Foreign & Heathen Mission Board and an Institutional Board (for campuses, Belle Plaine, etc.). The Synod tabled it indefinitely, saying, "Synod's work, at the present time, does not warrant [two additional boards]."(95) When the Michigan District saw the problems of keeping an equal balance on the Board of Trustees, she suggest that the present system could not allow equal representation of pastors and laymen on the BoT or allow much continuity, since no one could logically succeed himself. So Michigan proposed having both a layman and a pastor from each

district. Perhaps they were looking for an alternative to an elected chairman or a full-time person. But the suggestion would have created a huge, unwieldy Board of Trustees. The Synod rejected the suggestion.(96)

In the same convention Michigan proposed limiting the power of the Board of Trustees by a constitutional change. But the floor committee saw that it was impractical to set limits on the Board of Trustees. What would you do in emergencies? Besides, they said, the BoT never had exceeded its powers. It always consulted with all officials before taking action, and it was ultimately accountable to the Synod in convention.(97)

It was at this time that the Board of Trustees got its new executive (but not full-time) chairman. The new administrative position was accepted. The Board's request, however, reflects a rather mature understanding of administration that indicates the Synod was changing its attitude:

[This man will not have] more or different authority than he has at this time, but adds a ninth member to the Board, places the election of the Chairman in the hands of the Synod itself, and does not make the person of the Chairman dependent upon the nominations for Trustees of any particular District of the Synod.(98)

It seems that democracy and "grassroots" concerns could be preserved more efficiently this way. It would be a small step to a full-time, called servant of the Synod.

In 1953, the development started to accelerate. The Synod had made definite moves into foreign missions, and the overworked General Mission Board demanded some consideration. The Synod had

to broaden the GMB's power to handle the specialties of starting foreign missions. She was hardly prepared for it. When the Board made its report, it didn't realize how true its preamble was, and that soon the actions of 1953 would be grossly inadequate.

In our report we are motivated by the conviction that the work of the Mission Boards will increase with expanding fields, as the experience of the last few years has indicated, and that the duties on Synodical boards should not entail more work than a pastor of a congregation can perform without harm to his parish. If the work on any board becomes too great, such work should be divided. We are also in accord with the Synod's expression of not favoring officials without a congregation.(99)

The Synod then approved the division of the GMB into two boards by a vote of 120 to 4. The General Board for Home Missions and the General Board for Foreign and Heathen Missions were born.(100)

These weren't the only changes in 1953. Once again, the Board of Trustees was given more responsibility, this time with renting or approving the rental of parsonages and teacherages in missions and purchasing property.(101) Again, people called in vain for a full-time editor of the Synod's magazines.(102) Arizona asked again for full district status, its fourth time since the late 1920's, and at last got it.(103) And the Synod expanded district responsibilities by incorporating District Boards of Education into the District Constitutions.(104)

In 1955 the pressure started coming to bear. The executive

(part-time) chairman of the Board of Trustees, only in place since the 1949 convention, was already overloaded. The Committee on Publications (appointed in 1953(105)) never saw the man although as chairman of the Trustees he was supposed to serve on their committee:

This committee has functioned quite irregularly since it reported to the District conventions a year ago. Its chairman, the executive chairman of the Board of Trustees, found that his time was consumed by more pressing duties. At the suggestion of the Conference of Presidents he appointed a proxy to serve him until the Joint Synod shall have made other provisions for the personnel of the committee.(106)

This note of the Committee on Publications brings up a point. In the last several years--well into the Depression--one committee after another had been created to take care of various aspects of the Church's life, aspects that the Wisconsin Synod had never had to consider until she got big enough to have those problems, until the Depression made it imperative that she handle those problems on a synodical scale. Suddenly, we had committees on campus ministry, on welfare and support, on military spiritual welfare. And in 1955, two more were added to the list, the Board of Stewardship and Information and the Audio-Visual Aids Committee which was under Stewardship.(107) Someone had to serve on these boards. And it normally had to be someone who could communicate their needs to the Synodical Council or the Board of Trustees. Who had the time to serve their own board's needs and run around to the meetings of all these committees, even if only to be an ex officio attendant?

It was in this convention, too, that the already loaded Board of Education, the only board with a full-time worker, was given the responsibility of high schools as well. In their report they asked for the Synod to consider creating within the Board of Ed. two full-time executive secretaries, one for Christian Day Schools and the other for the Department of Part-Time & Adult Education (the Exec. Secr. of General Parish Education).(108) The work load was getting to be too much.

Somewhere, something was going to have to give.

1955 was an indication of something to come. The Synod had begun to realize already that very soon she might be on her own, without the Missouri Synod to prop her up. If we were going to survive a possible break with Missouri, we would have to start working, particularly in the area of home missions. For years we had been farming our people out to the Missouri Synod. If we broke with her, we could no longer just transfer anyone in Utah or Albuquerque, New Mexico to a Missouri Synod congregation; but how could we say, "We can't be there to serve you, either.?" To do that we had to consider a more organized administration that could coordinate actions. We had to do something. By 1955 at least some people knew that. By 1961, everyone did.(109)

Before any real, calculated steps were taken in that direction, however, other men had already begun to see that our church was developing beyond its present organization. In 1955, the Constitution Committee suggested a complete overhaul of the constitution.(110) Pastor James P. Schaefer relates,

The resolutions of Synod should rightfully belong in our governing document, and it was obvious as we went through the forties and early fifties that we've got to have a constitution, you know. Somebody would stand up and say, "Aah, there was a resolution passed back then and we were supposed to put that in the handbook and it's not in the handbook and you know that you shouldn't do it that w---" "OOH! Well, yeah, well." And John Brenner, of course, had a fabulous memory, and he had a lot of these little resolutions. It wasn't fair really to people. They didn't know how the Synod was run. They didn't know what the Synod could do and what it couldn't do. So in 1951...they activated a Committee on Constitutional Matters. E. Arnold Sitz was the chairman and Albert Dowmann--and Cherney was one of the members--and Arthur Voss...was on this constitution committee. Well, Art Voss got busy and he resigned from it, and then... in October of '55, I was appointed to the constitution committee--and I didn't know a thing about constitutions or things like that. I wasn't particularly interested, either. But first thing, you know, Arnold Sitz has me as chairman of this committee. Then he tells me, "We've got to revise the constitution." And there is nothing! All you have are these four or five pages from 1937. So we met for about three years--I met with him, with Sitz, E. Arnold Sitz, whenever Conference of Presidents met, which was three times a year. Then he would stay an extra day, and I would meet with him, and we would look through the constitution. Every page he would go on endlessly, reminiscing about this or that, because every constitution is really a legal history of the church, of the body that it governs.... I remember, finally, after about 1958, I said twice, "We're getting no place. We haven't rewritten one word of the constitution. Why don't I sit down and start writing, revising the constitution." So for the next year that was really what consumed almost all of my spare time. Writing. First of all taking the constitution and separating the bylaws from the constitution. Then reading the Proceedings from 1917 to 1957 for any resolutions which should be incorporated in the bylaws, because there were resolutions of Synod which should really be written into bylaws and not simply resolutions. Like, "we will add two men to the Board of Trustees." Well, that was never put in the constitution

or the bylaws. It has to be in the constitution! So in 1959, we had separated Bylaws from the constitution. We had combed over the Proceedings for all resolutions. We made some suggestions for changes in the constitution--some substantial changes, I think, that were incorporated into the constitution.

It was not a boiler-plate job, because we couldn't boiler-plate. There were a few places where we could boiler-plate. I did have the Missouri Synod Handbook. For example, in disciplinary actions, I did do some boiler-plate from the Missouri Synod, because we had no procedure for appeal. If a person was disciplined there was really no mode of appeal. Now if you'll look in our present constitution, at least the revised one we're working on now, you'll find four pages of due process resolutions.

