



Understanding Constitutional Violations

*Position Statement in the Conflict with the Alaska Synod Bishops
of the Congregation Council of Resurrection Lutheran Church, Juneau, Alaska*

The ELCA: A Confessional Church with Interdependent Constitutions

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA), including its synods and congregations, operates as a confessional body using the model of governance by interdependent constitutions that uphold good order, unity, and integrity within the church. These constitutions are not merely perfunctory; they embody a theological commitment to the authority of Christ, lived with discernment, mutual respect, and accountability.

This position statement addresses two significant actions undertaken by former Alaska Synod Bishop Shelley Wickstrom, the prior Alaska Synod bishop, that violated [Resurrection Lutheran Church's \(RLC\) constitution](https://www.resurrectionlutheran.org) (RLC has adopted the [ELCA Model Constitution for Congregations](https://www.elca.org)) and the [Alaska Synod Constitution](https://www.alaskasynod.org) (which follows the [ELCA Model Constitution for Synods](https://www.elca.org)). The conflict at RLC can be summarized as follows:

*A small group of detractors at RLC, having failed to secure a council majority at the 2024 annual meeting, resorted to bullying tactics to install themselves as council officers. Although they were later removed from office, Bishop Wickstrom, acting without constitutional authority, reappointed the ousted president to facilitate an unconstitutional congregational vote aimed at ending Pastor Perkins' call and prematurely halting the congregation's discernment process. Following Bishop Wickstrom's retirement, the RLC Council continued to reject the unlawful attempt to remove Pastor Perkins, prompting Bishop Oslovich to allow Bishop Wickstrom to covertly continue pursuing the pastor's removal through a flawed *C15.11 / †S17.11 adjudication process. This culminated in the wrongful removal of Pastor Perkins from the roster, the appointment of a part-time interim pastor, and the staging of exclusive, non-transparent events at RLC. These include an unconstitutional and hastily called annual meeting designed to install a new council loyal to the detractors, undermining constitutional governance, congregational unity, and justice.*

The ELCA Constitutional Framework th Actions of Bishop Wickstrom

ELCA Model Constitution for Congregations

Section *C9.05 of the RLC constitution explicitly requires a two-thirds majority vote of the congregation to terminate the call of a pastor without cause or inability (e.g., Consultation Committee process - section *C9.05.b). This provision is grounded in protecting the pastoral office from arbitrary or capricious expulsion and ensuring due process. In the case of RLC, there was never any issue raised regarding Pastor Perkins' inability or cause for removal, nor was the Consultation Committee process started at RLC.

The Proposed Vote at the June 9th Congregation Meeting

In her inappropriate directive for a congregational vote to change Pastor Perkins' call from full-time to half-time – which she explicitly stated would terminate Pastor Perkins' call, Bishop Wickstrom set the voting threshold at 51%, contravening *C9.05. This action disregarded constitutional protections and was outside her authority.

The only authority under RLC's constitution granted to the bishop is in *C10.02, which permits the synod bishop to request the president to call a special congregation meeting for June 9, 2024. However, *C10.02 does not grant the bishop authority to specify the agenda or voting procedures, preside at, or provide their own parliamentarian – all of which Bishop Wickstrom attempted to wield at the June 9th meeting.

The justification the bishop provided to RLC's council, suggested a deliberate attempt to obscure her unconstitutional vote threshold of 51%, under the guise to "save the church" in a financial crisis by calling for a vote to change Pastor Perkins' call from full-time to half-time (despite an approved annual budget for a full-time call). This was, of course, necessitated by the inability of the bishop and the small group desiring to end Pastor Perkins' call to meet the constitutionally mandated 2/3 vote threshold.

No Constitutional Exception for Financial Distress Permitting Termination of a Pastor

There is no constitutional provision within the ELCA Model Constitution or the RLC Constitution that allows financial distress or a financial crisis to justify circumventing **C9.05**, which outlines the process for terminating a pastor's call. Even in cases where a congregation faces financial difficulty in compensating its pastor, such situations do not automatically result in termination. Typically, accommodations are worked out collaboratively between the congregation and the pastor.

