

**EXCERPTS FROM THE SYNODICAL SURVEY COMMISSION REPORTS,
ARCHIVED AT THE CONCORDIA HISTORICAL INSTITUTE, SAINT LOUIS,
MISSOURI**

RE: HISTORY OF SYNODICAL FINANCES

* * * * *

REPORT #1

THE DISTRICT-SYNOD RELATIONS OF
THE LUTHERAN CHURCH-MISSOURI SYNOD
IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE, 1847-1872

Aug. R. Suelflow

A Report To The Synodical Survey Commission

August 1960

* * * * *

I.C. IMPLEMENTATION OF DISTRICT DIVISION IN ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. The districts were considered independent in those matters which pertained only to their own district. Accordingly, the districts were empowered to have separate constitutions and officers.

2. The functions and duties of the Synod and districts were carefully delineated in the 1854 Constitution. The original objectives of the Synod remained intact. However,, in matters of jurisdiction between the Synod and its districts the following items were specifically reserved as a synodical function including "everything which is administered for all individual district synods as a corporate entity." These included:

a. General supervision of doctrine and over its faithful application in each individual district.

b. Designating the boundaries of individual districts.

c. Investigating and rendering a final decision of all matters "in which appeal has been made either from the decision of its officials or from the decision of one of the district synods."

d. Home missions in areas outside of the districts.

e. Foreign missions.

f. Establishing, maintaining and supervising all educational institutions of the Synod.

g. The election of instructors and other officers of synodical institutions.

h. Examining "of those who seek synodical membership by joining one of the districts, assigning theological candidates and matters pertaining to ordination and installation."

i. Publishing religious periodicals as official church organs.

j. Contracting and establishing religious fellowship with those not associated with the Synod.

3. To the districts were assigned all matters which pertained to the administration of its own affairs. Specific reference was made to the exceptions in the constitution which expressly reserved certain matters to the Synod. District business was described as:

a. The examination of its candidates for the teaching office, and ordination and installation of its candidates for the ministry.

b. Home missions in their districts - especially in assisting vacant and indigent congregations. (1854 Constitution, Chapter IV, Section B and C)

4. Other matters.

a. Convention arrangements were identical to the present. The districts met in two consecutive years with the Synod meeting every third year.

b. Exchange of delegates between districts was encouraged.

c. On financial matters an unusual note is found in the 1852 convention (Proceedings, 1852, p. 21) that the district treasurer, after paying the necessary district expenses, was to forward to the synodical treasurer all unused funds out of which the expenses of the Synod were to be met. This is further defined in the 1854 Constitution, (Chapter VI, D, 2) with "after special expenses of his district have been met (administrative expenses, travel expenses of the district president, printing costs and incidental extraordinary expenses), to which the expenditures for home and heathen missions are not to be reckoned, the treasurer shall forward to the synodical treasurer all district surpluses with the exception of monies which have been entrusted to the district for special district purposes."

* * * *

II.I. The district merely operate in smaller geographical areas the total synodical program assigned to it by the total congregations. To speak of the district and synodical budget as two separate items is erroneous. (The monies spent within the district to carry out the synodical or district objectives are part of the total synodical program. It is also correct to observe that the officers and executives of a district are synodical officers and executives)

* * * * *

THE DISTRICT-SYNOD RELATIONS OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH-MISSOURI SYNOD IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE, 1872-1922

(A Report to the Synodical Survey Commission)