We wrote the whole thing out, and then sent it out to all the people who were involved in it and got their agreement, because I said, "We're not going to argue in 1959 over what it should be. I'm not going to argue with the Board of Trustees that this is the way it's supposed to be. We're going to settle that before we get to the floor of Synod, so that nobody in Synod has to choose up sides between the Constitutional Committee and the agency that we're talking about.

For instance, we had a nominating committee. We put into the constitution a nominating committee.... The nomination of people was very haphazard. Often it was the boards who made the nominations. Sometimes they were made from the floor of the convention. And sometimes they were made by the districts. So in all cases where the district did not nominate, we put those cases into the hands of a nominating committee. Centralization, you see.

Anyway, we settled all those arguments.... So when we went to convention, we had the support of everyone who was involved in the constitution officially in 1959. So when we went to the floor committee there wasn't somebody standing up and saying, "I'm on the Board of Trustees and I object to that!" And as far as the Synod is concerned, as long as the boards... and things are in agreement, we had no problems. And it was all of a piece. It

was one resolution that took care of adopting the whole constitution and bylaws.(111)

In a sense, it is amazing that the Synod functioned at all with the constitution as it was before 1959. Perhaps it passed without a dissent because people were suddenly relieved to know what was going on. And the administration cooperated with a parish pastor and his committee--it would only be right to assume--for the sake of the people and order in God's church.

While Schaefer and his committee were working on the constitution, other things were happening in the Synod. 1957 was an avalanche of requests for more administration. A new evangelism committee was started.(112) A request to turn the office of the Synod's statistician into a paid, part-time (seasonal) office in the hands of possibly a layman was adopted by the convention.(113) The possibility of a full-time executive secretary of the Board for Information and Stewardship was adopted with understanding of the "pressure of work involved in its program."(114) The Board of Education was allowed an assistant executive secretary and a split into two departments. The chance for another full-time man was put on the ice.(115) Only the General Board for Home Missions was denied the full-time secretary for home missions they requested.(116)

Perhaps the words that opened this paper, the words President Naumann used to open the convention had some effect on people. Perhaps after years of seeing their committeemen run down, the Synod decided to take some of the burden off their pastor's and laymen's backs. Perhaps old fears of expenses didn't mean any-

thing to people who realized their pastors were serving them no matter what the capacity, and the cost didn't matter. Perhaps the new fears of what would happen once we left Missouri behind drove people to move more toward a real administration in the Wisconsin Synod. Perhaps the pastorate that balked so long at leaving the parish ministry began to realize that serving God's kingdom in administration could be just as important--if not moreso under the circumstances--as service in the parish.

Certainly the President inspired confidence when he reminded the people in his address, "When the president of Synod speaks in the name of Synod during the biennium he is required to make a report to the Synod at the convention."(117) In every way, although he had great responsibilities, he was always accountable to the people in convention. This was no dictatorship. How could it be?

Perhaps it is not so significant, then--when you consider how history was carrying the Wisconsin Synod along (and by that we can also understand God, I'm sure)--that at this time someone suggested a full-time presidency:

On the second day of the convention the following resolution was adopted: resolved, that a committee of five be appointed by the two vice-presidents to investigate the possibility of making the presidency of the Synod a full-time office.(118)

Of course, the old fears rose. The committee made every effort to push off the topic. Their recommendations were to 1. study it for a while; 2. have the CoP appoint three men who were to first of all "consider limiting the tenure of the office of the

President, to investigate all other aspects of the question during the next two years, and to report its finding and conclusions to the 1959 convention"; and 3. to try to get around this by relieving the president of some congregational work with assistance and time saving office devices like a typewriter and dictaphone.(119)

The Conference of Presidents set up the committee, and the committee set right to work. But it is interesting, what the committee came up with as opposed to what happened at the convention. Pastor James P. Schaefer remembers,

The Conference of Presidents had talked about the need for a full-time president, and they had appointed a committee. Habeck was on the committee, Oscar Siegler, and--somebody else. It was a three-man committee. And this committee had come up with a six-page report--all kinds of horrors of the full-time presidency. All kinds of dangers. Foot-loose president without a congregation! And so on, all this kind of stuff. It was--I think it was about six pages. The Committee on Constitutional Matters had come in with a resolution; it was about half-a-page long. Whereas, whereas, whereas, whereas, whereas, whereas, whereas--it may have been eight or ten whereas's. "Therefore be it resolved that the Synod create the office of a full-time President, and be it further resolved that the Board of Trustees establish the compensation of the President, and be it further resolved that if the President is not re-elected, the Board of Trustees shall provide financially for him until he receives a call."

I think there was about ten minutes debate on the full-time presidency. The floor committee adopted our... memorial without changing it. Maybe they changed the wording--I doubt it very much. And it went through Synod just like that!(120)

President Naumann softened them up beforehand, you might say--

although perhaps unintentionally--when he referred to assistance for executive officers,

Whether the Synod can with a good conscience continue to make such great demands without remuneration upon the congregations whose pastors are elected to synodical offices that carry with them tremendous responsibilities, especially in these last days of sore distress, must also be decided once more on the basis of studies that have been made by committees. Whether we dare to burden men with the constant feeling of frustration and guilt because they cannot carry out faithfully the responsibilities laid upon them in each of two time-consuming offices, we must consider seriously and prayerfully.(121)

A general president can carry a lot of clout if he knows how to use it.

All of this sounds quite a bit different from former President John Brenner. What made Naumann so willing to see a full-time presidency come into being, whether he was the president or not? It certainly was not a point of conceit. Those who knew him "don't remember ever hearing him speak about kingdom work in the first person singular.... don't remember him talking about himself in that connection, except to say that he counted it a privilege, yes, an amazing gift of grace that God should have used him, a frail, earthen vessel, 'to proclaim to the gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ.'"(122) He did not seek the presidency. On the contrary, in 1959, "he reluctantly surrendered a pastorate to become a full-time president."(123) He was not concerned about himself. In fact, "Even casual acquaintance revealed that President Naumann was a dedicated man, consumed by the desire to serve the Lord and to save souls. He carried self-effacement to a fault in the presidential

office."(124)

Even though he evidently was reluctant to leave the parish behind, the transition to a full-time presidency was probably easier for O.J. Naumann than for anyone else in the Synod. His father, Justus Naumann, had been the first full-time president of the Minnesota Synod back in 1915.(125) He knew that a man could function as a minister, a servant of God's people, in a non-parish ministry. But that would not have been enough motivation. Obviously, God moved him to take the call into the ministry of the presidency and to leave behind the call of his parish in the Twin Cities.(126) And yet, there were things that God used to convince him of the need for a full-time presidency and his place in leading the Synod to that:

To the next synod head would fall the responsibility of "presiding over" the dissolution of relationships, or, possibly, being able to influence the Missouri group to change its ways. The fourth ballot at Watertown handed the job to Naumann--in addition to his full time church pastorate.

In the next few years, however, doctrinal discussions and meetings throughout the nation took Naumann away from St. Paul many weeks of the year.

"As the weight of synod matters increased, I felt unable to do justice to both synod and congregation," he recalled. "Also, my sons were asking questions like 'When is dad going to visit us?' and 'How come dad is home with us tonight?'"(127)

In Naumann's opening speech at the 1959 convention, you can see a concern for other men, like him, who wanted to be everything to their families and congregations and synod, but just couldn't. Brenner used the Board of Trustees as his administrative

arm.(128) But now the BoT was too busy, as it was, to take on part of the president's responsibilities as well. The Synod had grown. It was time for the administration to grow up with it.