At RLC, this was not a relevant concern. The congregation had already approved a 2024 budget that provided for full-time compensation for Pastor Perkins. Furthermore, prior to the intentional undermining of the church's contract with the City and Borough of Juneau to operate the Cold Weather Emergency Shelter for a third year—a contract that subsidized nearly a third of the pastor's compensation—the 2024 budget was projected to have a positive balance.

By unilaterally calling for a vote to alter Pastor Perkins' call without the consent or invitation of the RLC congregation or council, Bishop Wickstrom undermined the autonomy of RLC's governance structure as defined in **C5.03**, which protects the congregation's rights in both ecclesiastical and legal matters.

Unconstitutional Appointment of a Favorably-Disposed Presiding Officer

The June 9, 2024, congregation meeting was marred by significant procedural and constitutional irregularities. To facilitate an unconstitutional vote, Bishop Wickstrom unilaterally re-appointed Lisa Brendle as council president. This action violated **C11.02** of the RLC Constitution, which reserves the election of council officers exclusively to the congregation council. Neither the RLC nor the Alaska Synod Constitution grants such authority to the bishop.

Circumventing Constitutional Voting Requirements

Leading up to the June 9 meeting, President Karen Lawfer repeatedly requested that Bishop Wickstrom provide a constitutional justification for using a simple 51% majority vote to terminate the pastor's call, rather than the constitutionally required two-thirds majority under **C9.05**. No such justification was provided. Instead, Bishop Wickstrom moved forward with plans for the meeting, intending for Council Member Brendle, re-appointed as president, to preside.

Conflict of Interest and Misrepresentation

President Lawfer learned through Synod Council Member Bradley Perkins' conversation with Synod Council Attorney Zach Manzella that Attorney Manzella would be attending the June 9 meeting as Bishop Wickstrom's parliamentarian. Attorney Manzella indicated that he was unlikely to rule the 51% threshold unconstitutional, stating, *"I think everyone should just get together and vote."* Furthermore, he declined to address a blatantly false claim by Bishop Wickstrom made in an open email on June 8. In that email, the bishop falsely asserted that her 2023 "listening team" constituted the Consultation Committee required under **C9.05a.2**, despite the team failing to meet any procedural requirements outlined in the constitution.

Preemptive Meeting Cancellation

Faced with these developments, President Lawfer concluded that motions to prevent the unconstitutional vote at the proposed June 9 meeting would likely be ruled out of order. As a result, she preemptively canceled the meeting on June 8, 24 hours before it was scheduled, via an email to all congregation members. Her communication explained the lack of constitutional justification for the meeting and its intended vote.

However, later that same day, re-appointed "President" Brendle attempted to re-call the meeting at an alternate location (the downtown library rather than the sanctuary). Brendle's email, sent from her personal account, failed to reach all congregation members and did not provide an option for electronic attendance, further violating procedural norms.

Bishop Wickstrom's Attempt to Overturn RLC's Correction of Officers

Bishop Wickstrom's unconstitutional re-appointment of Council Member Brendle as president was a direct response to RLC's correction of officers on May 16, 2024. This correction was necessitated by violations of RLC's **Meeting Code of Conduct** during the annual election of officers. These violations, involving misconduct by some council members, resulted in the removal of Brendle (as well as the secretary and treasurer) from their respective officer roles.

Despite the gravity of the documented violations, Bishop Wickstrom made no effort to investigate or request information about the correction report that justified the council's actions. Instead, the bishop immediately adopted a flawed technical argument presented by the ousted officers, framing their removal as procedurally invalid.

By re-appointing Brendle, Bishop Wickstrom circumvented RLC's governing structures, compounding the constitutional breach. This overreach undermined the council's authority and exacerbated the conflict, as subsequent actions were designed to suppress legitimate parliamentary challenges, as reflected in the minutes and synod adjudication documents related to the June 9, 2024, meeting.

Invalidation of the Actions at the June 9th Meeting

While C10.02 of the RLC Constitution grants the bishop the authority to request the congregation president to call a meeting, the actions taken with regard to and at the June 9, 2024, meeting were unconstitutional.

Overreach on Officer Correction

Bishop Wickstrom lacked the constitutional authority (under RLC or Alaska Synod constitutions) to review or overturn the RLC Council's decision to apply its Meeting Code of Conduct (*C12.04.f) in correcting its officers.