REPORT 2B

February, 1961

Aug. R. Suelflow

* * * *

III.J. Quite consistently the district President was drawn into the financial matters of the Synod. As early as 1878 the district Presidents, together with the district Counselors served as the Home Mission Board subcommittee to allocate funds for the districts (the year which established a synodical Home Mission Board). in a certain sense, we might say that this was an early beginning of our present Fiscal Conference. In view of the inequalities which existed in the administration of the home mission fund in Synod at the turn of the century (financially independent districts retained the necessary funds, and transmitted their "surplus" to the synodical home mission treasury, which in turn made the money available to the subsidized districts), several conventions wrestled with the problem of developing a more systematic type of giving. The assumption was that the average communicant was not adequately informed concerning the synodical needs. In addition, it was felt that there were inefficient methods of collecting monies in many of the congregations. The annual average contribution of the more than 600,000 communicants was less than \$1 per year. In 1905 a financial procedure known as the "Detroit Plan" was adopted which again utilized the synodical President, the district Presidents and the Circuit Counselors in bringing the story to bear on the local level. [Proceedings, 1905, pp. 138-139] The system did not yield the desired results. Essentially in the same form, the 1917 Convention adopted a resolution involving also the lay delegates to the convention in transmitting the synodical story to their Circuits. This again involved transmission from the Circuits to the district President to the synodical President. However, there is very little evidence that it functioned properly. (Proceedings, 1917, German-pp. 107-109; English-pp. 55-57] The Convention felt that the real problem of the financial ills of the Synod lay in intercommunication. Since the members of the parish were not thoroughly informed, they were not properly motivated in their giving. The formal administrative structure was deeply involved in the financial problems of the Synod.

* * * *

III.L. As has already been indicated in other reports, the Synod was blessed with a multiplicity of individual treasuries. When the need for coordination became acute, the 1914 Convention resolved that the synodical President, the district Presidents and the synodical treasurer comprise a committee which was to give thorough consideration to the consolidation of the different treasuries. This committee was to report to the next convention before financial appropriations were made. The same Convention (1914) also assigned to the district Presidents, in conjunction with the synodical President and the treasurer, the task of discussing all financial matters of the Synod at the annual meeting assigning calls to the candidates. [Proceedings, 1914, pp. 153-157-German; p. 48-49-English] Thus another step had been taken in the development of the annual Fiscal Conference.

* * * *

V.A. HOME MISSIONS

1. Prior to 1878 the District Home Mission Boards sent all monies for this purpose directly to the synodical mission treasury. The district boards were then to submit requests for aid to the synodical Home Missions Commission. (One exception: in 1874 the rapidly-expanding

Northern District was allowed to establish its own exclusive" home mission treasury, i.e., to use all proceeds for its own immediate needs.) [Proceedings, 1874, p. 78] By 1887 the districts' requests were so extensive that \$11,200 could not be appropriated. Intensive local drives for funds were subsequently made within the Districts to help meet immediate "local" needs. This marks the inception of a significant change in procedure, so that by 1896 the districts advanced only their "surplus funds" to the synodical Mission Treasury for redistribution to the subsidized Districts.

2. This change in procedure is further demonstrated by the Synod's attitude apropos of its role in the Home Mission program. At the 1884 Delegate Convention, the Synod reiterated its previous position that Home Missions are definitely the concern of the Synod, not merely of individual districts. All districts were called upon to support this work (by remitting all their collected funds to the General Mission Treasury). [Proceedings, 1884, pp. 64-67] By 1893, occasioned by the growing deficits in the synodical Home Mission budget, some agitation was expressed that each district should assume full responsibility for home mission work in its own immediate area. The synodical Commission then reemphasized its stand that this work specifically belongs within the activity of the entire church; hence, each district must be responsible to help the others. [Proceedings, 1893, p. 82] In 1896, then, a deficit was again reported in the synodical Commission's budget because the districts had not forwarded their "surpluses." The synodical President was then authorized by the synodical convention to emphasize at each district convention the need for full, mutual cooperation in this endeavor. (Proceedings, 1896, p. 76]

3. The plight of the Commission was increased by the depression years prior to the turn of the century. In 1899 the synodical Convention called for home mission needs to be met by an increased emphasis in both mission festival offerings and regular, periodic collections on the part of the Synod's congregations. The Synod also provided for a separate Home Mission treasury (separating it from the synodical mission treasury). The Synod further gave the mandate that the synodical President was to meet with the synodical Home Mission Commission and representatives of the district equivalent commissions at least once during the sessions of the Delegate Convention. (Proceedings, 1899, p. 67]