As Pastor Schaefer said above, the Committee on the Full-Time Presidency provided an excellent discussion on the plus and minuses of a full-time man. They included the old fears of centralization and losing touch with the congregation. They offered alternatives. They suggested, "now is not the time." They proposed limiting the presidency to three (3) terms, cutting down his responsibilities and providing time-saving devices, like a typewriter and dictaphone. They even tried to push it off into another study-committee.(129)

But the Synod did not listen to them. Michigan said the report was hogwash. The full-time presidency 1. would not remove him from pastoral concerns; 2. would not concentrate power or centralize it--the duties were the same, he just would have more time to do them; 3. would not hamper our freedom to elect a president--it was a full-time call, not a life-time call.(130)

The whereas's of the floor committee reflect a completely different attitude toward full-time presidents than existed before this, an attitude that turns the decisions and fears of 1923, etc. right around:

Whereas, The Constitution of the Synod requires that its President promote the welfare of the Synod in every direction; and

Whereas, The President, by virtue of his office, is the chief executive of the Synod and required to supervise the implementation

of its resolutions; and

Whereas, Over the past thirty-five years the administrative complexity of the Synod, presently divided among forty boards, commissions, and committees, has greatly increased and requires a coordinating executive; and

Whereas, the duties of the General President have multiplied to such an extent that he can no longer fulfill the obligations which occupy the parish pastor; and

Whereas, The Synod expects its President to have proper time to evaluate any and all developments which affect our Church; and the Synod would likewise profit by more frequent personal contact with its President; therefore be it resolved,

[that we have a full-time President.](131)

It seems that, as long as people in the Synod had no other things to fear than centralization of authority, they could always prevent themselves from getting a full-time president. Their fear made them assume, actually, that any real administration must be evil and that it would destroy God's Church. It is a fine thing to be cautious, true. But I fear that there is a misunderstanding, that approaches unbelief, in people who assume that an external thing like administration is what will destroy a church. Cannot God use administration, too? Cannot God protect us with his Word?

In 1923, the same year that the Synod rejected a full-time presidency, August Pieper wrote,

But constitutions, arrangements and systems are in themselves dead things; they do not guarantee success. It is the men, the intellectual forces which stand behind the system, and the work they do, that produces results. In his kingdom of grace, too, God has made the results dependent on faithful,

diligent labor, although he has reserved the size of the blessing to his own power.(132)

Forms of government are dead things--indifferent things, things that can serve good as well as evil. Every president that the Wisconsin Synod has had since Muehlhaeuser has proven to be a good man, at the very least a harmless man. And we have God's Word, too. There was nothing wrong with Wisconsin's centralizing somewhat in 1959;

Administration and centralization are thrust upon you. Nobody really seeks it. It is put upon you by the pressures of history. And the pressures of history to us were so apparent, so clear, that there was hardly any alternative to what we had done in the past.

If a church does not organize itself to meet its challenges, its strength is dissipated, because there has got to be a focus to what we do, there has got to be a responsibility--people have got to be responsible for certain things.(133)

Administration wasn't a mistake in 1959. If we wanted to keep on serving God as the Wisconsin Synod, it was inevitable.

PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE
AN ERA OF DEVELOPMENT AND FINE-TUNING
1959-1987

The development of a full-time presidency was perhaps the single most important development in our administration. And yet, if we had stopped there, it would have been a useless development. Other things had to happen and grow in our church government to create a church government that was ready for the future.

In 1959 the same convention that resolved a full-time president, also made other decisions for advancing administration. They

turned down a request by the General Board for Home Missions for a full-time GBHM secretary because the job description included too much work even for one man and more power than any one board of Synod had.(134) They scratched a 1957 resolution on Statistician (that allowed him to be a seasonally paid, part-time layman) as impractical.(135) They dropped a request for a full-time executive secretary for the Board for Information and Stewardship because the Synod was studying new ways to implement stewardship (the end of the quota system-1965) and they didn't want to put a man in what may have proven to be a temporary or at least undefined office.(136) They scratched a 1937 Trust Funds Committee which was too independent and unaccountable to the Board of Trustees and reworked it into the Investment Committee.(137) They finalized a 1957 move to expand the staff of the Board of Education with an assistant executive secretary.(138) They resolved to give aid to the congregations of district presidents, okayed a temporary full-time chairman of the Board for Foreign Missions, and set up a recruitment committee.(139) And the convention also promoted a study committee to investigate practical ways and means of developing autonomy for districts, especially in matters of home missions, as soon as possible.(140)

All of these sound like tremendous developments, but there were still things the Synod had neglected. They were crucial to the life of the Synod, especially in 1961, when we broke away from the Missouri Synod.

We had a mission board which was made up of a lot of part-time guys, guys that had large parishes, and they simply were not able to

focus on the necessity for the expansion of our home mission program. The watershed year for us was '61, when we said that, we're gonna go it alone. We can no longer depend on Missouri. We can no longer transfer to Missouri. We can no longer in good conscious--many said this--we can not any longer in good conscious--and we said this officially--entrust the souls of our people to the Missouri Synod. And we were in sixteen states when we said it. What're you gonna do? Are you going to say to those people who have moved to California, for example, or Utah, or Alberquerque, New Mexico--you'll say, "Well, you know, we can't release you to the Missouri Synod. On the other hand, we can't serve you either." And from that has come our basic mission thrust. The Decision of '61. If we had not broken in '61, we would be wallowing around probably pretty much the way we were in the '50's and '40's.(141)

The break with Missouri was definitely one of the deciding factors in the development of our Synod's administration. In order to survive as a synod, and, more importantly, in order to protect the souls of our people, we had to do something more. In 1959, the Synod refused a full-time man in home missions because of problems with the proposal. But the time was coming when we would need that man, and other full-time men, too. And a well tuned administration, too.

1961, with all the agony it brought in the split with Missouri, perhaps didn't provide a good atmosphere for more administrative development, even though the Synod would desperately need it soon. The Convention rejected a full-time stewardship secretary again, with restudy of the position pushed off until the Synod knew where its stewardship program would be going.(142) Synod rejected any further development of an office of full-time executive chairman of the Board of Trustees--after two years of

study, they decided to maintain the status quo.(143) They squelched any Board for Higher Education, because when the matters could be handled on local levels just as easily, centralization was undesirable, and the scope of the work would have needed a full-time executive secretary.(144) They dropped the idea of a full-time chairmanship on the Board for World Missions. They only gave the Board another two-year term to try out what had proved to be a valuable servant. They even suggested going back to part-time chairmen.(145)

It was as if the Synod was in a reactionary phase, trying to recapture what she had before 1959. If the 1961 convention supported anything, it was more autonomy within the districts and more "democracy". California was granted mission district status--and so the Synod grassroots expanded.(146) Each district received an evangelism committee.(147) The convention accepted a revised, more thorough and extensive District Constitution.(148) The Committee to study District Autonomy promoted it wholeheartedly, because it would supposedly stimulate home mission programs better, it would spread out responsibility, it would remove burdens and final decisions from overworked synodical officials, it would expedite more efficient and faster action and decision making, it would be more democratic and decentralized, and "it is being used successfully in other, larger synods."(149) The convention couldn't go for such a change too quickly, but was serious enough about it to hand the resolution to the CoP's and Trustees for study until 1963.(150)

All this shows that the Synod was not whole-hog on centralized

government. She saw advantages in balance between the districts and the general synodical government. She wouldn't create administration without good reason. At any other time this would be great, but in 1961, when the Synod needed to consider how she would reach out to her people all over the nation, calling a halt to further administration was unsafe. 1963 proved that.

In 1961, before the convention, Pastor Harold Eckert, the part-time Executive Chairman of the Board of Trustees, got too busy to be of much use in his congregation. St. Jacobi was in a building and relocating project at the time, and needed his time and input desperately. They asked him to resign his post as chairman. But the President and officers of Synod--not knowing what to do to replace such a good chairman--persuaded the congregation to let Pastor Eckert finish his term of office. Suddenly, however, Mr. C. J. Niedfeldt, the treasurer of the Board of Trustees, became seriously ill, was hospitalized and had major surgery. Synod provided additional help for the fiscal office. The Study Committee thought, "well, if more staff is coming in and Mr. Niedfeldt returns, we don't need a full-time chairman." They apparently assumed that Niedfeldt would recover and that Eckert could still handle the job. So, instead of creating a full-time chairman, they left Eckert in the same capacity he was serving before. But Niedfeldt unexpectedly died before the '61 convention (his funeral delayed its opening). Suddenly Eckert was the only one who knew Niedfeldt's job and could legally fill out forms and authorize checks, etc. It took all of Eckert's time. He couldn't even prepare a study or plan to enlarge the staff and

divide duties and responsibilities. The '61 convention put this problem on the backburner and dealt with the problems of the Missouri Synod. Eckert was re-elected for two years. But the new pension plan, the new pre-budget subscription system, and the new Church Extension Loan Program, in addition to CEF demanded an extensive audit of all funds and financial records. That meant introducing uniform bookkeeping in all the institutions of the Synod, in addition to laying plans for vastly expanding worker-training facilities. And someone had to train the new treasurer and all the new additional help in the fiscal office. St. Jacobi couldn't take it anymore. The congregation felt compelled to ask Pastor Eckert to resign as elected chairman. They asked him 18 September, 1961. By 26 September, he had resigned the chair.

