

RESPONSE REGARDING FRIENDSHIP & DOCTRINE –  
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Introduction</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>A Brief History</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Larry and C.J. – 1982-1997</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>A 3½ Year Process with C.J. Starting in December 2000</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Evaluations from Covenant Life Pastors – December 2003</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>Kenneth’s Evaluation of C.J.</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>Grant’s Evaluation of C.J.</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>C.J. Not Transparent with Pastors at Covenant Life Church</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>Summary of Concerns from Apostolic Team – April 2004</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>Phone Call with Joshua, Kenneth, Bob – June 15, 2004</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>Meeting between Apostolic Team &amp; Josh, Kenneth, Grant, Bob – August 20, 2004</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>The Circle of Confession for C.J</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>Follow Up on August 20, 2004 Meeting</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>C.J. Redirecting the Focus after August 20, 2004 Meeting</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Dave’s November 11, 2004 Summary</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>Joshua’s Reply to Dave</u>	<u>37</u>
<u>C.J. and Brent’s Meeting in Charlotte – November 19, 2004</u>	<u>38</u>
<u>Brent’s Feedback for C.J. from Meeting in Charlotte – January 19, 2005</u>	<u>39</u>
<u>Two Examples of Offense Expounded</u>	<u>46</u>

Example 1: “An Element of Hypocrisy”	46
Example 2: Stepping Down as Team Leader	49
<u>Things Never Addressed or Explained</u>	<u>53</u>
<u>Team Retreat in Herndon, VA - January 11-13, 2005</u>	<u>55</u>
<u>“I Do Not Trust You!” - January 2005</u>	<u>58</u>
<u>C.J. Taking Over the Process Per Steve</u>	<u>60</u>
<u>Dave and Brent’s Concerns for Steve</u>	<u>61</u>
<u>Follow Up After the January 2005 Team Retreat</u>	<u>61</u>
<u>Bob and Kenneth Request a Meeting with Brent - March 30, 2005</u>	<u>67</u>
<u>Brent’s Job Performance Evaluation by C.J. - April 2005</u>	<u>68</u>
<u>Brent’s Fall from (Sovereign) Grace</u>	<u>69</u>
<u>The Home Stretch - April thru November 2005</u>	<u>74</u>
<u>The Separation in Heart</u>	<u>88</u>
<u>C.J.’s Visit to Charlotte - September 30-October 2, 2005</u>	<u>89</u>
<u>Dave’s Private Letter - January 2006</u>	<u>90</u>
<u>The Final Goodbye - November 20, 2007</u>	<u>90</u>
<u>The Pre-Conference Gathering at T4G - April 2008</u>	<u>92</u>
<u>A Nine Page Letter of Concerns Disregarded - March 2009</u>	<u>92</u>
<u>Brent’s Concern for Hypocrisy - Three Examples</u>	<u>94</u>
Example 1: The Seven Year Plan	94
Example 2: Jeff Teaching on the Sacraments	100
Example 3: Writing the Book, <i>Humility: Greatness Defined</i>	104

<u>Doctrine &amp; Practice Now Separate Us</u>	<u>106</u>
<u>No Room for Brent's Charismatic Theology?</u>	<u>119</u>
<u>Brent Removed from the Pastors College</u>	<u>122</u>
<u>Personal Anecdote on August 20, 2004 Meeting</u>	<u>125</u>
<u>Brent Banned from Sovereign Grace Churches</u>	<u>126</u>
<u>The Need for Private Acknowledgment by C.J.</u>	<u>126</u>
<u>The Need for Public Confession by C.J.</u>	<u>127</u>
<u>Final Remarks - An Appeal for Integrity, Truth Telling &amp; Justice</u>	<u>128</u>
<u>Endnotes</u>	<u>129</u>
<u>End</u>	<u>141</u>

RESPONSE REGARDING FRIENDSHIP AND DOCTRINE  
MARCH 17, 2010

Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Thank you C.J. for writing. I hope and pray our friendship will be restored and the issues of offense that separate us will be removed. While the past five years have been punctuated with anguish and pain, it was an honor to work with you over the last three decades. I learned so much from you and I was blessed to serve in so many wonderful capacities. Here is your e-mail that I am replying to in what follows.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 14, 2010 3:17 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Letter from CJ

Dear Brent,

I hope this e mail finds you enjoying God's grace.

Recently I was informed that you might have some offenses with me. I was saddened to hear this, but not surprised given the sinful tendencies present in my heart and life. Brent, if it is accurate that you have offenses against me, I want to do whatever I can to address these and pursue reconciliation. I also want to make every effort to preserve our friendship. Even though I know we hold disagreements over doctrine and practice that now separate us from serving together, I don't want there to be any separation of heart between us. Your friendship has been an undeserved gift and I have countless memories of serving the Savior with you that I still treasure.

Finally, I believe you are called to pastoral ministry and I want to help you in any way I can should you desire to pursue this call.

My friend, if it is accurate that offenses exist, I would like to fly to Charlotte to hear your heart and consider your perspective in hopes of discovering if I have sinned against you. If that is the case, I would be eager to ask your forgiveness.

C.J., I have a great love for you. I sought to demonstrate it over the years. That love was most poignantly expressed on August 20, 2004. I knew the outcome of that meeting could (not would) have terrible consequences for me.<sup>2</sup> I went into the meeting with fear and trembling. I also went into the meeting with hope and faith. I knew the result could be greater fruitfulness for you and greater glory for God. Afterward I told

Dave it was the most loving and sacrificial thing I'd ever done. He understood my meaning in context. It was not a boast.

My love for you continues. I've always protected your reputation, honored your labors, advanced your interests, and sought to care for your soul. At times, care for your soul included honest input. You now offer "to fly to Charlotte to hear your heart and consider your perspective in hopes of discovering if I have sinned against you." For reasons that will become apparent, I am not prepared to meet face to face at this time. I will instead share my heart and perspective in writing.

I appreciate the sentiments you express in the e-mail above; but, I also find them disconcerting. On the one hand, I hope they represent a change of heart. On the other hand, I find them disingenuous. Let me briefly explain.

During the last decade, many people brought to your attention numerous ways they thought you sinned against me. I did the same either directly or indirectly through others. Unfortunately, this never resulted in any personal confession. You either rejected our input as unfounded or failed to apply it to any actual occasions of sin. For instance, you denied ever being bitter, resentful, or angry at me - a concern raised by many people.

Therefore, I don't know how you can say that "Recently I was informed that you might have some offenses with me." This is unintelligible because the "offenses" outlined in my response are not new to you. You are well acquainted with them. They have been outstanding and unresolved. As such, I don't understand how you can claim ignorance<sup>3</sup> until quite recently.

The same is true about "preserving our friendship" and not wanting "any separation of heart between us."<sup>4</sup> I want that to be true but it has not been my experience. Since the day I stepped down from the apostolic team over two years ago, I've not seen you or talked to you. I will say more about this later.

Nevertheless, I appreciate your willingness to contact me and inquire about offenses or ways I think you've sinned. I hope this represents a new and different approach. I'd like to see our friendship recovered. I'd love to have my confidence in you and Sovereign Grace restored. I want to pass on good reports to others. I want to see the movement prosper and not be subject to reproach. You and Sovereign Grace have born a lot of godly fruit. May that only increase! I remain very grateful to God for you and many others in the movement.

I also understand your preference to do this in person and not by e-mail. For me, however, e-mail is a necessary first step. My trust has been shaken. E-mail ensures

accuracy and accountability. It is also a form of letter writing which the saints have used as a fruitful vehicle of communication throughout church history.

For the most part, I've presented this material in chronological order. This provides historical context and progression. Where we are today has a long history. The breakdown in our relationship is rooted in the past. That is why it is critical to review the past. Secondarily this approach shows your long term knowledge of offenses (i.e., ways you sinned against me) and "separation of heart" between us. They are not recent developments or nebulous issues. Having read this paper, I hope you will honestly acknowledge both points.<sup>5</sup>

Lastly and most importantly, I write because of my deep love for you and for Sovereign Grace Ministries. My greatest concern is for the increasing presence of deceit and hypocrisy rooted in self preservation and love of reputation.<sup>6</sup> I'd be overjoyed to see you acknowledge these things to the movement, whether or not you ask my forgiveness for anything specific. Comparatively speaking, the later is unimportant. Ultimately, this isn't about us. It is about something much bigger. Therefore, I provide the history that follows for your careful consideration.

I have not relied upon my memory in putting this response together since memory alone is inadequate and not always reliable. I could never retain and preserve accuracy without the use of primary source material. I think you'd agree that I have served, at least in large measure, as the "unofficial" historian and archivist for the movement. In preparing to write, therefore, I have reviewed thousands of pages of e-mails, official minutes, notes from meetings, transcribed messages, and writings in my journal. My ability to present in detail does not come from a heart eaten up with bitterness. My ability to remember minute details and provide intimate observations do not come from a mind constantly rehashing the past. It comes from these sources.

I cite and include many documents. The only changes made are due to spell check or reformatting for consistency. The only additions are in brackets [ ]. These are explanatory notes I've added to make the meaning more understandable or add personal commentary. I excerpt some documents (i.e., not include or quote in entirety) for the sake of brevity and focus. I underline for emphasis. When I quote speakers from conversations, I only do so when indicated by quotation marks in my notes. This means I was able to catch the wording and write it down or recorded it with great care. Otherwise I never put statements in quotation marks. This doesn't mean I always get it right. It means I try to be as accurate (and just) as possible. Lastly, I have left out many important issues and illustrations. Even the ones I have included are often abridged. I address "the disagreements over doctrine and practice" later in this response.

## A Brief History -1974-1982

My first introduction to you and Larry Tomczak was at the Jesus Festival in 1974 in Erie, Pennsylvania. I loved hearing both of you preach. Four years later, I met Larry for the first time. He came to be a guest speaker at the Charismatic Conference held at Melodyland Christian Center in Anaheim. I was one of 25 pastoral interns at the church, and in the providence of God, was assigned to be Larry's host. The following summer, I graduated from the School of Theology and returned to Indiana, Pennsylvania.

I met you in August of 1979 when I came to visit Gathering of Believers for three weeks. Steve Shank was my host. In 1980, I became the senior pastor of Indiana Christian Fellowship. The following year, we asked you and Larry to provide oversight for us as a church. This first church "adoption," along with the church plant in Cleveland, marked the unofficial beginning of Sovereign Grace Ministries. In August of 1982, Jenny and I moved to Wheaton, MD so I could begin the Leadership Training School and join you, Larry and Bill Galbraith on the emerging apostolic team. This was the official beginning of Sovereign Grace Ministries. Our time together spans more than three decades. I continue to count it a great joy and privilege to have been a part from the start and to have worked with you for so long.

## Larry and C.J. - 1982-1997

Once we began functioning as an apostolic team, I quickly became aware that you and Larry had difficulties relating to each other. In my naivety, I was very surprised by this reality. I still remember the first time Larry asked me to lead you and him through the resolution of a conflict during a team meeting. The notion scared me. I thought to myself, "This is way over my head. Who am I to try and help Larry and CJ?"

Little did I know I would continue to play this role from 1982 until 1997 when Larry left the movement. During this time period, I learned a lot about you and not just in relation to Larry. It included many different people and contexts.<sup>7</sup> I discovered you were most tempted when you felt sinned against, judged or misrepresented. This often led to bitterness, anger, sinful judgments, distrust, and relational withdrawal.

Don't misunderstand, I also observed far more than patterns of temptation and sin. I have in mind many evidences of grace in your life which were a joy to observe and learn from. In fact, I appreciated how you and Larry attempted to grow in your relationship and successfully worked together for so long. A lot of good fruit was produced as a result.

## A 3½ Year Process Starting December 2000

Fast forward. During a team meeting on December 4, 2000, Dave, Steve and I began to raise issues of concern for you. For example, we pointed out you were often difficult to correct, became offended when you felt misunderstood or judge by others, quickly and hastily arrived at conclusions about people based on limited information, came to extreme conclusions about people in a presumptive and premature fashion, were stubborn when you thought God had spoken to you or you had a strong opinion about something, made decisions without adequate appreciation for the personal effect on others, and led the apostolic team more by expedience rather than by process. We also noted a lack of discussion and involvement as a team in decision making. These things didn't happen all the time but tended to be general patterns. For the next three years, I led a process whereby we consistently tried to help you see these and other issues of character. Unfortunately, that lengthy process proved unsuccessful.

During 2003 our appeals to you intensified. For instance, Dave met with you in Baltimore on April 24 and covered numerous concerns. We took the next team meeting on May 13 to follow up with you. We talked about "silencing mechanism" you tended to use when someone like Dave attempted to bring you correction (i.e., how you could be "exacting" and take offense, judge, mistrust or adjust a person if they didn't have the right attitude and use the right words or illustrations when bringing correction to you). We talked about whether or not you viewed the apostolic team as a venue for confession because we did not know where you struggled with sin and whether you were growing or being evaluated.

We also reminded you that the absence of confession was raised 1½ years earlier at Celebration United Kingdom. At that time, you promised to talk about the confession of sin to us as a team. You never did.<sup>8</sup> During the May 13 team meeting, I pointed out how this was "uncharitable and irresponsible." You asked our forgiveness for not getting back to us but we never talked about the lack of transparency in the ensuing months.

We also asked if the CLC pastors were speaking into your life. You assured us they were. (Later we discovered this was untrue.<sup>9</sup> They were providing very little input.) If true, we asked why we were not updated on the team level. We talked about the disconnect between us being evaluated by you, but you not being evaluated by us.<sup>10</sup> We also talked about other issues and examples but I have not included them here.

A few days later, Dave e-mailed me on May 16 and asked the following.

"Will CJ be returning to his network (Josh, etc.) to share your concerns for him and observations from that day and also the areas where he repented? Also, will you be speaking with them about these things? Lastly, there were a

number of things you asked CJ to think about that day. Should you be expecting to hear back from him on those or only if he feels convicted or desires to pursue it? Brent, you don't need to get back to me on this and I don't feel any need to see these things pressed through. These are just logical questions that have come to my mind over the past couple of days to ensure we all maximize the time spent and information exchanged. We covered so much ground with so much being said...is there benefit for you to know where he is going with all of it? That's all, you may have considered this already. Whatever you decide is fine..."

I decided to take no specific action at the time in response to Dave. I wanted to see if you would voluntarily inform Josh, Kenneth, Grant, etc. of our input and also whether you would get back to us with further updates on your soul. You did not get back to us and we found out later you did not inform Josh, Kenneth, Grant, etc. of our input. As a result, I felt the need to broaden the circle and see if the pastors at Covenant Life Church shared our concerns and could identify with our experiences. I put this on the agenda for our August team meeting. You responded to me via e-mail on August 14 saying,

"I was going through the agenda with Carolyn last night and realized when we came to your desire to meet with Josh, etc. that I would like to be there whenever there is an evaluation of me.<sup>11</sup> Two mistakes I made last year were meeting with your [local] team [in Charlotte] and Dave's [local] team [in Philadelphia] without you guys being present. For a number of reasons I will never do that again.<sup>12</sup> I think any communication of this nature should be direct. We end up talking with all the people involved anyway so it is not only wise it is the best use of time. And you and Dave should have been present to hear, ask questions, agree or disagree, etc.<sup>13</sup> So let me know what you have in mind and who you want to be involved so hopefully I can benefit from the time.

I forwarded this to Dave and Steve. In response, Dave wrote Steve and me on August 28 saying,

"As I've considered our conversation the other day, it seems to me that we should at least give CJ an opportunity to share (with all of us in a team meeting) why he doesn't want Brent to do the review without him present and we should have the opportunity to respond to this. I think this would serve, not only by giving each of us the opportunity to interact with CJ's reasons, but also to ensure that this approach (lead guy always present) doesn't become default policy for us."

Steve followed and wrote, "Good Dave... I would agree... It would be appropriate for us to understand CJ's reluctance... Is it the process? Our assessment of him which he doesn't feel is valid? Does he feel our observations of him are a reflection of us instead? How so? Etc., etc..." I responded to both men, "Also concur. I'll e-mail him shortly. Thanks so much."

On September 8, I wrote you,

"I am not sure how to proceed. I'd certainly have you present for any evaluation but I am wondering if that is necessary when simply asking questions (gathering information) of an individual. I think it would be helpful to get Steve and Dave's thoughts on Wednesday at the [September] team meeting."

### Evaluations from Covenant Life Pastors - December 2003

After the September team meeting, I decided in deference to you, to solicit written evaluations and only follow up on things of concern that were noted for further clarification. Here is what I wrote to the CLC pastors on November 23.

"In preparation for our team retreat on December 16-18 we'd like to ask for your help in providing us an evaluation of C.J. In some respects, you relate and work more closely with him than we do. Therefore, we look forward to your feedback on ways you feel he can grow and ways you feel he excels. Please feel free to provide additional written explanations for your answers pertaining to both his strengths and weaknesses. Also, if you wish, please add any additional comments that are relevant but not addressed on the form. Either Steve, Dave or I will try to get back to you by phone during the week of December 9-12 with clarifying questions we may have. Therefore, could you please send us this completed evaluation by the end of the day on Friday, December 5? Thanks so very much brothers for serving us and C.J. in this way."

### Kenneth's Evaluation

I received Kenneth's evaluation on December 12. He wrote the following, "I'm not aware of correction he is receiving from others. [He] seeks input on selected topics during our monthly accountability times [which just began due to our correction]. [But] not from me in family/married life. Maybe others."

I followed up with a phone call that afternoon. Here are some of the notes from my conversation with Kenneth. I sent them to you, Dave and Steve at the time.

- When correcting C.J. you have to be real precise for him to receive.
- This can be hard for men to do who are less gifted than C.J.
- Should be easier to bring things to him.
- Needs to grow in learning to listen carefully even if he thinks the person's perspective is wrong.
- Needs to listen when person is conveying a sense of something that is wrong but having a hard time being precise.
- Can exhibit a quickness and strength of response.
- Kenneth and Josh show a sense of deference [to C.J.] in their hearts - don't press issues.
- Neither Josh nor Kenneth raises these kinds of issues with C.J. That is, whether he receives correction humbly and is easy to confront or responds gently and kindly, not abruptly or harshly, when disagreeing with someone.
- C.J. not making aware of input from others - e.g., CLC pastors, apostolic team, Carolyn
- Don't know if he is receiving correction.
- Kenneth assumes no one is bringing correction or things to him.
- Occasionally asks for input on parenting issues. Nothing on marriage.
- Input resolves around the effect of schedule or work around the home.

### Grant's Evaluation

On December 13, Grant wrote the following in his evaluation, "My primary concern for C.J. would be in the area of who is supposed to be caring for him? Perhaps this is taking place with you men on the apostolic team? We have tried numerous times to get together here over the past year but have not been able to make it happen. So care for he and Carolyn is not happening here<sup>14</sup> unless there is something I am unaware of."

That afternoon I followed up with a phone call. Here are some of the notes from my conversation with Grant. I sent them to you, Dave and Steve at the time.

- Can be in a meeting talking about a situation that C.J. is not involved in and he will hear some facts and be tempted to make conclusions or assumptions.
- At times C.J. can too quickly come to a conclusion without knowing all the facts, prematurely coming to conclusions or making assumptions.
- Grant is not aware of any correction C.J. is receiving from the apostolic team or others. This issue has always been ongoing concern for C.J.
- Grant has raised his ongoing concern over the years that C.J. receives pastoral care.

- Grant is not aware of anyone raising any issues or concerns with C.J. in private.
- Grant believes they have a very limited view of what is going on in his life, a narrow window to look through, and limited opportunity for observation of C.J.
- Over past year, correction of C.J. and confession by C.J. has not happened at all - there is no context for this to happen.
- Grant has assumed it is happening with the apostolic team.
- Thinks C.J.'s self assessment may be such that he and Carolyn just don't require input.

### C.J. Not Transparent with Pastors at Covenant Life Church

I also talked to Joshua on December 14. His comments echoed Grant's and Kenneth's. He shared different examples of self righteousness,<sup>15</sup> sinful judgments, and pride in your life. For example, the difficulty he had in talking with you about starting two services at Covenant Life Church.

After talking to Joshua, Kenneth and Grant; I wrote you, Dave and Steve the following.

"In my opinion, we should take some time at the [upcoming team] retreat to hear C.J.'s thoughts on the evaluations and talk about a strategy that ensures he is receiving proper care and input from the men at Covenant Life (i.e., primarily Josh, Kenneth, Grant). In this regard, I think it may serve them to be made aware of the issues we have been talking about with C.J. and the observations we have provided him."

As a result of those evaluations and phone calls, I discovered you had not told them about any of our input over the past three years including the substantial input we recently gave you at the May 13 team meeting. I was shocked and dismayed but did not communicate those sentiments to Joshua, Kenneth or Grant.

On the December 16-18, 2003 retreat, we again raised concerns for you but with little effect. Five weeks later, I had lunch with Joshua on January 24, 2004. I asked him directly if you had been filling him on our correction. He said he was vaguely and barely aware of any evaluation we had brought you. When I asked what he remembered you sharing with him, he could not recall anything. It is hard to express how distressed I felt that you were once more withholding information.<sup>16</sup>

### Summary of Concerns from Apostolic Team - April 2004

Fast forward again. In April of 2004, Dave, Steve and I provided summary statements to Joshua, Kenneth, and Bob. I chose to state my concerns as succinctly as possible for

the sake of clarity. I tried to condense 24 years of observations and express things as graciously and mildly as possible by avoiding words like pride, hypocrisy, integrity, etc. Here is what I communicated regarding you.<sup>17</sup>

1. “Can become resentful, distrustful or withdraw when he feels misunderstood, judged, or sinned against by others.
2. Can judge or prematurely come to conclusions about others based on limited or incomplete information.
3. When correcting or disagreeing can communicate his assessment or perspective too strongly or categorically.
4. Can lack gentleness and not perceive the unhelpful effect of his words, actions or decisions upon an individual.
5. Can be difficult to correct and help because he often disagrees with or has a different perspective on illustrations.
6. Infrequently makes us aware of specific sins or the correction others are bringing to him.”

Dave wrote a lengthier summary as follows.

“In December of 2003, we convened a team retreat to discuss team polity and to review the recent evaluations on CJ. At this retreat, Brent suggested each team member summarize the concerns raised for CJ in a separate document for review by the CLC guys who pastor CJ. This document represents that summary.

Most of the weaknesses referenced below have been raised with CJ over the past few years. They were then summarized for CJ during our time in Baltimore (Spring 2003) and discussed further as an apostolic team at the Dec. Team retreat. I’m not presently aware of the degree to which CJ may agree or disagree with these observations, but I do believe he has endeavored to humbly receive them. Also, these are simply my interpretation of CJ’s leadership weaknesses and may not be helpful or accurate. Finally, it is an honor and a blast to serve CJ regardless of whether he agrees or makes any changes.

A summary of what was communicated:

- 1) I wondered whether CJ has been too exacting in his listening - Speaking with him, particularly in areas of correction or disagreement, can at times produce a notable burden on the person seeking to communicate. Is he patient with imprecise words or critiques that aren’t carefully illustrated? Do people he is building with find him easy to correct? ‘Examples’ seem to become highly important but insufficiently helpful or potent (seems to lose the ‘forest’ of the point through the “trees” of insufficient illustrations?)

Sometimes seems as if not recollecting may greatly diminish his pursuit and the utility of possible illustrations (Should CJ accept responsibility for his words even when he doesn't remember?)

- 2) I think CJ may be vulnerable to making hasty or expedient judgments on people or situations. This can result in impetuous words or actions. Also when opposing ideas or critiques are offered, CJ may rest on his internal conclusion and overlook the need to lead an individual, or in some cases the A[postolic] Team, in discussion towards mutual understanding of the issues. There can also then be a sense of reaction in follow-up communiqués that may indicate a haste in judgment. He can sometimes appear to get hooked in ways that he may be imperceptive to and then communicate to others out of this.
- 3) I didn't think CJ was offering a sufficient example (at least over the past few years) of confessing sin or pursuing evaluation with the A. Team, nor had he been deliberate in updating team members on areas being brought to him by others.
  - a. Perhaps a recent example? Did CJ act to inform his local team (those involved in his care and accountability) that the A. Team had spent the recent retreat (Dec. 2003) covering areas of concern for CJ? Brent indicated that it did not appear that Josh had a clear recollection of any issues raised with CJ when Brent met with him in January of 2004. Perhaps Josh did know but just thought it wise not to break open the conversation at that time.
  - b. To what extent are those select few at CLC (those involved in CJ's care and accountability) providing challenge for CJ when they perceive areas of concern? This may be happening sufficiently, but it is not something that the A. Team hears much in CJ's conversations. (I believe the A. Team just wants to make certain that CJ has local voices that provide not only excellent care, which they certainly do, but also sufficient challenge and correction).
- 4) I didn't think CJ had taken sufficient leadership over the recent years in defining the team and determining our direction. This had been an ongoing dialogue between us and a growing concern for me.
  - a. The team does not possess sufficient clarity in relationship to where the movement requires team direction and decision and where decentralized leadership is necessary.

- b. An inadvertent drift where CJ becomes the focal point and clearinghouse for movement direction, thereby unintentionally marginalizing the team in important decisions.
- c. There is an insufficient amount of strategic planning. Seems he may have institutionalized the assumption that God doesn't give us much direction for the future and organized us around it.
- d. It appears as if CJ has agreed with some, perhaps much of this [leadership] assessment and has implemented some changes that are already making a big difference. Thanks buddy!

CJ is an exceptional leader and this summary does not provide the opportunity to celebrate all of the ways in which he excels. Even beyond his ministerial effectiveness though, I am deeply touched by his ongoing friendship and love for me. I trust this perspective, though flawed by my own fallenness, serves this dialogue by sharpening the leadership of the man God has called to lead us."

#### Phone Call with Joshua, Kenneth, Bob - June 15, 2004

Dave, Steve and I had a phone call with Joshua, Kenneth and Bob on June 15, 2004. Bob was a new addition. Previously you wrote me on April 24 saying, "So that there is no confusion if you are sending your concerns to the guys here I am accountable to and meeting with please send any info to Josh, Kenneth and Bob."

During this call Josh told us once again they were not made aware of the May 2003 or December 2003 input we provided you on both of those retreats. All three of them told us the April 2004 written summaries were very helpful and they expressed "board agreement with them having observed many of the same things." In fact, they had an all day meeting with you on May 7 to discuss the summaries.

The next day you wrote them,

"How kind of you men [Joshua, Kenneth, Bob] to care for me yesterday with your correction and counsel. And how kind of you to give me the gift of your time as well. I am well aware that there are many other tasks you could have devoted yourself today yesterday afternoon instead of spending time with me."

At our May 19 team meeting and at the June 10-13 team retreat in Asheville, you never mentioned to us this daylong meeting with Joshua, Kenneth and Bob or the correction and counsel they provided you. We had no idea they had gone through the summaries with you until our June 15 phone call with them. You should have talked to us and asked Joshua, Kenneth and Bob to fill us in on their time with you. This was another

example of you withholding vital information. Furthermore you never took any initiative later to talk with us about the content of summaries.

As a result of our summaries and conversations, Josh told us he was now more willing “to challenge C.J. and bring observations and corrections in a way that was different than before.”

During the June 15 phone call, Josh told us you were “difficult to correct because of his strength” and “not shy about his opinion.” He said “people go with what he is saying because of his position and strength of personality.”<sup>18</sup> That you were “very decisive and hasty - often through E Mail.” He mentioned again the example of you “not wanting to do two services at CLC” and “not feeling there was receptivity on his part” and it was “hard to talk with C.J. about numerical growth.” He also reiterated that “guys don’t hear from C.J. re: our [the apostolic team’s] observations” and “in the past the context for focused observations has not been present.” He added that “C.J. provides input for others but not the other way around.”<sup>19</sup> Joshua said he is “changing his mind set and approach in how they care for the Mahaney’s” because “we are not in settings where C.J. confesses specific sin especially related to marriage... Confessions are more on the level of schedule... Maybe C.J. doesn’t sin as much as we do.”

Kenneth said he “assumed we [the apostolic team] were bringing care and accountability” and therefore did not feel the need to do so with you. He was also “surprised he did not fill us [the apostolic team] in on [their] May 7 meeting. Kenneth said “C.J. feels a freedom to disagree in the process of correction more than others.” There “can be immediate disagreement” and “he doesn’t entreat further observations.” “Given his position and discernment” this “can shut down the process.” He “is generally more quick to disagree.”

Bob said all these issues “can make it difficult to communicate with him.” It “puts a burden on the person” particularly with “word choice” when bringing input. Bob said C.J. makes “hasty judgments” and “quick emotional responses that others cannot process.” He also “appreciated the grace in all our summaries” and felt they “demonstrated great humility.”

Three days after the June 15 phone call Dave followed up with me and Steve.

From: Dave Harvey  
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2004 2:24 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Cc: Steve Shank  
Subject: RE: Confidential

Thanks for doing this Brent [i.e., leading the process]. I know it is distasteful, and that there are a thousand other ways you would rather use your time...but you are being a faithful friend!<sup>20</sup>

I've included all of my thoughts below with the idea that some may be more helpful and advantageous than others...so feel free to edit as seems wise to you. I tried to think down roads not already covered by your original e-mail.

My thoughts:

- Seems like we need two different documents: One that describes the things we would encourage the CLC guys to follow up on, and one that summarizes the things we need to follow up on.
- Related then to the second document, I would create two different segments of observations and questions. One that relates to 'process' and the other that relates to 'content'. For instance, there are many questions below that relate to the process...why didn't CJ tell them or us this or that?...I believe that discussion is important, but I also think it needs to remain distinct from the actual substance of what we are and were bringing to him. Also it seems important now that we cover both (process and content) since the CLC guys have broad agreement on many of the issues.
- In terms of 'content', it would be helpful to ask Josh to produce a written document that summarizes what they sought to bring to CJ on May 7th. Then we can compare this with our summaries to see where we are encountering a similarity in perspective and experience. I know they did it verbally on the phone the other day, but I think it would be helpful to have something in writing for the purpose of clarity and follow-up. Also, it may be helpful to have this before we talk to CJ...
- Question regarding process: Did CJ share the letter that he received from the CFC [Covenant Fellowship Church] pastoral team with the guys that are caring for him in CLC (or the feedback he received from the Charlotte guys)? [C.J., you never did either of these.]<sup>21</sup> Even if he disagreed, would he not want to notify those that he is accountable to that some notable & written feedback was being offered to him from some credible teams in our apostolic churches? (I still have not seen this letter, but I assume it was clear and that there may be some helpful things in it.)
- Why did he represent the CLC guys as disagreeing with us? [When they didn't.] Why represent them as saying the areas under critique are actually strengths for him? [When they didn't.]<sup>22</sup>
- Has CJ been clear with the apostolic team on where exactly he feels like his leadership has been weak and insufficient, where he feels we have been 'patient' with him, and explored with the A. Team whether these issues are rooted in gifting or character? In light of the December [CLC] evaluations,

the [December 2003 team] retreat and the [April 2004] summaries, I would think that he would respond to us with some clear reflections on exactly where he feels he has been deficient and where he would like to change. In my recollection, no such dialogue has taken place (although there have been many allusions to weaknesses and deficiencies).

- Here is an issue that we should probably draw the CLC guys out on: Would it be their experience that CJ can be tempted to emotionally withdraw his attention or enthusiasm when he feels misunderstood or under scrutiny?
- Brent (regarding question below), I would stay away from questions that elicit 'yes/no' answers below and frame them in a way to elicit discussion and disclosure: Rather than, "Does C.J. realize there is broad agreement with them on our April 04 summaries?", perhaps we could ask, "How might CJ help us understand his representation of the CLC guys when they would describe themselves as having broad agreement with the summaries?"
- Guys, there are several illustrations of times where I specifically asked CJ if he would talk with someone about what I am talking to him about and he did not.<sup>23</sup> These illustrations may or may not prove to be helpful as we involve the CLC team. I would need your help to know whether it would even be wise to bring these forward. No problem if it is not necessary to walk down this road.
- Should we come back to the New Attitude conversation and talk about where he went with the dialogue and where he went with Pat's input and how he represented Pat's input as a helpful and recent illustration to our experience in engaging him?
- How effective has CJ been at leading us through an honest evaluation of our strengths and weaknesses as a team and movement? Seems like we celebrate strengths but we don't really talk about weaknesses. Also, he doesn't seem to talk much about where CLC or the CLC guys may be weak or in need of improvement.
- Lastly, and perhaps less importantly, I would be interested in hearing from the CLC guys on whether they feel that CJ substitutes e-mail for personal contact<sup>24</sup> in a way that complicates clarity and their attempts at building. This is not essential, but I do think there is a value of expedience in communication that can sometimes overrule the law of love in some of CJ's e-mails (correcting by e-mail, notifying people of substantial changes by e-mail, etc.)