4. Between 1899 and 1902, requests by the subsidized districts totaled \$62,540.84, of which only \$24,815.08 was made available. The larger, self-sustaining districts had no extensive surpluses, while the newer mission districts remained dependent on the Home Mission treasury of the Synod. However, via vigorous local drives, these districts also sought to become self-supporting and thus to achieve a measure of autonomy. In 1905, and again in 1908, the synodical Commission urgently petitioned all districts to forward their surplus funds. (By 1905, the Commission supported work in Brazil, London, Australia, and New Zealand. Accordingly, in 1908, the Commission was subdivided into a "Inner Missions Commission for North America" and one for "Inner Missions in Foreign Countries.") [Proceedings' 1908, pp. 76-77]

5. In 1911 there was a deficit of some \$36,000 in the "Inner Missions in North America" treasury. At that time, the Delegate-Synod recommended [empfehlen) that the districts provide a specified sum annually for synodical home mission work. The Synod also resolved to petition the synodical President to present this matter to the district conventions in a "heartwarming" manner.

[Proceedings, 1911, p. 87) In 1914 the Commission required \$107,188 for its work; District surpluses amounted to \$55,383. Synod resolved to appropriate \$150,000 for home missions during the next triennium and, if necessary, to borrow the required funds. All Districts and congregations were urgently petitioned to consider home missions one of the main funds and systematically to support it. Synod further resolved that the synodical Commission should enter into closer relations with the various district boards. (The specific plan is not given in Proceedings, 1914, English-p. 30] Because of the urgency of the situation, the Synod also resolved to initiate a widespread discussion concerning the advisability of having a general Superintendent of Missions. Regarding the salaries of the home missionaries, the Synod resolved that the synodical Commission was to regulate such salaries in the dependent, subsidized Districts (the former adjective is the term in the English Proceedings, the latter is the German). In the independent, nonsubsidized Districts, regulation of salaries must rest with the District Home Mission Boards. [Proceedings, 1914, German-pp. 73-74]

6. At the 1917 Delegate-Synod the Commission reported that the proposed (1914) \$150,000 budget fell short by \$54,131. (No mention is made of Synod having borrowed any money to meet these needs, as resolved in the 1914 Delegate-Synod.) The Synod then resolved to appropriate \$60,000 per annum for this treasury during the next triennium and to authorize the synodical Commission to appeal to each district for a fixed proportionate amount. It also resolved that the Commission is to present either through its own membership or by proxy the cause of synodical Home Missions at the conventions of the districts. (Why didn't the existing District Home Mission Boards do this?) The Synod further resolved that the Commission shall be required to meet with representatives of the district boards and with the synodical Board for Church Extension on the day previous to the opening of each Delegate-Synod. (Proceedings, 1917, English-pp. 34-35]

7. At the 1920 Delegate Convention, the Synod reiterated its "decentralized" plan for home missions that was operative in the past. The individual districts shall assume major responsibility for home mission work. The synodical Commission, consisting of five members, shall advise the districts of major needs after a thorough examination of the total situation. At the triennial convention and in the interim years, the representatives of the district boards for Home Missions and Church Extension shall meet with the synodical Home Mission Commission to confer on the entire mission program and to achieve a uniform cooperation of all the districts. The chief topic for discussion shall be the apportionment among the various districts. The districts shall be asked to include in their budgets their specified contribution to the General Mission Treasury. The Home Mission Commission shall also be permitted to make special direct appeals to the Districts for funds whenever necessary. [Proceedings, 1920, p. 5]