The Conference of Presidents had to call an emergency meeting to head off imminent disaster. The President had to do something. On the request of the Board of Trustees, the Conference of Presidents made a full-time call to Pastor Eckert to become full-time executive chairman of the Board of Trustees. The CoP sent a letter to St. Jacobi asking them for a peaceful release of their pastor. On 30 October, 1961, the release came. By 31 October, Eckert had already accepted the call.(151)

In the span of a few months, the Synod came awfully close to losing the only people who really understood the in's and out's of our budget and the work of the Board of Trustees. She found out the hard way that, even if the problems of splitting with Missouri were supremely important in 1961, it was equally disastrous for a synod to ignore the need for full-time administration

at this time, when her future survival as a synod very much depended on it.(152)

The President's explanation of the incident and his petition that the Synod approve of the Conference of Presidents' action, must have impressed on the convention their duty to the future, their need seriously and honestly to consider full-time administration. The 1963 convention turned over almost every decision about administration made by the 1961 convention. They okayed executive secretaries for the General Board for Home Missions, the Board for World Missions, and the Board of Trustees.(153) They even initiated a study to develop policies for creating and calling full-time executive secretaries in the future.(154) They even declared that these were calls, forms of the public ministry under our Doctrine of Church and Ministry, and therefore open only to pastors.(155) They also refused to limit the tenure of elected officials.(156) Thanks to what God did with Pastor Eckert and how Pastor Eckert reacted under the circumstances, the Synod recognized the value of full-time administrators and backed them to the hilt.

The positive attitude held on into the 1965 Convention and beyond. 1963 started a trend of administrative development that would continue into the 80's (and perhaps beyond). 1965 saw the acceptance of a full-time Executive Secretary of the Board for Information and Stewardship.(157) It rejoiced in thanks for the office of Executive Secretary for Home Missions.(158) And she made permanent the full-time officials that the 1963 Convention had called for.(159)

For the first time, perhaps, the Synod was starting to consider the future, too. The Committee to Study Full-Time Executive Secretaries called for careful consideration in the development of our administration:

There is good warrant to consider carefully both the advantages and disadvantages in establishing additional full-time executive positions. As stewards entrusted with the management of the Lord's work, we must diligently seek to carry out this responsibility as faithfully and efficiently as possible and be ready to delegate responsibilities on a full-time basis wherever and whenever the need is justified. The time may come when our Lord so prospers the work of our Synod that no one man will be able to carry out the workload of his elective or appointive office on a part-time basis, and that full-time men will have to be called. Rather than look upon such a situation with a purely negative attitude, we ought to regard it with joy and humble thanks that the Lord has seen fit to bless our work so abundantly, and see in it His urging to expand our program on a more efficient basis.

But at the same time, we must not close our ears to the voice of church history which bears testimony to the dangers that accompany the centralization and concentration of power in the office of one man. The Constitution must make provision for proper safeguards and lines of responsibility. Furthermore, we dare not create full-time executive positions without due regard for the manpower situation that obtains. Practical wisdom alone dictates this caution. Certainly we would not want the Gospel to suffer from a lack of workers in the field. (160)

Perhaps it was with this in mind that the Synod called for a re-evaluation of the administration (161)--a reworking that might incorporate a reorganized Board of Education (162), a Board of all Welfare Agencies of Synod, (163) and a Lutheran Spiritual Welfare Commission under the GBHM, (164) among other things.

A re-evaluation of the administration at this point was a vital thing. Ever since the creation of a full-time Executive Secretary for the Board of Education in the '30's, administration had started to grow larger, always because we needed a full-time man in an overworked area or there were needs for a new committee in areas of new interests or there was need for more authority in an existing board because of greater expansion. Conventions added these generally without thinking about how administration would have to work together. In 1945, there were 16 boards and standing committees reporting to a seven-day convention. In 1967, 39 boards and standing committees reported to the convention. Almost all of these boards were autonomous--only at a convention, every two years could anyone question their actions. Administration became stifled, unwieldy, paralyzed and inefficient. Certain responsibilities and uses of authority were unclear also. What was the chain of accountability? Who acted foremost in an emergency?

Even the revision of the constitution couldn't clear up all these problems. "The revision was helpful, but in some areas it merely reduced existing confusion and inefficiency to pring in convenient form."(165)

When the Handbook came out in 1963, the Synod realized there was a problem and appointed a study committee (called the Bolle Committee after its chairman, Pastor Bolle). In 1965 the Committee reported that "there was a degree of confusion among the many boards and committees in terms of objectives, responsibilities and authority."(166)

One member of the Bolle Committee, Mr. Ralph E. Geror, a former operations manager for Northwest Airlines in Tucson, Arizona, put it more succinctly, "The business of the Synod is saving souls. This can only be done through progress, efficiently, and the labor of those persons dedicated to it." According to Geror,

the present organization structure can, at best, be a slow monotonous moving machinery that can only result in discouragement of its delegates and representatives.... The present Wisconsin Synod organization consists of many 'satellites' (that is, boards, commissions, and committees) fastened to a single body (that is, the biennial convention) which, for daily business purposes, is non-existent.... Expansion of the Wisconsin Synod's scope of activity throughout the United States and foreign territories will ultimately force a realignment of the Synod's organization. Autonomous boards and committees are not compatible with the requirements of growth and expansion. (167)

If the Synod was going to work to the best of her ability, and without risk of abuse of power, she had to re-evaluate. Pastor James P. Schaefer tells what the committee did:

In '65 I was chairman of the Constitution Committee... we presented a resolution that the Synod, the convention should authorize an administration survey commission, which would look at the administration of the Synod with the view of updating it, modernizing it, streamlining it if necessary, and so on. Then the committee was appointed. I was appointed chairman--Norm Berg was on it. Well, as a result of this resolution of 1965, we moved a little slowly, because I took out about a year to get the Missio Dei campaign started. So we met maybe once or twice while I was on this brief absence, but we didn't get very far.

We went to the '67 convention and we suggest that we get professional help. "Professional Help!--We're the Church of Jesus Christ, we don't need professional help!" Well, we did. We got it through convention and we got a 60--65,000 dollar grant from AAL. And we went and

found Tec-Search, which was a management consultant firm in Chicago. It was headed by Carl Muhlenbruch who was a member of the Board of Directors of the Missouri Synod, a fine Christian, and Bob Seymour, who was a former professor at the University of Washington--I think it was. And, we said we had problems. Well, they suggested, "Let's have a seminar.", so we had a five day seminar in Madison, in the fall of '67, in which all the administrators of Synod--and remember we had almost all part-time--we had President Naumann who was full-time, Pastor Wiechmann who was full-time, Pastor Hoenecke who was full-time (but he was way in San Diego, for all we knew. He was not really part of our home office staff), and there was Eckert, Pastor Eckert, the Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees, and all the rest were part-time administrators. The largest budget in the Synod was put together, not by anybody here in Milwaukee, but by somebody in Winona... and he was a part-time administrator--Arnie Moennecke. Nobody here touched it, you know. So it was necessary to concentrate on management theory and management practice. So they put together a five day seminar. They brought in a lot of things that they talked to us on--management by objectives, control, structure, review, policy structure and so on. We had heard none of this. We had nothing, absolutely nothing. We managed by the seat of our pants, that's what we did.