Unconstitutional Reinstatement of Officers

The bishop unilaterally reinstated prior officers, including Brendle as "president." Since this action was outside the bishop's authority, Brendle's ability to preside at the June 9 meeting was invalid, as was Bishop Wickstrom's role as co-president.

Unconstitutional Voting Thresholds and Motions

The votes taken at the June 9 meeting, as documented in the minutes, were unconstitutional due to procedural violations:

- Motion 1: "To change the RLC pastoral Full-Time Call from Full-Time to a Part-Time Call but not to exceed a Half-Time Call." (Passed)
- Motion 2: To set the effective date as July 1, 2024. (Passed)
- Motion 3: "...To call Pastor Karen Perkins to a Part-Time but not to exceed a Half-Time position at Resurrection Lutheran Church in Juneau, Alaska." (Failed)

These votes were conducted under an improper 51% threshold set by Bishop Wickstrom in violation of C9.05, which requires a two-thirds majority to terminate a pastoral call. The June 9 meeting and its resulting actions violated both RLC's constitutional processes and ELCA governance norms. These constitutional breaches render all decisions and votes taken at the meeting invalid, undermining the legitimacy of subsequent actions based on these outcomes.

Complicity and Continued Efforts Under Bishop Oslovich

Following Bishop Wickstrom's retirement, her successor, Bishop Timothy Oslovich, perpetuated the unconstitutional practices previously initiated. One significant issue under his tenure has been the continued defense of the June 9 meeting's procedures and outcomes. Despite clear violations of both the RLC and Alaska Synod constitutions, Bishop Oslovich has maintained that the actions taken by Bishop Wickstrom were valid.

Bishop Oslovich's Imaginative Explanation of the June 9th Meeting

Despite being canceled by legitimately elected President Lawfer due to its unconstitutional nature (and President Lawfer's realization that with Bishop Wickstrom's favorably-disposed presider, the unconstitutional vote was certain to occur), the meeting was rescheduled without proper authority. The continuing claim by Bishop Oslovich that everyone had an opportunity to attend and that the attendee's eventual vote met the necessary threshold of 2/3 to terminate Pastor Perkins' call lacks constitutional credibility and validity.

The RLC constitution *C9.05 mandates an announced two-thirds majority threshold vote for terminating a pastoral call without cause or inability. The fact that Bishop Wickstrom announced a 51% majority threshold vote invalidated the vote, regardless of actual outcome, rendering the vote constitutionally null- regardless of the actual tabulation.

To support his argument that it was “the will of the congregation to terminate Pastor Karen,” Bishop Oslovich has also repeatedly referenced the votes to end her call of 26, 28, and 30 (a number that inexplicably increased over time). While the June 9, 2024, meeting fails to include an attendance list of voting members, the RLC Council has determined it was not attended by a majority of the council or congregation members – likely due to the meeting cancellation by President Lawfer due to her belief that vote proposed by the bishop was unconstitutional.

The RLC council also verified against the church’s Shepherd’s Staff records for June 9, 2024, that vote tallies in the meeting minutes exceed the possible number of voting members that the council estimated could have attended (by confirming who did not attend). This analysis showed, at most, a possible attendance of only 22 voting members. Such discrepancies raise serious questions about the integrity of the voting process and the accuracy of the reported results.

The Attempted Misuse and Misapplication of a *C15.11 / †S17.11 Adjudication

The *C15.11 / †S17.11 provision (*C15.11 in the RLC Constitution and †S17.11 in the Alaska Synod Constitution) is intended to resolve substantive disagreements between factions within a congregation that cannot otherwise be resolved. Any attempt to use this provision to overrule, nullify, or amend a congregation’s constitution represents a gross perversion of its intended purpose. Allowing such misuse would fundamentally undermine church governance and constitutional integrity.

Using C15.11 / †S17.11 to Attempt Time Travel

Bishop Wickstrom’s actions regarding the June 9, 2024, meeting were unconstitutional and without legal effect. Despite this, the RLC Council continued to affirm the authority of its duly elected officers and the call of Pastor Perkins, with the hope that the transition from Bishop Wickstrom to Bishop Oslovich would result in the synod leaving RLC to resolve its issues independently.