B. GENERAL MISSION ACTIVITIES IN OTHER MISSIONS

1. INNER MISSIONS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES:

a. Separate Commission organized in 1908 (differentiated from Home Missions in North America). The recurrent problem of this Commission was not financial, but oriented about the man-power shortage. Work in Brazil was the most extensive; work also in London and in Europe (via the Free Church) and New Zealand and Australia (via sister Synods).

b. District-Synod relations: The Commission was authorized to appoint one representative in each district who would present a report on progress and needs at each district convention. Apparently this was sufficient since the Commission did not, during this period, encounter difficulties similar in scope to those of its North American counterpart. [Proceedings, 1908, p. 79]

2. OTHER MISSIONS:

a. By 1914 the Foreign Tongue Missions Commission (Esthonian, Lithuanian, Finnish, Polish, Slovak, etc.), the Commission for World Missions in Foreign Countries (Heathen), the Indian Mission Commission, the Immigrant Mission Commission, and the Negro mission Commission (of the Synodical Conference) all had engaged special district representatives to report to the district conventions. A blanket resolution in 1920 enabled all Mission Commissions to: "appoint representatives in the various districts of Synod, who shall speak for the respective missions." (Proceedings, 1920, German-p. 55; English-p. 65]

b. During this period the Deaf Missions Commission remained "unique": although it engaged 9 missionaries serving 61 preaching-stations from coast to coast, it had no specific District representation (either via single representatives or via District Deaf Mission Boards or even via existing district mission commissions, e.g., Home Missions). Appeals were made directly to the congregations, by-passing all District administration.

* * * * *

IX. 4. Originally all the districts were "created equal," yet the tendency became gradually apparent which seemed to differentiate between "independent" and "dependent" districts. This distinction was made almost exclusively on the basis of the financial ability of a district. Nevertheless, it presented the Synod with a new type of problem. Those districts which were formed in order to extend the kingdom in new frontiers usually found that they did not have sufficient financial resources to back up an aggressive frontier program. Consequently, they looked to the Synod for support. The older districts, on the other hand, whose mission potential declined at this time, were asked to transfer their "surplus funds" to the synodical treasury. To a certain extent, the subsidized districts were at the mercy of the financially independent districts. Thus, if an independent district wishes to maintain a higher standard of salaries in its midst, even for its missionaries, it could do so with immunity. The financially dependent district, however, had to rely completely upon the "mercy" of the larger independent districts. This development brought several additional problems to the Synod during the period under investigation. These may be outlined as:

- a. A greater inequality between the districts which was non-existent originally.
- b. The desire on the part of an older, financially secure district to provide properly for its own before it became willing to admit that it had a financial surplus.
- c. An intense desire on the part of the "dependent" districts to become independent as rapidly as possible with the result that it might neglect its responsibilities for the work at large in order to achieve this.
- d. The inequality thus existing would discourage a large, unwieldy district from suggesting a division, for fear that all or some of its parts after the division would become "dependent."
- e. The fostering of a competitive spirit between the districts to the detriment of

the work at large.

f. The growing tendency for the districts to drift apart from one another in their desire to become financially independent.

* * * * *

IX. 13. In the relationships between the Synod and its districts, there is a growing tendency to develop a "we" and "they" relationship. With the increasing pattern of district autonomy, some of the districts began to feel that the synodical work, as translated by the district, began and ended within their geographic boundaries. Perhaps this was partially due to the enormous assignments which the individual districts assumed in missions, charitable work, and on the congregational level in church construction and community outreach.

14. The chief function of the Home Mission Commission during this period lay in its coordinative endeavors. Funds for this work were contributed by all the districts, and the requests of the individual districts were directed to the Home Mission Commission which then allocated the necessary funds on a percentage basis, depending on their needs.