So from that in '67, there was a task force appointed--I guess maybe the administration survey commission appointed it, maybe President Naumann, I don't recall. And we worked with Tec-Search for the next six months to a year developing our purpose, objectives and policies.

Very few understood the need for this. Very few. We were quite naive about administration in those days. There was the Board of Trustees and they made all the decisions and there was the Conference of Presidents. Those were the two big boards.

[Without this kind of a reworking their was a temptation for a man to abuse his position]. I think there was--I argue, and I think I'm quite right in this, that at one time in this Synod, if there were three men who said, "No" to it, that was the end of any project....

They were very, very powerful men. These three men, or four men, or handful of men--today there is no one person, or ten persons, who can push something through or axe something. There simply is not. The responsibility is diffused, in a good sense. You see, the Coordinating Council was a creation of the Administration Survey Commission. We have a new budgeting system which was also the creation of the Administration Survey Commission. We have the planning program budgeting system which was also introduced by the Administration Survey Commission--ours. And these have broadened responsibilities, but have sharpened the focus of our thrust so that we're doing more things in concert than anybody'd done before, even despite our budget crunch.(168)

Up until this time the Synod and its administration had basically been "more problem-solvers than decision makers,"(169) always playing catch-up with what we should have done two years, four years ago. Now she was getting ready for the future.

In the 1969 convention, the Administration Survey Commission provided resolutions for better communication in elections, for the dissolution of the Synodical Council (which for the time was defeated), for the operation of the Board of Trustees as a single-staff concept, for the development of the Treasure into an office independent of the Board of Trustees and not a voting member of it, for the creation of a Coordinating Council that would develop the budget and future plans of the Synod, for the inclusion of five laymen on the Coordinating Council, and for the Planning Program Budget System which would take into account realistic short and long-range planning.(170) All of this was implemented. The Synod was on its way.

In the meantime, there were small developments in 1967. A full-

time stewardship counselor was called for the Missio Dei campaign.(171) Membership on mission district mission boards was opened up to whatever size the mission district felt was needed.(172) Conferences were divided into circuits for the sake of budgeting.(173) And another (the third) request came in for a full-time editor of the Northwestern Lutheran (only to be rejected again).(174)

In 1969, besides implementing the vast changes proposed by the Administration Survey Commission, the Synod approved more representation for districts on the Board of Support,(175) recreated the Architectural Department for the GBHM and BoT,(176) and granted Florida mission district status.(177)

1971 saw more concern for representation of and action on district levels. An ever-expanding Synod added Texas-New Mexico to its mission districts.(178) Then it sought to give its mission districts more say on the General Board for Home Missions.(179) The convention expanded representation on the Board for Information and Stewardship(180) and on the Special Ministries Board(181) along with the possibility of a full-time executive secretary for the Special Ministries Board.(182) The Synod also opened up the ten-year old question of District Autonomy and seriously considered it by setting up a study committee.(183)

1973 continued the trend of development and showed an even greater concern for the district level administrations. When someone questioned the accountability of our executive secretaries the Synod upheld their positions because they were

called workers. The Convention indicated that these men were still pastors, still on call lists, still serving as servants of God and his people. As far as their accountability went, they were "accountable to their governing boards which are elected by the Synod."(184) They were constantly reminded of their position as servants and advisors, not dictators. Executive secretaries, serving on well-informed boards could rarely become dictatorial and autocratic--the boards could easily put them in their place, even request a resignation in an extreme case.(185)

The Synod in 1973 then recommended a full-time Evangelism Counselor (for study until 1975) and called a full-time managing editor for the Northwestern Lutheran.(186)

But the greater bulk of 1973 decisions dealt with districts. New bylaws were set for the establishing of new districts;(187) the districts were restructured;(188) the Synod rejected a proposal to take away some district representation of the GBHM even though some thought there were too many men on it;(189) district presidents were limited to one office (however, the ambiguous resolution says, "that we retain the present policy concerning the offices which district presidents may hold"--a policy we had but were not really practicing);(190) and assistance was pledged to congregations who needed help for their overworked pastors who were also district presidents.(191)

In 1975 the Synod finalized much that was started in 1973, and went a little further in development on synodical and district levels. A full-time position was created for a Coordinator of

Evangelism.(192) Convention opened a study to increase the possible number of legal signorities on behalf of our Synod from two of three men on the BoT to two of six: chairman, vice-chairman, secretary, executive secretary of the BoT, real estate manager, and treasurer.(193) A study committee clarified the accountability of administrators with a constitutional ammendment, "Full-time executives shall be accountable to and execute the decision of the board, commission, or committee under which they serve."(194)

In interest of the district levels, the convention increased the size of the Special Ministries Board for the second convention in a row.(195) It established Special Ministries Boards on the district level.(196) It finalized a handbook for circuit pastors.(197) It set up District Boards for Parish Education.(198) The new district bylaws were finalized.(199) And a new mission district was established in the Northeast, called the Colonial Mission District.(200)

Perhaps more significant than all of these was the proposal to obtain a new administration building for the expanding administration.(201) The Synod first obtained an administrative building back in the first half of the century, incorporated with the Northwestern Publishing House down on North Avenue. But that was way too small for the administration we had in 1975. Without any objections, the Synod which once balked altogether at administration quickly passed the resolution and empowered the BoT to buy the necessary land and build.(202)

1977 didn't present much change in the administration. The convention did establish a Secretary of Home Missions as an aid to the Executive Secretary of the GBHM.(203) For the most part, however, 1977 just saw more concern for representation of the districts on the Board for Parish Education(204) and more lay representation on the GBHM.(205) The GBHM, in a self-study, also realized the value of the districts, especially the missionaries as "troubleshooters, advisers and counselors rather than [just] as resident pastors."(206) The administration was saying, "We can't do this alone. We are all in this together."

In 1979, administrative development slowed down more. The Synod had caught up with its administrative growth. Her needs for administration were being met as far as the present size of the church body was concerned. But now the Synod turned itself more to administrators for the people who were not yet in our Synod, the mission prospects of the world. All the Synod asked for herself was a full-time stewardship counselor.(207) In 1979, the Synod confirmed the position of an executive secretary of home missions.(208) She established a full-time executive secretary of evangelism.(209)

Other than that the only decisions Synod made refused full district status to the Texas Mission District (growth was slowing down)(210) and refused vice presidents any involvement in district offices.(211)

1981 would have continued in this same vein, confirming old business (like an evangelism counselor(212) and admin. building

relocation(213)), but for one thing. The Synod called for another look, another survey of the administration. She meant more than reorganizing the Board for Parish Education(214) and the dissolution of the old and recently redundant Synodical Council, too.(215) She meant a complete overview. There were problems:

Certain part-time administrators, particularly district presidents, are experiencing work overloads.

Smaller districts are experiencing administrative difficulties due to the distance involved in travel, to personnel turnover, and to the lack of an adequate and experienced pool of manpower for positions, boards, and commissions that are currently mandated by the Synod's constitution.

There is a sensitivity between the larger and smaller districts concerning an appropriate balance of representation within certain administrative units.

Mandatory district representation has resulted in oversized synodical boards and commissions in some instances.

An increase in the number of districts has led to complications in communication.(216)

A committee was appointed and given the assignment to review both the synodical and district administrative structures. Vowing that "there should be no recommended change just for the sake of change,"(217) the commission set to work first of all by studying thoroughly the objectives and policies of the Synod and of its divisions and units, including the position descriptions of key personnel, all in the light of the applicable sections of the synodical constitution and its by-laws.(218) It reviewed the functions of the various commissions and committees from the

point of the view of their contribution to the over-riding purpose of the Synod and their position in the synodical organizational chart. In the process the commission interviewed personally at least once, and in some instances several times, representatives of all the divisions, of most of the units, and of many commissions and committees. It considered largely any and all communications from people who saw their requests for help in the Northwestern Lutheran. The commission also studied the constitutions and bylaws of several other church bodies with similar external administrative structures.(219)

On the basis of this the Survey Commission realized that they would not have to do any major surgery, but some relationships between existing boards and units would definitely have to be cleared up and redefined.