While some in the congregation, misled by Bishop Wickstrom’s overreach, expressed frustration, the small faction allied with her was infuriated. Their dissatisfaction, combined with apparent frustration from Bishop Wickstrom herself, seems to have inspired the idea of using a *C15.11 / †S17.11 adjudication to retroactively validate the invalid actions of June 9. The goal was to have the Synod Council declare her actions valid and “final” under the guise of a *C15.11 / †S17.11 adjudication.

However, this attempt to rewrite history is inherently flawed. Time travel remains impossible, and nothing can retroactively grant legal or constitutional validity to actions that were void from the outset. As such:

- Pastor Karen Perkins remains the duly called pastor of RLC.
- President Lawfer and the other officers corrected and affirmed on May 16, 2024, remain the legitimate officers of RLC.

No ruling under *C15.11 / †S17.11 can change the past or reverse the consequences of unconstitutional actions. Once the bell has been rung, it cannot be unringed.

Attempted Constitutional Amendment of *C9.05 Provisions for Termination of a Pastor

Amending a constitutional provision such as **C9.05**, which governs the termination of the mutual relationship between a minister of Word and Sacrament and the congregation, is a deliberately rigorous process under RLC's constitution. This provision includes a crucial safeguard requiring a two-thirds majority vote for the termination of Pastor Perkins' call, protecting against arbitrary or capricious actions.

Under **C16.01**, any proposed amendment must:

- Be initiated by at least five voting members or by the council.
- Be filed in writing with the council 60 days before formal consideration by the congregation at a regular or special meeting specifically called for that purpose.
- Be accompanied by the council's recommendations, which must be shared with the congregation at least 30 days before the meeting.

Further, **C16.02** requires that amendments:

- Be approved at a congregation meeting by a majority vote.
- Be ratified without change at the next regular congregation meeting by a two-thirds vote.

The idea of using a C15.11 adjudication to bypass this deliberate amendment process is inconceivable. Yet, in this instance, a C15.11 adjudication was improperly employed to attempt an effective amendment of **C9.05**, lowering the required threshold for terminating a pastoral call from two-thirds to a simple majority of 51%.

This misuse of C15.11 represents a severe overreach, undermining the integrity of the congregation's constitution and governance. Such an action sets a dangerous precedent, eroding the foundational principles of church governance and congregational autonomy.

Attempted Nullification of Election Interference Protection

In the year leading up to RLC's annual meeting, intolerable behaviors had escalated, particularly during meetings, prompting the adoption of RLC's Meeting Code of Conduct by the Council on January 18, 2024, less than two months prior to its election of officers (over the extended, vociferous objections of the group eventually found to have so interfered). Following the election at the March 7, 2024, meeting, council and congregation members noted a significant increase in behaviors that violated the Basic Rules of the Code, including bullying, harassing, and swarming.

The enactment of this code of conduct was a constitutional action under the laws of the State of Alaska and RLC's Congregational Council, as outlined in RLC's Constitution and Bylaws:

- *C1.03. This congregation shall be incorporated under the laws of the State of Alaska.
- *C12.04. The Congregation Council shall have general oversight of the life and activities of this congregation, and in particular its worship life, to the end that everything be done in accordance with the Word of God and the faith and practice of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The duties of the Congregation Council shall include the following:
 - f. To promote a congregational climate of peace and goodwill and, as differences and conflicts arise, to endeavor to foster mutual understanding.

Following the election of new officers at the March 7, 2024, when a group of officers from the “minority-side” of the council were elected in a surprising turn of events, the RLC Council initiated an investigation at the request of council and congregation members. On May 16, 2024, the investigation concluded that there were violations of the RLC’s Meeting Code of Conduct that impacted the outcome of the election, necessitating the correction of officers.

While C11.02 of the RLC constitution proscribes the election of its officers, no authority or right is granted or vests in the Synod, the Synod Council, the Synod Bishop or its officers to determine the officers of congregations under either congregation or Alaska Synod constitutions. That a *C15.11 / †S17.11 adjudication could not be used to circumvent a church’s election process, for which their council had expressly implemented a code of conduct to protect the integrity of their governance. Where the Synod has no authority appoint a congregation’s officers, to so interfere, would be a constitutional travesty.