Please let me know whether this is sufficiently clear and helpful.

Dave

Meeting between Apostolic Team and Josh, Kenneth, Grant, Bob - August 20, 2004

After the June 15 phone call it became apparent we needed to set up a meeting with you, Joshua, Kenneth, Grant and Bob and also ask you to write down the sins you were convicted of. I wrote you the following on August 3,

“The written confession helps you to further identify and clarify issues of sin for yourself and us...The meeting on August 20<sup>th</sup> is for follow up and follow through. My time with you...did not allow for a lengthy discussion or review of all that has transpired or been raised with you over the past 12 months. Likewise, hearing from the CLC men, asking further questions, talking about specifics examples, revisiting the summaries, etc. can only benefit you. I am sure you agree.”

You provided us an e-mail confession on August 10. Then we met with you on August 20. This was the all important meeting at the Covenant Life bldg. We asked Bob to take official notes for everyone. Here they are.

CJ            Opened with CJ thanking guys for the encouragement he’s received in the midst of his discouragement as he’s seen more sin.

Brent        The team communicated to CJ that the issue of CJ stepping down is not one they’ve ever considered. Nor do they think he needs to make a movement wide confession.

CJ            Feels everyone’s forgiveness has been consistent.

Brent        CJ has been making consistent progress, as a result of the Spirit’s illumination.

Dave        Brent has excelled in his care and affection for CJ. Brent is intent on making sure there is care, protection, deliberation, and caution in this whole process. He is engaging God in the process.

Brent        Reviewed CJ’s confession of Aug. 10. Mostly dealing with CJ being difficult to entreat or correct. Thought it would be helpful to better understand sinful cravings behind CJ’s actions. Obviously related to pride, but Brent communicated to CJ that he can be inordinately concerned about his reputation.<sup>25</sup> Seems paradoxical, because he knows few guys who so despise putting himself forward or promoting himself. Obviously, this isn’t a categorical statement. CJ’s feeling judged, misunderstood can often lead to him becoming mistrusting and withdrawing.

CJ told Brent a week and a half ago some areas of temptation. He wasn't inclined to engage Brent or others in the details of the temptation. He gave two reasons for this. First, he didn't want to divert attention from his own heart. But he also told Brent he feared that he would be judged by Dave and Brent. Brent pointed out that CJ used the word "fear" several times, and anticipated there was a likelihood he would be judged. Thought CJ might have a preoccupation with being judged that results in a significant fear for him. He asked CJ why he feared being judged. Brent thinks that CJ can crave a reputation that is as good as he thinks he is.<sup>26</sup>

Josh Has seen evidences of what Brent is describing in CJ. Has seen at times that CJ does things in reaction to what Larry T. did. He doesn't in any way want to be perceived as doing what Larry did. Shared another illustration where a guy said CJ hadn't returned something. He was tempted in that situation because he believes returning things is a strength in his life.

Brent Wants to submit that CJ has a high view of himself in some ways that are now being challenged. There is a paradox to all of this. Thinks CJ has represented himself as accountable in a way he hasn't been. CJ told Brent at one point that he receives more accountability and pastoring than anyone in the movement. Thinks there is an element of deception there. For a year and a half CJ didn't participate in a care group. The picture CJ painted of our [the CLC pastors] involvement in his life has not been accurate. Also thinks CJ has represented himself as being teachable,<sup>27</sup> and would think of himself that way, up until now. The CLC pastors communicated a different view of CJ's teachability. Mentioned the illustration of the decision of how to handle growth at CLC.

Josh After Josh brought that up to him, CJ responded immediately and things have changed.

Dave The paradox in CJ's life motivated Dave to meet with CJ in Baltimore, and explain how he saw things in CJ's life that CJ didn't see in himself. He talked to Steve and Brent to make sure that he wasn't simply imposing a process on CJ, and to make sure he wasn't totally off base. CJ would represent himself as a man who humbly receives from the team, but there are big gaps. He would not characterize CJ's leadership of the A-team as humble. Illustration: situation with Bo, when the three other guys [Brent, Steve, and

Dave] said that CJ introduced the issue of trust too early in the process. CJ didn't seem to be responsive to appeals from the other guys to talk about it.

Brent CJ would see himself as strong in confessing sin. But the team has made the observation that there seems to be a weakness in terms of specificity in his preaching when it comes to confession of sin. Sins in his marriage or sins in general weren't being confessed regularly to the CLC pastors.

Josh Has shared those specifics with CJ in other contexts. In August, there was a marked change in the specificity of his confession. He realized that we didn't often hear the specifics of conflict between CJ and Carolyn.

Kenneth Things have definitely changed in regards to specificity, but he hasn't been personally involved in helping CJ with his marriage.

Josh There was a marked change in CJ when he began his accountability group [which was requested by Brent, Dave, Steve], but no acknowledgement that he was responding to the team's observations [which gave the impression you were acting on your own initiative].<sup>28</sup>

Brent At times CJ puts himself forward in a favorable light, more favorable than the facts support. Illustration: When Dave, Brent, and Steve talked to CJ about CJ unilaterally ending New Attitude on the heels of 6 months of talking about how decisions like that should be made, they felt their adjustment was met with pride. Brent followed up, and CJ mentioned that Pat disagreed with Dave and Brent. Brent followed up with Pat and he acknowledged that he had concerns about CJ's heart, although he hadn't reached any conclusions. CJ painted a picture of Pat being supportive of CJ. Thinks CJ can be deceived in this area. The opposite is true, also. When people are giving CJ an unfavorable report, he doesn't always share that.

Steve Numerous times CJ has used Carolyn's or the CLC pastors' commendation<sup>29</sup> to support disagreement with the A-team's perspective.

Josh Does anyone else have illustrations for the point Brent is making?

Kenneth Hasn't seen the specificity in confession that others have demonstrated.

Brent At the December '03 retreat, they talked about these issues with CJ, they had the written evaluations from the CLC pastors. At that retreat, CJ repented of a couple things, but disagreed with most of it. CJ never came to us [the CLC men] and acknowledged the things he confessed. Nor did he go beyond filling us in on the team's oral presentation. CJ has acknowledged this in his confession in the context of pride and feeling his discernment is superior. [Brent] Sees more pervasive pride in how CJ views himself - [that is] not in a suspicious way, but in a confident way. It's not simply pride in his discernment, but pride in his opinion of himself.<sup>30</sup>

Feels there's been an element of hypocrisy in CJ.<sup>31</sup> If he doesn't agree with observations from others, that's one thing. If he doesn't share that with others, that's another issue.

Josh Agrees with the assessment of the sin at work and the way it was deceiving CJ. Doesn't think CJ was intentionally seeking to deceive us, which doesn't make it any less serious.<sup>32</sup> The way in which CJ asked for observations at times lent to a less thorough response. All of us will face this temptation to believe the person who says that what we're doing is okay. We're seeing CJ's reaction to observations in a new way because we're bringing observations more frequently and specifically.

Dave There is an issue of perplexity, which he has raised with CJ, which may be an issue of integrity.<sup>33</sup> That is the times the team has asked him to get specific observations from others and he hasn't done it. Example of Dave asking CJ to follow up with Brent, and have the team talk about his unteachability, and CJ not following through. Seemed like these things stopped at CJ. Another illustration was a letter of concern from the Philly team which the A-team and the CLC pastors never heard about.

Brent The [apostolic] team doesn't often hear of areas that we [the pastoral team] are correcting CJ on, and it doesn't sound as though the pastoral team is hearing concerns from the A-team.

CJ can become resentful, mistrusting, withdrawn when he feels sinned against or judged by others.

CJ told Brent he's not fully seeing this one yet. Praying through it, asking for input. Situation with Bo, the team had two major concerns. First, communicating to Bo by e-mail rather than face to face. More important was CJ's unwillingness to meet with Bo, communicating in strong terms that he didn't trust Bo [which was unfounded]. Bo was raising some observations in the midst of that about CJ. The team told CJ he couldn't pull the trust card on Bo, that he needed to be willing to talk to him about it. Thinks that attitude exists frequently, but not to that degree.

Another illustration was conversations about CJ's book [*The Cross Centered Life*]. Suggested that it was TOO cross-centered, and didn't speak of the resurrection enough. CJ introduced an agenda item of cross-centeredness at a retreat. The next day, the team received an e-mail from CJ that no one had to read, promote, or agree with the book. When asked about it, CJ said he didn't want to be self-promoting like Larry T. Brent thought the issue was self-pity, and possibly resentment.<sup>34</sup> Asked CJ how he ended up there. That never got resolved.

Wants the CLC pastors to be aware of this so that we can follow up. The most recent example is a contemplation of Brent's and CJ's roles. CJ told Brent he didn't think he should serve as a pastor to the team [you wanted me to take this responsibility]. The team would be concerned that CJ will pull back from pastoring them. This is a pattern they've seen.

Has CJ been sinned against in this situation? Is he reacting to something?

If CJ thinks he's been ineffective in caring for the team he should invite the team to help him be more effective. The team would say they prefer to have CJ care for the team.

Dave We all think CJ should lead us to a wise process that results in a restructuring. Also agree that Brent is eminently qualified to take on any responsibility CJ would desire. To discuss this in the middle of this process is awkward and unwise. This might be a good illustration of what tends to happen when CJ is corrected, at least from Dave's perspective. It would be better if CJ was inquiring about where he has been deficient, and then communicating that he wants to change. Ultimately, that response doesn't contribute to the building of the team.

- Grant An illustration, as these things have more recently come to light, CJ has asked whether or not he should be the team leader. To introduce that in the midst of evaluation can seem to be an overreaction, potentially born out of self-pity, and can put others in the position of not wanting to share observations when there is that kind of response.
- Josh Remembers CJ referring to the situation in Philly and saying he wasn't going to lead in that way again. Also, shared that because of weaknesses he saw in others sharing observations harshly,<sup>35</sup> he was purposefully not sharing observations with others. Seems to be a giving up attitude, rather than examining carefully something that he might have done wrong. More of the attitude, "if what I've done isn't fruitful or appreciated, I'm just going to stop doing it."
- Brent In May of 2003, CJ told Brent he didn't want to continue be involved (oversee pastorally? Oversee?) in Philly in light of his experience there. CJ has a tendency to become easily condemned and discouraged. Thinks this is probably tied in to love of reputation, that CJ doesn't want to look bad.
- CJ Please don't draw me into anything I don't disagree with. Have found that he agrees with most things [later, you radically revised your position] that have been presented. Agrees that he thinks highly of himself, a fruit of pride.
- Josh Can you fill that out with specific categories or illustrations?
- CJ Would have assumed he was more accountable than he was. Looks back and sees that what he was doing was woefully insufficient [later, you radically revised your position and said you really had been accountable]. Hasn't just been sitting here, but has been convicted. Agrees immediately that he has a sinful craving for reputation.<sup>36</sup>
- Kenneth Asked how CJ would handle the situation with the e-mail about his book differently now.
- CJ He'd ask more questions, invite them to give him their perspective. Acknowledged he wasn't humble.<sup>37</sup>

- Brent At those times, think CJ could do more heart work and self-examination. Thinks CJ becomes resentful and angry and bitter in those situations in a way he's not aware. On *The Cross Centered Life* issue, did CJ resent that criticism at all and start to respond sinfully by withdrawing? Seemed extreme.
- CJ Yes, seems extreme, and he said he'd consider it.<sup>38</sup>
- Kenneth Almost a judgment when individuals have criticized Carolyn's book [*Feminine Appeal*]. There can be an attitude that no one has to agree with her. Instead of there being a peaceful discussion, it seems as though there is anger there.
- Grant Why would the category of self-promotion be in CJ's mind when that wasn't a part of the discussion?
- CJ That would have been in his mind from the day he received the book.
- Brent Thinks that's where his heart deceives him. They were having a theological discussion, and in response CJ told them they didn't have to promote it.
- Grant Has the appearance of manipulation cloaked in the virtue of humility.<sup>39</sup> A more apparent explanation would seem to be that CJ's work was being critiqued and CJ's flesh was reacting to that.
- Steve CJ's response seem to be quick.
- Kenneth Another underlying motive might be the fact that CJ pursues integrity to a high degree. Wonders if there is a craving not to be perceived like Larry, that is inordinate. There is not a wisdom that is open to reason. He should have known there was something wrong in his soul because he wasn't responding gently and kindly to the observations that were being brought.
- Brent Another illustration - Washington Times article. Felt CJ spoke disparagingly of the reporter when they weren't there. Brent brought up that when CJ felt sinned against, he reacted. Self-righteousness is a great category for us to confess our sin out of, but wonders if his assessment of himself and his reputation are too high. Self-righteousness has to do with feeling morally superior, not that

this person is misrepresenting me and I don't like being misrepresented. That is love of reputation.

CJ It's odd because Larry can slander him and it doesn't affect him at all.

Josh The people Larry influences don't matter that much to CJ. Might make a difference if it was someone CJ cared about.

Brent To simplify, Brent thinks CJ's view of himself is accountable, teachable, and good at confessing sin. Doesn't think those things are as present in CJ's life as he thinks they are.

CJ Feels he has thought more highly of himself, and compared himself favorably with others. Doesn't think he's thought unfavorably of himself.<sup>40</sup>

Grant There are various issues in CJ's life that he hasn't received input well on. In general, Grant feels CJ hasn't had enough accountability, and allowed the A-team and the CLC pastors to believe the other group was taking care of it.<sup>41</sup> This has been a longstanding issue.<sup>42</sup>

CJ Sees a whole lot of pride in the past. Wasn't lying to each group, trying to cover up.<sup>43</sup>

Kenneth Was part of the motivation, if you have a higher assessment of yourself, you don't feel like you need accountability, and when guys ask if you're getting it, you don't feel you need as much as others. Thinks that's critical in terms of the future.

Brent Wonders if in his pride CJ didn't think that he needed others to figure things out on his own.

Kenneth Humility and confession of sin lead to accountability. They communicate a perception of need.

Josh In the past few weeks, CJ has really stepped it up in these areas.

Grant Sanctification is in the details. Generally speaking, these are categories that CJ has led us in. Seems like details have been lacking.

Pat Asked CJ why he wouldn't share what he was thinking.

- CJ Doesn't want to interrupt the conviction that is taking place in his heart.
- Josh Obviously there is a place for self-control. But because this has been a consistent issue, it would help in the evaluation of CJ's heart if he told others about his thought processes. We need to see how CJ thinks, where cravings are present, etc. But it would help CJ to have other eyes on his thoughts.
- Pat Would it be humility to let others judge whether his thoughts were accurate or not?
- CJ Struggles with the area of restraint. Trying to not say as much. What just happened was a good thing (him not saying what he was thinking), he thinks.<sup>44</sup>
- Dave Thinks this is an important point because this exemplifies certain places certain examples he has tried to build into us - self-disclosure,<sup>45</sup> inviting others into our thought processes. CJ didn't bring up at a team retreat what we had talked about. CJ's approach doesn't exemplify walking in the light. CJ ends up controlling and leaving unevaluated too many things. CJ ends up staking out something of a moral high ground, not intentionally.
- Brent In CJ's exchange with Pat, CJ mentioned the word "perceived." Whatever he was thinking, he didn't want to share in part because of how he might be perceived.<sup>46</sup> Most helpful if CJ said he was a work in progress, told us the things he agreed with, and then the things he's not seeing. Doesn't think CJ does a good job telling us what he is seeing. Realizes he hasn't had time to contemplate all this. Also important to share with us what he's not seeing and may disagree with because of the way we'll perceive him, thinking that he might be lambasted.
- Kenneth Seems like CJ's comfortable with his own assessment.
- CJ Says he's not comfortable with his own assessment.<sup>47</sup>
- Grant Don't lock on to one thing that has been said that you disagree with.
- Kenneth Seems like CJ was offended with what Brent said.
- CJ CJ wants to be clear in what he's seeing.

- Josh CJ doesn't lead the meeting in terms of what's important.
- CJ During the period he wasn't seeking accountability, CJ thought he was fighting sin and informing others what was going on.
- Grant That's how you draw others into the conversation and into your life. In specific areas, Grant hasn't heard CJ confess sin, like lust. Lack of specificity will keep CJ from growing.
- Brent Asked forgiveness for using the word "lambasted." CJ can make the fatal mistake of judging the response of those bringing him correction and then trying to figure things out on his own. Concerned that people will think, "Aha! We've got him."
- CJ Doesn't think his process is what Brent is describing.<sup>48</sup>
- Grant Asked CJ if what he expressed to Brent was an ongoing concern. Who is CJ thinking of?
- CJ At times CJ acknowledged he has not received correction from Dave and Brent because he thinks it has been rooted in offense.
- Grant Humility would cause CJ to invite others into that process. CJ might be right or wrong in his assessment of the hearts of others.
- Josh CJ just shared part of his thinking process and it was extremely helpful. That helps others serve CJ.
- Grant CJ should involve others whether those bringing correction to him are offended or whether or not he's judging them. CJ should think of sharing his heart not to critique others but to reveal more of his own sin.
- CJ Talked about conviction. Sometimes it comes abruptly and starts to focus. Then as he looks back it makes a difference in how he perceives things.
- Josh Everyone would say there is a humility and perception we would affirm. Not sure Brent's statement was helpful, because it was so general. But thinks CJ's temptation in these moments and meetings is to want to be one to direct the focus of things.<sup>49</sup>

- Grant CJ's description of what we're doing as unimportant. This point of self-disclosure is key to all we're talking about.
- Brent Was trying to reference was Josh's comment of CJ saying "guilty as charged" and then there's silence. That doesn't really help us.
- CJ Would have loved to have dwelt on each point today.<sup>50</sup>
- Josh This has served us by walking through these examples, so we can review these notes later on, and give extended time to specific areas. We can't cover this all<sup>51</sup> in one meeting.
- Brent Asked CJ what his thoughts were on the last point - withdrawing when he perceives others judging him.
- CJ Seeing that the least. (e.g., Bo, *Cross Centered Life*, Philly)
- Josh Doesn't think "withdrawing" - isn't the best word. It seems to be more resentment and distrusting.<sup>52</sup> At times there is a strength of response in CJ that seems to be resentful, especially when others criticize members of his family. Illustration: Carolyn's message to women. Josh sensed a tension in CJ when he brought up some negative comments from some women in the church. Same thing happened in a pastor's meeting, which Grant challenged.
- CJ Agreed with Grant's perception, didn't agree with Josh's.
- Kenneth What motive would CJ attribute to his making comments that made others feel uncomfortable?
- CJ Josh was driving the agenda, and CJ wanted to get his items taken care of. That's what he was resentful of.
- Kenneth Felt that CJ's response to Brent when he used the word "lambasted" was intense. Wondered if CJ's response couldn't be more kind.
- Dave Sometimes CJ can get hooked on what people say and respond in a way that has a silencing, punishing effect<sup>53</sup> on the person he's talking to.
- CJ Didn't see that in his response to Brent.

- Grant      What happened today isn't the clearest example of this response. But there seemed to be some of it there. When CJ says, "if that's the effect, then we just need to start over," that has an effect. Seems like CJ has concluded, and isn't asking questions.
- Josh      Even if there wasn't sin in CJ's heart, that response [to Brent] doesn't position CJ to position and hear. It isn't a question, and it could be said in a way that's humble. Sounds like "I'm doing my best here, and if that's all you think of it, then let's start at the beginning." That's not the best way to get at the good content from Brent.
- Josh      CJ can be self-disclosing and still be asking questions.
- Bob      It seems there is an air of finality in CJ's responses that doesn't invite questions or evaluation. At times he states his disagreement, at other times he doesn't disclose what's going on in his heart. In either case, he thinks his conclusion is accurate and isn't allowing others to help him.
- CJ      Agrees with all the major categories<sup>54</sup> that have been brought to him, except he's not seeing the last one. Agrees that he can feel condemned when his reputation is assailed.
- Brent      CJ needs a lot more input from the guys on the pastoral team. Quarterly couples times that Josh is leading, starting with CJ. Monthly accountability meetings, starting with CJ, Pat is joining us for that. Spontaneous times. Good to iron out who's responsible for who pastorally. Who should be caring for the Laymans, Kauflins, and Marescos - Josh or CJ? Some other arrangement? Thinks we need to make sure that the Mahaneys are cared for first if we're only meeting quarterly.
- Kenneth    What about Carolyn?
- Brent      Heard that Carolyn has regular times with Betsy and Nancy, but not sure that's sufficient. Thinks the contact between the A-team and the CLC pastors has been insufficient. For the next year, would like one of the guys on the CLC team to fill the team in quarterly on how things are going, as part of the monthly team phone call. Would probably take an hour. If something significant occurs, positive or negative, Brent would want someone to call him. Also, as things come up with the [apostolic] team, they will point CJ back to the pastoral team.

Thinks we should bring Carolyn into the equation as often as possible. Thinks that it would be helpful to have CJ ask for feedback from relationships outside Sovereign Grace [i.e., national leaders like Piper, Powlison, Dever, etc.].

Asked whether or not CJ should at some point confess his sins to a larger group, whether that be the Sovereign Grace staff, the CLC pastors. His thoughts: 1. It's always good for the person who does it. 2. Are there historical situations where we've had other guys do this? 3. Is it proper as an issue of integrity, to have key guys brought in to our assessment of CJ, so that their opinion of CJ is more accurate.<sup>55</sup> Does integrity require that they be informed?<sup>56</sup>

Steve Thinks the CLC guys should consider Brent's questions. Personally, he can see the CLC staff as being a venue, and possibly the Sovereign Grace managers. Wouldn't go the extended team right now. Reasons: Progress is being made, guys that are now being added wouldn't have any experience with CJ.

Dave Wants to reflect on all that's been said today, consider how CJ is processing all that he's heard, before he makes a formal recommendation [regarding scope of confession]. Given the seriousness of the situation, and the fact that the pattern has been a pattern of resistance, and the measure of CJ's responsibilities and role, and the fact that we would typically have guys humble themselves before some group.

Josh We will definitely consider those things.<sup>57</sup> Thanked the apostolic team for effectively caring for CJ and for us.

Brent Expressed that there is no one we would rather have leading the apostolic team than CJ. Expressed appreciation for CJ and Carolyn for their example and friendship.

Dave The things we've covered are not what we think about when we think about CJ's leadership. There is an overwhelming category of grace when we think of CJ.

The Circle of Confession for C.J.<sup>58</sup>

Leading up to this meeting, I e-mailed the following to Dave and Steve on August 17, "I'd like to recommend on Friday [at the August 20 meeting] that C.J. make a confession to all the CLC pastors and to the extended team [comprised of the regional teams overseeing churches] in Nov/Dec.? Do you agree that this would serve him and is a good and necessary thing to recommend?"

Dave agreed with my proposition and Steve expressed reservations. Steve wrote saying,

"I would need to know more of your thinking why the extended [regional] teams should be brought into this... at the moment, I think it should stay with us and the CLC guys responsible to pastor CJ... I think it would be those men's call if they extend it to the entire CLC pastoral team.

The next day, August 18, Dave responded to Steve regarding his request "to know more of your thinking."

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 18, 2004 7:46 AM  
**To:** Steve Shank  
**Cc:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** CONFIDENTIAL - Confession

I [Dave] may try to call you [Steve] on this today or tomorrow to explain my thoughts further, but I recently had a chance to sit down and look over a # of documents that help to bring interpretation to this event for me. One would be the [April] summaries we all sent to the CLC guys. A cursory read validates the sense of gravity that I felt (although it is easy for me to lose this sense of gravity now that CJ is responding so humbly [you just provided the August 10 e-mail confession] - don't know whether that [losing a sense of gravity] is a good thing or a bad thing), and I believe Brent's is equally grabbing. In response to my experience over the past few years (at least the way I interpret it), I recently sat down to try to summarize, in an overarching way, what I am hearing from everyone involved. This is what I came up with:

I think his responsibilities before God and the people in movement that love him and trust him led all of us to assume that:

1. CJ was pursuing correction about self - he was not
2. CJ was humble towards correction - he was not
3. CJ was talking to other people about the primary concerns being raised with him - he was not

4. CJ was truly accountable in certain important areas – he was not
5. CJ was responding lovingly to misunderstanding & pressing into his friendships for clarity & with affirmation – he was not
6. CJ was leading the movement through the primary influence and direction of the A. Team (or team was involved in strategic planning for future) or that we were actually talking about where we were weak and needed improvement. [he was not]
7. CJ was seeing the need to illustrate his sermons with examples of his own weakness and sinfulness (this was weak)
8. All the while teaching on humility, writing on it & referencing himself in regards to it when we were calling him to account.
9. Been enormously troubling to us & personally grievous for me

Because of the portrait that forms above,<sup>59</sup> I don't think we want to limit the confession to the CLC guys involved (not sure CJ would want this either, but I don't know). Also, I'm not sure that the fact that others that don't relate to CJ as much (rest of CLC team) is a good reason for not having him go broader. I don't think we should evaluate the circle of confessions by the aggrieved parties but by the longstanding nature of the pattern, the resistance of the person, the measure of his responsibilities, the norm in Sovereign Grace, etc., etc. For CJ to confess his sin to his [pastoral] team and the upper echelon of leadership in Sovereign Grace (extended [regional] teams) does not appear to me to be excessive. The groups are both highly contained and very mature (present company excluded!).

I seem to recall Brent doing a similar thing when confronted with his pride (Brent, is that true?) years ago and him confessing to the Sr. Pastors. [I shared with all the pastors in 1990 the areas of pride God was illuminating in my life.] I think it is just a way to mortify this thing and receive the grace that comes from humble confession. But I may be totally wrong here.

Hope this helps you understand why I was advocating those two contexts. Please challenge my thinking because I don't assume that I have this right. We don't often walk down this road!

#### Follow Up on August 20, 2004 Meeting

Dave wrote me on September 3, "It might be helpful for you to take some time to map out a clear road forward based upon everything that has been said. This will not only inform CJ on where we are but it will inform everyone on where we need to go." I answered, "Totally agree with the need for this. I'll be working on it - probably next week. One disadvantage, we won't talk about things until our Oct 26-28 retreat if we

leave things alone during the September 15 phone meeting [in light of the “Milestone Weekend” at CLC]. Do you think it would be good to invite Josh, Kenneth, Bob and Grant to the retreat for half a day?”

On September 3 Dave wrote me,

“I think that might be a good idea. However, even more important than their attendance would be our certainty of the role they are playing and the clarity they are bringing... We need to hear more from them. We need to hear what they think, where they are seeing things that CJ doesn’t necessarily see, what they are addressing, etc... It would not be helpful for them to (I’m not saying they are doing this.) close circle around CJ.... This is also where CJ’s newer doctrine of discouraging the talking about situations when the corrected is not present is going to be seriously counterproductive. If we cannot connect with them to evaluate clarity and direction except in CJ’s presence, this process will be much longer than any of us would want. I hope to make these points to Josh sometime.”

C.J. Redirecting the Focus after August 20, 2004 Meeting<sup>60</sup>

On September 8, you told me on the phone that “Carolyn had questions about the process” and you asked for “one meeting to ask a lot of questions about the large body of material” you “may not have heard correctly or understood” from August 20.

On September 10, you wrote me.

“At some point if and when you guys think it is appropriate in the distant future I would be glad to share with you and Dave observations I have from this season. If necessary I can include Carolyn in that process but I don’t think it will be.”

Later in the day you wrote again.

“In looking over the notes from the time [on] Aug 20 I need to talk with you before the [October] retreat (if that is the next meeting) because there are different points/illustrations I need to ask you about so I can make sure I understand and hear you clearly as well provide you with my perspective and invite your evaluation of my perspective.”

On September 22, I responded.

“I/we certainly want to hear your perspective. I/we understand and appreciate that “there are different points/illustrations I [C.J.] need to ask you [Brent] about so I can make sure I understand and hear you clearly as well provide you with my perspective and invite your evaluation of my perspective.” This is good and necessary discussion to have. I’d request, however, this be done in the context of the larger group.<sup>61</sup> From my perspective, it is important for all the men to participate in this discussion.”

On October 19, you wrote me.

“Thanks for wanting to have these conversations on the [October] retreat but I don’t think this will be possible [even though you requested our meeting occur before the retreat]. I am going to need a period of time to organize my thoughts/questions on both the process and observations I would have over the last two years for you and Dave apart from this process. I am not going to be able to do this before the retreat, nor would there be the amount of time necessary on the retreat to devote to this from my perspective. I don’t want to be rushed in either the preparation necessary for these conversations or the time frame of these conversations I want to have with you and Dave. And I appreciate your invitation to share with everyone but I think it would be wise for me to talk with you both personally and then I am glad for everyone to hear anything and everything.”<sup>62</sup>

In response, Dave wrote me and Josh.

“I think I would appeal that meeting [as a team] before or during [the October retreat] remain a priority. My sense from the CLC guys was that the team dynamic is their primary concern. I think that would be the same for the A. Team. Therefore, I think addressing these issues at the retreat becomes the best use of the time (even if CJ is only able to share in a preliminary way and we come back to it in the future)...I think the process is now stalled unless we do move forward on these conversations. In other words and if I understand correctly, CJ is not really able to process our perspective or illustrations on his sin because of these unknown and unspoken variables that he has withheld over the last couple of years. And since there isn’t time to talk or inclination to talk right now, seems like we are not able to move forward. Also, since thinking about how to approach us will be time consuming for CJ, it appears as the process is now left hanging. Personally, I think moving this forward will serve the team health (and our mental health!) best.”

On October 21, Josh wrote me back.

“Kenneth, Grant and I met with CJ to discuss the timing of him sharing his thoughts with you men. We encouraged him to do this next week at your retreat, and he was reluctant but willing to do this if this was what we thought was best. But as we talked more and heard more of his perspective we came to understand why this might not be wisest or best for the overall process. The first reason is that CJ’s desire is to have a whole day with each of you. The things he wants to share he wants to be able to explain in detail and not rush through with the concern of keeping the rest of the team waiting. He views this as an 8-10 hour process not something that can be handled in a morning.”

Dave responded to Josh.

“While the e-mail [above] was helpful for Brent and I, it probably raised more questions for us as well. I think it would be profitable and necessary for us to talk through our questions with you so that we can determine how best to proceed. We’re hoping you might be able to make some time available this afternoon, but we can be as flexible as necessary in order to make this happen.”

On October 22, Dave and I talked with Josh, Grant and Kenneth by phone (Steve was unavailable on a couple’s retreat). During this call Dave told them that your request presented an “element of difficulty” since for the “past 3-4 years he [Dave] had a history of taking initiative with C.J. in asking for input.”

Dave went on to say that,

“Now coming out on the other side of August 20 we are unaware of where C.J. has seen the helpfulness of our concerns. Instead there is a two year backlog of concerns for us which now takes front and center stage.<sup>63</sup> We should expect to hear the results of C.J.’s time with you since the August 20 meeting and back from him on his e-mail confessions [from August 10 & October 13].”

We proceeded with the team retreat in Herndon on October 26-28. Josh, Kenneth, Grant and Bob did not join us. You took no initiative to inform us or engage us about anything from the last 3 months. We kept it to business. There was an elephant in the room. Your focus was now on evaluating us. The day after the retreat you e-mailed me.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Friday, October 29, 2004 9:51 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Evaluations

Are you going to initiate the evaluations of team members using the forms we used last year? I'd like you to do this if possible and if possible it would be ideal to have this stuff either for our January retreat.

Let me know what you think.

Thanks,

CJ

On November 3, I wrote you.

"...I'd also like to suggest we go over Dave, Steve and my [job performance] reviews at our March retreat [instead of the January retreat]. This would give us plenty of time to talk with you [in January]. Since August 20 we've had no interactions with you as a team or in conjunction with you and the CLC men. In my mind, this seems a good and necessary thing to do. If you agree, would you consider having the CLC men join us on the January retreat so we can talk about all that has transpired?

#### Dave's November 11, 2004 Summary

This summary was sent to Joshua, Grant, Kenneth, Steve and me. Nearly three months had transpired since our meeting with you on August 20.

Josh,

This is my best shot at summarizing my questions. Thanks for your willingness to look this over. I'm not necessarily looking for a response on anything because I know we are engaged in a dynamic situation that is still playing out. But I welcome any feedback that you (or any of you men) would like to offer as well.

Thanks!

Dave

Hi guys [Joshua, Grant, Kenneth].

Thought it might be wise to drop you a note to offer an update on where things are sitting for me and the remaining questions I have in this process. These are offered with hope that by sharing them, you might better understand my heart and concerns and that this may be of service to both of us as we proceed. In so doing, I welcome your perspective.