On the Synodical level, the problems mainly dealt with producing printed materials. There was confusion between Northwestern Publishing House and several boards. Beyond that, there were only a few trouble areas.(220)

The real concern was with the district structure. So the Commission went to the districts and held regional conferences with various representatives of district government, the committees and district boards and circuit pastors, etc.(221) They got the district representatives' input on questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the present organization and structure of the WELS, especially with regard to the impact and involvement of the "grass roots" in the life and work of the

Synod.(222) More significant for the future, however, were questions on the appropriateness of a full-time district president and on the organization of boards on district levels.(223)

The commission compiled the answers to their questions and began to pound out proposals for better district organization and communication between districts and the Synod as a whole. A good portion of their report dealt with the possibility of full-time district presidents, the positive and negative sides of the question and some alternatives to a full-time presidency. The results are remarkably parallel to the arguments which went on over the full-time general presidency. People saw the obvious organizational advantages, but they balked for fear of centralization, that such offices would become too political, that no one would want to leave the parish for a full-time district presidency. They said that there wasn't really a need for it at this time, that the constitution didn't call for it, that it was too expensive and would take valuable men out of the parish.(224)

It seems that, for all our Synod has learned about the value of administration, the old fears are still there, and the old "crisis action" attitude is still there, too. Full-time presidents won't come until the church develops to the point where even full-time presidents won't be able to handle the district work without some full-time staff as well. The Synod will have to look for alternatives in the meantime.

One of those alternatives was to carry out what conventions had already resolved in the early '70's: the vice presidents shouldn't be district presidents and vice versa. That was one of the Commissions final resolutions.(225)

On the Synodical level the proposed changes dealt basically with the concern of the districts for "taxation without representation".(226) This was established with proposals for representation on institutional boards; limited terms of office, changes in nominating procedures; the use of laymen where they are more qualified than pastors (as on the BoT); to change the name of the Synod to one representing the whole body; to increase the power of regional mission boards, district mission boards and their chairmen by delegating GBHM responsibilities to them; change the representation on the BoT.(227) In the districts themselves the resolutions all called for beefed up administration, conspicuously a full-time district presidency.(228)

When the time finally came to bring this before the convention, in 1985, the floor committee on the proposed changes spent almost all of the convention in committee meetings.(229) On Thursday, Chairman Pastor Joel Gerlach presented the resolutions, but had to return on Friday with some reworked material. The floor committee commended the Administration Survey Commission and presented their report, with a few changes. They proposed that the Synod change from a six division to a five division administration: 1. Home Missions Division; 2. Foreign Missions Division; 3. Worker Training Division; 4. Parish Services

Division; and 5. Administration Division. They divided the Board of Information and Stewardship into two divisions: 1. The Commission for Communication and Financial Support and 2. The Board for Stewardship. They proposed a number of minor suggestions on representation.(230) The Commission suggested that only the GBHM should have true representation from every district. They placed limitations in length of service on certain positions in the administration. They made the Executive Secretaries non-voting, "advisory only" members of the Coordinating Council.(231)

It is not the purpose of this paper to list every change that the Administration Survey Commission proposed in the 1985 Convention. That would take pages, the report in the BoRaM of 1985 is almost as long as this paper (pages 222-288). And yet, we have not seen the last of the proposed changes. The present changes may prove inadequate or improper. The 1987 Convention may overturn what was done in '85. Perhaps, the 1985 changes will have to wait for another writer to analyze them. What we are mostly concerned with here is the reaction of Synod to such changes. The changes for the most part concern themselves with efficiency, yes, but mostly with decentralization of power, communication with the entire Synod, and fair representation. The Synod was no longer afraid to have administration, but she wanted to make sure that the administration functioned with the people of the Synod in mind. Only then could the Synod work as a whole to promote God's Word.

While all these studies were going on, suggestions came up at the

1983 Convention, but almost everything was put off until the committee came through with its report. New districts were formed--the North Atlantic and South Central Districts(232)--and the administration moved into its new building at 2929 Mayfair Road in Milwaukee,(233) but nothing of overall administrative importance occurred.

In 1985, the development went on with the opening of a position for a secretary of secondary schools within the framework of the Board for Parish Education.(234) In 1987 a proposal would come forward for a full-time campus ministry administrator/counselor.(235) But the main movements were in that Survey Commission's efforts.

The Synod was tuning up her administration for the future, and the people of the Synod were behind her all the way.

THE FUTURE

What will happen now is anyone's guess. But there are trends. Throughout the history of the Synod there have been people who feared administration because they saw in that the fall of the church. They advocated part-time men. Delegate! But as the Synod has grown, it has become impossible to delegate without delegating to someone who is already overloaded. Full-time administration on any level is inevitable. But where will the next change happen? Will the Synod decide to split into regional Synods to preserve its small-synod flavor, its representation? Unlikely. Will we get full-time vice presidents or full-time

district presidents or both? President Mischke and others assume that the Synod will not go for full-time district presidents because that is what the Missouri Synod did. They suspect that the Synod will divide up the responsibilities of the presidency to the vice presidents.(236) Others say that the Synod will go for full-time district presidents first or only because that promotes decentralization, it pulls down the power of the president to the "grassroots".(237) You can have both, it seems, and eventually you may have to, but if you use fear of centralization and fear of what other churches did before they went unorthodox, you will have neither. Who will win?

It is the contention of this writer that probably the next shift will take place on the district level, but it will be long in coming. The reports of the 1985 Survey Commission point out many excellent advantages to a full-time district presidency, advantages which help congregations and help maintain doctrine and practice. Already the possible use of senior graduate assistants for the district presidents, instead of vicars, could provide a transition to full-time district presidencies. The signs are there. Objections to the idea, as I mentioned earlier, talk mainly of uneasiness with the idea. They are for the most part concerned with feelings, with the newness of the concept. For that reason, as it was with our other administrative developments, it will be a long time in coming. I have heard one DP's congregation crying that their pastor was not there to do the work, it was all on his assistant. In their minds, he already is a full-time district president, not so much their pastor. But

the rest of the congregations in the districts will have to realize this, too, before a change will come. Back to "crisis action" I'm afraid. Some may say that, on that basis, the vice presidents will go full-time first, but the old fears of top-heavy administration were part of what brought on the 1985 Survey. Voices on the convention floor may stop that altogether. Either way, I'm afraid that any new changes won't come easy, and perhaps that, too, is just as well, because the men in those offices will take their places realizing that they are a vital part of serving God in his kingdom, but servants and not prestigious administrators. Perhaps, then the Synod will be convinced also of the value of that part of administration.

In all of this it is important to remember what administration really is. It is external, it is passive--neither secular or sacred. It just is. Administration has little or nothing to do with the fall of a church. "Missouri didn't fall away because of her administration. It was her seminary that did that."(238)

The Wisconsin Synod doesn't have to be afraid of administration. Even if someone abused his office and became a dictator, we wouldn't have to fear that. God can work through a dictator as easily as he can through a democracy. The externals don't matter, relatively speaking. Of course, we believe that administration rules more God-pleasingly when it considers itself the servant of the people. But don't we have that? Doesn't our doctrine of church and ministry remind all our administrators of that? Hasn't God protected us with his Word?

Grace, and grace alone, is our strength. Not

rational organization--though that is a wise and desirable goal in the service of the Gospel. Not management--though that must not be offered as an excuse for shoddy management in the service of the Gospel. A recent book by the Lutheran World Federation gives a brief account of every Lutheran church body in the world. The article on the Wisconsin Synod says that "consensus in Lutheran doctrine rather than reliance on structure holds this body together" (Lutheran Churches in the World, p. 342). That consensus, not structure, is our strength. Grace created that consensus. Grace sustains that consensus. Only that places our management structure in its right perspective. Our polity is the response to our theological consensus under grace....(239)

In this history, we have seen how God used the men who were our presidents, the demands of historical events and synodical development, the fears and confidence of the Synod in convention, and the Doctrine of Church and Ministry to maintain in our church an administration that put God, his Word and his people first. It inspires confidence for the future. With God's help, we have a lot to look forward to.