Avoiding Fundamental Constitutional Violations by Focusing on Parliamentary Procedure

In the present case of RLC, Bishop Oslovich did precisely this by inviting a *C15.11 / †S17.11 action, purportedly to address substantive issues related to parliamentary procedures, intended to validate Bishop Wickstrom’s actions and overrule RLC’s constitution and governance. In his Proposed Resolution of Disputed Issues at Resurrection Lutheran Church, Bishop Oslovich focused on parliamentary issues he claims validates Bishop Wickstrom’s actions at the June 9th meeting. However, as can be seen from the notes in *Addendum Annotated Proposed Resolution of Disputed Issues at Resurrection Lutheran Church*, there are many numerous inaccuracies, biases, and incomplete or misleading statements that undermine the validity of the bishop’s conclusions.

This move, ironically (in that Bishop Wickstrom went to great lengths to appoint a favorably-disposed presider for her June 9th vote to avoid any parliamentary objections), underscored the misuse of parliamentary procedural mechanisms to override fundamental constitutional protections.

The focus on parliamentary procedures rather than the core constitutional protections and governance violations reflects a continued misunderstanding and misapplication of ELCA church governance principles. The attempted use of a *C15.11 / †S17.11 adjudication to retroactively legitimize the unconstitutional acts initiated by Bishop Wickstrom, not only undermine the RLC and Alaska Synod constitutions, but also set a concerning precedent for governance within Alaska Synod, and even the broader ELCA community.

Broader Implications and Misuse of Parliamentary Procedure

The ELCA and its synods are confessional churches governed by constitutions, not merely parliamentary organizations. While **Robert’s Rules of Order** (RRO) provides guidance on procedural matters under provisions like C10.07, it cannot override explicit constitutional mandates. As RRO states:

“Rules contained in this manual cannot be used to contravene higher governing documents such as constitutions, bylaws, or laws applicable to the organization.” (RRO 13:25–7; RRO 39:5).

Misapplication of Parliamentary Arguments in C15.11 / †S17.11 Adjudication

The argument presented in the Synod Council’s C15.11 / †S17.11 adjudication minutes—that a simple vote could overrule an objection to the voting threshold—is fundamentally flawed. Constitutional provisions, including those governing amendments, explicitly prescribe procedures that cannot be bypassed through parliamentary maneuvers or simple majority votes. For example, the attempt to alter C9.05 provisions for terminating a pastoral call through a C15.11 / †S17.11 adjudication represents a misuse of process that undermines both constitutional authority and the integrity of governance.

Constitutional Legitimacy of RLC’s Officer Correction

RLC’s correction of its officer elections, following documented violations of the RLC Meeting Code of Conduct at the March 7, 2024, council meeting, was entirely constitutional under RLC’s governing documents. This action cannot be invalidated by Bishop Oslovich’s illegitimate C15.11 / †S17.11 adjudication, which relied solely on flawed parliamentary arguments.

Additionally, neither Bishop Wickstrom nor Bishop Oslovich has addressed or expressed concern for the bullying, harassment, or swarming that influenced the original election outcome. These actions, which violate fundamental ethical and procedural principles, were ignored despite clear guidance in RRO, including:

“Procedures should not be used to perpetuate improper actions or silence valid objections.” (RRO 46:49–50).

“Objections must be addressed to preserve the fairness and integrity of organizational proceedings.” (RRO 23:6).

Significant Harm from Incongruous, Destructive and Indefensible Actions

The actions initiated by Bishop Wickstrom and perpetuated under Bishop Oslovich have caused profound harm to RLC’s governance, mission, and community. These violations have eroded trust, compromised the church’s integrity, and undermined its confessional identity.

The numerous incongruous, destructive, and indefensible actions—including the rushed vote orchestrated during the final days of Bishop Wickstrom’s tenure—have inflicted lasting damage on the congregation, the wider community, and individuals targeted by these actions. The antagonism and costly consequences of these choices demand immediate attention. They cannot be ignored, nor can they be deferred for others to address.

Restoration of trust and integrity requires transparency, accountability, and a renewed commitment to constitutional principles.