But first, let's celebrate grace: I see changes in CJ. He opened this past retreat with expressing his desire to be corrected should anything come up and he closed the retreat by asking for an evaluation of our time. Although it was evident he didn't want to talk about any of the recent matters, I still appreciate these specific attempts to honor God and I told him so. Also, I believe he is leading and involving the team in ways that are greatly enhancing our productivity while we are together.

Finally, I see important steps towards change through the reports of your experience with him. I believe your experience (and some of my own!) are a wonderful indication that God has begun a powerful work. This is all very encouraging to me!

Quick update from our last phone call: CJ has not contacted me with a date for meeting nor has he communicated any intent or desire to meet to raise his concerns.

Now, on to remaining questions that I might place in the 'unresolved' category:

1. To what extent should CJ's fresh conviction & humility guide him to update the Apostolic Team on important developments such as:
  - a. The helpfulness and applicability of the August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.
  - b. The results and helpfulness of the CLC summary produced after the August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. There appear to be areas where some of the original concerns raised by the team are corroborated by the CLC guys. It seems important to understand how CJ is interpreting that.
  - c. The results of his time with Bo, particularly on those points where the team was united in their appeals to CJ.
  - d. A review of his recent October confession for its relevance to our experience with him.
  - e. A general pursuit of any additional thoughts or observations in relationship to his soul or this process.
- The absence of conversation or self disclosure appears like a notable omission right now. Perhaps equally important is that it seems consistent with the pattern of how these things tend to play out, particularly over the last few years.

2. To what extent is it really wise for the process (and helpful to CJ & the Apostolic Team) to allow CJ's concerns over us to postpone additional confessions or updates, re-direct the process and close off communication about where we are and where we are going?<sup>64</sup> While I understand the explanations offered thus far, I guess I'm still uncertain as to whether CJ is examining his assumptions and perceptions of Brent and I through the points he has confessed ("quick to find fault with those correcting; pattern of sinful judgment towards those correcting"; etc.). It doesn't appear as if his words or approach since August 20<sup>th</sup> would lead to that conclusion,<sup>65</sup> though I am confident that you men are encouraging that exercise.
3. Has the CLC team encouraged CJ back to Brent and Dave regarding the longstanding concern over his tendencies towards 'withdrawal'? Since everyone (including the CLC guys, if I understood you correctly) appears to share this concern and it seems to affect the dynamic of the Apostolic Team, I wonder if this discussion should be more of a priority. It also seems that humility would lead CJ to share with us your observations for him on this point. The present (and historical) lack of discussion and resolution on this important point can leave open speculation about CJ's relational determination, particularly when he encounters disagreement or problems with the Apostolic Team.
4. Perhaps related to #3: Is CJ demonstrating a sufficient appreciation for what this process imposes on team dynamic, unity and communication? It seems the more common approach among us would be to elevate the priority of these kinds of discussions - partially to care for all involved; partially to uphold the unity of the team(s); and partially because these situations play out on a relational stage and those relationships are important. The fact that we could have weeks, even months pass with no discussion or deliberation is difficult to interpret, but not unusual for how we tend to proceed when there is misunderstanding or unresolved relational issues. (It bears saying though that there are many other ways that CJ communicates his love and affection, for which I am grateful to God and him.)
5. Would CJ (maybe the CLC guys as well) perceive any benefit in examining the comments made to Steve about Dave and Brent "controlling information and manipulating the process"?<sup>66</sup> This seems to be a serious statement and may reveal important information that helps us understand how CJ processes criticism or maybe even sinful judgments that CJ may be carrying. The irony of CJ's comments deepen as we find ourselves in a position where the process and information now rests with him and yet we

are not discussing these things or, for myself, even clear about how we are proceeding

6. This is one that seems important because it may illustrate how diverse our perspectives might be: Why would CJ represent the last couple of years as a period where he has withheld feedback and perspective and the upcoming period as one where he needs to 'come out of retirement' (CJ's e-mail comment) to serve us? Also, why are these issues, some of which you men indicated are not necessarily related to this process, being introduced and entertained right now? This not only appears procedurally unconventional but it reveals impressions about himself that I think it would serve to explore. I have no doubt that CJ has graciously overlooked some of my many faults and sins. It's just that I have pursued his perspective over the past few years and I have been assured by his answers that I am updated. To introduce the idea of a two-year unspoken backlog in the middle of this process is a perplexing development and difficult for me to reconcile with his words.<sup>67</sup>

To summarize, the following is my best shot at a summation of my original concerns, (though I am aware that I am capable of misunderstanding or misinterpreting CJ's words & actions): *To correct CJ, or to challenge his own self-perception, was to experience a reaction through e-mails, consistent disagreement (without seeking to sufficiently understand), a lack of sufficient follow-up and occasionally, relational withdrawal. Along with this, CJ was poor in volunteering areas of sin, temptation or weakness in himself.*

I believe God has begun a work in CJ and that he wants to cooperate with God's activity. But since CJ has not acknowledged the relevance of any of the illustrations that Brent and I have given and we're still not discussing these things, it's hard to know if we are making sufficient progress. I am delighted to hear things are moving forward on your end. That is very important evidence of CJ's desire and application. But I continue to wonder whether one of the best measures of CJ's growth will be in the way he is responding to the insights and concerns of Brent & I. Perhaps I am wrong on this.

I believe we are engaged in an important time of serving the entire team, not just CJ. I want to thank you for your patience and participation in it and I welcome any insights you have for me. I live more aware than ever that CJ is a great man and that I am a great sinner.

## Joshua's Reply to Dave

On November 19, Joshua wrote.

Dave,

Thanks for your written summary. I think you're asking good questions and I want to pursue these questions after CJ has had his time with Brent (today) and with you. CJ told me that he recently e-mailed you about setting up a time. Sorry for the delay.

All that to say, we want to explore the questions you're raising. We care about CJ and the whole team. We don't assume that everything has been addressed in CJ or that he's seeing all the issues with clarity. We hope that God will help us build on what has been accomplished.

Thanks for your help with the New York trip. I appreciated your creativity with the title. I really hope they use that.

Sincerely,  
Joshua

## C.J. and Brent's Meeting in Charlotte - November 19, 2004

Immediately after the August 20 meeting you changed the focus to an evaluation of Dave and especially me.<sup>68</sup> On November 19, you flew to Charlotte and took four hours<sup>69</sup> (at least not the 8-10 hours Josh said I should expect) to share your concerns for me. This was a lengthy monologue, not a dialogue. I listened and took extensive notes. Where possible I asked your forgiveness. Here and there, however, I succinctly voiced my disagreements out of concern for you. So many of the things you shared were contradicted by Bob's notes from the August 20 meeting. For instance, you insisted I advocated that you step down as team leader (more on this later) which was the opposite of what I said.<sup>70</sup> Leaving our time together I was very concerned for you. It was evident your offenses were affecting your heart and mind.<sup>71</sup> You came with many sinful judgments.<sup>72</sup>

Two months later on January 19, 2005, I sent you my notes (see below) from the meeting and included my disagreements. I hoped they would help you and give you pause for how you were misinterpreting and misrepresenting things to others.<sup>73</sup> Here is what I wrote.

“I am happy to talk about any of this with you at 2:30. It really is not my desire to be difficult. I want to support you and serve you,<sup>74</sup> I want to commend progress. I wish these differences did not exist. I invite your disagreement my friend. I want to move ahead.”

That same afternoon we talked by phone. I brought up my notes hoping we would talk about them. Instead, you told me you “didn’t feel there was a need to talk about them.”<sup>75</sup> I cordially disagreed.

Three months later on March 26, I asked your permission to send my notes onto Dave, Steve, Kenneth and Bob. I did not include Josh because he asked to be out of the process. He no longer wanted to be in a position where had to correct you or be affected by the things he heard about you. He simply wanted to be mentored by you. At this point, you put Bob in charge<sup>76</sup> of the process from your end.

Here is my email requesting permission. I have added a few thoughts in brackets [ ].

“Dave and Steve have wondered what your assessment of my leadership was on November 19 [2004] when we met in Charlotte. I assume the same is true of Kenneth and Bob. May I send them a copy of my January 19 [2005] response to you? [I was apprehensive how you would interpret any of my actions.] Of course, I’d want you to feel completely free to express any and all concerns or disagreements with them concerning my response. I do not need to be present or copied for this. [I was giving you a freedom you refused to give us after August 20.]

I have no desire to press any of these points. [I was giving up hope that you would acknowledge any wrong doing.] I would simply like to make them aware so they have a more complete picture of things. [They were only hearing your perspective on things which was often distorted.]

Thanks for considering it.  
Brent

Brent’s Feedback for C.J. from Meeting in Charlotte – January 19, 2005<sup>77</sup>

We met so you could provide me your critique of the August 20 meeting. These are my notes which I sent to you on January 19, 2005. While I said little at the November 19 meeting, I briefly responded to you on each point two months later.

## E Mail

- Your concern: I was using e-mail as a “primary means of correction.”
- My response: I think my e-mails were primarily informational and illustrative and not corrective. I also reminded you that you asked Dave and me on August 4 to e-mail you any and all additional examples related to the issues [of pride in your life, etc.]. The e-mails that followed were all in response to your request.

## Hope

- Your concern: We “didn’t impart hope” to you.
- My response: Imparting hope was made more difficult by several factors. You were not updating us as a team on progress with the CLC men [Josh, Grant, Bob, Kenneth], we were not hearing from the CLC men on progress, phone calls and meetings with this in mind were cancelled, you were expressing disagreement with most of the examples we shared on August 20, no examples were acknowledged as helpful or applicable, you were struggling with the process and with Dave and me.

## Seriousness

- Your concern: I made “repeated statements about seriousness.”
- My response: I may have at the August 20 meeting. I am not sure. Previously, I can only remember one occasion where I used the word “serious” in an e-mail. You agreed in a follow up e-mail that the issues were serious.

## Comparison to RB

- Your concern: That I made a “careless comparison [of you] to RB.”
- My response: You misunderstood the e-mail [i.e., judged me] where I referenced RB. The context of my e-mail made clear I was only asking you to use RB’s written confession as an example for your own. That was all. In any case, I quickly clarified my reference to RB in follow up e-mails as soon as I discovered you were struggling.

## Stepping Down

- Your concern: My reference to “having [you] step down.”
- My response: The only occasion I’ve ever mentioned “stepping down” was at the August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. It was a hypothetical reference if you had not repented. Josh agreed with this perspective. Previously, you were the one who introduced the idea of stepping down. All of us responded to you in clear cut terms that this was not necessary. This was repeatedly affirmed.

## Hypocrisy

- Your concern: You did not find “my explanation regarding hypocrisy” helpful on August 20.
- My response: I only used the word once in reference to you not telling the CLC men about our input during the 18 month period of time. From my perspective, this was contrary to what we have taught and practiced.

## BC and BP<sup>78</sup>

- Your concern: You thought I was comparing you to BC and BP because you were “not getting the extreme nature of things.”
- My response: You asked me via e-mail to explain my reference on August 20 to “an element of hypocrisy.” In my response to you on Sept 22, I referenced BC and BP. It is very clear, however, that I implied nothing by way of character comparison. In context, my comments regarding them only had to do with the things we learned about informing others of input we are receiving.

## Normal Sanctification

- Your concern: You didn’t understand “why so many interactions” thereby making it “more serious” rather than viewing things as “normal sanctification.”
- My response: We have a difference of perspective on this point [i.e., the issues were serious].

## Escalation

- Your concern: The request for a [written] “confession escalated things” in your mind.
- My response: This was not an escalation. It was just a simple request for you to write down the things you were seeing. We felt this would benefit you and us. This reason was clearly communicated to you via e-mail.

## “Tribunal”

- Your concern: You felt the August 20 meeting was a “tribunal” with no statement of encouragement.<sup>79</sup>
- My response: I mentioned to the men at the beginning of the August 20 meeting that we had encouraged you at length during our August 13 team meeting. At that time we spent at least 30 minutes expressing our deep appreciation, encouragement and affection for you. This did not seem to help you. In retrospect, I wish we had taken the time to encourage you again at the beginning of the August 20 meeting.

## Alliance

- Your concern: There has been an “alliance” between Dave and me.
- My response: Dave and I have worked together at times (along with Steve) but we have not allied ourselves against you.

## Taking Up Offenses for One Another

- Your concern: Dave took up offenses for me (e.g. doing less teaching in the Pastors College) and I took up offenses for Dave (e.g., asking Jeff, not Dave, to do the Called Men seminar at Celebration; Dave not writing books for SGM).
- My response: We have not been motivated by offense (i.e., anger, bitterness or resentment). We used the examples above to help you see some of the issues related to gentleness, etc. I don’t believe we have taken up offenses for each other.

### Dave Offended & Unkind

- Your concern: You quoted Dave as saying on August 4 [during a phone call with us] that “You [C.J.] don’t appreciate what guys do.” “You [C.J.] don’t recognize the contributions of others.” “You [C.J.] miss opportunities to recognize the contributions of others.” You felt Dave was being unkind to you in making these comments.
- My response: I don’t have any recollection of Dave saying these things in this way. I don’t remember him speaking in an unkind manner.

### Few Hours of Correction

- Your concern: You didn’t think it was wise to make “a few hours of corrective statements” without dialogue during the first part of the August 20 meeting.
- My response: I asked you to forgive me for leading that part of the meeting (12:30-1:50 pm) in a way that did not facilitate dialogue. I corrected your recollection that it was “2-3 hours” in duration. I also mentioned that I left 2½ hours for dialogue (2:00-5:30 pm) which I sought to initiate immediately after the break.

### I Seemed Irritated

- Your concern: “I [Brent] seemed irritated” at the August 20 meeting.
- My response: I don’t think this was the case. I was uncharitable at one point when I used the word “lambasted” but I don’t remember expressing irritation during the meeting. When I asked all the men present for any correction [after the August 20 mtg.], they have not expressed this as an observation.

### Confession of Sin

- Your concern: You weren’t sure “why a wider confession of sin was necessary” especially since you have “historically confessed your sins to others.” [No one agreed with your self-assessment.]
- My response: I think the nature and pattern of sins<sup>80</sup> being addressed warranted a consideration of confessing to a larger group (e.g. CLC pastors, some Sov. Grace managers, or some men serving on the extended [regional] teams). We never pressed for this or conveyed this was a necessity. We

never implied or thought a confession to CLC or the movement was necessary. Just the opposite.

### Public Confessions

- Your concern: You said you would walk more carefully than me in having men make public confessions. That you are more restrained than me.
- My response: I would see this differently. I think the opposite has historically been the case.

### TH

- Your concern: You wondered why DH didn't make a public confession<sup>81</sup> given the way TH lived during a 3 year period of time.
- My response: I don't know the particulars so I don't know if a confession to the church was warranted. I do know DH was confessing his sin to the men locally and was walking in the light with them.<sup>82</sup>

### BL Taking Up Our Offense

- Your concern: Dave and I have gone back to BL and "transferred our offense" with you to him.
- My response: I don't think we have done this. [And BL told us "not at all."]

### Not Discerning of BL's Sins

- Your concern: You didn't think we were perceptive and discerning of BL's sins.
- My response: I think Dave, Steve and me had a good handle on BL's sins. We were also concerned for the harsh assessment you were making of BL.<sup>83</sup>

### Care Group

- Your concern: That I did not make "inquiry into what took place during the 18 months" when you didn't have a Care Group. That I used this illustration as part of a "damming body of evidence."
- My response: I would not agree. At the team retreat in December 03 we were surprised to find out three things: 1) you had not participated in a

couples retreat for 3 years, 2) you had not been involved in men's accountability meetings, and 3) you hadn't had a Care Group meeting over the last 18 months.<sup>84</sup> In expressing my concern, I also sympathetically communicated my understanding. I specifically mentioned Nicole's sickness, Janelle's wedding, your father in law's health, Carolyn's book writing, your book writing, and the challenge of coming up with dates that worked for everyone. I did not press the issue of Care Group.

#### Postpone August 20 Meeting

- Your concern: You and Carolyn felt the August 20 should have been postponed until after the Milestone Weekend in September [17-19].
- My response: I don't know how this was possible. I did try to tamp things down after the August 20 meeting. I reminded you that I asked for everything to be put on hold until our team retreat at the end of October. You didn't remember this. During this time, you and Steve were talking/e-mailing and that was keeping the issues active during the Milestone Weekend.

I expressed my concern that Carolyn had struggled with the impact of this process on the Milestone Weekend way back in June at the CBA Convention before you had acknowledged any sin to us. I communicated that I didn't know how things could have been done differently unless we tabled all our concerns from the December 2003 team retreat until after the Milestone Weekend [which was] ten months later.

#### Two Services

- Your concern: You said Josh inaccurately "misrepresented [you] on having 2 services" at CLC at August 20 meeting.
- My response: I have no idea if this is true. If it is true, Josh should get back to us. If it is true, I assume he has already asked your forgiveness.

#### Cross Centered Life

- Your concern: Thought I judged you at August 20 meeting by saying you were resentful regarding our discussions about *The Cross Centered Life*.
- My response: I didn't say you were resentful. Quoting Bob's notes I said, I "thought the issue was self-pity, and possibly resentfulness."

## Two Examples of Offense Expounded

You were resentful, bitter and angry about many things.<sup>85</sup> As a result, your perspective on what and how things were said or done was sorely distorted. Though each of the topics above could be expanded upon, I've selected two of the 24, hypocrisy and stepping down, as illustrative of the rest.

### Example 1: "An Element of Hypocrisy"

When we met on November 19 in Charlotte, so I could hear your critique of me, you brought up the reference to hypocrisy. You told me I should not have used the word and you did not think it applied to you. Going into the August 20 meeting, Dave asked me to consider not using the word "hypocrisy" out of concern for your reaction. I shared with Dave I thought we needed to use biblical terminology if we were going to help you. Knowing how easily you could stumble, I purposefully used the phrase "an element of hypocrisy" on August 20. I was trying to be so careful. Nevertheless, you took offense and felt the need to correct me on November 19. Here is the e-mail trail which began the day after our meeting. You wrote the following.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 21, 2004 8:52 AM<sup>86</sup>  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Confidential

If you have a few minutes I need to ask you a question/clarification on Bo today. Also, it would help to ask you about a statement you made related to me and hypocrisy. I want to know if I have the quote right and understand your concern.

If possible please send me the specific categories you presented. It would help to have your wording so I can let you know what I perceive and what I don't yet perceive.<sup>87</sup>

Thanks again for taking the time to come here yesterday and provide me with your care and correction.

**From:** Brent Detwiler

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 22, 2004 7:30 PM

**To:** Grant Layman; Steve Shank; Bob Kauflin; Pat Ennis; Kenneth Maresco, C.J. Mahaney, Joshua Harris; Dave Harvey

**Subject:** Confidential - Hypocrisy

In your e-mail below you say "it would help to ask you about a statement you made related to me and hypocrisy. I want to know if I have the quote right and understand your concern."

Here are some excerpts from Bob's notes from the August 20 meeting to give you the context.

Kenneth Hasn't seen [with C.J.] the specificity in confession that others have demonstrated.

Brent At the December '03 [apostolic team] retreat, they [the apostolic team] talked about these issues with CJ, they had the written evaluations from the CLC pastors. At that retreat, CJ repented of a couple things [i.e., the handling of Bo and Tyler], but disagreed with most of it. CJ never came to us [CLC pastors] and acknowledged the things he confessed. Nor did he go beyond filling us [CLC men] in on the [apostolic] team's oral presentation [additional input]. CJ has acknowledged this in his [August 10 e-mail] confession in the context of pride and feeling his discernment is superior. Sees more pervasive pride in how CJ views himself - not in a suspicious way, but in a confident way. It's not simply pride in his discernment, but pride in his opinion of himself.

[Brent] feels there's been an element of hypocrisy in CJ. If he doesn't agree with observations from others, that's one thing. If he doesn't share that with others, that's another issue.

Josh Agrees with the assessment of the sin at work and the way it was deceiving CJ. Doesn't think CJ was intentionally seeking to deceive us, which doesn't make it any less serious. The way in which CJ asked for observations at times lent to a less thorough response. All of us will face this temptation to believe the person who says that what we're doing is okay. We're seeing CJ's reaction to observations in a new way because we're bringing observations more frequently and specifically.

Many years ago a similar scenario presented itself with BC... We were bringing things to his attention but he was not telling the local men around him. The local men were bringing things to his attention but he was not telling the apostolic team.

I remember talking about this and all of us making a commitment to inform others of the correction we receive from others so we don't make the same mistake. This same kind of thing happened with BP. It again accentuated the need to always inform others of the correction we are receiving whether we agree with it or not.

In your case, not providing this kind of information to the CLC men over an 18 month period seems [was] contrary to what we have taught, agreed to and practiced. Of course, we're never had an exception for times we don't agree with the correction we are receiving. Just the opposite. When we don't agree it is more critical that we inform others. If we share with humility and self suspicion, it can easily be done without "embarrassing" the person(s) bringing the correction and not putting them in a bad light.

Is there anything you are struggling with by my referencing an "element of hypocrisy." I'd be happy to hear your perspective or disagreement if you have one.

Brent

**From:** C.J. Mahaney

**Sent:** Thursday, September 23, 2004 10:03 AM

**To:** Brent Detwiler; Dave Harvey; Steve Shank; Joshua Harris; Grant Layman; Kenneth Maresco; Bob Kauflin; Pat Ennis

**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Hypocrisy

Well, there is much I want to talk with you and Dave about [a month after the August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting you were struggling with our input in a major way] at the proper time my friend. But I don't prefer to communicate about this kind of stuff through e-mail and I will ask the guys here how they think I should proceed. They continue to do an excellent job watching over my soul.

So thanks for sending this. I will talk with the guys here about this and at the appropriate time provide you with my perspective.<sup>88</sup>

## Example 2: Stepping Down as Team Leader

This is another example of offense that affected your relationship with me. Even though I never suggested you step down as the team leader you continued to correct me for supposedly doing so and this despite many attempts to assure you otherwise.<sup>89</sup> This offense, that I wanted or suggested you resign, was conveyed to Steve and others and had a negative impact on them.<sup>90</sup> What is remarkable, you were the one who suggested the idea of stepping down.<sup>91</sup> Here is the e-mail trail.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 17, 2004 8:49 AM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Dave,

...I am glad to write up a confession<sup>92</sup> [sadly it turned out you became resentful of this request] similar to RB's and would also want you men to know if you think I should step down because of my sins I don't think I would make that difficult for you. Actually I think I would make it easy for you.<sup>93</sup> The only challenge would be timing since the transition [Joshua becoming the senior pastor] is in September. But God will give you men clarity and wisdom as to how to proceed...

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 17, 2004 9:27 AM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

...I don't think you should step down and I personally don't want to serve anyone else. I'm sure you would make it easy for us, since I know that you are not selfishly motivated to keep your job or use your platform.<sup>94</sup> I love that about you. So, I think you're stuck with us a little longer! However it may be appropriate in some public context for you to share the dealings of God in your life right now. [This never occurred. The CLC pastors who knew "closed circle" as Dave predicted.] But there is plenty of time to consider the path from here and I don't think we need to get ahead of ourselves since there is no urgency to this matter...

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 5, 2004 8:47 PM  
**To:** C. J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** Confidential - Feedback

Dear C.J.,

Thank you for your honesty this morning and thank you for continuing to do the hard (and sometimes discouraging) work of self examination. I am praying you will receive grace from the Savior and be assured our love and affection in the process.

Let me provide you some feedback from our phone conversation this morning...

...I was surprised to hear you say that "Two of four guys [Dave and me] I am serving [are] having serious doubts about whether I should be doing this [team leader]." I've never consider this prospect or even intimated at it. On the contrary, we have been constant in our affirmations of your team leadership. This has never been questioned, only repeatedly affirmed. What would cause you to make a statement like this? [Which was declarative, not interrogative.]

I don't ask these things to condemn you or because I am angry with you. I just want to ask questions to help you further evaluate your heart. Please feel free to disagree with any of my observations, statements, concerns or recollections.

There is no need for a prompt response. Take your time in getting back to me.<sup>95</sup> I realize there is so much else going on in your life and ministry.

Thanks my friend.  
Brent

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Friday, August 6, 2004 10:07 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Feedback

Brent,

Thanks for your care, correction and patience!

Bring on the feedback and questions my friend! I only benefit when you do this

so PLEASE DON'T HESITATE to do this. My only concern is that I find e-mails so limiting particularly when these kinds of issues are involved. So I would prefer to talk to you and I will make time to talk to you everyday if necessary so I can perceive my sin and hopefully grow...<sup>96</sup>

As for the statement "Two of the four guys, etc.", I think I said "if". I don't know what you guys are thinking but if you have these kind of thoughts I don't want it to be difficult to introduce them and make this transition. So it's not a bizarre thought to me to think that you might at least wonder in light of all my sins and then all the deficiencies in my planning/administration whether I should continue to be the team leader. [This quickly changed and became a major source of offense to you.] I think some of what we experienced with Larry in the past also has some influence on me. As we walked through that lengthy challenging season with him on this point I purposed that I would make it easy if this day came for me.<sup>97</sup> But I very glad to hear you guys don't think this way and that settles it for me and I won't bring it up again<sup>98</sup> [which you continued to do].

#### Bob's Notes Regarding Stepping Down from August 20, 2004 Meeting

- Brent           The team communicated to CJ that the issue of CJ stepping down is not one they've ever considered. Nor do they think he needs to make a movement wide confession.
- Grant           An illustration, as these things have more recently come to light, CJ has asked whether or not he should be the team leader.<sup>99</sup> To introduce that in the midst of evaluation can seem to be an overreaction, potentially born out of self-pity, and can put others in the position of not wanting to share observations when there is that kind of response.
- Brent           Expressed that there is no one we would rather have leading the apostolic team than CJ. Expressed appreciation for CJ and Carolyn for their example and friendship.

Nevertheless, you continued to believe I wanted you to step down. Without our knowing, you were talking with Steve about this and other unhelpful issues. Without my prompting, Dave addressed this matter with Josh after a phone call Dave and Steve had with him.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 19, 2004 2:50 PM  
**To:** Joshua Harris  
**Subject:** Confidential

Hey Josh. Great job leading today. Thanks again for expressing your care in such a tangible way.

Just a thought to follow up on something Steve said. He indicated, something to the effect that, Brent's words and attitude in this process have communicated to CJ and others the potential need for repositioning or re-evaluation of his role if he does not respond (I think the way Steve summarized what he has heard from Brent was: "if there isn't significant growth then we may need to look at your role on the team"). While I don't think it is necessary or helpful to answer Steve's perceptions<sup>100</sup> at this time, I did want to follow up with you on this one because I think it misrepresents (unintentionally I'm sure) Brent's heart and approach thus far.<sup>101</sup>

Brent would've been among the first to respond to CJ when, at the outset, CJ indicated he would be willing to step aside. This was as crazy to Brent as it was to the rest of us. In my opinion, the way Brent opened up the August 20<sup>th</sup> time - communicating to CJ that the issue of CJ stepping down is not one they've ever considered, he doesn't need to make a movement wide confession, and that there is no one we would rather have leading the apostolic team than CJ - has characterized his attitude and approach all along in both public and private.<sup>102</sup>

Just a point of clarification that seems important.<sup>103</sup> Thanks for listening.

Dave

**From:** Joshua Harris  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 19, 2004 5:13 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** Re: Confidential

This is very helpful. Thank you!

JH

C.J.'s Meeting with Brent in Charlotte  
November 19, 2004

Here are the notes I sent you from our meeting. After many attempts to assure you otherwise, you remained offended and still charged me with saying you needed to step down from the leading the team. This twisting of reality had now become common.<sup>104</sup>

### Stepping Down

- Your concern: My reference to “having him [you] step down.”
- My response: The only occasion I’ve ever mentioned “stepping down” was at the August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. It was a hypothetical reference if you had not repented. Josh agreed with this perspective. Previously, you were the one who introduced the idea of him stepping down. All of us responded to you in clear cut terms that this was not necessary. This was repeatedly affirmed.

### Things Never Addressed or Explained

In December we talked about whether or not Josh, Bob and Kenneth should join us on our January 11-13, 2005 retreat in Herndon, VA. I was still trying to get everyone together. Here is what I wrote Josh on December 17.

“Thanks Josh for getting back to me and thanks for your willingness to consider a joint meeting.<sup>105</sup> Here are few of my thoughts that may help you to understand my perspective. C.J. has been talking to us individually about his evaluation of us and the process (which I appreciate), but I don’t think we have ever talked as a team over the last 12 months<sup>106</sup> about anything leading up to or flowing out of the August 20 meeting as it pertains to him. If my memory serves me well, this is an unprecedented way of handling things.<sup>107</sup> I’d also add that we’ve had many opportunities to talk as a team but have not done so.

...As a result, I remain perplexed why we have never talked with you men or with C.J. as a team. From my perspective, there remains a substantive list<sup>108</sup> of things that have never been addressed or explained.

Josh, I welcome your correction, adjustment, disagreement or questions. Please feel free to challenge my perspective and my recollection. I am both sinful and fallible. I am glad to write down my thoughts for you as you request. Thanks

for the invitation to do so and thanks for your on-going care and concern for all of us.”

The next day you wrote me the following.

“I would benefit from having the “substantive list of things that have never been addressed or explained.” I wasn’t aware there was this list or more issues that hadn’t been brought to my attention or that I hadn’t responded<sup>109</sup> to so I would like this specific list to begin to consider these items.”

Here is my December 31 response to you and Josh and copied to Dave and Steve.

Josh and C.J.,

Josh, thank you for your on-going care and involvement in C.J.’s life. You are a dear and precious friend to him. C.J., thank you for interacting with Josh and the other men and benefiting from their input and encouragement. All of us on the team are grateful for your responsiveness to God and the changes that have been observed [by the CLC men] in your life.<sup>110</sup> We are also grateful for the questions, critique and input you have provided us individually.

Given your request, here are some general questions touching upon those issues I think have gone unaddressed or unexplained.

1. Should we have heard back from the CLC men [Josh, Kenneth, Grant, Bob] and C.J. after the August 20 meeting so we could know what issues were followed up on and how C.J. was processing them? For instance, were any of the examples we used helpful to C.J. in illustrating our points?
2. Should C.J. have talked to us about his e-mail confession of October 13 so we could understand how he came to see the things he acknowledged? Did any of the things acknowledged have a personal bearing upon us?
3. How have the CLC men helped C.J. and Carolyn in their struggles with us? Should we know what the CLC men have been covering with C.J. and the progress that is being made (we have no information except for the Oct 5 “Moving Ahead” report)? How are pastoral care and accountability being provided for C.J. and Carolyn?

These matters seem relevant to me, but I will leave it to you, Dave and Steve, to determine if they are legitimate topics worthy of conversation.”

On January 7, Kenneth wrote back on behalf of Josh, Grant and Bob and answered these questions. Here is what he said in relation to following up with us regarding the effect of your sin on us.

“We believe that this is CJ’s intent. And again, have encouraged him to continue to discuss<sup>111</sup> [in reality no discussion had occurred] with the team his understanding of the ways in which his sins have a personal bearing upon you. This was the heart of our recommendations from October 5<sup>th</sup>. We believe that he fully intends<sup>112</sup> to press into these areas. [You never did.] We are also aware that CJ has a conviction to where possible, confess sins face to face<sup>113</sup> rather than through e-mail. And we believe this is commendable and helpful as a general practice.... Whenever we have observed any element of potentially sinful attitudes<sup>114</sup> from CJ we have faithfully shared our thoughts and perspective and encouraged CJ to get back to you.”<sup>115</sup>

Kenneth also said,

“We desire to serve CJ in areas of accountability and personal sanctification, and are very open to the team’s and CJ’s assessment of our care for him in this process. Please feel free to call [me] or Grant for follow up. We prefer to speak personally as a means of sharing about these kinds of issues in the future... And again would welcome the team’s perspective<sup>116</sup> if you have any concerns at all regarding our attitude or approach in any and all of these matters.”

Team Retreat in Herndon, VA - January 11-13, 2005

C.J., Brent, Dave, Steve, Pat

I appreciated Kenneth’s response. I was hopeful you’d finally approach us with humility and transparency. According to Kenneth, you fully intended to discuss and press into the ways in which your sins personally impacted us. This was the heart of their counsel to you. That you had a conviction to confess sins face to face rather than by e-mail. It was also encouraging to hear that “Whenever we have observed any element of potentially sinful attitudes from CJ we have faithfully shared our thoughts and perspective and encouraged CJ to get back to you.” He provided you excellent counsel but, as it turned out, you chose not to follow it on the upcoming retreat.