ENDNOTES

1. Proceedings, 1957, p.14. President Naumann's plea to consider expansion of our Board of Education. ("Proceedings" in this paper will always refer to the Proceedings of the WELS or Joint Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan and Other States.)
2. J. P. Koehler, The History of the Wisconsin Synod (Sauk Rapids, Minnesota: Faith-Life, The Protestant Conference, 1981), p. 40.
3. For a more complete picture of frontier life for Wisconsin's ministers, check out Professor Fredrich's forthcoming book (a manuscript is available in the library) or J.P. Koehler's The History of the Wisconsin Synod.
4. Professor Fredrich, Manuscript for a new history of the Wisconsin Synod, 1986-87. Copies of Professor Fredrich's forthcoming book can be found in the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library. Chapter 4, p. 5.
5. Koehler, p. 40.
6. Ibid., p.117.
7. Ibid., p. 66.
8. Ibid., p. 40.
9. Ibid., p. 117.
10. Koehler, p. 40 and Fredrich, ch 2, p. 4.
11. Fredrich, ch. 4, p. 15.
12. Ibid. ch. 7, pages 6,7.
13. Koehler, p. 165f.
14. Fredrich, ch 7, p. 7.
15. Ibid., ch 7, p.5.
16. Koehler, p. 52.
17. Fredrich, ch 7, p. 4.
18. Ibid., ch 9, p. 5.
19. Ibid., ch 5, p. 13.
20. Ibid., ch 12, p. 4.

21. Proceedings of die Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode von Wisconsin und andere Staten, 1916, p. 123.
22. Proceedings, 1919, p. 66-75.
23. Ibid., p.176.
24. Proceedings, 1923, p. 94-98.
25. Robert Gurgel, "G. E. Bergemann: An Evangelical Approach to the Ministry", church history paper from 2 May 1975, available in the Library of the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, p. 5.
26. Ibid., p. 2.
27. Armin Engel, "The Bergemann Era--1908-1933", Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Volume 72, p. 299.
28. Ibid., p. 299f.
29. Proceedings, 1923, p.106. I have placed the quote in the original German to show the emphasis the Conference put with the term "taxation without representation", a phrase that would come up again in 1985 when the outer areas of the Synod would request more representation on boards and committees. The translation goes as follows: "According to reports only pastors and laymen from the state of Wisconsin can be elected to the Board of Trustees. Well, there will be general contentment only then, if every district is represented, for we intend no "taxation without representation"--we intend, so the Western Conference of the Dakota-Montana District has protested energetically from here on future elections of this kind."
30. Ibid.
31. Proceedings, 1935, p. 101-102.
32. Proceedings, 1937, more discussion on the duties of the DP's, p. 10,19, & 51. Proceedings, 1939, the District Constitution, p. 144-148.
33. Interview with President Mischke, February, 1987. For some time a district president in the Western Wisconsin District, President Mischke saw a change in attitudes. By the time he was a district president, congregations had learned to respect their DP's a great deal more.
34. Interview with Professor Carl Lawrenz, emeritus, April, 1987.
35. Armin Engel, p. 303.

36. Proceedings, 1927, p. 65f.
37. Ibid.
38. Interview with Professor Carl Lawrenz, emeritus.
39. Proceedings, 1933, p. 23-24.
40. August Pieper, "Concerning the Doctrine of the Church and of its Ministry, with Special Reference to the Synod and its Discipline", WLQ, Volume 59, Number 2, April 1962 (a reprint from October 1929 translated by Professor Vogel), p. 81f.
41. Ibid., p. 135-136.
42. Ibid.
43. Interview with Professor Carl Lawrenz, emeritus.
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid.
46. Fredrich, ch 11, p. 6f.
47. Quoted by Fredrich (ch 6, p. 12ff.) from the 1877 Proceedings.
48. Fredrich, ch 6, p. 13-14.
49. Proceedings, 1933, p. 127.
50. Ibid., p. 85.
51. Ibid., p. 86.
52. Ibid., p. 84-85.
53. Ibid., p. 90.
54. Proceedings, 1935, p. 51-52.
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid.
57. Proceedings, 1933, p. 79.
58. Proceedings, 1935, p. 84.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid., p. 70.
61. Ibid., p. 95f.

62. Proceedings, 1937, p. 48f.
63. Ibid., p. 51.
64. Ibid., pp. 69, 96, 99.
65. Ibid., p. 23.
66. Proceedings, 1939, p. 23.
67. Ibid., p.64ff.
68. Ibid., p.53.
69. Ibid., p. 57.
70. Ibid., pp. 144-148.
71. Ibid., pp. 62-64.
72. Ibid., p. 59f.
73. Ibid., p. 27.
74. Proceedings, 1941, p. 98-103.
75. Ibid., p. 78ff.
76. Ibid., p. 79.
77. Proceedings, 1945, p. 23.
78. Ibid., p. 83f.
79. Ibid., p. 70.
80. Ibid., pp. 19, 119.
81. Ibid., p. 45.
82. Interview with James P. Schaefer, March, 1987.
83. Proceedings, 1947, p. 122.
84. Ibid., p. 94.
85. Ibid., p. 157.
86. Interview with Professor Carl Lawrenz, Emeritus.
87. "Eulogy of President John Brenner", WLO, volume 60, # 1, Jan. 1963, p. 4.
88. Ibid., p. 2.

89. Richard C. Schwerin, "A Biography of Pastor John William Otto Brenner" 1976 Church History Paper, p. 4.
90. Ibid., p. 5. Brenner didn't have much time for pastors whom he termed "waschlappen": dishrags, men who had no convictions and who were not firm in their ministry. When he made decisions he stuck to them.
91. Interview with Professor Carl Lawrenz, Emeritus.
92. Schwerin, p. 6.
93. Interview with Professor Carl Lawrenz, Emeritus.
94. Proceedings, 1949, p. 22.
95. Ibid., p. 69f.
96. Ibid., p. 137-139.
97. Ibid., p. 132-135.
98. Ibid., p. 130f.
99. Proceedings, 1953, p. 54.
100. Ibid., p. 55-58.
101. Ibid., p. 59-61.
102. Ibid., p. 112.
103. Ibid., p. 53.
104. Ibid., p. 95.
105. Ibid., p. 9.
106. Proceedings, 1955, p. 124.
107. Ibid., p. 127,129.
108. Ibid., p. 75.
109. Interview with Pastor James P. Schaefer.
110. Proceedings, 1955, p. 131.
111. Interview with Pastor James P. Schaefer.
112. Proceedings, 1957, p. 72f.
113. Ibid., p. 187.

114. Ibid., pp. 175, 178.
115. Ibid., pp. 94-99.
116. Ibid., p. 63.
117. Ibid., p. 18.
118. Ibid., p. 22.
119. Ibid.
120. Interview with Pastor James P. Schaefer.
121. Proceedings, 1959, p. 14.
122. President Carl Mischke, "In Memoriam", Northwestern Lutheran, 22 July 1979, p. 233.
123. E.C. Fredrich, "Presidency in Perspective", NWL, 5 August 1979, p. 251.
124. Ibid.
125. Fredrich, manuscript, ch 11, p. 7.
126. Interview with Pastor James P. Schaefer.
127. James M. Johnston, "Rev. Naumann: Voice of Conservatism," The Milwaukee Sentinel, Saturday, 19 October 1968, p. 20, part I.
128. Schaefer.
129. Proceedings, 1959, p. 24ff.
130. Ibid., p. 36.
131. Ibid., p. 37.
132. August Pieper, "Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther, 1811-1887 Anniversary Reflections," WLO, reprint Winter 1987, v. 84, # 1, p. 23.
133. Schaefer.
134. Proceedings, 1959, p. 49f.
135. Ibid., p. 223.
136. Ibid., p. 246.
137. Ibid., p. 220f.
138. Ibid., p. 117.