Prepared by Congregation Counsel of Resurrection Lutheran Church Council and adopted as an official position statement by the Council on January 16, 2025, on information and belief, subject to reasonable amendment by Counsel, with concurrence of the Congregation President.

Addendum

Annotated Proposed Resolution of Disputed Issues at Resurrection Lutheran Church

Addendum

Annotated Proposed Resolution of Disputed Issues at Resurrection Lutheran Church

The following is an annotated version of Bishop Oslovich's attempt to seek "timely resolution of the dispute" under the *C15.11 / †S17.11 adjudication he initiated regarding Resurrection Lutheran Church, Juneau, Alaska. The notes in red are intended to demonstrate how many of his statements were biased, false, misleading or incomplete. This is just ONE example of the many documents related to the *C15.11 / †S17.11 adjudication include errors, opinions posing as facts, or opinions based on unchecked claims from unidentified sources. These notes were prepared on information and belief on behalf of the RLC Council as of January 1, 2025.

Proposed Resolution (Verdict) of Disputed Issues at Resurrection Lutheran Church July 25, 2024

The people of Resurrection Lutheran Church and the people of Juneau continue to be in my prayers.

Much good ministry has happened through Resurrection Lutheran Church. Many people have been spiritually encouraged, fed, clothed, given shelter, and helped in many other ways. These ministries are how we live out our calling as followers of Jesus.

Very sadly, there has been considerable conflict (and complaints of bullying and harassment) at Resurrection Lutheran Church. The fair way to resolve the conflict is to follow our own rules – rules that we agreed to follow when we joined the church. (Yes, and the bishop is not excepted.)

I (invited people to ask, specifying the questions, and) was asked under *C15.11 of the Constitution of Resurrection Lutheran Church to propose a resolution to two disputes: (1) Who are the officers of Resurrection Lutheran Church? and (2) Was the meeting held on June 9, 2024, a legal congregation meeting?

Before addressing the specific questions, I think it is important to note that Resurrection Lutheran Church has been experiencing conflict for quite some time. In March 2023, a Listening Team from the Alaska Synod produced a report on disagreements at Resurrection (specifically stating that they were not making judgements or recommendations), and Bishop Shelley Wickstrom made recommendations to the congregation based on the report. One of the recommendations was for the congregation to vote on whether the pastoral call should be reduced to half time (FALSE) and whether Pastor Karen Perkins should continue in that call. (FALSE – look at the document, it isn't there)

Since Resurrection Lutheran Church was working with Pastor Laurin Vance to attempt to resolve the conflicts (original agreement with Rev. Vance was peripherally related, but discernment focused), Bishop Wickstrom did not call for an immediate congregation meeting (she claimed a year later, leaving out that we were in the process of including her recommendations in our discernment process) for the congregation to vote on whether the pastoral call should be reduced to half time (came from where?) and whether Pastor Karen Perkins should continue in that call. In May of 2024 (suddenly squeezing it in before retiring, and not within constitutional requirements), after more than a year (of congregational discernment work, including passing an annual budget, pressing for clarified finances and favoring pursuing alternatives), Bishop Wickstrom asked the president to call a congregation meeting to address those questions. (After the Council voted not to ignore the work we had done since then.) According to Resurrection Lutheran Church's Constitution, "C10.02. The president of the Congregation Council shall call a special meeting upon request of the synod bishop." There is nothing in this provision or in the Constitution that allows the president to refuse to call the meeting. (We all agreed.) Even if the president feels that the meeting was being called to debate a motion that was out of order (unconstitutional), the

president would still be obligated to call the meeting. (never debated) At the meeting, the question of the propriety (not if unconstitutional) of a motion would be decided according to the Constitution and Robert's Rules of Order (Since the bishop said she would preside at the meeting and insisted she would bring her own parliamentary—neither of which she has the right to do, she would be deciding her own propriety). That is the proper way to conduct business. No one person has the power to cancel a meeting because they disagree with the agenda. (I thought it was the chair's responsibility to disallow any out-of-order business. Since the bishop erroneously declared Lisa the president, she was deciding who would decide propriety.)