The Friday before the January team retreat (the same day we heard from Kenneth), Dave talked to you about the need to discuss the October 13 e-mail confession at the retreat. You agreed and told him you should have already done so with us. He fully expected you would come prepared to review it. When you did not bring it up, we brought it and attempted to draw you out. All you were willing to say was what you told Dave, which was, you should have talked to us about it already. You did not ask

our forgiveness. And bafflingly, you did not proceed to discuss the confession at all. You simply moved on. In this context, you also told us how you didn't like e-mail confessions (this appeared to be a reference to Steve who had just written one to us) and would rather confess sin in person. Of course, this was hypocritical and made no sense since your only confessions to us were by email and not face to face.

During the retreat we had some discussion about you never asking forgiveness for specific incidences of sin. Incredulously, you told us you were not required to do so provided you were seeing the categories of sin.<sup>117</sup> I suggested you should desire to confess specific sin to us and others if truly convicted of categories of sin because specific confession demonstrates repentance and humility and leads to reconciliation. Your ongoing unwillingness to discuss illustrations and ask forgiveness for specific sin was very troubling and contrary to all the counsel you were receiving and everything you had taught in the past.<sup>118</sup>

Five months earlier and ten days before the August 20 meeting, you acknowledged the following via e-mail. Here is what you wrote,

“On numerous occasions I have not been easy to entreat or correct.... I can be quick to disagree when I am being corrected. I have disagreed with those correcting me before I have sufficiently understood the nature and content of their correction. Too often I have failed to humbly ask questions and draw out the one correcting me. I have not consistently made the individual correcting me comfortable by inviting and encouraging their correction. I have failed to discern the effect of my disagreement upon the one correcting me.... I have not sufficiently perceived the effect of my words and decisions upon individuals.... To my shame there have been many occasions in recent history where my arrogance has been pronounced and I have not been easy to entreat.... And I would like to express my deep gratefulness to Brent, Dave and Steve for their kindness and patience. I think these sins have been most evident to you and sadly manifested the most toward you men. I am so deeply grieved by this. And yet your response to my many sins has been forbearance and forgiveness.”

In August you acknowledged you had sinned against us in “recent history” on “many occasions” but in January you remained unwilling to voluntarily acknowledge any of them. Nevertheless, we tried to engage you. For example, Dave asked why you turned the process of evaluation to us immediately after the August 20 meeting without ever having a discussion about doing so.

This was reminiscent of previous experiences like the one with BL going back to December 2000. I am sure you remember the struggles you were having with him. You recused yourself and I was put in charge of a process whereby the team tried to help both of you. When you disagreed with our concerns for you; you unilaterally removed

me, took over the process and stopped the evaluation. For the next five years we patiently, but unsuccessfully, tried to help you see your sins against him and us. We brought this illustration up again. Finally on the retreat you acknowledged some aspects of your sins against us. Here is what Dave wrote.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Date:** Sunday, April 17, 2005 06:44 AM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Bob Kauflin; Kenneth Maresco  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

This is my two cents on how to proceed.

I will query the A. Team to see what might be remaining, either in relation to BL or how you handled the team in relationship to BL and find out if there is anything worth talking about. If there is a list, I will pass it along.

I think you should inform the CLC guys of the specifics of what you confessed to BL and the sin you also confessed to us in our last team meeting in relationship to removing Brent from leading the process and taking the leadership without consulting the team.<sup>119</sup>

One final illustration. During the January retreat, I brought up the secret and counterproductive discussions you and Steve were having about Dave and me.<sup>120</sup> In particular, I referenced your e-mail to Steve from September 18, 2004. This was not the first time I tried to talk to you about it. If you remember, you sent this "confidential" e-mail to me by mistake. It read as follows.

"I do not understand (but I want to understand) how Brent states there are to be no secrets but I am not to know what you [Steve] are thinking and the CLC guys aren't to be informed that these conversations are taking place until Brent and Dave determine it is appropriate. It seems (an observation not a conclusion) to me that there is a selective procedure in place and that those men are trying to manage or limit the information. So I am glad to make time to talk and definitely want to be of any help I can. I am preparing for tomorrow and I meet with Thomas Womack this afternoon so you can let me know what time works best for you."

What you asserted about Dave and I had no bearing in reality. I never said you weren't to know what Steve was thinking or that the CLC guys weren't to be informed until we deemed it appropriate. These were sinful judgments. It was also heartbreaking that it

seemed to you we had put “a selective procedure” into place and were “trying to manage and limit the information.” I was deeply saddened to realize you thought we might be acting deceitfully.<sup>121</sup>

I forwarded your September 18 e-mail to Dave. In response, here is what Dave asked Steve and me. Like me, he was a baffled.

“Can anyone explain to me what this reference means (above)? What I mean is, I’m curious as to what he [C.J.] is referring to? I would be glad to just e-mail CJ and/or Josh if you guys don’t understand the reference either. Maybe it’s not important right now and I don’t necessarily want to open up any more fronts. But it does seem to go to his perception of what is happening. But where are we withholding information? Brent, any thoughts?”

Within two months you had effectively forgotten your August 10 e-mail confession. At the time you also acknowledged, “I have arrogantly assumed the superiority of my discernment when corrected.... I can be quick to find fault with the one correcting me thus revealing my self-righteousness.... There has been a pattern of sinful judgment toward those who are correcting me.... I have not communicated the correction of the team to the CLC men, arrogantly assuming the inaccuracy of their correction and wrongly assuming the agreement of the CLC team with my perspective.”

Bob recorded in the notes at the August 20 meeting, “At times CJ acknowledged he has not received correction from Dave and Brent because he thinks it has been rooted in offense.” In other words, you felt free to dismiss our discernment, input, and observations because you believed we were motivated out of resentment and bitterness.<sup>122</sup> For example, you told me that Dave was bitter because you had Jeff, not him, do the “Called Men” seminar at Celebration East and because you had not assigned him any books to write for Sovereign Grace Ministries. You told me, I was bitter because you reduced the number of courses I taught in the Pastors College. For these kinds of reasons, you never informed the CLC pastors of our input. You believed our observations were inaccurate and motivated by a desire to get back at you. If I may say so, that was ludicrous.

#### “I Do Not Trust You!” – January 2005

Unfortunately, you were not willing to talk at the January 2005 retreat about your e-mail to Steve when you said, “but I am not to know what you [Steve] are thinking and the CLC guys aren’t to be informed that these conversations are taking place until Brent and Dave determine it is appropriate” etc. When I attempted to draw you out, you became angry and emphatically stated, “I do not trust you!”<sup>123</sup> That comment deeply affected me. In context, that meant you did not trust my motives, actions, or

discernment. I let the statement go but came back to it the next day. When I brought it, you denied saying it. Dave and Steve had to correct your recollection.<sup>124</sup> You acquiesced. You went on to qualify your meaning and said “I don’t have confidence in you.”

The next week, I followed up and sent you my November 19 notes from our meeting in Charlotte. We talked by phone on January 19. I asked if we could discuss the content of the notes, but you said there was no need to do so. As a result, I succinctly communicated my concerns for how you were viewing things and for your sinful judgments of us. You disagreed. I also brought up your comment about not trusting me and how strongly you can say things when offended.<sup>125</sup> During our conversation, I also asked if you or Carolyn had been angry at me or resentful of me. You said both of you had been angry and resentful, like anyone else would, but not specifically toward me. The categorical and immediate denial was surreal.<sup>126</sup> There was no self suspicion.

The “I don’t trust you” statement at the retreat was not a new revelation. Steve already informed Dave and me on October 26, 2004 that you didn’t trust our motives or agree with our illustrations. He told us, you believed we were motivated by offenses. In this regard and in contrast to trusting us, Steve said “C.J. does trust his own perceptions.” That is, your perceptions of our hearts.

Before Steve told us this, I already knew trust was an issue for you. We talked about it earlier. On August 6 you wrote.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Friday, August 6, 2004 10:12 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Confidential

One more VERY IMPORTANT POINT. I don’t think I have a “fundamental distrust of you and Dave.” Being tempted to mistrust in just a few areas is very different from a fundamental distrust.

This would be one of the fears I had in calling you. I didn’t want you to proceed to this place as a result of the temptations I experienced.

My friend, after my wife you are on the short list of those I trust the most. So how do we resolve this one?

Trust had become a major issue. In five months, I went from someone you trusted the most to someone you trusted the least. In my April 2004 summary for the Josh, Kenneth, Grant and Bob, I shared six points of concern for you. The first was “Can become resentful, distrustful or withdraw when he feels misunderstood, judged, or

sinned against by others.” This was based upon a sinful tendency I observed over 25 years together. It was also a major concern for Dave.

### C.J. Taking Over the Process Per Steve

I’ve already referenced how you took over the process after the August 20 meeting like you did with Bo in the past. Here are a few more emails regarding your actions.

On September 17 you wrote the following to me, Dave, Steve, Josh, Kenneth, Grant, and Pat.

“In my monthly conversation with Steve yesterday he informed me that he had met with Brent and Dave [at Celebration UK on August 31] to communicate some of his concerns with aspects of the approach and process related to my recent sins. I told Steve that I didn’t need to know or want to know the specifics of his concerns at this point but that he should let the CLC guys know about them at some point. At present I just want to consider my appropriate response to our last meeting together [on August 20] and let you men know what sins I have been convicted about since that.<sup>127</sup> I will draw Steve out at some point in the future after this confession [the October 13 e-mail confession] and hear his perspective.”

Steve responded to you on September 22 saying,

“It is not the responsibility primarily for the one being corrected [C.J.] to continue to influence and direct the process<sup>128</sup>.... I am not sure why you felt it necessary/appropriate to inform the CLC guys and cc Brent and Dave of the same, when I assured you that I would be bringing my thoughts to them at the appropriate time... it would appear, without hearing from you the why questions, that you took it upon yourself to force the issue and discussion, when there was no need for you to... I would encourage you to ask of yourself why you thought this necessary.”

Steve also responded to Dave and me by saying,

“Just got this.... Obviously, I had no clue CJ would send this... [I] don’t believe it was his place to initiate this... especially in light of our complete discussion... [I] will be speaking to CJ regarding this when Milestone Weekend (sure is...) is over... Another example?<sup>129</sup> Any questions, let me know...”

## Dave and Brent's Concerns for Steve

Obviously Dave and I were concerned for the secret conversations and e-mails<sup>130</sup> you were having with Steve. In general, we felt Steve was not serving you well and vice versa. Dave wrote Steve the same day.

"I do have some questions about the timing and manner in which you have chosen to proceed with this [i.e., secretly communicating with you starting August 24 without our knowledge] and also a question about whether you are sufficiently distinguishing major and minor points (and approaching this process in light of those clear distinctions) [i.e., whether Steve was being discerning], but I am fine to wait for some future time for us to discuss.... Admittedly, I was surprised to read CJ's e-mail because I thought it could leave the impression that you were disassociating with Brent and I in the process and that did not appear to be your heart when we spoke on the phone."<sup>131</sup>

Dave wrote me also.

"I would also want to make the point that I would see this as part of a historical pattern where he [Steve] has not discerned sufficiently, nor served CJ with what he does discern and also tends to grant wide latitude to CJ's sins<sup>132</sup> in a way that does not serve CJ. Would you agree with this assessment."

I agreed and these concerns were communicated to Steve and Josh. In this regard, Steve told Dave and me on October 26 that he was "possibility motivated by pride" in wanting to make a "unique contribution" in the process, by "self-righteousness" in having "better discernment" than us, by fear of Brent and Dave, and by wanting "C.J.'s approval."

## Follow Up After the January 2005 Team Retreat

Dave attempted to contact Kenneth after the January retreat to express our concerns from the retreat and to try and understand what things were being covered with you since you were not telling us.

Here is part of Kenneth's response to Dave on February 4. It was copied to Grant, Josh and Bob.

"We are continuing to pursue fellowship with the Mahaney's and see this as a process. We would love for CJ to share with you what we are speaking to him about, and would encourage the team (as a team in this practice) to share what

each pastoral team is bringing to each Apostolic team leader [member], as you pursue fellowship together.

We would also welcome if you thought it would be helpful for CJ to share with us any observations you are bringing to him,<sup>133</sup> that would enable us to serve him better. We are asking him for your assessment of him<sup>134</sup> and how he is doing.

We are making progress, and we don't want to do anything to jeopardize that progress or violate the Mahaney's trust." [This was a constant concern for them. They were afraid to do anything that you'd react to.]<sup>135</sup>

Dave responded to Kenneth on February 17, 2005 and copied Josh, Grant, and Bob. Here are the six questions he raised.

"I guess these would be the questions where I would love to get some feedback from you. Most of them (with the exception of #6) relate to how we should conduct the process from here:

- 1) What should the parameters for involvement be for the CLC guys in the remainder of this process (i.e., process related to the A. Team & CJ)? This seems important to clarify because we may have misunderstood your role and made some incorrect assumptions about how you preferred to be involved.
- 2) It would appear that the CLC guys may be making certain assumptions in their communiqués (past conversations; letter to Brent; etc.) regarding CJ's circulation of what they have shared with him. If I understand correctly, you are assuming that CJ is sharing with the A. Team the areas you are addressing with him. [This never happened.]<sup>136</sup> Is it important in your care for CJ to understand whether this is an accurate assumption?
- 3) It seems as if you are also expecting CJ to share with you the areas of concern communicated by the A. Team. If he is doing this, then I want to make sure that we answer any questions or concerns that you might have for us about what is being shared. If he is not doing this with you, then I wonder why this is not taking place & how you might interpret the omission?
- 4) In reference to #2 & #3, can you help me better understand why it is important for CJ to be the exclusive courier of information<sup>137</sup> between both teams? Would there be any benefit in kicking around whether that is a wise approach in serving a leader of CJ's stature & responsibility?

- 5) What would the resolution process look like for any unresolved areas that might affect the unity of the A. Team or the relationship between an individual A. Team member and CJ (assuming they have been discussed with CJ)? Also, I would love to get your thoughts on what closure should look like for this process.
- 6) Here's a tension that I think exists that I could use your perspective on: I think we've probably thrown some stumbling blocks in CJ's path and that has complicated things. He's had a chance to share these with us and I'm really glad he did. I think it will help us to understand better how to care for him in our supplemental role. But on the other hand, I'm not always sure that CJ is effectively evaluating his impressions of what he is hearing and experiencing from us through what he has confessed. He seems to have a difficult time applying his written confessions of sin to this team (as an example, he has never discussed or referenced the Oct e-mail confession with us even though we brought it up and asked him to talk about it. Seems like you men assumed that he would be doing this also, but perhaps I misunderstood Kenneth's reference in the letter to Brent). I really want to understand this paradox [hypocrisy] better because I think it causes us to see his growth in a slightly different way than you men. (By the way, this has all been shared with him<sup>138</sup> and presumably, he has shared our perspective with you.)<sup>139</sup>

Guys, I understand your reluctance to jump into this side of the pool. Actually, I'm not looking to tread water very long here myself [your anger and resistance deterred all of us] - provided we (the A-team) can be certain that in moving on, we are not compromising our friendship or care for CJ. I guess I'm just not sure what significance to assign to some of the things above. We just don't have the consistent exposure to him that you do, and perhaps this magnifies the apparent inconsistencies.

Kimm spoke with Carolyn yesterday and she mentioned that the Mahaney's are changing Care Group's and that the Bob may be their new Care Group leader.<sup>140</sup> So, if Bob is now "point-man of the month" for the Mahaney (ha, ha), then please feel free to redirect me to him and not Kenneth for this conversation. Whatever you men prefer is fine with me.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns about my approach or attitude. And thanks for your ongoing investment of time and care.

As a result of this e-mail, Kenneth asked Dave to put some recommendations together for how to proceed. Dave asked for Steve and my input. Here is one of the clarifying e-mails I sent Dave and Steve on March 3, 2005.

“To the best of my recollection<sup>141</sup> I make the following general observations since the December 2003 Retreat:

C.J. has not:

1. Initiated or engaged us in discussion as a team on any of the issues that have been raised with him.
2. Informed us as a team of any input or illustrations shared by the CLC men related to issues of character raised with him.
3. Asked forgiveness for any illustrations that have been share with him by us with the exception of the situation with Bo and Tyler.
4. Acknowledged any sinful judgments toward us.
5. Acknowledged any resentment, bitterness, or anger toward us.

On March 9, Dave wrote C.J., Josh, Kenneth, Bob and Grant with the following recommendations for how to proceed. Given the lack of progress, Dave was trying to bring closure but with some integrity.

“Thanks for your counsel and participation in shaping this recommendation [below]. We hope it is self-explanatory, but please get back to us if you have any questions or clarifications...

Recommendations for Proceeding:<sup>142</sup>

1. CJ sits with the CLC guys prior to the March A. Team retreat and discusses the questions below.
2. CJ shares the notable outcomes of this discussion with the A. Team at the retreat.
3. The A. Team members interact with CJ over this meeting and provide any additional encouragement, questions or thoughts.
4. The A. Team members can, if they so desire, elect to summarize remaining thoughts/concerns in a brief (bullets!) e-mail. This will be sent to CJ and

CLC guys. No follow up will be necessary unless CJ and/or the CLC guys deem it necessary.

5. At CJ's discretion, the A. Team prays together entrusting all perspectives and remaining questions to God.

Remaining Questions for Discussion:<sup>143</sup>

1. The A. Team would not be aware of the major areas of focus or concern where the CLC guys are seeking to serve CJ...and we are not sure if you are aware of the categories we have been visiting with CJ either. Moreover, it would not appear to us that CJ is sufficiently intentional at initiating dialogue or disclosing important illustrations in a way that would help us understand his clarity of soul and deepen our experience of fellowship. Could CJ & the CLC guys discuss whether it is reasonable for us to expect him to initiate these conversations and relate the notable patterns of sin being discussed in this season?
2. Returning back to Brent's question posed to the CLC guys, "Should C.J. have talked to us about his e-mail confession of October 13 so we could understand how he came to see the things he acknowledged? Did any of the things acknowledged have a personal bearing upon us?" Perhaps CJ and the CLC guys could dialogue about why this might be an important exercise and why this confession was not discussed or applied to the A. Team.
3. In the summary for CJ, the CLC guys indicated that though you don't know his motives, CJ can at times appear to become withdrawn or resentful when he feels sinned against or misunderstood by others. This potential pattern is a remaining concern for the A. Team. Are there any specific areas/illustrations or patterns where the CLC guys have observed that CJ may have become resentful or withdrawn in respect to A. Team members?<sup>144</sup> How would the CLC guys & CJ recommend we engage in a profitable conversation around this area?
4. The A. Team needs to establish an understanding - applicable to all - that recognizes the need to occasionally discuss the care or perspective of A. Team members with the people entrusted with primary pastoral care (CJ to Mark Prater or Mickey; A. Team member to Kenneth/Bob, etc). What advice would you & CJ have for us towards sharpening our approach in this area?

Shortly afterward Dave talked with Kenneth and Bob<sup>145</sup> about these recommendations. Dave filled Steve and me in on March 24. Here are my notes.

- Dave told us that “C.J. and CLC guys had problems with the questions”<sup>146</sup> [i.e., the four “Remaining Questions for Discussion” above]. Dave felt we were “coming up against a different understanding of humility and what leadership looks like.” They “saw [Dave’s] questions as unhelpful” and “had more questions from the questions.” Dave said “C.J. was not at a high level of faith to talk about these things” and “feels he is doing the things addressed in our questions.”<sup>147</sup> For instance, “C.J. thinks we covered and talked about his October 13 e-mail confession.” [We never talked about this confession.]<sup>148</sup>
- Dave went onto say he “does not have confidence in moving forward with our [planned] conversation tomorrow with C.J.” If we did “C.J. would like for Bob and Kenneth to be there on phone call.” Dave reiterated he “does not have any faith for discussion tomorrow.”<sup>149</sup>

Steve and I agreed with Dave. We “were coming up against a different understanding of humility” at least when applied to you. You were resentful that we asked these kinds of questions. These questions should have been embraced. Bob and Kenneth treated you partially and shielded you instead of holding you accountable. No one else in the movement could have gotten away with this kind of response. Dave wrote you the same day saying, “After taking counsel with our friends at CLC and your fellow A. Team members, we no longer think it profitable or advisable to cover the questions tomorrow.” As a result, the phone call was cancelled.<sup>150</sup>

Dave, Steve and I were all concerned with what was taking place. As we talked, I referenced concerns from my time with you back in November 2004 in Charlotte. They asked for my notes. As a result, I e-mailed you on March 26 to ask for permission.

“Dave and Steve have wondered what your assessment of my leadership was on November 19 when we met in Charlotte. I assume the same is true of Kenneth and Bob. May I send them a copy of my January 19 response [from our November 19 meeting] to you? Of course, I’d want you to feel completely free to express any and all concerns or disagreements with them concerning my response [in contrast to your forbidding us the same freedom]. I do not need to be present or copied for this [in contrast to your requirement to be present in all conversations]. I have no desire to press any of these points. I would simply like to make them aware so they have a more complete picture of things.”

You wrote back the same day and said, "I will pass it along to Bob and Kenneth." I wrote back and said "Thanks C.J. I will pass it on to Steve and Dave." As it turned out, your response to me was deceitful because you had long before passed on the notes to Kenneth and Bob without my knowledge. I had no problem with Bob and Kenneth having the notes - just the opposite - but I did have problems with your dishonesty.

In this regard, I wrote Bob on May 3, 2005 inquiring, "If I may ask, have you shared any concerns [regarding dishonesty] you may have with C.J. on this matter or will this be new to him?" Bob wrote back, "I have asked him numerous questions about his response [pretending to not have passed on the notes] and think it would be helpful for you two to talk." You never acknowledged leading me to believe you did not give them the notes.<sup>151</sup>

### Bob and Kenneth Request a Meeting with Brent - March 30, 2005

While teaching at the Pastors College, I received a message that Bob and Kenneth wanted to meet with me. I was hopeful they were interested in hearing my perspective on how things had deteriorated and why. Instead, they came to confront and reprove me. They started by saying my notes from November 19 were "unhelpful and unwise" and that I was "proud in my responses to C.J.'s critique."<sup>152</sup> They expressed no concerns for the issues I raised in the notes and expressed no interest in hearing my perspective on things addressed in the notes.<sup>153</sup>

I pointed out that they had heard your perspective and interpretation for the past seven months (September 04-March 05). During that time, Dave and I repeatedly tried to set up phone calls, meetings, or retreats so all of us could talk and share perspectives and concerns. All these requests were denied. I pointed out how we regularly asked for and received their evaluation but how they never asked for our evaluation. They were not responsive to this point at the time.

I also pointed out you had (1) not initiated or engaged us in discussion on any of the issues we raised on August 20 or from the April 04 summaries, (2) not informed us of any input or illustrations shared with you by the CLC men related to issues of character, (3) not asked our forgiveness for any illustrations we shared (with the exception of Bo and Tyler), (4) not acknowledged any sinful judgments, and (5) not acknowledged any resentment, bitterness or anger toward us. Bob and Kenneth expressed no concern for these things.<sup>154</sup> In your defense, they said you told them you had talked to us about the October 13 e-mail confession. That was a lie.<sup>155</sup> We have never talked about that confession to this day.

After I shared these points, Kenneth reproved me by quoting 1 Timothy 5:1, "Do not rebuke an older man." I was stunned. For one thing, Kenneth should know you are not

an “older man.” We are the same age, came to Christ at the same time, and been in ministry the same number of years. That aside, Kenneth used this passage to silence me. I did not yield to him and communicated to both of them my extreme concern for their attitude and approach.<sup>156</sup> When Kenneth quoted 1 Timothy 5:1, I immediately thought of all the men in ministry who have used “touch not God’s anointed” to avoid accountability.

It seemed apparent they had taken up an offense<sup>157</sup> for you and set up the meeting to adjust me. There was no openness to anything I said. They were oppositional to each of my concerns. They appeared to be turning a blind eye. I don’t know if they were sent by you to correct me. If they were, I’d consider that an abusive use of your position and authority.<sup>158</sup>

### Brent’s Job Performance Evaluation by C.J. – April 2005

A few days after my meeting with Bob and Kenneth, you filled out my annual job performance evaluation. You indicated there were no evidences of grace in my life with regard to being open or transparent, identifying sin; inviting, receiving or considering correction; or asking for input for my personal, married and ministry life. These characteristics were non-existent in my life. In contrast and at the same time, all the men on my regional team, who filled out the same form, gave me good to great marks in these categories. Larry Malament wrote you about this discrepancy.

**From:** Larry Malament  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 07, 2005 3:49 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Evaluation

Hi C.J.

Today Brent and I met for accountability and he passed on to me your recent evaluation of him from the “Job Review Form”. It was concerning for me as I read your evaluation of Brent regarding the following:

1. Revealing and transparent: **weak**
2. Regularly invites correction: **weak**
3. Receives correction humbly: **weak**
4. Willing to consider correction: **weak**
5. Sets example of identifying sin: **weak**
6. Invites and seeks input in married life, personal: **weak**
7. Invites and seeks input for ministry effectiveness: **weak**

It would be helpful to me if you could provide some examples and explanations of how you came to your evaluation so I can discuss these with Brent in more depth. The way the form reads, when weak is checked it communicates these character qualities are not present since the next box that can be checked says, **Present but needs work**. Would that also be your assessment of these areas in Brent's life? Thanks for the help. I trust this will serve Brent. Although your evaluation would not be my present experience (a few years ago during the transition [when I turned CrossWay over to Mickey] I would have seen "some" of these weaknesses present in Brent), I know you see him in a different context and in different situations where these issues seem to be revealed as you observe him. Any examples and input would be helpful. Thanks for doing this.

Larry was concerned for your evaluation because this was not his experience with me (he had one example from 3 years earlier). He also wanted to confirm that you really thought these virtues were entirely absent in my life. That's why he asked, "Would that also be your assessment ["not present" versus "present but needs work"] of these areas in Brent's life?" I will come back to this illustration later but here is how you responded.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 07, 2005 5:38 PM  
**To:** Larry Malament  
**Subject:** RE: Evaluation

I will let you know when/whether I can do this.

I think it might be helpful if you set up a time to talk with Bob and Kenneth together to get their perspective of a recent time they had with Brent where they were sharing observations with him.

Thanks for the way you serve him and care for him.

My disagreement with Bob and Kenneth on March 30, 2005 was, and continues to be, used against me as an example<sup>159</sup> of pride and unteachableness. I'd suggest the harsh evaluation<sup>160</sup> of me was due to your bitterness toward me.

### Brent's Fall from (Sovereign) Grace

This evaluation was in stark contrast to seven months earlier when you ardently proposed I take a much greater leadership role with the apostolic team and take

pastoral responsibility for the team. I quickly went from “someone...with more character” on August 9 (see below) to someone with practically no character. Around the same time, or a little later, you sent me a prelease copy of your book, *Humility: True Greatness*. Inside you wrote the following note: “With my gratefulness for your example of humility and your friendship!” Overnight, I went from “an example of humility” to the epitome of pride. August 20 mark a radical change in our relationship and my responsibilities.<sup>161</sup> Gradually my role was decreased at conferences, in the Pastors College, etc. The following documents my fall from grace.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 5, 2004 3:46 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** An idea

My friend,

I have been working on some stuff for the next team call next week and I had an idea I wanted to know if you could consider. If necessary let’s talk about this because it is hard to reduce this to a short e-mail. Here is my idea. Because of my limitations and deficiencies in relation to planning/administration how about if you take responsibility for assembling the agenda for each team phone call and then leading us through the agenda during the call?

You are undeniably gifted at this and I am undeniably not so this would serve me and I think the team.... What do you think? If you agree I’d like to propose it next Friday [at the August 20 meeting at CLC].

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Friday, August 06, 2004 7:25 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler; Dave Harvey; Steve Shank; Pat Ennis; Joshua Harris  
**Subject:** Team Phone Call

I wanted to prepare you for an idea I’d like to propose next week during our call that I think will serve us all. Since this stuff is much easier to talk about and more effectively communicated over the phone I will make this e-mail brief.

I think it would serve me and more importantly the team, Sovereign Grace and the entire world if Brent became responsible for obtaining and formulating our agenda for each meeting and retreat and then leading the discussion of each item during the phone call or retreat. Here’s the short reason why. Brent is gifted in administration and I am not...

I think we will all benefit from this since Brent can help with all the broader planning, push along stuff I forget about and I could go on and on. So for your own sake, for the sake of your families, for my sake, for the sake of Sovereign Grace and for all mankind I hope you will agree to at least experiment with this for a season. And if Brent doesn't do a good job I can fire him at any time.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Monday, August 09, 2004 9:42 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Confidential

Just want you to keep current with my thinking. I haven't heard from Steve and Pat yet but I am going to appeal for at least an experiment with you and this new role on Friday. I can't think of any reason why not to do this and given the clear lack of gifting and character in my life there is no reason to postpone this in my opinion. I think you will do a GREAT job formulating and preparing the agenda and leading our calls/retreat discussions with my help.... Also, though I won't propose this on Friday, I am going to eventually propose (sometime in the near future) that you take responsibility for the team pastorally.... So I think God's intention for this process is not only my personal sanctification but to reposition me according to the gifts he has given me, have someone more gifted and with more character<sup>162</sup> serve the team more effectively in providing administration and personal care and ultimately expanding Sovereign Grace for His glory.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 10, 2004 7:10 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Well, I will present this to them once I hear from you my friend. Would you like to serve me and the team in these ways? I would really like you to and I think you would do a great job.<sup>163</sup>

As for pastoral care you and Jenny would become responsible for the 3 couples [Mahaney, Harvey, and Shank] but remember this is supplemental not primary care. So you and Jenny can work out how often you want to talk with each guy and each wife. I don't think you need to do this more than 4 to 6 times a year and actually less because of our couple's retreats.... And you would be responsible for any end of the year evaluation with the respective pastoral team like you've done with me. I haven't done this so you can pioneer how you

want to do this with the other two guys. We can work out the details and specifics easily. So are you open to serving me/team in this administrative and pastoral capacity?

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 12, 2004 7:32 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Admin/Pastoring

I understand your caution and concern but I really think these changes are God's will and for the good of the team. They position me according to my gifts my friend. Carolyn agrees...

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 14, 2004 9:58 AM  
**To:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank  
**Cc:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Confidential

Dave and Steve (and Brent),

As I am sure you are aware I did not attempt to cover the item on my list about a new role for Brent yesterday. Given the length of the agenda and other concerns I didn't think it wise to devote time to discuss this yesterday. Also, I think at least one of you recommended we not devote time to this due to all the agenda items.

Actually I think the best way to proceed (and there is no urgency with this decision) is to meet with each of you guys personally and give my perspective about a possible new administrative/pastoral role for Brent on the team.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 14, 2004 10:19 AM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

I'm sure Brent would do a great job. Look forward to talking with you.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 14, 2004 12:31 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Brent Detwiler; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

.....Just one additional thought on the timing of this (you may have already considered this so just disregard if so): One challenge is that it makes it more difficult to explore the legitimacy of whether you tend to withdraw (withdraw in the sense of putting a kind of distance between yourself and those challenging you) in response to this kind of corrective feedback because you are proposing a functional re-structure at the same time we are serving you in the process. This can complicate things since we have not had the opportunity to discover whether this is a pattern worthy of attention nor to evaluate to what extent (if any) your present proposal might be influenced by your temptations. While I can fully support a new role for Brent at any time (he is certainly worthy and qualified!), it may be wiser to have the opportunity to talk about and consider the legitimacy of that perspective before you move to adjust your pastoral or functional relationship with any of us.

Dave's Comment at August 20 Mtg.  
Taken from Bob's Notes

"We all think CJ should lead us to a wise process that results in a restructuring. Also agree that Brent is eminently qualified to take on any responsibility CJ would desire. To discuss this in the middle of this process is awkward and unwise. This might be a good illustration of what tends to happen when CJ is corrected, at least from Dave's perspective. It would be better if CJ was inquiring about where he has been deficient, and then communicating that he wants to change. Ultimately, that response doesn't contribute to the building of the team. "

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 24, 2004 12:01 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler; Dave Harvey; Steve Shank; Pat Ennis  
**Cc:** Joshua Harris  
**Subject:** Confidential

Josh informed me that Kenneth spoke to Brent and Dave after our meeting last week (Steve I wasn't told whether you were included) and appealed that my proposal to have Brent replace me and become pastorally responsible for the

team be adopted. Well this whole thing certainly isn't going as I planned it.... Carolyn thinks this change is wise and should be made but she thought I should wait and not make this proposal at this time. Josh thinks the proposal has merit but he thought I should wait as well. And you know what Kenneth thinks. So I do wish I would have waited but I thought this would strengthen the team and hopefully draw us closer together.