139. Ibid., p. 37.
140. Ibid., p. 51.
141. Schaefer.
142. Proceedings, 1961, p. 238.
143. Ibid., p. 200.
144. Ibid., pp. 31, 32.
145. Ibid., pp. 41f, 58, 59, & 63.
146. Ibid., p. 38f.
147. Ibid., p. 233.
148. Ibid., p. 241.
149. Ibid., p. 36f.
150. Ibid., p. 39.
151. Proceedings, 1963, p. 15ff. This is President Naumann's opening speech. He wanted to explain to the Synod that they were not trying to be high-handed in their administrative actions, but that he and the CoP's had the Synod's best in mind when they called Eckert to a full-time position. He then asked the Synod to approve the CoP's actions.
152. Schaefer.
153. Proceedings, 1963, pp. 232ff (material also on pp. 16, 159-161, & 178).
154. Ibid., p. 233, 235.
155. Ibid., p. 236.
156. Ibid., p. 233f.
157. Proceedings, 1965, p. 362f.
158. Ibid., p. 197.
159. Ibid., p. 302 (an excellent history and analysis of recent developments in administration is in this committee's report).
160. Ibid.
161. Ibid., p. 17.

162. Ibid., pp. 168-171, & 177.
163. Ibid., p. 268.
164. Ibid., p. 189.
165. Reverend James P. Schaefer, "Keynote Address of the Seminar on Administration, Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod", Madison, Wisconsin, 12-17 November, 1967, p. 1.
166. Ibid.
167. Ibid., p. 2.
168. Interview with Pastor James P. Schaefer.
169. Schaefer, "Keynote Address", 1967, p. 3.
170. Proceedings, 1969, pp. 162-170.
171. Proceedings, 1967, p. 392.
172. Ibid., p. 315.
173. Ibid., p. 314.
174. Ibid., p. 400.
175. Proceedings, 1969, p. 146.
176. Ibid., p. 127.
177. Ibid.
178. Proceedings, 1971, p. 88.
179. Ibid., p. 120.
180. Ibid.
181. Ibid., p. 118.
182. Ibid., pp. 117, 92.
183. Ibid., p. 120.
184. Proceedings, 1973, p. 101.
185. Conversations with Pastor Robert Voss, former Executive Secretary of the Board for Worker Training. Synod Sunday, May, 1987.
186. Proceedings, 1973, pp. 66 & 148.

187. Ibid., p. 104.
188. Ibid., pp. 62-65.
189. Ibid., pp. 66-68.
190. Ibid., p. 103.
191. Ibid., p. 136.
192. Proceedings, 1975, p. 75f.
193. Ibid., p. 107.
194. Ibid., p. 104.
195. Ibid., p. 72.
196. Ibid., p. 73f.
197. Ibid., p. 105f.
198. Ibid., p. 104.
199. Ibid., pp. 102-103.
200. Ibid., p. 74.
201. Ibid., p. 130.
202. Ibid.
203. Proceedings, 1977, pp. 79-80.
204. Ibid., pp. 36-38.
205. Ibid., p. 81.
206. Ibid., p. 82.
207. Proceedings, 1979, p. 187f.
208. Ibid., p. 100.
209. Ibid., p. 106f.
210. Ibid., p. 48f.
211. Ibid., p. 44.
212. Proceedings, 1981, p. 77.
213. Ibid., p. 135.
214. Ibid., p. 72.

215. Ibid., p. 48.
216. Ibid., p. 45f.
217. Administration Survey Commission, Fall 1983 Regional Conference, Introductory Remarks, Professor David Valleskey.
218. Ibid.
219. Ibid.
220. Ibid.
221. Interview with Professor David Valleskey, April, 1987.
222. Ad. Survey Commission, Fall 1983 Regional Conference, Work Sessions 1-2.
223. Ibid., Work Sessions 3-5.
224. Administrative Survey Commission, RE: Responses to "The Office of the District President Should Be a Full-time Office" by Participants in Regional Meetings, November 1983.
225. Administrative Survey Commission, RE: Proposed Changes in Synod Structure and Organization, November 1983.
226. Interview with Professor David Valleskey.
227. ASC, RE: Proposed Changes, pp. 1-6.
228. Ibid., pp. 6-9.
229. Minutes of the WELS Convention - 1985, David Worgull, Secretary.
230. Proceedings, 1985, pp. 153-163.
231. BoRaMs, 1985, pp. 222-288.
232. Proceedings, 1983, p. 45f.
233. Ibid., p. 146.
234. Proceedings, 1985, p. 63f.
235. Lightsource, Volume 9, Number 5, April 1987, a flier of the WELS Lutheran Campus Ministry.
236. Interview with President Carl Mischke, February, 1987.
237. Interview with Pastor James P. Schaefer.

238. Mischke, Interview.

239. Rev. James P. Schaefer, "Keynote Address: Management Development Seminar, WELS", Ramada Inn, Milwaukee, 19-22 September, 1977, p. 5f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY RESOURCES

Administration Survey Commission, Fall 1983 Regional Conference, Introductory Remarks, Professor David Vallesky (member of the committee, all material by the Commission can be found in his files).

_____, Fall 1983 Regional Conference, Work Sessions, 1-6.

_____, RE: Proposed Changes in Synod Structure and Organization, November 1983.

_____, RE: Responses to "The Office of the District President Should Be a Full-Time Office" by Participants in Regional Meetings, November 1983.

BoRAMs, 1985 (Book of Reports and Memorials, available in Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library on Reference).

Lightsource, volume 9, number 5, April 1987 (a flier of the WELS Campus Ministry, Wisconsin Lutheran Chapel, 634 Wisconsin Street, Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54901-4375).

"Minutes of the WELS Convention - 1985", David Worgull, Secretary (from the files of Professor David Vallesky).

Proceedings of the WELS, 1916 - 1985 (available in the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library, Reference).

Rev. James P. Schaefer. "Keynote Address of the Seminar on Administration, Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod". Held at Madison, Wisconsin, 12-17 November, 1967 (from the files of Rev. James P. Schaefer).

_____. "Keynote Address: Management Development Seminar, WELS." Held at the Ramada Inn, Milwaukee, 19-22 September, 1977 (from the files of Rev. James P. Schaefer).

Personal Interviews on Tape with

Professor Carl Lawrenz, Emeritus. April, 1987.

President Carl Mischke. February, 1987.

Pastor James P. Schaefer. March, 1987.

Professor David Vallesky. April, 1987.

Pastor Robert Voss-- Board for Worker Training. May, 1987

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECONDARY RESOURCES

Armin Engel. "The Bergemann Era--1908-1933." Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Volume 72, pp. 294-308.

Professor E. C. Fredrich. History of the Wisconsin Synod--in manuscript form in the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, 1987.

_____. "Presidency in Perspective." Northwestern Lutheran, 5 August, 1979, pp. 250-251.

Robert Gurgel. "G. E. Bergemann: An Evangelical Approach to the Ministry." Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library--Church History Paper File, 2 May 1975.

James M. Johnston. "Rev. Naumann: Voice of Conservatism." The Milwaukee Sentinel, Saturday, 19 October, 1968, p. 20, part I.

J. P. Koehler. The History of the Wisconsin Synod. Sauk Rapids, Minnesota: Faith-Life, The Protestant Conference, 1981.

President Carl Mischke. "In Memoriam." Northwestern Lutheran, 22 July, 1979, p. 233.

August Pieper. "Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther, 1811-1887 Anniversary Reflections." Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, reprint in Winter 1987, Volume 84, Number 1, pp. 12-28.

_____. "Concerning the Doctrine of the Church and of its Ministry, with Special Reference to the Synod and its Discipline." Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, Volume 59, Number 2, April 1962 (a reprint from October 1929, translated by Professor Vogel), pp. 81-136.

Richard C. Schwerin. "A Biography of Pastor John William Otto Brenner." Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library--Church History Paper File, 1976.