15. A somewhat vicious circle was created by the circumstances. In the first place there were several districts who did not have any "surplus" mission funds to transfer from their treasuries. This had the tendency to create zealous efforts within the district to "scrape together" as much money as possible in order to meet their own home mission demands. This very action on the part of the district had the tendency to develop autonomous, independent districts. This further created the tendency on the part of some of the districts to attempt to retain as much of their "balance" at the end of the year in case of unforeseen or emergency developments. The newer mission districts, on the other hand, continued to rely on the synodical treasury for their primary income. Their mission needs were huge, and their financial resources hopelessly inadequate. Consequently, they were at the mercy of the other districts which had developed a form of self-sufficiency. On other occasions, a large "mission district" such as the Minnesota and Dakota District, had received tremendous subsidies because of the vastness of their fields. In order to gain some form of "independence" it may have suggested that the outlying territories be severed, and developed into separate districts. Whenever a district began to rely too heavily on synodical subsidy, it soon found that it would not be in a position to carry out all of its home mission responsibilities.

16. The original position of the Synod towards its districts was reversed, and a new pattern was established. While the Synod itself originally divided into districts in order to do more effective work, the districts subsequently were reluctant to divide for fear that they might lose some of the independence which had been gained through their own financial and numerical growth. In view of the existing pattern, after more than one hundred years of development, the Synod found itself confronted with extremely strong, independent, self-sustaining districts on the one hand, and weaker, smaller, dependent districts which require financial subsidy.

17. In reading the record, one cannot draw any other conclusion than that the Home Mission Commission frequently was hamstrung because of the independence which the Synod had granted to the district commissions on home missions. In spite of the fact that the convention

floor committee in 1914 recommended that a "superintendent of missions" be appointed to supervise all of the Synod's and districts' home mission activities, the proposals were rejected. one suspects that this was done in view of the coordinating and allocating role which the synodical Commission had exercised up to this time and in view of the fact that the actual implementation of home mission work was carried on by the districts. Thus it would become obvious that the convention would not see any need for a full-time official whose chief service might deteriorate into that of a bookkeeper.

18. The analogy which President Schwan used prior to the turn of the century of the district-synod relationship consisting of a fleet of ships working together in order to achieve a common goal was becoming less applicable. Some of the larger ships were going off into independent directions, and showed less concern for the smaller floundering ones.

19. In view of the fact that the Synod had a Commission on Home Missions, and that each of the districts had a similar commission, it is extremely difficult to understand why in 1917 the Home Mission Commission was authorized to present its needs to the districts either through its own membership or by proxy. Why the synodical Commission could not utilize the district mission commissions is a question which remains unanswered. Was there inadequate liaison between the two? Weren't the district commissions sufficiently acquainted with the overall picture in the synod to give a clear, comprehensive picture? Was their orientation too parochial? Did the synodical Commission have a hidden fear that the overall work would be neglected if a member of a district's commission would present the comprehensive program?

20. Since 1911 other mission activities of the Synod conducted on the synodical level developed the "district representative" plan. It was followed in 1914, and finally in 1920 a blanket resolution empowered all specialized missions to do likewise. The chief function of this "district representative" was to bring information to the districts, and thereby communicate also to the pastors and congregations. Generally such representatives were appointed by the synodical Commission.

* * * * *

THE DISTRICT-SYNOD RELATIONS
THE LUTHERAN CHURCH-MISSOURI SYNOD
IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE 1922-PRESENT

(A Report To The Synodical Survey Commission)

REPORT 3B
JULY, 1961
Aug. R. Suelflow

* * * * *

V.D. Board of Home Missions was created five years (1878) after the first District Mission Board was established. (Michigan, 1873)

1. As might be expected, a great deal of cooperation and association has existed between the synodical Board of Home Missions and the District equivalents. Various Districts have been involved in carrying out synodically initiated programs of home missions in their respective areas, In 1923, Synod resolved to further home mission work among the Indians in Minnesota. To promote this work it resolved to include two members of the Minnesota Home Mission Board on the Commission which would supervise this program. [Proceedings, 1923, p. 41] in a similar fashion, Synod authorized the Texas District to promote mission work among Lutherans in Mexico City, and provided financial assistance for this program. [Proceedings, 1926, p. 114]

2. Until 1932, the great depression convention, Synod carried on Foreign Language Missions to several language groups within this country. That year the Synod resolved to eliminate its Board for Foreign Tongue Missions and to transfer these missions to the Mission Boards of the Districts.