### The Home Stretch - April thru November 2005

This section documents how the long process that began in December 2000 came to an end. Simply put, Dave and I gave up. The wagons had circled. You were entangled in the very patterns of sin we brought up over the previous five years. Sadly, nothing was ever resolved. Dave's four "Remaining Questions for Discussion" were never discussed. Bob's correction of me continued while ignoring our concerns for him and you. Here is the e-mail trail.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Date:** Sunday, April 17, 2005 8:09 AM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin  
**Cc:** Kenneth Maresco; C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

...I will be glad to circulate this [Bob's question below] to the team, but my sense is that we have determined to move on and that this might be best.... Also, there would probably need to be a discussion between the A. Team and you [Bob] and Kenneth that would precede the process below. But again, I think that could wait as well.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 30, 2005 2:58 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** FW: Confidential

Before I get back to Bob and clarify that I believe I am supposed to keep my mouth shut for a while, but nevertheless giving into a momentary bout of lunacy in asking this question...what are your thoughts on Bob's question about unaddressed areas or conversations needed?

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Friday, May 06, 2005 4:23 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

I'd communicate we don't have the freedom to address issues in C.J.'s life given his assessment of our motives (that we are offended) and our accuracy (that we are sinfully judging). We are going into "retirement" ...to quote a phrase.

Fast forward from May to August. Dave again expressed his fundamental concerns for you, and Bob in particular, since Bob was directing the process.

From: Dave Harvey  
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2004 3:37 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Confidential: RE: Dinner on Aug 20<sup>th</sup>

-  
I have not written this assuming it will be circulated. Should you ever desire this, I will craft it accordingly. [I appreciated Dave's unvarnished honesty here] Here's my quick thoughts:

-  
As you may recall, I've never been comfortable with the development of this position [that we can't talk to the CLC pastors about C.J. and they can't talk to us about C.J. unless C.J. is the courier of information or personally present], particularly as it relates to guys with substantial responsibility (like us on the A. Team and also Sr. Pastors). I think the effect is basically to protect the guy under critique<sup>164</sup> rather than to facilitate the communication of perspective. I understand the rebuttal, "Can't we all just move beyond our fear of man and share our thoughts like men are supposed to do" OR "it gets too confusing because things are shared that can't be addressed or reviewed by the guy under scrutiny." My response is three fold:

- 1) It's a fallen world and even the best leaders will share more freely without us there. Our hope is not in participating or overseeing the dialogue but in the guy (for instance, Josh or Brent) leading the meeting. I would also say that what has been revealed about how much the CLC guys were bringing [which was very little] to CJ under the system he was advocating would be additional evidence for my point. It doesn't appear as if there was a healthy exchange. If I'm CJ, I might now want an extended period of time to advocate a 'no restriction policy' on guys talking to one another for my benefit [you were doing the opposite].
- 2) Secondly, it was us pulling the CLC guys together without CJ that ultimately resulted in the movement forward. Had that not happened, I wonder where

we would presently be. So I think the opposite approach is bearing the better fruit right now.

- 3) It is more confusing perhaps, but it is better than things not being said at all. I'm not advocating we establish a habit of doing meetings apart from the guys being addressed. I'm simply advocating that a discipline process, even a modified one such as the one we are presently in, sometimes necessitates these kinds of meetings and conversations. There are also other times where it is appropriate for guys to discuss someone not present. To me, and I could be wrong here, Josh being concerned to meet with us because of how CJ desires these kinds of things does not seem healthy or profitable.<sup>165</sup>

- I think CJ's position on not meeting apart from him is something he established, but never really discussed with us, so I wonder whether that needs to re-examined. This is partly because I wonder how much of it may have been influenced by the sin he is confessing<sup>166</sup>.... and partially for the reasons I already sent you in the e-mail excerpts below last summer:

- 
- a. "If some of Dave and Brent's perceptions are accurate, then CJ's presence may actually discourage productive dialogue [because of sinful reactions]. Also, if folks are excessively concerned with 'how' they say things, then things may not get said. [Everyone was very concerned with what they said so as not to offend or anger you.]<sup>167</sup>
- b. The reason why it may not be wise for CJ to meet with teams without the Sr. Pastor present is that - in my opinion - it does not play to CJ's strengths (a tendency towards 'haste' in process, conclusions and communication ...?) [i.e., sinful judgments]. I'm not sure that this same issue would be (or has been) a serious factor with the rest of the apostolic team meeting with pastoral teams, nor do I think that CJ's new position is one we want to advocate for our extended teams. I wouldn't want to draw a universal conclusion on the practice because CJ - due, I believe, to his style and approach - had unfruitful experiences. It seems as if you and I, and our local teams, are saying that this had to do with CJ's approach...not the overall practice. If we did make this change (only dialogue with teams with senior guys present), I would want to talk about it and ratify it as a team. It seems as if CJ may be taking his assumptions and making it policy. [Later, this "policy" was not applied by you to others. For instance, beginning in June 2006 you frequently met without me to talk about me. This was particularly hypocritical given how adamant you were about this requirement.]<sup>168</sup>
- c. I believe the approach CJ is advocating may be more expedient (just gather everyone together and throw it out on the table) but I'm not sure it results in a clearer pursuit of helpful observations and perspective. I don't think

that expedience should be a primary factor in the approach we choose here.”

I hope these ramblings serve you in some way. Also, I hope we have a chance to talk about this at some point, but I understand if it does not seem like a priority. Lastly, I understand if you think this dinner meeting may not be wise. However there may be some benefit in you & I connecting over dinner (we could cover a # of other things besides CJ as well!!)

**From:** Bob Kauflin  
**Sent:** Friday, August 19, 2005 4:36 PM  
**To:** Steve Shank; Brent Detwiler; Dave Harvey  
**Cc:** Kenneth Maresco  
**Subject:** Confidential

Gentlemen,

Thanks for taking the time to talk today. It was helpful to hear your perspectives on how we might have served you better through this process. [Bob thanked us but didn't acknowledge our concerns as legitimate.<sup>169</sup> For instance, our concern for a “culture of accommodation” whereby you were held to a different standard.] We deeply care for CJ and each of you men, and trust that what we've learned will serve us in the future.

As to another time to talk, these would be what I think we might accomplish, the Lord helping us:

1. Kenneth and I finish responding to the 4 points from the “Looking Forward” [i.e., Dave's four Remaining Questions for Discussion] document. Those are attached [see below].
2. Kenneth and I share perspectives/ask questions/hear from you on how this process unfolded.
3. Discuss ways we can most effectively serve CJ and the team and you can serve each other in the days to come.

That's what I'm thinking. If you have any thoughts as to the wisdom of this, please let me know. If you have any other suggestions, I'd be happy to hear those as well.

Otherwise, I'll have Rakel set up a phone call sometime in September. Judging from today, I'd allow three hours.

I thank God for each of you and the way God has used you to glorify our Savior.

“Four Remaining Concerns” [i.e., Remaining Questions for Discussion] from Dave on March 9, 2005 on behalf of Steve and Brent

[A year had passed since August 20, 2004 and these issues were still unanswered or not discussed. This was unprecedented.]<sup>170</sup>

1. The A. Team would not be aware of the major areas of focus or concern where the CLC guys are seeking to serve CJ...and we are not sure if you are aware of the categories we have been visiting with CJ either. Moreover, it would not appear to us that CJ is sufficiently intentional at initiating dialogue or disclosing important illustrations in a way that would help us understand his clarity of soul and deepen our experience of fellowship. Could CJ & the CLC guys discuss whether it is reasonable for us to expect him to initiate these conversations & relate the notable patterns of sin being discussed in this season?
2. Returning back to Brent's question posed to the CLC guys, "Should C.J. have talked to us about his e-mail confession of October 13 so we could understand how he came to see the things he acknowledged? Did any of the things acknowledged have a personal bearing upon us?" Perhaps CJ and the CLC guys could dialogue about why this might be an important exercise and why this confession was not discussed or applied to the A. Team.
3. In the summary for CJ, the CLC guys indicated that though you don't know his motives, CJ can at times appear to become withdrawn or resentful when he feels sinned against or misunderstood by others. This potential pattern is a remaining concern for the A. Team. Are there any specific areas/illustrations or patterns where the CLC guys have observed that CJ may have become resentful or withdrawn in respect to A. Team members? How would the CLC guys & CJ recommend we engage in a profitable conversation around this area?
4. The A. Team needs to establish an understanding - applicable to all - that recognizes the need to occasionally discuss the care or perspective of A. Team members with the people entrusted with primary pastoral care (CJ to Mark Prater or Mickey; A. Team member to Kenneth/Bob, etc). What advice would you & CJ have for us towards sharpening our approach in this area?"

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Date:** Friday, August 19, 2005 4:08 PM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin, Kenneth Maresco  
**Cc:** Dave Harvey, Steve Shank  
**Subject:** Confidential - Input & Confession

These are the comments I had in mind [during the phone call today] when illustrating our lack of awareness as to the kinds of issues you were following up with C.J. on, or he was pursuing you on, after the August 20 mtg.

- Josh            Has shared those specifics with CJ in other contexts. In August, there was a marked change in the specificity of his confession. He realized that we didn't often hear the specifics of conflict between CJ and Carolyn.
- Kenneth        Things have definitely changed in regards to specificity, but he hasn't been personally involved in helping CJ with his marriage.
- Kenneth        Hasn't seen the specificity in confession that others have demonstrated.
- Josh            We're seeing CJ's reaction to observations in a new way because we're bringing observations more frequently and specifically.
- Grant           There are various issues in CJ's life that he hasn't received input well on. In general, Grant feels CJ hasn't had enough accountability, and allowed the A-team and the CLC pastors to believe the other group was taking care of it. This has been a longstanding issue.
- Grant           Sanctification is in the details. Generally speaking, these are categories that CJ has led us in. Seems like details have been lacking.
- Kenneth        Seems like CJ's comfortable with his own assessment.
- Grant           That's how you draw others into the conversation and into your life. In specific areas, Grant hasn't heard CJ confess sin, like lust. Lack of specificity will keep CJ from growing.

I've also added some comments from Josh during a June 15, 2004 phone conversation.

#### Josh's Comments

- In the past the context for focused observations has not been present - C.J. provides input for others and not the other way around.
- Josh changing his mind set and approach in how they care for the Mahaney's.
- We are not in settings where C.J. confesses specific sin especially related to marriage.
- Confessions more on the level of schedule
- "Maybe C.J. doesn't sin as much as we do."

**From:** Bob Kauflin  
**Sent:** Fri 8/19/2005 4:34 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Re: Confidential - Input & Confession

Thanks, Brent.

It would help me if you told me what these e-mails are supposed to say to me. Do you think that our/my assessment of CJ's past accountability is off?...

Thanks. By the way, your encouragement was very meaningful. I wouldn't be doing what I'm doing apart from your example of care and biblical faithfulness.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Date:** Friday, August 19, 2005 5:43 PM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Input & Confession

Sorry for the lack of clarity. I brought this up today as an illustration of something we never heard more about since Aug 20. That is, was there further conversation regarding your perspective of C.J. in these areas and did he agree or disagree. I've/we've assumed C.J. has drawn each of you out on your comments from the Aug 20 mtg. but we don't know if that ever happen.<sup>171</sup> I sent the notes because I was not able to clearly articulate my reference to those things from memory today.

**From:** Bob Kauflin  
**Sent:** Friday, August 19, 2005 6:06 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Re: Confidential - Communication

Brent,

I wonder if this is part of the problem.<sup>172</sup> You're looking for more specifics, but I'm not sure you're going to get them. [This was a sad commentary on Bob's perspective. Our expectations were quite reasonable.<sup>173</sup>

We've attempted to celebrate where CJ has been seeing his sin, helping him apply it to new and past situations, and moving on, encouraged by the Spirit's work in his life.... I wonder if you place too much emphasis on the illustrations<sup>174</sup> you've brought up and can't rejoice in what God is doing in CJ... [We wanted to rejoice but you were not even talking to us. All our illustrations were discounted. These comments by Bob were so misguided. He had lost all objectivity.]<sup>175</sup> which would be understandable if you think he's not responding to correction or making attempts to see his sin... [You were not responding to us and there were no attempts to acknowledge your sin. Just the opposite was true.]

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 21, 2005 10:47 PM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Communication

If it helps, I think I am just limited in being able "to see or to rejoice in the changes." Since August of last year [a full year], we haven't talked as a team about issues related to C.J.... Given these circumstances, it's hard to be aware of his growth in grace. You are able to engage him and observe him regularly. That is not something we are doing. So please know, I rejoice in the good reports you have given and in all the changes you have observed.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2005 3:55 PM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin  
**Cc:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank; Kenneth Maresco  
**Subject:** CONFIDENTIAL - Expectations

In re-reading your e-mail, I recognized I didn't respond to your inquiry about [sinful] expectations.<sup>176</sup> It would be my view that C.J. has not responded well to us as a team since the August 20, 2004 mtg. That certainly doesn't mean he hasn't responded or that there are no evidences of grace. I also realize and respect the fact that you have a different view born out of your own experience. I rejoice in this.

It would also be my perspective that some things have apparently gone unaddressed by you men with C.J. Granted, I know little about what you have covered over the past 12 months. I am aware, however, there are important matters (in my opinion) we have never heard from back from C.J. on. Having made these points, I nevertheless thank you for your exhortation to evaluate whether my expectations are sinful [which is what Bob told me during August 19 phone call]. Though I have not been convicted of sin, I do not dismiss your concern. I share it.

I don't think there is profit in rehearsing the points above. I have communicated my observations and concerns in person and in print to everyone involved. As I expressed during my March 30, 2005 meeting with you and Kenneth, I have committed these things to God knowing we have all attempted to glorify God in this difficult process. I also realize and regret that I have served C.J. poorly at points in this process [e.g., using the word "lambasted," taking an 1 hour 20 minutes for the overview on August 20]. Thanks my friend for the care you have extended to all concerned.

I am saddened that C.J. feels I have been motivated by offense.<sup>177</sup> but I also know of his love and continue to count it a great honor to serve and encourage him in whatever ways the Lord permits in the future.

After our August 19 phone call with Bob and Kenneth, Dave recommended the following course of action.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 30, 2005 5:16 PM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin; Steve Shank; Brent Detwiler  
**Cc:** Kenneth Maresco  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Hi guys. I've had an opportunity to ponder our last conversation, reflect upon the flurry of follow-up e-mails and consider the way forward. Although I am more humbled than ever by my ignorance, I would like to offer the following observations:

In my opinion,

Our communication around these issues, while deeply appreciated, does not appear to be producing the kind of clarity that justifies the time and effort necessary.

It appears to me that the conversations that Bob recommends below may have already taken place. Perhaps I am just speaking for myself but I have now had a number of conversations with Kenneth and Bob, some of which have included the points below. I am assuming the same is true for Brent and Steve, but that may not be a correct assumption. However it seems as if we now find ourselves re-stating perspectives and concerns without a distinct sense of what God wants us to understand and pursue. I wonder whether we just need more time to ponder what has already been said as we look to God and our own hearts.

I think we should follow Bob and Kenneth's advice and pursue any conversation over remaining concerns with CJ. This would not necessarily eliminate the additional step of any of us discussing them with Bob and/or Kenneth. But I think this step should be done individually (if at all) [Dave was going silent.] and not as a group. I intend to contact Bob soon to arrange a time to talk or connect in some way.

Please feel free to get back to me with any thoughts or disagreements you have on these observations. And let me close by once again thanking Bob and Kenneth for their tireless efforts and abiding desire to serve us. Bob and Kenneth, I'm sure I speak for Brent and Steve when I say that your intentions and your care are deeply felt and appreciated.

**From:** Dave Harvey

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 30, 2005 5:27 PM

**To:** Brent Detwiler

**Subject:** RE: Confidential

In other words, if we want to pursue dialogue with Bob and/or Kenneth over this, we should do it individually and not as a group. Remaining concerns for CJ should be shared with CJ but don't necessarily need to be discussed in a meeting convened with Bob and Kenneth.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 30, 2005 5:27 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

...Can you share any fuller your thoughts as to why you arrived at this? No obligation. Welcome home...hope you had a good vacation.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 30, 2005 5:39 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

As you may recall, I had circulated word prior to our last discussion that I did not think the team approach was bearing fruit in our approach to CJ and that I didn't think I wanted to participate in that way any longer. However, out of concern for our current state, I subordinated this sense to see what kind of fruit might come of our conversation (Bob, Kenneth and A. Team). In reflecting on that conversation and considering another one, it seems we have taken that approach as far as it will go.<sup>178</sup> I think future conversations will probably result in restatements of things already said but not necessarily move us down the road at all. I don't know what does work, but maybe we can eliminate options until we arrive at the best approach.

Any thoughts?

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 31, 2005 3:10 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

I typically don't remember anything you say ☺...though on occasion it might have some limited value.

A few thoughts. First, I don't think Bob and Kenneth see how a lack of response to our request for involvement [e.g. asking to meet with them and you] during the process negatively impacted the process. Second, it doesn't appear they share our concern for a "culture of accommodation." [They applied a double standard to you.] Third, they seem to have accepted C.I.'s view that we have been talking [as a team] and he has been filling us in since last August

[which never happened]. Fourth, they don't seem interested in our observations of C.J.<sup>179</sup>

Therefore, it is hard to press ahead with any sense of faith. Thanks my friend for all your thoughts and leadership to date. I am so grateful to God for you!

**From:** Brent Detwiler

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 31, 2005 3:20 PM

**To:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank; Kenneth Maresco, Bob Kauflin

**Subject:** Confidential

Bob & Kenneth,

I appreciate your willingness to ask for feedback during our phone call. I'd agree with Dave, I don't think additional time need be invested<sup>180</sup> in this process. We have sought to discuss the salient points and hear one another out. Thank you for your friendship and care toward us all and especially C.J.

Brent

**From:** Dave Harvey

**Sent:** Monday, September 12, 2005 7:38 AM

**To:** Bob Kauflin

**Cc:** Kenneth Maresco; Brent Detwiler; Steve Shank

**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Bob,

I need a bit of time to ponder how to proceed in serving this process.... A few passing thoughts that I hope will bring clarity...Personally, I would now advocate less concern on your part over how things are brought to CJ and more attention to certain issues that have been put on the table, but I'm not entrenched in a conviction that I am right...Your observations that I have been unclear are confusing to me<sup>181</sup> in light of our many conversations and the four questions for closure that I summarized on behalf of the team. Also, I think you may recall how often I have raised the possibility of an undetected pattern of behavior in CJ that translates into 'withdrawal' when he feels misunderstood or sinned against. I understand that you don't think this word is a helpful one and that CJ doesn't see this particular issue... From here, I want to pray and ponder the helpfulness of a more thorough response over against whether it just serves more to allow closure on this note and live with the lack of clarity and/or disagreement...

From: Bob Kauflin  
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2005 10:19 AM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: Confidential

Your words of encouragement are very meaningful, Brent. I thought you said PLENTY at the conference!

I'd love to talk to you some time about your relationship with CJ<sup>182</sup> and any loose ends that remain, as you've mentioned in previous e-mails. Let me know what you think.

Also, how do you think the recent retreat went? Appreciate you much.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Date: Thu, 3 Nov 2005 15:49:17 -0500  
To: Bob Kauflin  
Conversation: Confidential  
Subject: RE: Confidential

Retreat went well.... No "loose ends" I haven't already shared. You're welcome to send me any new thoughts.

Thanks  
Brent

**From:** Bob Kauflin  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 26, 2005 5:14 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Re: Confidential

Thanks, Brent. Sorry this is taking so long to get back to you.

As far as "loose ends," I'm speaking of the loose ends you have already shared. Specifically:

August 22 [2005] e-mail

“It would also be my perspective that some things have apparently gone unaddressed by you men with C.J. Granted, I know little about what you have covered over the past 12 months. I am aware, however, there are important matters (in my opinion) we have never heard from back from C.J. on.”

I’m not sure what we haven’t addressed, and the important issues you want to hear back from CJ on<sup>183</sup>... Thanks for all you do to serve Sovereign Grace, Brent. More importantly, thanks for seeking to live a life worthy of the Gospel.

This final response from Bob on November 26, 2005 was distressing. I knew very little about what Bob, Kenneth, etc. covered with you over the 12 months. Why did I know so little? First, because they were unwilling to fill us in due to the restrictions placed upon them by you that you must always be present. Second, because you were withholding the information from us. This goes to the heart of Dave’s first question that was left unanswered.

“The A. Team would not be aware of the major areas of focus or concern where the CLC guys are seeking to serve CJ...and we are not sure if you are aware of the categories we have been visiting with CJ either. Moreover, it would not appear to us that CJ is sufficiently intentional at initiating dialogue or disclosing important illustrations in a way that would help us understand his clarity of soul and deepen our experience of fellowship. Could CJ & the CLC guys discuss whether it is reasonable for us to expect him to initiate these conversations & relate the notable patterns of sin being discussed in this season?”

It was also shocking for Bob to ask, “I am not sure what...important issues you [Brent] want to hear back from CJ on?” After fifteen months of repeated appeals, Bob was oblivious to one of our major concerns. That is, you never getting back to us on anything even though directed to do so. Furthermore, Bob labeled my “expectations” as “sinful.” This goes to the heart of Dave’s second question that was left unanswered.

“Returning back to Brent’s question posed to the CLC guys, “Should C.J. have talked to us about his e-mail confession of October 13 so we could understand how he came to see the things he acknowledged? Did any of the things acknowledged have a personal bearing upon us?” Perhaps CJ and the CLC guys could dialogue about why this might be an important exercise and why this confession was not discussed or applied to the A. Team.”

## The Separation in Heart<sup>184</sup>

This separation began immediately after the August 20, 2004 meeting. After the meeting you began to pull back from me and take a critical view of me. In the years leading up to the meeting, I worked hard to serve you well because I loved you dearly and regarded you highly. I appreciated Dave's comments at the beginning of the meeting per Bob's notes. "Brent has excelled in his care and affection for CJ. Brent is intent on making sure there is care, protection, deliberation, and caution in this whole process. He is engaging God in the process."

As an example, here is one of many e-mails I sent you. You had just received the job performance evaluations from Dave, Steve, Josh, Kenneth, Grant, me, etc.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 13, 2003 4:20 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Compilation of Job Reviews

My dear friend,

You are the only team leader any of us want. No one has any reservations about you leading the [upcoming December] retreat. The evaluations don't disqualify you in the least from leading us now or in the future. We all treasure your wisdom, count it a great honor to work with you, have great respect for you, and prize our friendship with you. Really! Written evaluations are helpful but have limitations. Please don't interpret them too negatively. We are all for you!!!

With much love and regard.  
Brent

The next three plus years were not pleasant. You related to me with little gospel and grace. During that period you made several harsh comments to me and about me. On one occasion, you said I was the only pastor in Sovereign Grace who had "not grown in preaching in the last 6-8 years." That may have been true but I don't know how you arrived at that conclusion. On another occasion, you emphatically stated that "I never want anyone to go through what I went through!" That summed up your perspective. We were the ones at fault - especially me. There was no awareness of what we had been through. During these years, numerous individuals expressed concerns that you were resentful and bitter at me. You always disagreed with them. In time, you passed on your offenses to others.

I brought this up to the Assessment Team a week before I resigned last summer. We talked about it. I appealed that this crucial information be included in the report to the Sovereign Grace leadership team. Here is what I wrote.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Date: Sun, 19 Jul 2009 13:28:04 -0500  
To: Bob Kauflin; Phil Sasser; Wayne Brooks  
Subject: Sin Focus

In your feedback for SGM, it is my perspective that the three year “sin focused” [approach with me] began with C.J. Then he conveyed it to Larry [Malament] and Gene [Emerson].

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2009 6:55 AM  
To: Bob Kauflin; Phil Sasser; Wayne Brooks  
Subject: RE: Sin Focus

If you want me to explain my statement or provide you information to support my statement, I’d be willing to.

Bob never asked for a further explanation or additional information.

C.J.’s Visit to Charlotte – September 30-October 2, 2005<sup>185</sup>

The separation in heart was evident during your visit to Charlotte in the fall of 2005. Your relationship with me had drastically changed. Let me explain. I planted CrossWay Community Church in 1991. You visited many times over its 15 years history. We would carefully plan each trip. It always included substantial time with me, Jenny and me, and our family. You’d always stay at our house. We have many fond memories of these times together. We always looked forward to your visits.

This time you and Mickey planned the entire trip. You expressed no interest in getting time with me, Jenny and me, or the family. Instead of staying in our home you requested a motel – the first time ever. You spent all your extra time with Mickey. Before your message on Sunday morning, you honored Mickey and made no mention of me. That was a notable omission given our normal practice. These kinds of changes sent a clear message. I was out of favor with you.

## Dave's Private Letter - January 2006

From August 20, 2004 (the CLC meeting) to November 20, 2007 (my last day on the leadership team), you never talked to us as a team about heart issues in your life. In January 2006, Dave wrote you a lengthy personal letter.<sup>186</sup> You did not respond to the letter and you never told anyone about it. This was Dave's last attempt. He strongly appealed that we talk about your withdrawal from us. I asked Dave if I could read the letter but he declined. He wanted to keep it "private." Instead, he told me about the contents. I wrote Bob, Phil and Wayne about this letter (below) during the assessment they did of me.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2009 8:29 AM  
To: Bob Kauflin; Phil Sasser; Wayne Brooks  
Subject: Dave's Letter to C.J.

In January 06, Dave wrote a lengthy personal letter to C.J. In it he tried to help C.J. see how his sinful response to our correction had adversely affected his relationship with the team and especially me. Dave told me C.J. never got back to him on it. Perhaps he [C.J.] shared this letter with those watching over his soul [which you did not do].

If you are interested in understanding my perspective below, you should ask Dave for this letter and share it with those caring for C.J.

Bob did not ask Dave for the letter or bring this to your attention. If he had it would have been a fresh reminder that things were not right between us. You said only "recently" (January 2010) were you informed I might have some offenses with you. Bob should have brought it up back in July 2009. I don't know why he kept it from you.<sup>187</sup> Also, when you received this letter from Dave it should have been discussed with the apostolic team and the CLC pastors. This is what you'd expect of others. That is, transparency and accountability - not concealment.

## The Final Goodbye - November 20, 2007

The last time you and I were together or talked was at the Phillips-Harborplace Restaurant in Baltimore on November 20, 2007. That was the retreat when Steve and I stepped down from the leadership team. You probably remember, my son Stephen had a bad car accident the day before. He rolled and totaled his vehicle. I left our lunch early so I could catch a flight home. You finished up the next day.

Before leaving, however, I extended an open invitation to preach any time you could at the new church that would begin in April 08. I said you could come anytime with no advanced noticed necessary. I also said I'd love to get together anytime you visited CrossWay Community Church in Charlotte. You did not respond in the affirmative. With that, I said goodbye to you, Dave, Steve and Pat at the restaurant. I left with tears in my eyes. Some tears of gratefulness for the years I was blessed to serve you and Sovereign Grace Ministries. Most of sadness knowing how displeased you were with me and realizing our friendship was likely over. You never came to preach at Grace Community Church during our 18 month history. You never touched base with me when visiting CrossWay.

It was 1½ years after I resigned from the apostolic team that I heard from you for the first time. The surreptitious demand for my resignation as sr. pastor of Grace Community Church had just occurred. On June 3, 2009, you wrote a one sentence e-mail to say you were praying for me and available to help if I desired.<sup>188</sup> Here is what I wrote the Assessment Team about your e-mail and our relationship.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 12:38 PM  
To: Bob Kauflin; Phil Sasser; Wayne Brooks  
Subject: Report to SGM

One of the things that has been very difficult is the lack of any relationship with C.J. over the past 18 months which has been the hardest time in my life.<sup>189</sup> Asking about my forced resignation is the first time I have heard from him since Nov. 20, 2007 with one exception. At T4G 08 I approached Pat Ennis to ask if I could receive my 25 year service award from the previous year. The award had been forgotten. C.J. wrote me a short note with the check.

Otherwise I've had no contact with him since I (and Steve) stepped down from the apostolic team. I think this is due to a change in his disposition toward me after leading the three year process in helping him to see issues of sin that resulted in our August 20, 2004 meeting with the CLC senior leaders.

In my opinion, this breakdown in relationship has had a significant bearing on the process that began in June 06.<sup>190</sup> I appreciate C.J.'s interest below but it is hard to interpret after 1½ years of no communication. Could you include this in your report also?

So after I stepped down from the apostolic team, having faithfully served you for over 25 years, I didn't hear from you for 1½ years – not even an e-mail. I left the retreat early to catch a plane home to see my son and handle all the complications arising from a serious accident that totaled the vehicle and could have killed him and his friend. I

never heard from you the next day, week, month or year. It was apparent you wanted nothing to do with me. I understood.

#### The Pre-Conference Gathering at T4G - April 2008<sup>191</sup>

A number of men at our Sovereign Grace pre-conference gathering before Together for the Gospel 2008 noticed a very strange omission during the five hours we were together. This is what I mean. Many people were honored and many updates and reports were given. The most important update had to do with the restructuring of Sovereign Grace Ministries. You told all that pastors that Steve and I were no longer on the leadership team. You mentioned your gratefulness for our willingness to be “repositioned so we [SGM] could care more effectively for you [the SG pastors] and others in the future.”

Later you appropriately honored and thanked the men who were “taking on added responsibility in order to create manageable geographical regions.” You recognized Steve’s on-going role in Sovereign Grace and said his region was (and responsibilities were) “still big.” In contrast, nothing was said about the church I began two weeks earlier or about me no longer leading a regional team. Of course, my friends knew about these changes. What perplexed them, and distressed some of them, was the absence of any expression of appreciation for my 26 years of service. They did not understand this but I have never told them why you omitted any reference to me. I always protected your reputation.<sup>192</sup>

#### A Nine Page Letter of Concerns Disregarded - March 2009

From August 2004 until January 2010 (a 5+ years time period), you showed little to no concern for our friendship or the ways you sinned against me. I don’t know why the sudden change now but your recent claim of ignorance regarding offenses in the past is dishonest.<sup>193</sup>

For example, Eric sent you and the entire leadership team a nine page letter on March 24, 2009 in which he documented one concern after another for how you were treating me. Numerous offenses were cited and these were “only a sampling.” At the end of the letter, he requested a meeting “as soon as possible” to discuss the contents of the letter. Here is an excerpt.

“SGM has become uncharitable and impatient in its approach and response to concerns with Brent and GCC [Grace Community Church]. This is evidenced by SGM listening and acting primarily upon the claims and accusation of offended parties without soliciting and patiently hearing the perspective of

Brent or the leadership of GCC.... Brent has not asked me to write this letter. It was not his idea and he did not proof read it.... His progress in some areas has been remarkable. Other areas have progressed more slowly than some may have wished. Overall Brent has responded with incredible humility while shepherding his flock during a most difficult season.... I am asking that SGM be as entreatable as they are asking Brent to be. The examples and concerns I have brought, and this is only a sampling, are not issues of practicality. They are issues concerning the glory of God in the church.... We request a meeting as soon as possible to discuss further what has been presented here. Both Brent and I will be at the Leadership Conference in April if you have any time left. If not we fully understand.”

The following month at the Sovereign Grace Pastors Conference on April 20-22, 2009 in a closed session just for our pastors, you talked about how we should respond to critics. After that message Eric approached you, commended you for the excellent teaching, and told you it was not at all our experience.<sup>194</sup> You said you'd follow up with Dave. Here is how Dave responded, on your behalf, to the 9 page letter and our desperate appeal to meet.

From: Dave Harvey  
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2009 4:42 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Confidential - Doctrine

...So, at this point we are just uncertain on how best to proceed. In light of that fact, and also the demands of many other situations emerging in SGM, we would suggest the following:

1. Go ahead and send us your thoughts on the process, if you so desire.
2. We will be happy to take time to consider and pray over what you send. Then, if there appears to be anything for us to comment on, we will eventually get back to you.
3. In the interim, we will turn our attention to other matters in the movement that appear urgent. [Which did not include us.]
4. We will then revisit this issue in 6-12 months. That means you won't be hearing any response back from us for 6-12 months.

Get back to me with what you think about that.

This response was the complete opposite of what you taught the week before at the conference about getting with your critics and humbly listening to their critique. For example, “People are not so much concerned with whether you agree with them. What

they are concerned about is whether there is some process where they can voice it and you would address it without sinfully reacting to it.<sup>195</sup>

The issues we were bringing to your attention were urgent and we made that clear. Yet, we were dismissed out of hand. No process was granted unless you consider waiting for up to a year “if there appears to be anything...to comment on” an acceptable response.