Based on the draft minutes and the report of several people who were at the June 9, 2024, meeting, that meeting was legally called, and there was a quorum (with no voter list, we can't know that). Notice of the meeting went out to members of the congregation, and the meeting was announced at worship services at least two weeks before the date of the meeting. I realize that some people decided not to participate in the meeting on June 9. That was their choice. (for some) Nevertheless, the meeting was called and conducted according to the Constitution of Resurrection Lutheran Church (FALSE – there were other irregularities to circumvent cancellation, nevertheless denying access to all) and Robert's Rules of Order. The decisions made at the meeting are valid (unconstitutional decisions cannot be). Pastor Karen Perkins' call to Resurrection Lutheran Church ended on June 30, 2024. I ask all members of Resurrection Lutheran Church and Pastor Perkins to respect the (null) decisions made at the congregation meeting.

In regard to the issue of the identity officers at Resurrection Lutheran Church: unnamed (publicly) persons made an argument to overturn (WRONG) the results of the March 7, 2024, election of officers in a document titled "Correction Report to March 7, 2024, Minutes." They argued that because of violations to the Code of Conduct adopted by the Council of Resurrection Lutheran Church, the election was invalid (incorrect). However, the Code of Conduct says nothing about elections (nor, is it required to, however, it does disallow bullying and coercion at meetings which occurred during, and changed, the election). In addition, all 13 members of the Council unanimously approved (as the member(s) being bullied continued to be so, until after the April 2024 meeting) the minutes of the March 7, 2024, meeting at the April council meeting. Those minutes included the results of the election. (Properly called Council meetings subsequently voted to correct those minutes and later approved the minutes of that meeting. This is how corrections are made.) The claim that there is no guidance in Robert's Rules of Order regarding election challenges is also not correct. Robert's Rules of Order (what version?) (see 43:48 and 43:49) (no such sections exist in RRO 13 – see 46:49's reference to 23:6 for anything close to relevant guidance) lists the reasons and ways a challenge to an election may be made. None of the reasons applied in this case, and no challenge was made under Robert's Rules. The elections at the March 7, 2024, council meeting are valid (RRO 13 46:50 clearly proscribes his judgement), and the officers elected at that meeting are the officers of the council and the officers of the congregation.

My proposed resolution to the two issues at Resurrection Lutheran Church, Juneau, Alaska, are

- (1) The officers elected at the Council meeting on March 7, 2024, are the officers of the council and the congregation: Lisa Brendle - President, Delores Graver - Vice President, Ken Koelsch – Secretary, and Kristin Cadigan-McAdoo – Treasurer. I encourage everyone to acknowledge these people as the officers. (His ruling is both meaningless, as he hasn't the authority validate Bishop Wickstrom's action, as she had no constitutional – RLC or AK synod – authority. See RRO 13 46:50. Both bishop's expedient disregard for the bullying and coercion is callous and immoral, especially for a pastor or bishop.)
- (2) The June 9, 2024 congregation meeting was a legally called and conducted meeting of the congregation. The decisions made at that meeting are valid. Pastor Karen Perkins' call at

Resurrection Lutheran Church ended on June 30, 2024. I encourage everyone to acknowledge the legality of the meeting and the decisions made at that meeting.

I recognize that some members of Resurrection will not be happy with this resolution. However, I am simply following our governing documents after listening carefully to people from Resurrection and consulting with the Secretary of the ELCA, a certified parliamentarian, and experts in ELCA Constitutions.

I ask all of you who are council members, and I ask Pastor Karen Perkins: Are you willing to accept these proposed resolutions to the issues at Resurrection Lutheran Church?

Please respond by noon on Saturday, July 27, 2024.

Thank you.

All of you, all the members of Resurrection Lutheran Church, and all those who benefit from the ministry of the congregation are in my prayers.

Peace,

Tim Oslovich (he/him)
Bishop, Alaska Synod, ELCA
1847 W Northern Lights Blvd, #2, Anchorage, Alaska 99517
907-272-8899 FAX 907-274-3141

www.elcaalaska.net

Dena'inaq e'nen'aq' gheshtnu ch'q'u yeshdu. (Dena'ina)
I live on Dena'ina land

Do you know who the Indigenous people were and are [on the land you inhabit](#)?