3. Also on the Home Mission level during the earlier decades of this century, many missions were sponsored directly by Synod. In 1935, Synod urged the Districts in which these missions were located to either take them over or to serve as agents of Synod in supervising their activities. (Proceedings, 1935, p. 2491

4. Traditionally and consistently the Districts were concerned about mission work within their own areas. In view of such decentralization the Home Mission Board reported in 1947 that it experienced good relations not only with subsidized but also with self-supporting District Home Mission Boards. It reported that "all fully cooperated in carrying out the extensive mission expansion program entered upon." (Proceedings, 1947, pp. 354-355]

5. The synodical Board of Missions to the Deaf reported in 1950 that the 1947 recommendation of Synod encouraging the District Mission Boards to supervise work among the blind had been accepted by twelve Districts. (Proceedings, 1950, p. 461]

6. Also in 1950 the Board for Missions in North and South America reported that it had launched upon a program of more frequent contact with the various District boards. It stated that "it hopes to be able to gather helpful information from the various fields and to share this information with the various boards. It hopes also, in this way, to encourage and to strengthen the brethren who have been given the important assignment of carrying on the important work of District missions." [Proceedings, 1950, p. 431]

7. The same year the Executive Secretary of Missions reported that twelve District boards had indicated their willingness to work with Negro missions in their areas. This action had become necessary when, in 1946, the Synodical Conference had encouraged the respective District mission Boards to assume the guidance and development of this work in their areas. (Proceedings, 1950, pp. 420-423]

8. In 1953 the Board for Missions in North and South America presented to Synod

its philosophy of District Missions, and emphasized the primary responsibility, traditionally exercised by the Districts in carrying on this work. It stated that: "The primary responsibility for carrying on the Home Mission Program of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod rests upon the thirty-two Districts and not upon Synod's Home Mission Board ... This is a unique home mission arrangement in Protestantism. However, Synod's Home Mission Board is to interest itself in the Home Mission Program of the Church, give counsel and guidance to the District Mission Boards and also financial assistance where needed." (Proceedings, 1953, P. 379]

9. In 1959, Synod by resolution delineated the relationship between the North American Mission Board and the District Mission Boards. It resolved that:

"WHEREAS

1. Opportunities vary from one part of the country to the other.
2. Manpower supply is limited and should be utilized to greatest advantage.
3. Certain Districts and District Mission Boards have requested a greater coordination of their efforts with those of other Districts.

"RESOLVED:

1. That this convention request each District Mission Board to make a complete and intensive survey of the mission opportunities in its area, using all available assistance and resources, including those made available by Synod's Board for Missions in North and South America;
2. That District Home Mission Boards annually submit to Synod's Board for Missions in North and South America their survey findings regarding long-range opportunities and a complete report on each new project to be undertaken in the ensuing year, seeking the counsel of Synod's Board for Missions in North and South America;
3. That on the basis of such consultation, Synod's Board for Missions in North and South America propose both long-range and immediate expansion rates for each District, said expansion rates to be reviewed annually;
4. That on the basis of available manpower, available financial resources, and a comparison of the proposed project with other opportunities in North America, Synod's Board for Missions in North and South America, supply each District with an evaluation of the projects to be undertaken." (Proceedings, 1959, p. 157-158]

* * * * *

V.P. The District liaison of the Commission on College and University Work was assigned the Home Missions Boards of the Districts.