In the same teaching you also said, “It would serve all of us to review our history and think if there is someone you might have sinned against, someone who has left your church offended that remains unresolved, consider contacting that person to pursue reconciliation.” You knew I/we felt sinned against. There was no pursuit.<sup>196</sup>

During this 5 plus year period, I regularly, though I assume inadequately, asked forgiveness of you when I sinned (e.g. the resentment in my heart about your comment that I was not committed to our mission like others) even at the risk of it being used against me by you. Dave and Steve commended me for this.<sup>197</sup>

#### Brent’s Concern for Hypocrisy – Three Examples<sup>198</sup>

I’ve picked a few examples to help you further understand my concern for hypocrisy in your life.

##### Example 1: The Seven Year Plan

**From:** Gene Emerson  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 23, 2006 3:26 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** Speaking dates

Hi CJ,

It was great seeing you at the Knoxville wedding. Thanks for your investment in Will and Meg. I trust you’re encouraged by the fruit of your ministry!

A few months ago, you invited me to revisit the invitation for you to speak at our Revive conference this July 6 to 8 in Harrisonburg, Virginia. We’d still very much like you to speak, and since this is the first year of the regional celebration conference, I think your presence would be particularly important. Since Harrisonburg is close (about 2½ hour drive from Gaithersburg) you could do this in a day. Would you please consider and let me know?

Also, we're in the early stages of planning a regional marriage conference in Williamsburg for February 14 to 16, 2008 in Williamsburg. We're planning for 500 and hoping to negotiate space in the renovated Williamsburg Lodge. What a place to celebrate Valentine's Day! Would you and Carolyn please consider speaking at four sessions?

Thanks for considering this, CJ. I trust you perceive my tenaciousness as a fruit of our love and respect for you. We're always open to a weekend (Sunday) visit as well. Over half of our church is new since the last Celebration conference, and I'm eager to introduce them to you.

Merry Christmas to you and your family!

With joy,  
Gene

On 12/28/06, C.J. Mahaney wrote:

Gene,

Well, these guys got back to me sooner than I expected and I am sorry to say they don't think I should participate. Here is a primary reason why. We are walking through a lengthy process where they are kindly spending many hours evaluating what I am to do over the next 7 years Lord willing.<sup>199</sup> Their recommendation is that we consider how I can serve Sovereign Grace most effectively in these remaining years in writing, strategic initiatives etc. There are a number of possible recommendations on the table. Though it's been a lengthy process I have really appreciated both the time and wise counsel I have been receiving. Anyway, this 7 year plan plays a big role in declining your kind invitation.

Thanks for your understanding Gene.

With appreciation,  
CJ

I would not have known about the "7 year plan" if Gene hadn't sent me the e-mail above. He passed it on hoping I could persuade you to speak at Revive (the Upper Mid-South conference for our churches) and/or at the Married Couples Conference for the region. I wrote Dave and Steve to see if they knew anything about it. They did not.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 02, 2007 1:00 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Do you know anything about the 7 year plan? If not, do you know who is C.J. referring to?

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 02, 2007 1:16 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Nope. I assume CJ is referring to him, Jeff and Bob though....

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 10, 2007 8:33 PM  
**To:** Pat Ennis; C.J. Mahaney; Dave Harvey; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** 7 Year Plan

If you're not already planning to do so on the retreat, I'd love to hear your thoughts if possible on the 7 year plan you've been working on. I'm sure I'd learn from what you're doing.

Brent

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 10, 2007 8:38 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: 7 Year Plan

Well, I haven't thought about it for a few months so I am not sure I have much to share at this time. It primarily involves continuing to cultivate relationships with key leaders while adding a few and possibly writing a book on pastoral ministry before I delegate all this to Josh.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 10, 2007 8:57 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Steve Shank; Dave Harvey; Pat Ennis  
**Subject:** RE: 7 Year Plan

I'd love to hear your thoughts on how and when you'd delegate to Josh and how and when a team would form around him.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 10, 2007 9:03 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: 7 Year Plan

I have no specific thoughts other than do it when I'm 60.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 03, 2007 8:16 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** Confidential - 7 Yr. Plan

Does any of this leave you perplexed since we have not been part of the process?

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 03, 2007 9:05 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - 7 Yr. Plan

Not perplexed, because I don't think process on this kind of stuff is always a strength for us. But it does make life interesting...

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 04, 2007 8:16 AM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - 7 Yr. Plan

It seems independent of him to be working long and hard with other men on a seven year plan we don't know anything about. Further, he has already picked

his successor (Josh) and the time of his transition (age 60) yet we have never formally talked about these matters. Leaves me perplexed. I don't think this kind of thing would be acceptable for the rest of us to do.<sup>200</sup>

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 04, 2007 3:01 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** R E: Confidential - 7 Yr. Plan

I think he comes across to Gene as if all of this is more formalized than it really is. However I do think he has been meeting with Jeff, Bob and Pat to evaluate some of these things. I doubt that it has gotten as far as it appears to be below.

Shall I forward this to Steve to get his perspective as well?

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 06, 2007 10:43 AM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - 7 Yr. Plan

Your call whether you contact Steve. FYI - he didn't know about the 7 yr. plan [when I asked him].

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 06, 2007 10:46 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - 7 Yr. Plan

I will inquire of Steve...

Operating independently of the apostolic team was one of our original concerns. In Steve's April 2004 summary he put it this way.

"Close to this were questions as to the [apostolic] team's role in shaping decisions versus CJ making far ranging decisions on the counsel received from CLC [non-apostolic team members]. Needing to clarify what falls into the category of a team issue, and what CJ handles via input he gets from Bob, Jeff or Joshua or others."

I was also concerned for your apparent deceit. For instance, you told Gene on December 28,

“We are walking [present tense] through a lengthy process where they are kindly spending many hours evaluating what I am to do over the next 7 years.... Though it’s been a lengthy process I have really appreciated both the time and wise counsel I have been receiving. Anyway, this 7 year plan plays a big role in declining your kind invitation.”

Then I asked you on January 10,

“If you’re not already planning to do so on the [upcoming January] retreat, I’d love to hear your thoughts if possible on the 7 year plan you’ve been working on. I’m sure I’d learn from what you’re doing.” In response you said “Well, I haven’t thought about it for a few months so I am not sure I have much to share at this time.”

First, you tell Gene you can’t come because of all the work being done on the seven year plan. Then, two weeks later, you tell me you have not thought about the 7 year plan for a few months.

You also told me, “So I am not sure I have much to share [about the 7 year plan] at this time.” But you told Gene, “this 7 year plan plays a big role in declining your kind invitation” and in determining how you “serve Sovereign Grace most effectively in these remaining years in writing, strategic initiatives, etc. There are a number of possible recommendations on the table.”

When I asked about the 7 year plan you minimized its significance. You said, “It primarily involves continuing to cultivate relationships with key [national] leaders while adding a few and possibly writing a book on pastoral ministry before I delegate all this to Josh.” Then I said, “I’d love to hear your thoughts on how and when you’d delegate to Josh and how and when a team would form around him.” You responded, “I have no specific thoughts other than do it when I’m 60.”

Dave, Steve and I knew nothing about a 7 year plan. Yet you were “walking through a lengthy process” and “spending many hours evaluating what I am to do over the next 7 years.” And “Though it’s been a lengthy process I have really appreciated both the time and wise counsel I have been receiving.” You were not receiving any counsel from us. We were in the dark. Your accountability for the direction of Sovereign Grace Ministries was to the apostolic team. I don’t know what your motive was but you were putting plans together we did not know about. You have reprimanded other men for far less serious expressions of independence. No senior pastor would be allowed to

circumvent his fellow pastors and put together a 7 year plan with some of his Care Group leaders.<sup>201</sup>

### Example 2: Jeff Teaching on the Sacraments

At our team retreat in Herndon, VA in October 2004, we discussed the subject of “Water Baptism and Children.” I was asked to provide my thoughts on the subject. You were moving in the direction of withholding baptism from younger children who professed faith in the gospel and putting restrictions on the sacraments (e.g., they should be administered by pastors only, should be celebrated in the context of the church only).

We went through my outline (below). Dave and Steve expressed agreement with me. At the end of our discussion, though not completely persuaded, you made the comment you wouldn’t want to debate me on the subject given the simple teaching of Scripture on the subject. We also had a short and parallel discussion regarding the Lord’s Supper and children. In the end, we agreed to make no changes in our practice.

## WATER BAPTISM AND CHILDREN

### **I. When Should A Person Be Baptized?**

- A. A person should be water baptized as soon after they come to Christ as possible.
- B. In the New Testament water baptism followed immediately after the salvation experience or at the time of salvation.
  - 1. The day of Pentecost - Acts 2:41 (at the time of conversion)
  - 2. The Samaritans - Acts 8:12 (at the time of conversion)
  - 3. Simon - Acts 8:13 (at the time of conversion)
  - 4. The Ethiopian eunuch - Acts 8:35-39 (immediately following his conversion on the same day)
  - 5. Saul of Tarsus - Acts 9:17,18; 22:16 (3 days after his conversion, cf. Acts 9:9)
  - 6. Cornelius’ household - Acts 10:44-48 (at the time of conversion)
  - 7. Lydia’s household - Acts 16:13-15 (at the time of conversion)
  - 8. The jailer's household - Acts 16:30-34 (at the time of conversion in the middle of the night - cf. 16:33)
  - 9. Crispus’ household and many Corinthians - Acts 18:8 (at the time of conversion)
  - 10. John’s disciples - Acts 19:1-7 (as soon as they were instructed by Paul about Christian baptism – they were probably believers in Christ already)

- C. In the Book of Acts it was not necessary to wait for an official meeting of the church in order to baptize new believers. In almost every circumstance new converts were baptized immediately and with whatever means available. It was not necessary for a prescribed number of church members to be present. Typically, those in attendance were limited to the person or people doing the baptizing and those being baptized.

## II. Should Believing Children Be Baptized?

- A. Baptism was based upon a simple but sincere profession of faith. Persons were baptized when they became disciples. If a child shows evidence he understands the gospel (cognition), is willing to follow the Lord (volition), and is convicted of sin (affection); then, he should be baptized.
- B. Baptism was never postponed until convincing proofs of salvation were evident in a person's life. New converts were baptized immediately. They did not wait until the fruits of sanctification were apparent and a thereby a source of assurance (cf. Simon the magician).
- C. Children are able to understand the gospel, repent of their sins and savingly believe. (cf. 2 Timothy 3:15, Titus 1:6)
- D. Household baptisms probably included believing children.
- E. If a child can understand the gospel they can also understand the significance of water baptism (and the Lord's Supper).
- F. The New Testament never encourages, by way of teaching or practice, the putting off of water baptism in the case of believing adults or children.

At the Leadership Conference in April 2007 you had Jeff teach on the sacraments. His message title was, "Watch the Sacraments: Recapturing Vital Elements in the Life of the Church." There were many good points but there were several important points that differed with our previously agreed upon understanding and teaching on the subject. This took Dave, Steve and I by surprise. It also caused consternation for many of our pastors and we were put in an awkward position of trying to answer their questions. My main concern was for your independence. Unilaterally you introduce new doctrine and practice contrary to previous agreements and without any discussion. Here is the e-mail trail.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2007 12:54 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** Confidential - Sacraments

Will we discuss Jeff's being approved by C.J. to teach on the sacraments in the fashion he did without the knowledge of team?

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2007 1:14 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Sacraments

Feel free to bring it up. I think I raised it with him already in private...

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2007 1:14 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Sacraments

What was his response...?

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2007 1:16 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Sacraments

He indicated he agreed with what Jeff said but he would be happy to discuss it further as a team.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2007 1:16 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Sacraments

Did he see how he acted independently?

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2007 1:29 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Sacraments

I did not explore that category with him. Thoughts on how to proceed?

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2007 5:22 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Sacraments

I think you should talk to him about not proceeding "independently" on something of this magnitude especially given our previous discussion re: the topic.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2007 5:25 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Sacraments

I think YOU should talk to him and let me attend to the 10,000 other things you guys are dumping on me.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 23, 2007 5:26 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Sacraments

Chicken...but I am no better.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Friday, August 24, 2007 10:50 AM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Sacraments

Honestly, I'd be willing to bring this up to C.J. during a team meeting. Just let me know.

I did bring it up to you later at a team meeting. We talked about your independence. You didn't agree with us. You reiterated your doctrinal agreement with Jeff as grounds<sup>202</sup> to have him teach without talking to us.

As an aside, Dave's approach to you had changed. He was no longer bringing up issues of the heart. He was no longer raising concerns for your character. He decided to accommodate those deficiencies and move on. He and I talked about this on a few occasions. He encouraged me to do the same. I was trying to do so but important issues kept coming up like this one regarding Jeff staking out new positions on the sacraments.

### Example 3: Writing the Book, *Humility: Greatness Defined*

On August 18, 2004, Dave wrote Steve and me about evidences of pride and independence in your life that warranted a wider confession of sin. He ended by saying "All the while teaching on humility, writing on it and referencing himself in regards to it [as an example] when we were calling him to account." I've already cited Dave's e-mail in entirety but this one sentence illustrates my point.

Leading up to the meeting on August 20, 2004 you were earnestly writing your book on humility. The writing probably continued after the meeting but I don't remember when the final manuscript was submitted to Multnomah. Anyway, the book came out in 2005. There were no references, or allusions, to the 3½ years of resistance<sup>203</sup> we experienced when providing you correction or to the process we were walking through with you.

Instead you gave counsel on how to grow in humility. "First, humbly recognize your need for others.... That's why I need the care and correction of my wife and fellow team members, and why I must pursue their care and correction. I need help, and so do you."<sup>204</sup> We were pursuing you but you were not pursuing us. You were resisting correction not receiving it.

At our team retreat in June 2006 you began to raise concerns for evidences of pride in my life. A few months later I wrote you about putting my teaching on the subject into book form. See below.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Sunday, September 01, 2006 7:03 PM  
To: C.J. Mahaney  
Cc: Larry Malament  
Subject: 50 Fruits

Would it be okay with you if I sent in my "The 50 Fruits of Pride" messages and outline to Crossway and Multnomah for their consideration? I realize how very unlikely it is they will ever review them. If okay, I'd ask Bob for some contact information. If you prefer I not do this just let me know.

Thanks  
Brent

From: C.J. Mahaney  
Sent: Saturday, September 01, 2006 7:24 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: 50 Fruits

...Do you think it's wise for you to send this in at this time with all that is transpiring at present with you and the pastoral team?...

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Sunday, September 02, 2006 12:49 AM  
To: C.J. Mahaney  
Cc: Larry Malament  
Subject: RE: 50 Fruits

The initiative and encouragement to do something with the material is coming from others. They have found it helpful and would like others to benefit. I am very content not do anything with it. It really is not my focus - I don't have ambitions to get it published.

I am trying to focus on my own heart - to do otherwise would be unwise as you indicate. I am glad to take no further action. Thanks for expressing your concern.

From: C.J. Mahaney  
Sent: Saturday, September 02, 2006 8:14 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: 50 Fruits

I would just encourage you to make sure that for any major decision you are thinking about that the local pastoral team be at the top of the “others” list you consult for counsel before you proceed.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Sunday, September 03, 2006 1:43 PM  
To: C.J. Mahaney  
Cc: Larry Malament  
Subject: RE: 50 Fruits

Sure will. I'd also desire your support.

At that point, I dropped the matter, did not contact any publishers, and never did any writing. You gave me good counsel. You just didn't follow it to yourself. You never asked us about whether you should be writing a book on humility.

### Doctrine and Practice Now Separate Us

This next section is long and deals with the issue of doctrine and practice as a basis for removing me from Sovereign Grace Ministries.

During the Baltimore Team Retreat in November 2007, you told us you wanted Dave, in his new position, “to secure theological uniformity in the essentials throughout Sovereign Grace and a selective uniformity in practices.” This was the same retreat when Steve and I resigned from the leadership team. You didn't go into any detail but I took special note. I've been waiting to see how this assignment for Dave would be worked out. You clearly indicated a change was coming. That appeared to mean a narrowing of acceptable beliefs and practice in Sovereign Grace was on its way.

Fast forward. On March 27, 2009 Dave wrote the following to the leadership team of Grace Community Church.

“It might be helpful to note that while the character issues remain a concern for us, we recognize the benefits of entrusting the evaluation and resolution of those character issues to the leadership team in Mooresville. However, it is the areas of disagreement in respect to doctrine and practice that we (the

[Sovereign Grace] leadership team) are particularly obligated to address. So we hope to give more thought to that as well in the near future.”

Leading up to this e-mail, Dave and Gene repeatedly said my preaching and teaching were not gospel centered. Yet when I asked them how they came to this conclusion, it turned out they had not listened to any of my messages in nearly 2½ years. These conclusions were based upon bogus reports and not upon an examination of my sermons.

For instance, Gene used Andy and Lanie George as his main illustration for my lack of gospel centeredness when Ray, Jonathan, Eric and I met with him on October 31, 2008. Gene sympathetically and supportively pointed out “they [the Georges] had concerns with [my] first message [at the beginning of the church] on sin and behavior.” That “it didn’t feel right” and claimed I “was preaching a different message” than was being preached at CrossWay Community Church. This was a sad exercise of leadership by Gene.

You can listen to this message which was entitled, “Amazing Grace” from April 6, 2008. The Georges left the church plant after two months. They only heard my first 8 messages while they were attending. You can listen to those messages also.

The Assessment Team investigated the charge from Dave and Gene. In particular, Phil Sasser evaluated my messages from the beginning of the church plant. He/they did not find my messages to be lacking in gospel centeredness or containing prescriptions for legalistic practices.<sup>205</sup> Dave and Gene never asked forgiveness for their sinful judgments.<sup>206</sup>

At the time of Dave’s e-mail on March 27, all the men on the local leadership team were speaking well of my character and commending me to Sovereign Grace Ministries. They were also raising grave concerns for how Sovereign Grace was dealing with me. Given the good reports about my character, Dave changed the topic to my doctrine and practice. This was the first time anyone ever raised concerns over doctrine and practice as grounds for removal from Sovereign Grace Ministries. As stated by Dave, these “disagreements” were even more important than perceived character deficiencies and the apostolic team was “particularly obligated to address” them. This included “areas” not just particular beliefs or approaches.

Unfortunately no one has been willing to define for me which of my doctrines and practices were unacceptable to Sovereign Grace Ministries and therefore warrant dismissal from the movement. The things Dave mentioned were non issues (see below). But as you said recently “I know we hold disagreements over doctrine and practice that

now separate us from serving together." I wish I knew what they were. Here is the e-mail history with Dave.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Wednesday, April 15, 2009 4:12 PM  
To: Dave Harvey  
Subject: Confidential - Doctrine

#### Introduction

- This is an initial installment in response to your questions and the beginning of a process whereby I will raise issues of concern. There are many important matters to address. This will take considerable effort so I plan to work on it a little at a time.

#### Your [Dave's] Statements re: Doctrine

- "Brent, this past December I sent you a letter on behalf of the leadership team expressing our concerns over certain issues of character, doctrine and practice." (4/11/09 e-mail)
- "I was glad he [Eric] shared his heart with us, but it illustrated the fact that we appear rather clueless on where these discussions have helped you and the areas of doctrine, character and practice needing change." (4/11/09 e-mail)
- "Are there any areas where you maintain a difference in theology or practice with SGM?" (4/11/09 e-mail)
- "It might be helpful to note that while the character issues remain a concern for us, we recognize the benefits of entrusting the evaluation and resolution of those character issues to the leadership team in Mooresville. However, it is the areas of disagreement in respect to doctrine and practice that we (the [Sovereign Grace] leadership team) are particularly obligated to address. So we hope to give more thought to that as well in the near future." (3/27/09 e-mail)

#### Important Clarification

- The first time you mentioned a concern for my doctrine or theology was two weeks ago (cf. the 3/27 quote above). Your "December...letter" was actually dated 11/22/08. There were no references in that correspondence to my doctrine or concerns for my doctrine.

- The introduction of doctrinal disagreements is a very recent development. It is not a subject you have talked to me about or raised with me in the past. I am surprised it has been introduced as a primary issue and would like to understand why.<sup>207</sup>

#### Membership-Church Commitments

[Note: The quotation below regarding doctrinal agreement comes from the Membership Agreement for Sovereign Grace Churches that all senior pastors are required to sign.]

- “To ensure substantial theological harmony...within Sovereign Grace, membership churches are to subscribe to the following documents: The Sovereign Grace Statement of Faith... Are to be in complete agreement with substitutionary atonement of Jesus, as described in *Living the Cross Centered Life...* and *Pierced for Our Transgressions*. Are to be in substantial agree with the *Perspectives* series, as updated from time to time, and current consisting of “Sovereign Grace and the Glorious Mystery of Election,” “Polity: Serving and Leading the Local Church,” “Am I Called? Discerning the Summons to Ministry,” “Missiology: Entering the Field of the Lord.”

#### Response to Theological Commitments

- Having written it, I can confidently say I am in complete agreement with the Sovereign Grace Statement of Faith.
- I am also in complete agreement with the substitutionary atonement of Christ as presented in the two books mentioned above and substantial agreement with the four booklets in the *Perspective* series mentioned above.
- I maintain no differences in theology for member churches within Sovereign Grace Ministries.

#### Questions Requiring a Response

- What doctrines do you have in mind when expressing such concern? Where do you disagree with my doctrine? Please be specific and thorough in your answer.<sup>208</sup>
- In what way does my doctrine need to change? Please be specific and thorough in your answer.

Thanks for your prompt reply to these questions. After I hear back from you, I will proceed to the issue of practice. Your answers to these questions will likely inform my response regarding practice.

Grace to you!  
Brent

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2009 4:42 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Doctrine

...I'm glad to hear that you do not see any significant differences. I think the categories we had specifically in mind would include the nature and extent of apostolic and pastoral authority. From past discussions and experiences, it seems that category has been an area where we have disagreed in rather important ways. However we certainly could have misunderstood you. In fact, I will assume we have if you are saying that there is no difference in our beliefs and practice in this area...

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2009 4:47 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** Confidential - Practice

Hi Dave,

Greetings my friend!

I understand you'll be on retreat next week and visiting Metro on Sunday. Whether for concentrated work or a time to relax, I pray the Lord will bless you. I am sure you could benefit from both, especially the later.

Here is the response you requested.

Errors in Practice

On April 11 you asked, "Where are you seeing errors in your practice?"

In the past, I've sometimes stressed certain practices too strongly or defined them too narrowly. As a result, I suspect some people may have confused

personal practice with biblical principal and invested too much authority and faith in the former rather than being sufficiently guided by the later. Also, some may have tended to put their hope in certain “practices” which guarantee nothing.

This is an area where I’ve needed to grow and have worked hard at it by the grace of God. I’ve labored to emphasize the principals of Scripture from which individuals can develop their own practices and not simply imitate others. I’ve emphasized more than ever the power of the gospel to change hearts and motivate people to honor God. I’ve also exhorted people to put their confidence in God not methods.

At the risk of being misunderstood (no indirect message intended), my own growth parallels the changes I have seen with respect to our teaching on modesty. Originally it was titled “Modesty Check.” In *Girl Talk* it was changed to “A Modesty Heart Check” without an introduction. In *Worldliness* a helpful introduction was added. “We don’t intend these questions to be a list of rules or consider them to be definitive guide to modest dress. The Modesty Heart Check is a tool, to be used in the context of biblical teaching on modesty, and never in isolation from God’s Word” (p. 173). So too, I have edited and re-edited my material.

Currently, I don’t think there are differences in our approach in practice. I would heartily agree with C.J.’s comments at the recent Pastors Conference. It has been 2½ years since I’ve given a message where I shared “practices” (really just guidelines) for consideration. I spoke on the subject of courtship [at the Summit Conference in Charlotte on November 2-4, 2006]. Afterward, Larry Malament exclaimed that my differentiating between principle and practice was “brilliant.” I doubt that was the case, but I appreciated his encouragement.

Last June, I did a two part series at Grace Community entitled “A Sanctification Primer.” In it I laid out my theology of change. I again recommend it to you and Gene. I covered a number of critical issues including the difference between principle and practice.

I feel I have grown in this area of understanding and teaching. My presentation of “practice” would be in keeping with those set forth in *I Kiss Dating Goodbye*, *Boy Meets Girl*, *Worldliness*, and *Feminine Appeal*. Like C.J., I would not recommend public school (cf. his comment at the Pastors Conference). Nevertheless, I am very carefully when talking about home schooling and reasons to consider it as one’s educational choice.

## Gene's Perspective

I think Gene has complicated matters by misrepresenting me to you and the leadership team (you'll need to read the e-mails below). We came to the Pastors Conference wondering what new direction or doctrine or practice would be presented that would represent "very different perspectives." We discovered none.

There was nothing "awkward" about our time after the conference with the sr. pastors and wives in Gene's region. Nothing Gene said made us "feel significantly uncomfortable." My approach to "practice" mirrored everyone else's in the room. We did not feel put in an "awkward position" and participated honestly.

I am afraid Gene misjudged us when he said we should "feel released from attending" and expressed concerns that his comments during the session might be taken by us as a "personal attack." We were glad to be present.

## Apostolic Ministry

On April 17, you also asked the following,<sup>209</sup> "I think the categories we had specifically in mind would include the nature and extent of apostolic and pastoral authority. From past discussions and experiences, it seems that category has been an area where we have disagreed in rather important ways. However we certainly could have misunderstood you. In fact, I will assume we have if you are saying that there is no difference in our beliefs and practice in this area."

We last discussed the subject of apostolic ministry in July, 2003. At the time, I expressed a concern that we were moving away from the kind of apostolic involvement that had built a strong family of churches. My primary focus was not on authority but involvement. On the issue of authority, however, I acknowledged we had differences. I felt the authority of apostles exceeded that of elders.

I also affirmed, and agreed with all, that the extent of apostolic involvement depended on the maturity level of the eldership and its proper functioning. Furthermore, I whole heartedly agreed that a proper exercise of any authority was based on servanthood, trust and relationship.

From July, 2003 forward, I adjusted my practice to the polity we set at the time which was later "codified" in your "Polity: Serving and Leading the Local

Church.” I abided by this polity through my entire tenure on the apostolic team which ended in December, 2007.

I continue to affirm this approach

Pastoral Authority

While on the team, I don’t remember ever discussing the extent of pastoral authority or ever having any differences between us. My understanding of pastoral ministry is the same as that of Sovereign Grace Ministries. That is, our “authority” derives from Scripture. This means our teaching and counsel is only “authoritative” to the degree it lines up with Scripture. Where the Bible is clear, we can be clear. Otherwise, we must exercise great care.

Gene misrepresents me when he says, “Thanks for your willingness to talk through your perspective on advocating a position and providing leadership in disputable matters in our last phone conversation.” Please be assured, this is not my approach. See my response to him.

I hope these answers are sufficient and helpful to you.

Love in Christ,  
Brent

Gene and I had a brief conversation about “principle and practice” before the Pastors Conference last April 6-8 at Covenant Life Church. He twisted my words and distorted my beliefs. Here are the e-mail exchanges.

From: Gene Emerson  
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2009 3:59 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: Regional meeting

Hi Brent,

Thanks for your willingness to talk through your perspective on advocating a position and providing leadership in disputable matters in our last phone conversation. I’m grateful we spoke and look forward to pursuing this topic in the future. However, since this will be the primary topic in our time together as regional senior pastors, I’m concerned that you & Jenny will feel significantly uncomfortable and in the awkward position of honestly responding or not participating. So, as I reflect on this, I want you to feel

released from attending. Of course, you're welcome to come--just don't want you to feel obligated to do so. Please consider and let me know either way.

Your friend,  
Gene

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2009 7:52 PM  
To: Gene Emerson  
Cc: Dave Harvey  
Subject: RE: Regional meeting

Hi Gene,

I would not say we "talked through" my perspective on these matters. I am concerned you may think you understand my position when you do not and then misrepresent me to others. For instance, I did not say a pastor should provide directive leadership on disputable matters. Just the opposite. I don't believe that.

I don't think you understand how I would advocate for home schooling. Advocate does not mean impose. Advocate does not mean "should." Advocate means give consideration to in light of the added opportunity it provides to shepherd your child's heart. Just so you know I have not even mentioned home schooling in the past 12 months of Sunday preaching [i.e., since the beginning of the church]. In a private meeting with our church plant home school parents, I carefully instructed them on how important it is to welcome and accept those who don't home school and how to differentiate between principle and practice.

I do think a pastor has a somber responsibility to teach on moral purity between the sexes as commanded by Scripture and to exhort parents to bring up their children in the instruction and discipline of the Lord (every child must be taught a thoroughly Christian worldview in all disciplines of life). This does not mean everyone will follow all the prescriptions Josh gives in his two books [on courtship] or Carolyn [Mahaney] in her modesty guidelines or choose to home school.

Please be careful not to assume you know what I believe and how I practice these beliefs based upon a brief conversation.

Thanks  
Brent

From: Gene Emerson  
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2009 9:38 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: Re: Regional meeting

Sorry my friend. Didn't intend to misrepresent you in what I wrote. I did think we have very different perspectives and don't want that to create an awkward day for you or for you to take my concerns as a personal attack.

The reports you received from Gene were misrepresentative and judgmental. He put things in the worst possible light. Let me share an analogy. In my opinion, the "Modesty Heart Check" is the most detailed prescription of practice SGM has put into print. Don't get me wrong - I find them extremely helpful and wise. Here's the point. If I wrote something comparable, I am afraid I'd be confronted for "legalism." For instance, "Does my shirt reveal any part of my cleavage? Does my midriff [between the chest and waist] show when I raise my hands above my head? Is my shirt just plain too tight? If the answer to any one of these questions is yes, then I need to change my outfit."<sup>210</sup>

Based on the March 27 e-mail from Dave and the March 30 e-mails from Gene, I expected to hear at the Pastors Conference the following week that additional doctrinal affirmations/denials would be required and certain practices would be incumbent, while other practices would be prohibited, for member churches. Instead, nothing was said or taught that put my affiliation with Sovereign Grace in jeopardy.

Nevertheless, Dave continued pressing the issues of doctrine and practice after the conference. After I laid out the doctrinal requirements for membership churches and expressed my agreement, however, Dave backed off on April 17 and pulled back his demands that my doctrine and practice change. I think he realized that you, the Sovereign Grace leadership team, could not remove me over doctrinal and practical differences given the agreements outlined in the "Membership Agreement for Sovereign Grace Churches." Nevertheless, it was not surprising when you recently asserted I cannot be a part of Sovereign Grace Ministries due to these unknown (to me) "disagreements." Here is the e-mail trail with you.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 14, 2010 3:17 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Letter from CJ

Dear Brent,

I hope this e mail finds you enjoying God's grace.

Recently I was informed that you might have some offenses with me. I was saddened to hear this, but not surprised given the sinful tendencies present in my heart and life. Brent, if it is accurate that you have offenses against me, I want to do whatever I can to address these and pursue reconciliation. I also want to make every effort to preserve our friendship. Even though I know we hold disagreements over doctrine and practice that now separate us from serving together,<sup>211</sup> I don't want there to be any separation of heart between us. Your friendship has been an undeserved gift and I have countless memories of serving the Savior with you that I still treasure...

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Friday, January 15, 2010 9:35 AM  
**To:** Nora Earles  
**Subject:** RE: Letter from CJ

Hi C.J.,

Just a quick note for now. Would you please tell me what you have in mind when you say "I know we hold disagreements over doctrine and practice that now separate us from serving together." I am not aware what those disagreements are but would really appreciate knowing. Would you please inform me and be as specific as possible?

Thanks so much,  
Brent

**From:** Nora Earles  
**Sent:** Friday, January 15, 2010 12:22 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** FW: Letter from CJ

Hey my friend,

Thanks for getting right back to me.

Good question! Well, perhaps we don't have any differences in doctrine or practice!<sup>212</sup> I'd love to talk with you to discover<sup>213</sup> if there are any differences but primarily I don't want our hearts to be separated and I want our friendship preserved if at all possible. Also, I want you to experience my support as you serve the Savior in the future.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Friday, January 15, 2010 2:20 PM  
**To:** Nora Earles  
**Subject:** RE: Letter from CJ

Of course, we both know we have doctrinal disagreements. We've talked about them over the [past 26] years. I was unaware, however, that these disagreements "now separate us from serving together." That's why I'd really appreciate if you answered my question.

**From:** Nora Earles  
**Sent:** Friday, January 15, 2010 2:26 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** FW: Letter from CJ

Brent,

I'm sorry if my attempt to discover whether you have offenses with me has been unhelpful and appears to have focused on doctrinal disagreements.<sup>214</sup> [I knew you weren't focused on doctrinal differences. This seemed like a reaction to my question.] The intent of my e-mail was to reach out to you and if necessary pursue reconciliation with you, not to review or rehearse any doctrinal praxis disagreements we might have. Whatever disagreements we have are secondary to maintaining our friendship and I'd be open to talking to you about such differences at some point in the future. But this should be a conversation not an e-mail exchange. And we've already experienced the

limitations and deficiencies of e-mail my friend so please let me know if it would serve you for us to meet and for you to share any offenses you have with me so that our friendship remains regardless of where we are serving the Savior.

C.J.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Friday, January 15, 2010 2:39 PM  
**To:** Nora Earles  
**Subject:** RE: Letter from CJ

I am glad to provide you an answer regarding our friendship, etc. but that will take a considerable amount of time. My question about doctrine and practice was just a “quick note for now.” It also seemed an easy one for you to answer.

It alarms me that serious concerns for my doctrine and practice were raised over a 10 month period as grounds for being disfellowshipped unless they changed. Yet, I have no clue what you had in mind. This also concerns me for my pastoral friends in the movement. If I can't be in Sovereign Grace then who else can't be in the movement? This is a serious issue. You have a moral responsibility to clearly articulate for these men what is, and is not, allowed in terms of belief and practice lest they be removed from the movement also. You concluded that specific disagreements with me are beyond the acceptable boundaries of Sovereign Grace Ministries. I'd still like to know what they are.

My greatest concern for your response regarding doctrine and practice was the flip flop. First you said, “I know we hold disagreements over doctrine and practice that now separate us from serving together.” Then you said “Well, perhaps we don't have any differences in doctrine or practice! I'd love to talk with you to discover if there are any differences.” This is deceitful for several reasons.<sup>215</sup>

You and I talked about doctrine and practice for over 25 years. I sought to serve the movement by teaching sound doctrine. It was a huge part of my life. I am not aware of any differences in practice; but you, more than anyone, know our differences in doctrine. For over a ¼ century you heard my doctrine up close.

As I reminisce, I was privileged by God to teach on Amillennialism at our first “Elders Week of Study” in 1982. The next year in Johnston, PA, I defined the gospel (i.e., the good news about Jesus' birth, life, death, resurrection and reign and emphasized that the Cross was the “heart of the gospel”). This was when we had a defective understanding of the gospel (i.e., “If he's not Lord of all, he's not Lord at all.”) and were

coming under attack. I wrote the Statement of Faith the same year. Later I founded the Pastors College and taught more than half its curriculum. I wrote numerous articles on doctrine for the magazine (e.g. Sanctification in December 96 when we rolled out our Reformed Theology issue), wrote the short "Statement of Belief" (cf. "We hold to an essentially Reformed understanding of Christian doctrine but with a significant charismatic dimension to our faith..."), revised and expanded the original Statement of Faith in 1998, and gave thousands of messages in SGM churches and conferences on doctrine. Most importantly I wrote and presented scores of doctrinal papers and outlines for discussion by the apostolic team over 25 years.

So let's just say, doctrine has been important to me. And let me also say, no one knows my doctrine and our doctrinal differences better than you do. They have not been great and they have always been welcomed. They were never viewed as "disagreements" but "differences." At some point, that changed in your mind, but I don't know when and I don't know what it included. It is obvious you and others have concluded those disagreements are now beyond the acceptable boundaries of Sovereign Grace Ministries. Could it include my charismatic theology?

### No Room for Brent's Charismatic Theology?

At the Team Retreat at the Courtyard Marriot in Herndon, VA on January 23-25, 2007, we found out you switched to a 3<sup>rd</sup> Wave understanding of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues. You said you thought "scholars for the Pentecostal position are much weaker." That "the Pentecostal approach to Acts lacks scholarship and an understanding of redemptive history in the Book of Acts." Further, that "Pentecostals dance around 1 Corinthians 12:13." You also expressed your disagreement with D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones (e.g. his book, *Joy Unspeakable*). You said a person "is not always aware when they are filled with the Holy Spirit."

You went on to say you were "far more charismatic today than you'd ever been" and you had "the most differences with Brent." Steve said he was still uncertain what he believed but was moving in your direction. Dave was inclined to believe the "dimensional view" with a metaphorical understanding of "baptism in the Holy Spirit" (i.e., a phrase that encompasses all the blessing of salvation including justification, union with Christ, regeneration, adoption, and filling of the Holy Spirit). Here are a couple e-mails from the retreat.

**From:** Brent Detwiler

**Sent:** Thursday, January 25, 2007 12:24 AM

**To:** Pat Ennis; C.J. Mahaney; Dave Harvey; Steve Shank

**Subject:** Position on Baptism in HS

Thanks for filling us in on your change of position tonight. I was not aware. Guys will ask me what your current position is. I've been telling them Pentecostal/Charismatic. Sorry. Thanks for the clarification.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 25, 2007 8:49 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Position on Baptism in HS

No need to be sorry at all. This change has taken place only recently [without interaction with the apostolic team] when I was able to study the topic and related topics thoroughly again.

A month later you wrote Dave, Steve and me asking us to state our positions on several topics. In this e-mail you celebrated our differences and diversity.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Friday, February 23, 2007 8:36 AM  
**To:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank; Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Leaders Conference

Hey boys,

Since you guys were encouraging me to preach a message on the person and work of the Spirit (possibly 1 Cor. 12-14) at the Leaders Conference I need to discover where there might be differences on this topic so I can wisely present the material if I preach on this. Obviously differences exist in Sovereign Grace on this topic and by the grace of God we are in agreement on that which is most important in relation to this topic. I've always viewed this diversity in Sovereign Grace as a strength. I'm sure you do as well.

But it would serve me and I think all of us to revisit the topic on our next phone call. So how about if you guys each send me a few lines describing what you presently believe about the following topics:

1. The baptism in the Spirit (subsequent to conversion, a part of conversion, etc.)
2. The gift of tongues (universality of, use in public meetings, etc.)
3. Singing in the Spirit (i.e., in public meetings without interpretation)
4. Prophecy (use of first person; use of personal prophecy)

I think that would cover it. If you think there is anything else that would be helpful to address please let me know. How about if you have this to me by March 13? I plan on having Jeff join our call in order to benefit from his perspective.

Thanks for taking the time to do this.

With appreciation,  
C.J.

Four months later at another team retreat on June 18-21, 2007 in Herndon, VA; you, Dave, Steve addressed me about my continuing charismatic theology in light of your change to a 3<sup>rd</sup> Wave position

Dave asked me “How am I stewarding my differences?” He went on to asked, “What does the absence of change say to you?” by which he meant, why haven’t I changed my position? He asked me if I “sought to assess the influences that are shaping Sovereign Grace? The thinkers, speakers, and authors?” He asked, “Who is influencing you?” and “What books are you reading?” To these questions I responded, I hope humbly, that I was reading the same books as you and few extras both for (Baker, Erwin, et al.) and against (Dunn, Brunner, et al.) a charismatic/Pentecostal interpretation.

Dave commented that “People far smarter than us are changing as our scholarship deepens and we read more. The absence of change for you should be cause for evaluation.” Steve added, “Others are making changes with things we once held dear. Those around you are changing. Are you engaging in honest evaluation or taking the posture of digging your heels in and defending the truth.” Steve suggested it could be an issue of “pride, obstinacy, and unteachableness.” Larry Malament (there as a guest) asked me, “Are you concerned for pride or self-righteousness or stubbornness in hanging onto your doctrines? Is your immutability grounded in pride and independence?” Dave responded by saying it was “a good question regarding whether Brent is being independent.”

I remember the conversation like it was yesterday. It was fine to ask questions about my pride and tell me my positions were unscholarly. What caught me off guard and hurt, was the awareness that all of you had talked about addressing me beforehand and gave me no forewarning. Things had rapidly changed and without my knowledge. Suddenly, pneumatological differences and diversity were a weakness, not a strength to be celebrated. I recommended that these significant changes in theological positions be openly communicated to the movement. That recommendation was denied. [To this day many people in the movement don’t know about the significant pneumatological changes in doctrine though they comment on a noticeable decline in charismatic activity.]

Brent Removed from the Pastors College

My charismatic theology and loss of favor resulted in my removal from the Pastors College. Both my doctrine and my influence on upcoming leaders was now undesirable. I tried to respond humbly.

**From:** Jeff Purswell  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 17, 2007 2:09 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Pastors College

Hello Brent,

I trust you are well, my friend.

Thanks for getting back to Evelyn with prospective dates for next year's PC calendar. As I'm compiling these and tackling the rather challenging task (I know you can relate) of putting together next year's schedule, I wanted to let you know that I've decided to make a change concerning the pneumatology course, and that C.J. and I will attempt to teach that course next year together. [Wayne Grudem ended up teaching it.] C.J. actually encouraged me to make this change, and I do think it makes sense in light of a few factors: given the modification in our Statement of Faith (which, I think, very much needs detailed explanation—historically, theologically, and pastorally), the greater specificity given to a Sovereign Grace perspective on this (i.e., the "Contours of Charismatic Theology" message at the last Leadership Conference, along with more stuff that's been published), and the modification of C.J.'s views, it seems that it would be beneficial to address this topic with all of these things in view. I think C.J. and I together would be able to do this.

This also allows me to do something I've been trying to do for a while—get C.J. more "classroom" time for the guys (right now, it's pretty much down to zero, which should not be!). Perhaps you would assume this, but I do want to affirm clearly that, in this course, I want us to set out the strongest arguments for the range of allowable views of the topic within Sovereign Grace, as well as to exhort the men to a passionate pursuit of the Spirit's activity, gifts, and power in our lives and ministries. Your example in such a pursuit has been a wonderful effect of your teaching in this area for years, and that is something I want at all costs to preserve. Thanks so much for your heart and leadership in this for so long.

I very much want you to continue teaching Systematic Theology 1 (i.e., Introduction to Systematic Theology and the Doctrine of Scripture). The September 4-7 date you sent works great – it's wonderful to have you kicking off the year for the guys.

If you have questions about this, Brent, feel free to let me know.

Grateful for you,

Jeff

I was now reduced to teaching Systematic Theology 1 in the Pastors College. In January 2008, I contacted Jeff about the upcoming 08-09 school year. I was planning my calendar but I also had in mind that you wouldn't want me to teach in the Pastors College any longer.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Saturday, January 26, 2008 9:50 AM  
To: Jeff Purswell  
Subject: PC - Brent

I am planning my Fall calendar. Would you like me to teach Systematic Theology 1 [i.e., Introduction to Systematic Theology and The Doctrine of Scripture] in the Pastors College on September 2-5? It would be a joy to do so.

From: Jeff Purswell  
Sent: Saturday, January 26, 2008 4:40 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: PC - Brent

Hello Brent,

Thanks for your note – it is very good to hear from you.

Actually, as C.J. and I have been looking over the calendar, we will be making a number of changes involving different teachers. So at this point, I will not have you teaching this course next year.

Of course, an e-mail like this wouldn't be complete without expressing my indebtedness to you for your investment in the PC over the years. In fact, as I like to tell the students – and I will continue to do so – the PC wouldn't be what it is now without your labors from the beginning. I trust you feel my deep

gratefulness, not only for this, but for your friendship and support over the years.

Thanks, my friend.

Jeff

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Saturday, January 26, 2008 6:35 PM  
To: Jeff Purswell  
Subject: RE: PC - Brent

That is personally sad to hear (I love teaching in the PC) but it is perfectly fine for C.J. to make any changes he would like (I am sure many others can teach the doctrine of Scripture better) but maybe you could provide some kind of explanation at some point. On the other hand, if you're uncomfortable doing so that is fine. It has been a joy teaching over the last 23 years [beginning with the Leadership Training School in 1983].

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Saturday, January 26, 2008 8:41 PM  
To: Jeff Purswell  
Subject: RE: PC - Brent

Please disregard my request. [It wasn't worth pressing for an honest explanation. I realized my influence in the PC was undesirable.] Thanks for continuing to improve the PC. That is plenty fine.

Sincerely,  
Brent

The stated reason for not having me teach was "C.J. and I have been looking over the calendar, we will be making a number of changes involving different teachers." These numerous changes involving different teachers never occurred. In fact there were absolutely no changes made involving SG teachers except that Jeff taught Pneumatology instead of Grudem and Jeff taught the Doctrine of Scripture instead of me. There were a couple minor changes for guest speakers.

Dave Harvey, Jeff Purswell, Bruce Chick, Mark Mullery, Gary Ricucci, Mickey Connolly, Bob Kauflin, Phil Sasser, Robin Boisvert, Steve Shank, Corby Megorden, Craig Cabaniss, Kenneth Maresco, Jim Donohue, and Tommy Hill all taught the same

courses in 08-09 as they did in 07-08. No new SG teachers were added. No old SG teachers were deleted. I was the only one removed.

Seven months earlier Jeff told me, "I very much want you to continue teaching...The Doctrine of Scripture.... It's wonderful to have you kicking off the year for the guys." Given those sentiments, I'd gladly have taught the course when no changes were made to the teaching rotation. Instead Jeff taught the course even though he was very busy and had too much on his plate already. This appears to have been a ploy to phase me out or at least a convenient opportunity to do so.<sup>216</sup> I might also add these changes were all done by e-mail and without a conversation with you or Jeff.

On a little different note, I was told a couple of months ago that all of Jenny and my messages were removed from the Sovereign Grace website. I just checked by doing a search. It appears to be the case. Could I get a copy of our messages so I can provide them to those who ask? Evidently, people are troubled by this and the fact that any reference to me has been expunged from the "history book" of Sovereign Grace Ministries.

#### Personal Anecdote on August 20, 2004 Meeting

After the August 20, 2004 meeting at Covenant Life Church all the men in the room came up to me and commended me for my presentation and my courage. I did not feel courageous. I was afraid to address these issues with you.

As the meeting progressed, I was comforted as I realized all the men essentially agreed with my assessment. This is evident from Bob's notes. So there was reason to be encouraged. Nevertheless, when the meeting was over and as I was leaving; I felt the Holy Spirit indicate that this meeting would ultimately result in my removal from Sovereign Grace Ministries. That thought came out of nowhere. On my way to the car, I called Jenny. She asked how the meeting went. I told it went well in the sense that all the CLC men were supportive and expressed agreement. But I also told her about the impression I received from the Holy Spirit.

I have not lived with that impression in the forefront of my mind for the last 2½ years but I have contemplated it from time to time. In retrospect, it is not hard to discern your profound offense from the August 20 meeting. It was particularly apparent during our November 19 meeting in Charlotte when you critiqued me. There was very little from the August 20 meeting you were not offended at. This was in contrast to your own comments at the August 20 meeting. Compare the two sets of notes. In three months, your perspective radically changed. I am afraid the seed fell on rocky soil.

Recently, Sovereign Grace has begun to repudiate any connection between August 20, 2004 and my present circumstances.<sup>217</sup> I think there is a vital and direct link. Your resentment of me resulted in sins against me. Later this bitterness contributed to an unjust process of evaluation led by Bob. I will not belabor the point.

### Brent Banned from Sovereign Grace Churches

As it stands, I've been banned by you and the leadership team from involvement in any of the churches. On September 24, 2009 Dave wrote,

“Should you desire to alter your approach [i.e., stop raising concerns and asking questions]<sup>218</sup> and turn your attention to the practical steps you would need to take for involvement in an SGM church...then I would be happy to speak with you in person or via phone.”

I have never shared the detailed concerns in this response with anyone. I've only shared my experiences in general with a handful of people. When I was involved in Sovereign Grace it was a joyful challenge to cover your sins, protect your reputation and celebrate your strengths. Your strengths touched and benefitted my life in many ways.

In contradistinction, people are now being told that my “disqualifying” sins have been addressed for many years. That they are long term. This is unjust. The first time you raised any concerns (i.e., the church planting proposal, sending Nick Swan to the Pastors College) was at the team retreat in June of 2006. People are being misled and it is intentional.<sup>219</sup>

### The Need for Private Acknowledgment by C.J.

You contacted me because you heard I might be offended. You didn't contact me because you were convicted of sin. Therefore, I hope this response helps you “to hear [my] heart and consider [my] perspective in hopes of discovering if [you] have sinned against [me].” I suggest you interact with this material and then write me back. Please let me know if you are convicted of anything. This is a necessary first step for me if we are to move ahead.

You should also consider the past input of others. Over the years, sins against me were brought to your attention by numerous individuals.<sup>220</sup> On these occasions, you always disagreed with their correction, said you experienced no conviction of sin and therefore could not ask my forgiveness. There are many examples. I suggest you revisit them.

While there has been no effort to preserve our friendship or ask my forgiveness in the past, I sincerely hope the future is different.

### The Need for Public Confession by C.J.

Over the last 30 years – and for less serious sins – you have disciplined, removed from ministry, required public confessions, done extensive investigations, reduced salaries, placed on probation, and curtailed the responsibilities of Sovereign Grace employees and pastors. In your case, none of these things occurred.<sup>221</sup>

Last April at the Sovereign Grace Pastors Conference you said,

“We all sin. We sin many times and we sin in many ways. The passage [James 3:2] is clear and it is confirmed in our experience. We not only sin frequently, we sin with variety. This passage applies to each and every pastor in Sovereign Grace. We are not flawless pastors. Quite the opposite. We are flawed pastors. We do not flawlessly pastor in Sovereign Grace. I wish we did. I wish I did. But I don’t. You don’t. We don’t.... But in Sovereign Grace we must acknowledge our flaws and we must learn from our flaws...”

You also said,

“It is stunning when anyone in any modern American institution takes honest responsibility. I want you to know it should not be stunning when pastors take responsibility. It should be the norm. And in Sovereign Grace we are not about damage control. It would be a clear contradiction of this passage [James 3:2] and what we believe about the doctrine of sin for us to engage in damage control. We do not engage in damage control. There will be no damage control in Sovereign Grace. We will seek to walk humbly before God and when we stumble we will not seek to engage in damage control. No, instead we will humbly acknowledge with sorrow that we stumbled. No damage control.”

In your case, there has been no confession but there has been considerable damage control.<sup>222</sup> I suggest you acknowledge to the blogosphere and confess to the churches in the movement, the patterns of sin we’ve addressed in your life. In addition, I think you should give a more detailed confession to the Sovereign Grace pastors and senior staff at the upcoming Pre-Conference Gathering before T4G. It presents a great venue and would be a wonderful display of humility.

So I will gladly meet with you and work to see our friendship restored provided you are willing to acknowledge your sins in private correspondence and confess your sins in public.<sup>223</sup>

## Final Remarks - An Appeal for Integrity, Truth Telling & Justice

I'd love to see our friendship restored. I'd love to see some acknowledgment of wrongdoing. I'd love to see issues from the past resolved. I'd love to be in good standing with Sovereign Grace Ministries. But all of these hopes and desires are very secondary!

Primarily, I hope and desire to see a restoration of integrity, truth telling and justice in Sovereign Grace so there is no lying, spin, manipulation, lording, cover-up, or partiality. I am concerned for the movement. Some men have followed sinful aspects of your example and leadership – the kind referenced in this response. These men have acted deceitfully, judgmentally, unbiblically, and hypocritically. Their example in turn, has harmed others and been corrosive in its effect.<sup>224</sup>

These things are not pervasive in their lives, your life or the movement but they are serious. I know you value integrity but when you feel judged or sinned against it is often subterfuged in your life. When you become resentful, bitter and angry – grace and integrity often get left behind. These are fueled by the idols of self-preservation and love of reputation. As the movement has grown, so has temptation and sin.

I love you and Sovereign Grace Ministries. It remains one the best combinations of sound doctrine, contemporary worship, community life, and gospel centered mission in the country. There are many outstanding pastors in the churches. And there are many godly aspects to your example and leadership. These too have been imbibed by others including me. I have greatly benefitted by your life, ministry and friendship.

Though concerned, I am hopeful in Christ, and pray God's grace will be poured out upon you in abundance!

## ENDNOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> I sent you "Response Regarding Friendship and Doctrine" on March 17, 2010 and "A Final Appeal" on October 8, 2010. You provided me your perspective on these documents on December 16, 2010 and again on March 11, 2011. In these responses, you treated lightly or passed over a lot of material. As a result, I've added endnotes to highlight what you failed to address or address inadequately.

<sup>2</sup> At no point did you acknowledge any relationship between the "terrible consequences for me" and the August 20, 2004 meeting.

<sup>3</sup> This was the first of many examples where you passed over the concerns I raised and left them unaddressed. Here you said nothing about your deceitful "claim [of] ignorance" which was "disconcerting," "disingenuous," and "unintelligible."

<sup>4</sup> You pretended there was no harm to "our friendship" or "separation of heart between us."

<sup>5</sup> You never acknowledged either of my points or your dishonesty.

<sup>6</sup> You acknowledged absolutely no deceit and practically no hypocrisy. You never talked about self preservation or love of reputation. In other words, you have no concerns for my greatest concerns for you and the movement.

<sup>7</sup> You don't acknowledge this long history of sin and its affects upon a host of people over the last three decades.

<sup>8</sup> This is another example of giving your word and then breaking your word. You did not address this illustration in either of your responses.

<sup>9</sup> You badly misled us in this regard. Dave and I were shocked by the almost total lack of accountability we later discovered in your life.

<sup>10</sup> You didn't address or acknowledge this double standard. It was another example of hypocrisy you passed over.

<sup>11</sup> Something you insisted for yourself but never ensured for Dave, me or others. This requirement effectively shut down the process. The CLC men were afraid to provide updates and you/they were unwilling to meet with us. As a result we never met together again (or even had a conference call) after the August 20 meeting. They "closed circle" and you were leading the wagon train.

<sup>12</sup> This was an empty boast. In the years to follow you repeatedly did evaluations of me without my knowledge or participation. You even had Larry Malament send you secret reports. Dave, Gene and Bob also followed your example of exclusion. It's incredible how much was said and done behind my back.

<sup>13</sup> True but you never talked to us about your hypocrisy. Nor did you ask our forgiveness or clean up the resultant debris.

<sup>14</sup> You have never acknowledged to me (or anyone else to my knowledge) this serious and long term expression of hypocrisy. You taught accountable. You required accountability. You had a reputation for accountability. But in reality, you had little accountability with the pastors at CLC. No one was speaking into your life for all practical purposes. This should be confessed to the movement and the pastors. Moreover, you had no accountability because you saw no need for accountability. Even when men brought care in the form of correction it was typically dismissed by you. You were able to shepherd your own heart with your superior discernment. You were above accountability.

<sup>15</sup> This is a biblical category you never used in reference to yourself. It is a very fitting one. It is related to your high estimation.

<sup>16</sup> You repeatedly withheld information you were asked to share and promised to share yet you acknowledged no deceit in either of your responses.

<sup>17</sup> A public confession is necessary given the adverse effect these sinful patterns have had upon a large number of people in Sovereign Grace Ministries and outside the movement over the past 30 years.

<sup>18</sup> One day I hope you realize how intimidating and controlling you have been with people. Consider these statements from Joshua, Kenneth and Bob. People are silenced and feel manipulated by you.

<sup>19</sup> Another example of hypocrisy.

---

<sup>20</sup> You thought I was a hateful friend, not a faithful friend. It appears you still think I was largely motivated by offense with two exceptions where you've changed your perspective (i.e. vacation days, stepping down). You state, "I should have explored my concerns with you and been humbly open to the possibility that you weren't offended and were not motivated by a previous offense when you were correcting me."

<sup>21</sup> You don't address these additional examples of withholding information. You felt free to withhold information under any circumstance or in any venue if you disagreed with it.

<sup>22</sup> This was an example of supplying us misinformation. You intentionally put yourself in a good light and deceitfully misrepresented the CLC pastors. They expressed "broad agreement" with us. You don't address this illustration.

<sup>23</sup> You don't speak to Dave's "several illustrations." You only acknowledged withholding our input from the CLC pastors and their input from us. You failed to address the widespread pattern of withholding unfavorable information. This goes to your love of reputation and image management not just "superior discernment" resulting in the dismissal of input.

<sup>24</sup> This was another example of hypocrisy. You criticized others for using e-mail for correction or other purposes but did not follow your own counsel. You'd convey quick decisions or direction without discussion. As Joshua pointed out, "You were very decisive and hasty - often through e-mail." Over the years you have brought harsh, sometimes devastating, correction via e-mail. You've done the same with decisions effecting people's lives or employment.

<sup>25</sup> Something you expressed no concern for in either of your responses.

<sup>26</sup> You make no comment about this sinful craving and controlling idol in your life. Your love (i.e., obsession) of reputation and high opinion of yourself go together. You fear being misunderstood and misrepresented because you crave the praise of men. This explains the lying, deceit, cover-up, intimidation, etc. People think of you as humble, teachable, accountable and truthful. In part, because you make self demeaning comments which are general in nature. You don't reveal specific occasions of sin or their seriousness. You often pretend humility (e.g. during panel discussions at T4G). Real humility would result in the open, honest accounting of your sins and their effects on others.

<sup>27</sup> This was purposeful self promotion and not just due to spiritual blindness. You were deceiving us, not just deceived. You tried to persuade us that you received more accountability, correction and pastoring than anyone in the movement at CLC. And that you received their input with characteristic humility and teachability.

<sup>28</sup> You began an accountability group at CLC at our request. The pastors thought you did this on your own initiative and credited you for it. You didn't adjust their faulty perspective. Later they found out it was done in response to direction from us. This was another example of deceit that goes unaddressed.

<sup>29</sup> This was under false pretense. You did not have their commendation on these occasions.

<sup>30</sup> You've told us for many years that you were "the worse sinner I know...the chief of sinners." In practice, however, you believed the opposite about yourself. You've held yourself in high regard.

<sup>31</sup> This mild, gracious and singular statement about hypocrisy was offensive to you. Later you confronted me for suggesting the possibility. You felt it had no relevance. Still today, you fail to acknowledge hypocrisy as an entangling sin. The only example you agreed with was not telling the CLC pastors about our input. Otherwise you disagreed with all my examples of hypocrisy.

<sup>32</sup> Actually it did make it less serious. There is a big difference between being duped and intentionally duping others. I don't know if Joshua still thinks you are innocent of duplicity.

<sup>33</sup> You don't acknowledge any lack of integrity at any time for anything. You don't address Dave's illustrations. We asked you to approach others for input or observations. You ignored us and did not follow through. Things really did stop at C.J.

<sup>34</sup> Three months later you confronted me for saying "you were resentful" when I simply suggested the possibility - a suggestion you were utterly closed to. You didn't ask forgiveness for this abusive correction.

<sup>35</sup> Of course, you thought Dave and I were harsh but not you. This was another example of hypocrisy. You acknowledged no occasion when you were harsh in tone or content in either response.

---

<sup>36</sup> You never talked to us about this sinful craving for reputation or its fruits in your life. You made no reference to it in either response. It appears to be a non issue in your thinking. Certainly not a significant category since you made no reference to any love of reputation.

<sup>37</sup> This was a passing remark. You never asked forgiveness. We never discussed it further. For instance, whether you were resentful.

<sup>38</sup> You “consider[ed] it” but came to the conclusion I was wrong for even suggesting the possibility. You ruled out any resentment, anger or bitterness.

<sup>39</sup> This was a very important statement by Grant. Your response that “no one had to read, promote, or agree with the book” was manipulative. For trying to discuss the issue of “cross-centeredness” we received this punishing response which was “cloaked in the virtue of humility.” You frequently say or do things that appear humble but are motivated out of a love of reputation. You want to look good by looking humble.

<sup>40</sup> True, you think highly of yourself but you’ve led people to believe you think little of yourself.

<sup>41</sup> You should never have allowed us to believe you were accountable.

<sup>42</sup> That is, the lack of accountability, correction and pastoral care. This should be confessed to the movement and pastors.

<sup>43</sup> I don’t believe you were being honest. You purposely withheld unfavorable information and provided favorable information on many occasions. You must take responsibility for your deceit rather than attributing it to the blinding effects of pride. Your inward deception was largely the fruit of your outward deceit. Not the other way around. You disobeyed Scripture. Eph 4:25 Therefore, laying aside falsehood, speak truth each one of you with his neighbor, for we are members of one another. Col 3:9 Do not lie to one another, since you laid aside the old self with its evil practices.

<sup>44</sup> No one agreed with you. You claimed humility in remaining silent. You claimed you didn’t want to interrupt the conviction you were experiencing. But it appears you were struggling with our input and “restraining” yourself from speaking up. Everyone else felt you were not being open and honest so we could know what you were really thinking and feeling. You saw your silence as humility, we saw it as pride. As Josh said, you didn’t want “to have other eyes on your thoughts.” You didn’t want us to know your temptations or sins.

<sup>45</sup> The lack of self-disclosure results in a lack of public-disclosure. Not walking in the light with us results in not walking in the light with the movement and pastors.

<sup>46</sup> Again the concern for reputation was partly behind the lack of transparency.

<sup>47</sup> This was untrue. As you’ve recently confessed, you’ve were very comfortable with yourself assessment and very uncomfortable with everyone else’s assessment of you.

<sup>48</sup> Of course, that way of processing correction is what you recently acknowledged.

<sup>49</sup> You denied doing this after the August 20 meeting in your second response.

<sup>50</sup> You did later but in a manner that proved unfruitful. You dwelt on offenses and disagreements. That is, all the ways you thought I sinned against you and judged you. We never talked about areas of agreement. You only talked about your disagreements.

<sup>51</sup> True enough but we were never given the opportunity to cover specific areas and examples again, despite many appeals and requests.

<sup>52</sup> This was a very important point by Joshua. It is far more accurate to view your “withdrawal” as resentment and distrust. In my case, however, you deny resentment had anything to do with your withdrawal from me or treatment of me. It has taken 10 years for you to see some aspects of your pride. I hope it doesn’t an additional 10 years to see your resentment. You didn’t trust my motives, discernment or illustrations and told me so. You thought my motives were bitter, discernment errant, and illustrations irrelevant. I was cut off by you.

<sup>53</sup> You didn’t address or acknowledge these specific effects on people which are types of spiritual abuse.

<sup>54</sup> You never repented of these major categories (e.g. withdrawal, resentment, lack of self-disclosure, love of reputation, being unentreatable, deceit, abusive reactions, etc.), confessed particular sins to individuals, or made any attempts at personal restoration or restitution. You were disobedient to Christ and the teaching of Scripture on these subjects. You don’t reference obedience/disobedience as a category by

---

which to understand your behavior. You tend to blame your actions on indwelling sin. You need to see your sins much more clearly as transgressions against God's holy law. That is, as willful choices not just blinded passions. You "agree[d] with all the major categories" but chose a path of disobedience. You need more illumination but your need for repentance and obedience is greater. For example, you know a public confession is required. I believe that is clear to you. You just have to humble yourself and obey our Lord Jesus.

<sup>55</sup> I always hoped you'd be the one to voluntarily and downwardly adjust people's opinion of you. Instead, that providential assignment fell to the blogs. Instead of humbling yourself, you've been humbled by God. I wish it were not the case. SGM Refuge began in June 2008. Since that humbling began Sovereign Grace has been busy trying to contain the damage. I don't think this public humiliation will abate until the sins of Sovereign Grace are publicly confessed as a fruit of private repentance.

<sup>56</sup> Yes but concerns for your reputation have outweighed concerns for integrity. I'm afraid Proverbs 10:9 applies, "He who walks in integrity walks securely, but he who perverts his ways will be found out." Dave has compromised himself since August 20, 2004. He has been a major factor in covering up your sins, his sins and the sins of others.

<sup>57</sup> We never heard back from anyone regarding arrangements for accountability or the circle of confession. Obviously you, Joshua, Grant, Kenneth and Bob, decided it was unnecessary to confess anything to anyone.

<sup>58</sup> You didn't address this section regarding the need for a wider confession given your blatant hypocrisy, etc.

<sup>59</sup> This portrait was not flattering but it was true. It was no caricature. People assumed all these were happening because they trusted you. This list should be confessed to the movement and pastors. Tragically, you continue to acknowledge no hypocrisy in reference to any of these points. People should know you've been a hypocrite in serious ways "given the portrait that forms above."

<sup>60</sup> You passed over this section and said nothing about redirecting the focus to Dave and me. Moreover, you deny effectively taking over the process or removing us from the process. Here is your only comment regarding the same. "Following the August meeting...I did not think of myself as leading this process, nor was I taking steps to remove you from the process...I don't recall intentionally cutting you and Dave out of any process."

<sup>61</sup> You did not allow this conversation to occur in the context of the larger group. I knew you wanted to correct me and I wanted the other men present to hear your offenses and disagreements. Instead you met with me alone on November 19 in Charlotte. I should have insisted that others were present. That was a mistake.