1. At the recommendation of the synodical Board for Home Missions, Synod in 1923 provided for the appointment of a Committee to study the matter of serving Lutheran students in the various colleges and universities. (Proceedings, 1923, p. 32] This Committee, originally called the Student Welfare Committee backed a resolution passed by Synod stating "That Synod call on its Districts to make provision for the students at institutions within the territory of each through the inner mission boards or otherwise." (Proceedings, 1926, p. 121] By 1947 the work of the Commission on College and University Work had developed to the point that it was able to recommend that Synod encourage each District to appoint a coordinator of Student Work. Synod adopted this recommendation. [Proceedings, 1947, p. 336]

2. In 1959 the Commission gave a rather explicit statement on its relationships to Districts. Speaking of the administration of its work it said, "The synodical Commission on College and University Work simply serves in an advisory capacity to Districts in the inauguration, maintenance, intensification, and extension of this extraordinary phase of Kingdom work. Synodical Districts provide both the manpower and the facilities needed for the primary tasks of conserving campus personnel in Christ, reclaiming them for Christ, winning them to Christ, and training them in the service of Christ." (Proceedings, 1959, p. 3921

Q. Synod's board for work among the blind had recommended that this work be carried on by the District mission boards. With this arrangement for work among the blind, it is surprising that the Board for Missions to the Deaf developed a different system for administering its work. This board, rather than utilizing the District and its organizations, has provided for regional representatives, one for the Eastern, one for Dixie, one for the Great Lakes, one for the Midwest, one for the North central, and one for the Pacific regions.

* * * * *

IX.D. A contrast of a study of this type reveals that the District-Synod relationship underwent several transitional stages.

1. The first, running approximately from 1854 until almost to the turn of the century, presents a picture of greater coordination, intimacy, and union of the various Districts as parts of a complete whole.

2. The second stage of these relationships may be termed "District predominance", running approximately from the turn of the century until the mid '20s of the present century. During this period perhaps, the Districts reached the climax of independence.

3. The last period may perhaps best be typified as a period of struggle on the part of the Districts for the continued preservation of a certain form of independence, frequently "curbed" by the growing synodical administrative machinery.

* * * * *

IX.L.L. The cooperative efforts between the Districts and the Synod may be ill-defined. These have been treated textually, but it may be well to outline them here.

1. The relations between the synodical President and the District Presidents were very well defined.

2. After both Synod and its Districts began to create a separate commission or board for separate functions, problems arose and various methods were utilized to overcome them:

a. The creation of some District boards antedated that of those on the synodical level.

b. Some District boards were reluctant to cooperate with synodical boards.

c. Some District boards served as sub-committees to the synodical boards.

d. Some synodical boards had no District equivalents and used "District representatives" to transmit their work.

e. Some synodical boards operated exclusively on the "top level" and consequently did not seek District connections.

f. In the majority of the cases relationships between synodical and District boards were only poorly defined if at all.

g. Only feeble attempts were made on the part of Synod to use the District structures in the synodical work. (Nominating committee for synodical conventions, District Presidents and one lay representative, 1899-1911; District Presidents and Counselors, served on subcommittee to Home Mission Board and Allocated Funds. 1878-1908?; District Presidents serving on the Board of Assignments, 1893-present; representatives from each District as members of the Fiscal Conference, 1926-present; District Presidents serving as an advisory group to Concordia Publishing House, early 20th Century; Initiating Missions in foreign countries in the convention interim, District Presidents, 1914-present; additional such contemporary relations are defined in Report D, pages 74-76).

h. The growth of Districts between 1922 and the present has elongated the distance between congregations and their Districts with the consequent, hesitant groping for a new role of the Circuits.

i. Normally the administration of the various Districts was considered an internal matter by the Synod. Nevertheless, from time to time, it has established certain conditions basic to the administration of the District organization. However, in this case also, no consistent pattern has been followed. Also, this inconsistency has created criticisms of the San Francisco Convention, when it regulated, to some extent the activities of the District Home Mission Boards. (By-Law Section 8.29)j.

* * * *