<sup>62</sup> I should not have allowed myself to be manipulated. Your promise was empty that "then I am glad for everyone to hear anything and everything." You blocked or refused all interaction between us, you and the CLC pastors. For example, your repeated unwillingness to answer the four questions Dave sent you.

<sup>63</sup> "Front and center stage" describes precisely what happened. You were fixated on us and directed the gaze of everyone in our direction and especially on to me. I quickly became public enemy #1. You were out of the spotlight and off the hot seat. For the next 15 months I was "hounded and harassed" (if you don't mind me putting it that way) for my supposed sins against you.

<sup>64</sup> You deny this happened but you don't deal with any of the evidence supporting this fact based conclusion. You abused your position and took over the process. Joshua, Grant and Kenneth were complicit in allowing you to do this.

<sup>65</sup> Your actions contradicted your e-mail confessions. The fruit of repentance was absent. More hypocrisy.

<sup>66</sup> This was an extremely serious judgment. I vividly remember how shocked we were by your false accusation. More so because you and Steve were talking this way behind our backs. You didn't address this illustration.

<sup>67</sup> Before August 20 you assured Dave you had no unspoken concerns for him. A couple months later you told him you had two years of accumulated concerns. You misled him. This flip flop really affected him. Dave stated his concern for your integrity in very nice terms.

- 
- <sup>68</sup> You flatly denied this in your second response.
- <sup>69</sup> You corrected me for my 1 hour 20 minute overview and the supposed lack of dialogue on August 20 (which is contradicted by the minutes) while delivering a 4 hour monologue of correction. You didn't address this example of hypocrisy.
- <sup>70</sup> You acknowledged your sinful judgment of me on this one point in your Dec 16, 2010 response. At the time, however, you "insisted" one thing was true when the "opposite" thing was true. Your thinking was irrational and nothing could persuade you otherwise. It was scary and typical behavior in relation to me. You didn't have a grasp on reality. Your heart was raging. You couldn't think straight. Your reasoning was crooked.
- <sup>71</sup> Something you continue to deny. You don't remember any resentment, bitterness or anger in your heart.
- <sup>72</sup> You addressed and acknowledged only one of your sinful judgments (i.e., saying I wanted you to step down). You passed over the remaining twenty or so.
- <sup>73</sup> You passed these judgments onto men like Steve, Joshua, Kenneth, Grant and Bob. You acknowledged nothing of the sort with no harm done.
- <sup>74</sup> Even though you treated me in an abusive fashion, I wanted to support you, serve you and move ahead. I wanted to commend progress but there was little to commend and there was a lot to be concerned about since you were not cooperating with us. I was trying to be honest with you and help you.
- <sup>75</sup> You saw no need to talk about them because you disagreed with them and thought I was blinded by bitterness.
- <sup>76</sup> This was a terrible mistake. Bob followed lock step in your path of resistance and deception.
- <sup>77</sup> As pointed out above you did not deal with the issues in this section. You passed over your sinful judgments and left them unaddressed. Nor did you acknowledge your expressions of hypocrisy.
- <sup>78</sup> Not a reference to Benny Phillips.
- <sup>79</sup> You crave encouragement and when you don't receive it become resentful. You felt deserving of our encouragement because of the high marks you gave yourself. We tried our best to encourage you but it was hard given your obstinacy, judgments, resentment and withdrawal. In actuality, we handled you with kid gloves.
- <sup>80</sup> You didn't see your sins as serious.
- <sup>81</sup> You thought DH needed to confess to the church but you didn't see any need for you to confess to a small group of leaders like the CLC pastors. Your sins were far greater than DH's.
- <sup>82</sup> Something you were not doing.
- <sup>83</sup> You were hard on BL and easy on yourself. BL handled your mistreatment well. His sins were less serious and he accepted responsibility for them. It took 7 years for you to take responsibility for your sins. BL was longsuffering.
- <sup>84</sup> You didn't address this serious example of hypocrisy. You participated in no couples retreat in 3 years, no care group in 18 months, and no men's accountability group. This was astounding. I remember being so shocked when discovered.
- <sup>85</sup> You disputed this by saying you didn't remember any resentment, bitterness or anger in attitude or posture of heart toward me. Yep, clean as a whistle, pure as snow and holy as Hannah. Pardon the sarcasm.
- <sup>86</sup> This e-mail was sent the next morning at 8:52 am. My comment about "an element of hypocrisy" appeared to be in the forefront of your mind. I suspect it was preoccupying because it was disturbing. Why? As it turned out you were offended by its use and felt it had no application to you. In less than 24 hours, your focus was on my supposed sins. You briefly acknowledged this hypocrisy in your second response. It is your only acknowledgment of hypocrisy and it pertains to not telling the CLC pastors about our input.
- <sup>87</sup> True enough. You were faithful to let me know you did not perceive any hypocrisy in yourself but you did perceive resentment in my soul for making the suggestion.

- 
- <sup>88</sup> You weren't interested in our perspective. You were intent on sharing your perspective. There was much you wanted to say to Dave and me. Starting August 21 your focus was on Dave and me. It stayed there. It was as if August 20 never happened.
- <sup>89</sup> You acknowledged judging me in your first response but do you realize how abusive you were?
- <sup>90</sup> You didn't address the adverse impact this sinful judgment had on others. In fact, you acknowledge no harmful affect on anyone at anytime for anything.
- <sup>91</sup> This was another example of appearing to be humble but in reality you had no intent of stepping down. You claimed you'd make stepping down easy for us if we felt it necessary. So not true.
- <sup>92</sup> Glad? Or did you really mean mad? You were not happy about this request.
- <sup>93</sup> These were empty boasts.
- <sup>94</sup> I was mistaken.
- <sup>95</sup> I didn't mean six years. ☺ Seriously, this was a "black and white" illustration of sinful judging but you would not humble yourself.
- <sup>96</sup> This sounded oh so humble but I/we/others experienced just the opposite. You barely benefited from our input. You rejected my feedback and didn't answer my questions. Two weeks later you badly stumble over my attempts to serve you at the August 20 meeting. This was humble sounding but you never followed through on your promises.
- <sup>97</sup> Contrary to your boast, you zealously "persecuted" me for supposedly suggesting you step down. You were indignant. I experienced your hostility once again for something you made up in your own mind contrary to the facts of the matter.
- <sup>98</sup> Another boast. Your offense was so great you could not let the issue go.
- <sup>99</sup> A mere platitude.
- <sup>100</sup> Which were entirely bogus.
- <sup>101</sup> Steve was bad for you and you were bad for Steve. You transferred offenses to each other and slandered me to others without my knowledge. Of course, Steve's comments were intentional. He intended to put me in a bad light. Did he do so knowing he was "intentionally" distorting the truth? I think so given the abundant evidence but only the Lord knows for sure.
- <sup>102</sup> This was Dave's perspective of me on October 19 - two months after the August 20 meeting. For over a year you, Steve, Bob, and Kenneth prosecuted your case against me.
- <sup>103</sup> It was important. You were making a case against me and turning others against me. You discredited me as a way to discrediting my input. You rejected the messenger and the message.
- <sup>104</sup> This was not an overstatement. Though you acknowledged no resentment, bitterness or anger; your offenses controlled you. Many of your thoughts and actions defied logic. This was another example of spiritual abuse - intimidation, manipulation, and control.
- <sup>105</sup> Five months after the August 20 meeting I was still trying in vain to get all of us back together for a follow up meeting. You actively prevented this from happening.
- <sup>106</sup> True. From December 2003 to December 2004. This continued indefinitely.
- <sup>107</sup> With the exception of August 20 you had not allowed us to talk as a team with you about our concerns for over 12 months. We repeatedly tried but you refused. After August 20 you took control of the process and focused on our perceived sin. Never in the history of Sovereign Grace Ministries had anyone taken control of (effectively shutting down) their own disciplinary process, then turned the process against those bringing the discipline, and steadfastly refused to meet and talk about the original concerns. You lorded over the process for your advantage and selfish benefit.
- <sup>108</sup> You just ignored all our concerns and requests and refused to engage us. Anyone else in the movement would have been fired for such actions.
- <sup>109</sup> This was a shameful and deceitful response. To claim such ignorance was impossible to understand. For four months we appealed to meet and talk about the August 20 meeting, input from CLC pastors, relevance of illustrations, effects upon us, redirecting the focus, demand to be present at all evaluations, refusal to interact, withdrawing from us, etc.
- <sup>110</sup> Dave and I observed little good fruit. In fact, we were concerned for the growing presence of bad fruit.

---

<sup>111</sup> You led Joshua, Kenneth, Grant and Bob to believe you were discussing issues with us when in fact this was not happening. More deception.

<sup>112</sup> What did you tell the men about your intentions? They believed you fully intended “to press into these areas” (i.e., the effects of your sins upon us). This was the heart of their recommendations but you had no such intention. You dismissed their input and rebelled against their counsel. I know you thought their input was worthless but why did you deceive them into thinking you’d be getting back to us?

<sup>113</sup> You often taught confession should be done in person not via email. Once again, you were hypocritical. You had no such conviction in your case. There were no “face to face” confessions – just two e-mail confessions. You skipped over this example.

<sup>114</sup> To this day, I don’t know what “potentially sinful attitudes” the men were addressing in your heart. We were never told. All you acknowledged was a failure to inform us of the ways the CLC pastors were correcting you due to pride. You never filled us in on their correction.

<sup>115</sup> You were proud but you were also rebellious, stubborn and deceitful.

<sup>116</sup> This turned out not to be the case when we provided our perspective.

<sup>117</sup> This was absurd. No one else could get away with a simple “I was proud, please forgive me.” The CLC pastors had instructed you to be specific in your confession of sin against us. This was the ultimate cop out but not even this occurred.

<sup>118</sup> You did not acknowledge hypocrisy as a sinful pattern in either of your responses. In fact, you only acknowledged one incident of hypocrisy. It appeared in your second response and dealt with not passing on our correction to the CLC pastors. Otherwise, you took considerable space to deny being hypocritical in three illustrations I used. I don’t believe you are blind to this sin and therefore in need of more illumination. I think you are willfully suppressing the truth about hypocrisy which is evident to you. It is not a problem of perception. It is a problem of volition. You refuse to acknowledge what you see clearly. The same is true for the Board of Directors.

<sup>119</sup> This is another example of lording it over us. When you disagreed with our evaluation you unilaterally removed me, took over the process and stopped any further evaluation of you. You used your position and exercised authority for your own sinful advantage and protection and in the process harmed other individuals.

<sup>120</sup> You didn’t acknowledge any wrong doing, only regret that you did not “quickly gathered the team together so that Steve could share his concern” with Dave and me. Otherwise you didn’t address this sinful interaction with Steve and the negative fruit it produced. It fueled your sinful suspicious of Dave and me.

<sup>121</sup> Your heart was in a bad way and full of many sinful judgments. You skipped over this illustration in your responses.

<sup>122</sup> This is a major concern for me! Countless times you have rejected correction because you think the person bringing it is bitter (e.g. Dave and me). This must stop! When people correct you, you practically equate it with bitterness. And you’ve often judged the person’s heart before talking to them. Hence many have pointed out how you judge hastily, prematurely, and without careful consideration of the facts. You frequently assume bitterness is present in their heart. Therefore, if someone adjusts you, they must be resentful of you. So often you turn the focus back upon the person and correct them for their pride, resentment, anger or bitterness. You may acknowledge some wrong but fundamentally you see the other person as the problem. In other words, if they weren’t resentful they wouldn’t be correcting you and their correction is erroneous because they are blinded by bitterness. This becomes a convenient excuse to dismiss them and their reproof. They are the one who need help! Not you. This is a prevalent error among Sovereign Grace pastors. Even when bitter, people need to be heard and heard fairly and sincerely. The easiest way to help them overcome their bitterness is to confess any sin committed against them.

<sup>123</sup> This too is a common response by you to correction. You reject the person because you’ve decided they cannot be trusted. They can’t be trusted because their motive for correcting you is bitter, their observations are errant, and their illustrations are sinful judgments. You felt so wronged by me. You felt

---

so justified in your harsh condemnation. You were angry. This was abusive in nature. It too goes unaddressed. You had no good reason not to trust me.

<sup>124</sup> This kind of thing frequently happens. You deny your words or actions.

<sup>125</sup> You also deny how forcefully and fiercely you can communicate.

<sup>126</sup> This pattern of denial continues. You repeatedly deny any resentful, angry or bitterness.

<sup>127</sup> This was another empty promise. Time after time you broke your word. You were the one who could not be trusted. You'd say the right thing and then do the opposite thing. You never talked to us and never let us know where you were convicted of sin.

<sup>128</sup> You denied doing this in your responses but it was obvious to Dave, Steve and me.

<sup>129</sup> Of you taking over the process.

<sup>130</sup> These began immediately after the August 20 meeting. You didn't address this deceitful activity.

<sup>131</sup> Steve was a man pleaser in this process and compromised his integrity as a result. He'd say one thing to you and another to us. Or, he'd slandered us and connivingly interact with you without our knowledge. He wanted to look good in everyone's sight but especially in yours.

<sup>132</sup> Steve was not willing to jeopardize his good standing with you. This was a historical pattern. He'd withhold his discernment and let us do the hard work. He didn't want to get in trouble with you. When he did speak it often lacked insight and sufficient firmness. He went easy on you. He lacked courage and a willingness to deny self. It was no wonder why you gravitated to Steve.

<sup>133</sup> They were under a wrong impression. You did not allow us to bring any input after August 20. It was 5 months later.

<sup>134</sup> What did you tell them? I hope it was the truth. That is, not much because you refused to interact with us even when we brought concerns and observations to your attention.

<sup>135</sup> Kenneth did not want to talk to us about you and he did not want us to talk to him about you. He was very concerned either would jeopardize your progress and violate your trust in the CLC pastors. They were silenced, we were cut off and you were mute. You refused to tell us about the input you were receiving and you refused to interact with us. In this way, you controlled and manipulated the process. We were separated from the CLC pastors and them from us. You also separated from us and therefore us from you. Furthermore, you refused all attempts to set up meetings with all parties in attendance. Six years later the Holy Spirit is bringing into the open what you attempted to control and conceal.

<sup>136</sup> Why were the CLC pastors under the impression you were filling us in on their input? Did you mislead them? We never talked about this and you didn't address it.

<sup>137</sup> This enabled you to control and cut off the flow of information. Allowing this to happen catered to your deceit.

<sup>138</sup> And all rejected by you. Dave and I were still sharing our perspective with you on retreats even though you refused to engage us.

<sup>139</sup> Which you now acknowledge you never did. You withheld this information. It was an ingrained pattern.

<sup>140</sup> This was a step in the wrong direction. Bob shared some of the same characteristics as Steve. Man (C.J.) pleasing was deeply imbedded in his soul. He coveted your favor and approval. He told me so. In consequence, Bob was far bolder (more arrogant) in his defense of you. He took up your offenses and shared your sinful judgments. He granted you great latitude.

<sup>141</sup> These recollections were all true. The repeatedly use of "any" was accurate. This covered the time span from August 2004 through March 2005. Furthermore, these 5 general observations were never discussed despite our ongoing appeals.

<sup>142</sup> None of these recommendations were adopted by you or the CLC pastors.

<sup>143</sup> None of these questions were discussed. You acknowledged this was wrong and due to your pride.

<sup>144</sup> In the first response, you agreed to distancing yourself and withdrawing your affection from me. In your second response, you deny this was due to resentment, anger or bitterness. To what then do you attribute your rejection and punishing reaction?

<sup>145</sup> Clarity on the issues and our relationship with the CLC pastors deteriorated after Bob took the point. Things decidedly worsen.

---

<sup>146</sup> You now say these questions should have been answered but weren't because of your pride. True but pride in what form? Be specific. And why did the CLC men also find these questions problematic and unhelpful? Clearly, it was due to your influence upon them and their craving for your approbation. Joshua, Grant, Kenneth and Bob need to take responsibility for their sins - man pleasing, sinful judgments, cowardice, favoritism, etc. These too should be communicated to the movement and pastors. They failed to hold you accountable to truth and allowed you to walk in falsehood and deception. They should have insisted these questions were answered immediately and thoroughly. Instead they struggled with them according to Bob and Kenneth. They were now your puppets and pawns. They changed our definition of humility in order to accommodate your pride.

<sup>147</sup> This was a lie not self-delusion. You knew you were doing none of these things. We repeatedly told you so over that 7 month period. It is dishonest to chalk this up to deception and a lack of illumination.

<sup>148</sup> This was another lie. You promised you'd talk to us at the October 2004 retreat about your e-mail confession but then refused to do so when we tried to draw you out. We "talked" about your refusal but not about the substance of your confession. You intentionally distorted the truth.

<sup>149</sup> We were at opposite ends of the spectrum. Even Steve agreed with Dave and me. The questions (and issues) we felt most critical to answer were dismissed as unhelpful and problematic intrusions. This was incredulous.

<sup>150</sup> Bob, Kenneth, and your opposition to the questions was so univocal and unequivocal there was no reason to talk further about Dave's four questions. No good would have resulted.

<sup>151</sup> Just another example of deceit you chose not to address and skipped over in your responses.

<sup>152</sup> From what you've recently confessed, I think my notes have proven to be wise and helpful. Similarly I was not being proud, I was risking everything by being truthful in order to help you. Bob and Kenneth lorded it over me that day. Long ago they should have asked my forgiveness.

<sup>153</sup> Bob and Kenneth were the ones being unhelpful, unwise and proud. Do you agree? If so, have your brought it to their attention?

<sup>154</sup> I was rebuked and reprovved for these five observations. You now acknowledge their truthfulness with the exception of number 5. You still deny any resentment, etc.

<sup>155</sup> Their only defense against my critique was based upon a lie you told them and they believed.

<sup>156</sup> This was a terrible injustice and horrible experience. Bob and Kenneth were full of arrogance and wrong headedness. They were completely duped yet supremely pompous.

<sup>157</sup> Something you denied in both your Dec. 16, 2010 and Mar. 11, 2011 responses. Remarkably, you failed to recognize having any negative impact upon anyone in their opinion of me or relationship to me. Wow.

<sup>158</sup> Innumerable times I asked you to be honest, candid, revealing, and thorough in your response to RRF&D and AFA. Here you made no comment on whether you sent Bob and Kenneth to confront and reprove me. If you did, this constitutes a terrible abuse of authority. This kind of lording needs to be confessed to the movement and pastors.

<sup>159</sup> This was more than "an" example. It became "the" example of my extreme pride and unteachableness. It was entirely unfounded.

<sup>160</sup> Of course, you didn't think it was harsh. You really believed these attributes were entirely absent in my life. To date you have never acknowledge any harshness or extremity in your evaluation of me. Nor have you ever acknowledge bitterness as the source of your harshness.

<sup>161</sup> You acknowledged no "radial" change in how you related to me. Moreover, you denied the "loss of relationship" had any bearing on the loss of responsibilities. In other words, you see no tie between your attitude toward me and your treatment of me.

<sup>162</sup> Later my responsibilities were decreased due to a newly discovered lack of gifting and capacity. This discovery was never explained to me. And my "more character" quickly became no character in critical categories.

<sup>163</sup> Not for long. Things quickly and radically changed after August 20, 2004. You denied this happened.

<sup>164</sup> You didn't address this issue.

<sup>165</sup> Dave was absolutely right. Your influence or control over people and circumstances was unhealthy and unprofitable. You denied doing this.

---

<sup>166</sup> You saw (or were unwilling to acknowledge) no connection between the sins in your e-mail confessions and how you controlled and directed the process in a self serving manner.

<sup>167</sup> Functionally, people feared you more than they feared God. Proverbs 29:25 applied, "The fear of man brings a snare." Good men were afraid to speak the truth. They were caught is sin.

<sup>168</sup> You chose not to comment on this blatant example of hypocrisy. You purposely passed over it. Hypocrisy is a prominent sin in your life. It should be confessed to the movement and pastors.

<sup>169</sup> A full year after the August 20, 2004 meeting, we were finally given the opportunity to share our concerns for "the culture of accommodation" we repeatedly observed between the CLC pastors and you. But Bob was defending you and fighting us. He brushed away our concerns with a "helpful to hear your perspectives" but forged ahead in his prosecution of us.

<sup>170</sup> For a whole year you refused to answer these questions and the CLC pastors allowed this to happened. Nothing like this has ever occurred in the history of Sovereign Grace Ministries. You were in a class all by yourself. You were above the rules. They didn't apply to you.

<sup>171</sup> The CLC pastors shared many serious concerns with you at the August 20, 2004 meeting a year earlier. I wondered if you ever followed up with them on those concerns. If you did, you never filled us in on those conversations.

<sup>172</sup> Earlier in the day Bob told me I needed to evaluate whether or not my expectations of you were sinful.

<sup>173</sup> We weren't looking for "more specifics," we were looking for any specifics. My expectations were not the problem and they were not sinful. The problem was Bob's ungodly laxity and your unwillingness to walk in the light.

<sup>174</sup> This wasn't the problem either. Bob's de-emphasis was the problem. He did not hold you accountable for your actions. According to Bob, we were supposed to be celebrating, moving on, and rejoicing even though you had not talked to us for a year and had not acknowledged any sin to us.

<sup>175</sup> I've never seen such bias and prejudice in a pastoral situation. Bob was blinded by his cravings to please you and by his own sense of self importance. Bob has often confessed his temptation to be a "messiah" in situations like this one. Audaciously, he dismissed our concerns and redirected the focus back onto us. I tried to respond humbling to Bob and avoid further disagreement but upon further reflection had to bring up the issue of "sinful expectations."

<sup>176</sup> Dave, Steve, Bob, Kenneth and I talked by phone three days earlier. During that conversation Bob suggested my expectations of you were "sinful" and needed to be evaluated. Six years later, you acknowledged in your Dec. 16, 2010 response that my "expectations" were legitimate and should have been met. Bob's mind was darkened. Our requests were reasonable and decent. They were not sinful as Bob implied. Rather, they were guided by wisdom and motivated by love.

<sup>177</sup> Something for which Bob showed no concern.

<sup>178</sup> We made no progress with Bob and Kenneth. As Dave said, we were "coming up against a different understanding of humility and what leadership looks like."

<sup>179</sup> You were silent on these four points. You made no comment. You should encourage Bob and Kenneth to acknowledge their error and learn from their mistakes so they don't repeat them.

<sup>180</sup> Only because we made no progress with Bob, Kenneth and you. You were viewed as the victim. We were viewed as the perpetrators.

<sup>181</sup> More than confusing. Dave was extremely troubled by Bob's comment that he had been unclear. Bob and Kenneth were hearing us but not listening to us. We'd been perfectly clear with them. They assigned so little value to our observations it was as if we never shared them. They were focused on us (how issues were brought) and not on you (what issues were brought). This was in large part due to your influenced upon them. You were offended at us. Their focus was your focus - our perceived sin, not your actual sin.

<sup>182</sup> Two months after my last correspondence with Bob, he contacted me again. His focus was still upon me and how I sinned against you. I suspect you were asking him to press the issues. The hounding continued...

<sup>183</sup> Bob was concerned these statements included "sinful expectations." I suspect you felt the same way since you thought these kinds of requests were motivated by personal offense. Was this why Bob

---

brought it up yet another time? In any case, Bob's response was beyond comprehension. We'd being over this ground many times in print and in conversation. You had not addressed any of our concerns and we never heard back from you regarding our questions.

<sup>184</sup> You disagreed with or denied each point in this section in your second response.

<sup>185</sup> You didn't address this illustration or offer any explanation.

<sup>186</sup> You claimed not to remember this important letter.

<sup>187</sup> Bob has never answered that question. In short, this was another example of preferential treatment. Bob should have been earnest to ask you about the letter.

<sup>188</sup> I didn't hear from you again for 7 months which was 4 months after I left Sovereign Grace Ministries. You acknowledged this was "a failure of love" but not due to bitterness, resentment or anger. It was simply a sin of omission.

<sup>189</sup> You skipped over this in your responses. You made no comment on your complete withdrawal from me as soon as I stepped down from the apostolic team.

<sup>190</sup> You denied "a change in...disposition toward me" had anything to do with the correction I began to receive starting in June 2006.

<sup>191</sup> You did not address this illustration. It was passed over without comment.

<sup>192</sup> That's why these documents will be a complete shock to them.

<sup>193</sup> Your claim of ignorance in your January 2010 letter was manipulative. This was another example of deceit you didn't address in your two responses.

<sup>194</sup> Another example of hypocrisy. You taught one thing while you lived another thing. You didn't speak to this illustration.

<sup>195</sup> Great teaching. No application. Dave's response was staggering. Pure hypocrisy.

<sup>196</sup> "The demands of many other situations" and "other matters in the movement that appear urgent" were excuses for not meeting with us to talk about 9 pages of extremely serious offenses, concerns and issues that were urgent and not apparently. We were shocked by the indifference and manipulation.

<sup>197</sup> On the occasion I just referenced you were addressed by Larry Malament regarding bitterness. Bob was on the phone also. You disagreed with Larry. Later, Dave and Steve commended me because they thought you might use my confession against me (i.e., I was bitter in general while you were bitter-less).

<sup>198</sup> These were the only examples from RRF&D and AFA you dealt with at length. Unfortunately, your 1,200 word response was in the form of a denial. You found these three illustrations irrelevant as it pertained to hypocrisy.

<sup>199</sup> Here you used the present tense with Gene. "We are walking through a lengthy process where they are kindly spending many hours evaluating what I am to do over the next 7 years Lord willing.... There are a number of possible recommendations on the table." Two weeks later you used the past tense with me. "Well, I haven't thought about it for a few months so I am not sure I have much to share at this time." You denied being deceptive with Gene but you made no effort to explain the obvious contradiction. Both assertions can't be true. You misled one of us. This was another example of deceit that went unaddressed.

<sup>200</sup> During the previous year you made three trips to Charlotte to confront me on issues like independence. You used three examples. Two were comprised of sinful judgments (i.e., Carolyn's booklet, how I chose messages) and one dealt with how I presented my proposal for planting a church in April 2006. In the example above, you not only denied being deceitful and hypocritical, you also denied being independent. You frequently confront sins in others that don't exist or are less serious than the same sins in your life. For example, you'll confront bitterness while bitter, pride while proud, independence while independent.

<sup>201</sup> You addressed this illustration at length in order to repudiate any hypocrisy, deceit or independence. I'm glad you were honest. It helps me to understand your self assessment.

<sup>202</sup> You knew Dave, Steve and I disagreed with Jeff. It was not a question of forgetting our previous agreement or failing to discuss it further to make sure we were in agreement. You revised history. Knowing we were not in agreement you nevertheless had Jeff introduce contrary doctrine/practice. Why? Because you agreed with him! That was the explanation you gave us. That's what mattered and

---

all that was necessary. You disregarded our previously decision and decided to introduce changes because you agreed with Jeff. This was an example of hypocrisy, deceit and independence, not just “bad leadership.”

<sup>203</sup> You should not have been writing the book on humility. But since you did, it should have included references to our dealings with you as a team. How could you leave this out? I hope you will include our experience with you the last 10 years when you revise the book in the future.

<sup>204</sup> I remember how hard it was to read this statement from *Humility: True Greatness* (pp. 128-129). You spent years resisting and refusing our care and correction. You didn’t embrace it or pursue it. You were also unaccountable to the CLC pastoral team. This comment (along with others) was so troubling and disillusioning. It misled people and gave them a false impression of you. It was a breath taking expression of hypocrisy. If you ever make a public confession you should cite this quote and make clear the full extent of your hypocrisy. The following was true in practice. “Hypocrisy is the state of pretending to have beliefs, opinions, virtues, feelings, qualities, or standards that one does not actually have. Hypocrisy involves the deception of others and is thus a kind of lie.” (Wikipedia) Or, hypocrisy is “an expression of agreement that is not supported by real conviction; insincerity by virtue of pretending to have qualities or beliefs that you do not really have.” (Princeton Wordnet)

<sup>205</sup> This was brought to their attention by the Assessment Team. These were persistent and serious charges by Dave and Gene based upon hearsay evidence.

<sup>206</sup> Which was a predictable pattern.

<sup>207</sup> Questions involving accountability were almost never answered by Dave or Gene.

<sup>208</sup> I’ve repeatedly ask for clarification over the last two years. No one has ever answered by questions. What doctrine and practice merited removal from Sovereign Grace Ministries? Dave mentioned only one area of possible difference. I still have no idea what other “areas of disagreement in respect to doctrine and practice” were of such great concern to you.

<sup>209</sup> Dave wrote the letter but it was on behalf of you and the SGM leadership team.

<sup>210</sup> This quote came from your book on *Worldliness* (p. 175). How was it that you were not corrected for legalism when others were corrected for far less intrusive regulations of conduct? Simply explained, what you may do, say or write; others may not do, say or write. This served as another example of a different (i.e., watered down, diluted) standard for you.

<sup>211</sup> You could not have been clearer! You knew and stated explicitly that it was no longer possible for me to serve in pastoral ministry in SGM because of your differences with me in doctrine and practice.

<sup>212</sup> Pure pretension. Shifting from certainty to uncertainty.

<sup>213</sup> Pure spin. Shifting from knowing to not knowing.

<sup>214</sup> Pure manipulation. Shifting from one subject to a different subject.

<sup>215</sup> Like so many other examples in RRF&D, you chose to skip over this clear cut illustration of duplicity. I asked you to be open, honest, transparent, frank and thorough in your response to what I wrote. In large measure you avoided my request. This “flip flop” was a prime example of spin as practiced by you, Dave, and others. It’s not the same Sovereign Grace I once knew but I remain hopeful you will renounce your sins, turn from them, confess publicly, get genuine accountability, and make restitution to those you’ve wronged. No more covering up.

<sup>216</sup> Fifteen men from Sovereign Grace Ministries or churches continued teaching in the Pastors College the year I was removed. I was bumped because you and Jeff wanted to make “a number of changes involving different teachers.” Truth be told, not a single change was made except for me. I tire of saying it, but you conveniently skipped over this sorrowful experience and provided me no answers. I don’t believe you were honest with me. You didn’t address this ploy. Making room for you and Jeff to teach the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wave position and supposed changes in the teaching rotation were half truths at best. In truth, you didn’t want me in the PC. You decided I no longer had anything to offer future pastors by way of life, doctrine, history or experience. My teaching and influence were undesirable. You denied your withdrawal from me, judgments of me, and resentment toward me had anything to do with my removal.

---

<sup>217</sup> You continued this repudiation in your March 11, 2011 response. You saw no correlation between your sinful assessment of me (i.e., many judgments) and your ungodly influence upon others whose perception of me was shaped by you in part.

<sup>218</sup> Dave cut off all interaction with me unless I stopped raising concerns and asking questions. This was a horrible abuse of authority. He was coercive and exploitive. If I wanted to be involved in a SGM church I needed to be silent and turn my attention away from others sins to my supposed sins. You didn't address this.

<sup>219</sup> For instance, this lie was told to all the Care Group leaders in Grace Community Church by Dave and Gene during a secret phone call I knew nothing about on June 4, 2007. People like Larry Malament also passed on this fabrication to others. It had a terrible effect upon people including close friends. Of course, you didn't address this illustration.

<sup>220</sup> You have an amazing ability to forget the unfavorable. Remarkably, you don't remember a single person ever expressing any concerns that you were, or might be, resentful or bitter toward me! Here are several brief examples. First, Kenneth and Bob told me in June 2004 how mad you and Carolyn were at me for the effect our dealings with you would have on the Milestone Weekend. They tried to help your hearts with anger and resentment. Second, here is what Kenneth wrote in conjunction with Joshua, Bob and Grant. "Whenever we have observed any element of potentially sinful attitudes from CJ we have faithfully shared our thoughts and perspective and encouraged CJ to get back to you." Do you mean to say these four men never expressed any concerns for your attitude toward me? Of course, they did this very thing on August 20, 2004. For example, when you sinfully reacted to my use of the word, lambasted" and also Joshua's observations that your withdrawing from us was really resentment in action. There are many other examples. You have a selective memory on these matters.

<sup>221</sup> You don't address your hypocrisy and or the Board's favoritism. If I am unfit for ministry, then my friend, you are unfit for ministry. Rather than a confession, maybe it should be a resignation. If we're are going to apply the same standards you don't have a choice.

<sup>222</sup> You didn't address the "cover-up" of your sins and the effect of those sins upon the movement and individuals.

<sup>223</sup> You acknowledged some sins in private correspondence but left unaddressed the majority of sins and the most serious sins. And you saw no need for public confession of any kind.

<sup>224</sup> You rebutted and denied any such effect. Nor did you address most of the sins in this and the following paragraph. You denied lying, deceit, a lack of integrity, hypocrisy, resentment, bitterness, or anger.