

## A FINAL APPEAL - TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Introduction</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Background</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Objections Answered</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>Asking for Input after the August 20, 2004 Meeting</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>Four Hours of Correction</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>The Request for Chad and Vacation Days</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>C.J.'s Superior Discernment</u>	<u>43</u>
<u>"I Know What Is Going on in Their Souls"</u>	<u>45</u>
<u>Deceit and Independence - Ending New Attitude</u>	<u>46</u>
<u>New Policy: C.J. Must Be Present at All Evaluations</u>	<u>56</u>
<u>A Kangaroo Court - Brent's Assessment</u>	<u>60</u>
<u>Repositioned Due to a Lack of Gifting</u>	<u>61</u>
<u>My "Legalistic" Teaching at a Men's Retreat</u>	<u>62</u>
<u>Recruiting for Church Plant During Sunday Message</u>	<u>67</u>
<u>Eldership in the New Testament Cover</u>	<u>69</u>
<u>The Church Planting Proposal - April 2006</u>	<u>72</u>
<u>Eager to Meet and a Final Appeal</u>	<u>75</u>
<u>My Biggest Concern - Integrity, Truth Telling, and Justice</u>	<u>75</u>
<u>The Case of North Coast Church</u>	<u>76</u>
<u>A Minor Example Illustrates Major Points - "Lambasted"</u>	<u>82</u>

<u>Dave's Missing Letter</u>	85
<u>Jenny Never Heard from Carolyn</u>	87
<u>Dave Gives Up - Joins the Culture of Accommodation</u>	90
<u>Bob as Enabler</u>	97
<u>The Need for Genuine Accountability</u>	109
<u>The Need for Public Confession</u>	115
<u>Nothing Caused Bob Any Concern</u>	120
<u>No One You Know Has Sinned</u>	123
<u>Dave Harvey - Banned from the Churches</u>	126
<u>Gene Emerson - Counseled a Conspiracy</u>	133
<u>Bob Kauflin - Pronounced Unfit</u>	135
<u>C.J. Mahaney - "We Cannot Serve Together"</u>	136
<u>KingsWay Community Church</u>	136
Example 1: Gene Emerson's Deceit	136
Example 2: Dave Harvey's Lording	154
<u>Final Remarks</u>	163
<u>Addendum - C.J.'s Travel Itinerary for 2005</u>	166
<u>Endnotes</u>	169
<u>End</u>	178

A FINAL APPEAL  
OCTOBER 8, 2010

*“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.” --Dave Harvey*

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

I'd like to begin by reiterating why I've put such great effort in writing you at length in a "Response Regarding Friendship and Doctrine" (RRF&D) and, now again, in "A Final Appeal" (AFA). At the risk of sounding sanctimonious, I am genuinely concerned for the glory of God, the propagation of the gospel, the testimony of Sovereign Grace Ministries, the well-being of others, and the good of your soul. I love you. I love Sovereign Grace Ministries. I want the full measure of God's blessing to rest upon you.

If I craved personal vindication, I could have spoken up on many occasions over many years. Instead, I've remained quiet in public but made appeals in private. I've not slandered you. I've protected you. I have sought to serve you and the Gospel. This is the impetus and driving force behind my appeals. I have no animus. By God's grace, I've sought to keep my heart pure. God knows to what extent I've succeeded.

In this document, like the last one, I have painstakingly researched all I have written and taken great care to present things justly and in context. I am sure I fail at points but what I have written is reliable and based on fact not hearsay. Once again, my ability to present in detail is due to the use of primary source material. Otherwise, I could not recall all of this material. My memory of conversations and events is not due to a heart filled with bitterness. Quotations are *ipsissima verba* not *ipsissima vox*.

This writing constitutes a final appeal. Scores of other helpful illustrations remain but I have no plans to write you about them at this time. That could change in the future depending on circumstances.

## Background

On January 14, you wrote me regarding our friendship and said you held "disagreements over doctrine and practice" that "now separate us from serving together" in ministry. I asked for a clarification on doctrine and practice which you refused to supply in writing. Then I wrote a response regarding our friendship.

**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.

On March 17, I sent you my "Response Regarding Friendship and Doctrine" (RRF&D). I didn't hear back so I wrote you on April 24.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 24, 2010 9:54 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** Response

Hello C.J.,

I hope things went well for you at T4G. Do you have any idea when you can provide me a response?

Thanks  
Brent

You wrote back explaining how busy you were and said you hoped to respond by mid-June. That was fine. You also said you didn't "know how to accelerate the process since a number of others are involved and implicated in your document." This comment was helpful to me. It gave me a small window into your soul. It shed light on how you viewed my perspectives on numerous people I mentioned in RRF&D. Finally, Bob responded to me on your behalf on June 18. This is something you've often had him do with me and others. I thought it improper. I did not want to work through a middle man so I redirected the interaction back to you. Here are the e-mails.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 15, 2010 9:59 AM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Response to Your E-mail

Briefly for now...I wish you could respond sooner. Three months seems like a long time to hear back.... Glad to hear you had the opportunity to get away and celebrate your 35<sup>th</sup> [anniversary]!

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 18, 2010 2:05 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** FW: Response to Your E-mail

Brent,

Thanks for your patience with the process. I don't know how to accelerate the process since a number of others are involved and implicated in your document and I'm seeking their observations, evaluation and recommendations as to how we can hopefully resolve this. Again, I appreciate your patience with me and the process...

In His grace,

C.J.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 19, 2010 9:49 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** Request for Written Response

Dear C.J.,

Bob wrote me yesterday on your behalf. I thanked him for his note but explained that I'd like to continue corresponding with you directly.

As a next step, would you please provide me a thorough response in writing to my document, "Response Regarding Friendship and Doctrine" (i.e., RRF&D)? After you do so, I am glad to talk about setting up a time to meet and discuss its contents including our friendship.

I hope this proposal meets with your approval.

Love in Christ,  
Brent

This proposal did not meet with your approval.

From: C.J. Mahaney  
Sent: Sunday, June 20, 2010 6:36 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: Reconciliation

Brent,

I hope you are having a most enjoyable Father's Day as you are one fine father and your children are clear confirmation of this!

Thanks for your e-mail and desire to pursue reconciliation. I am eager to meet with you and I hope we can do this soon.

As for a written response I would simply want you to know that after reading your document I am aware of specific ways I have sinned against you and I desire to sincerely and specifically acknowledge those sins and ask your forgiveness. So this would form the sole purpose of our meeting. I have no desire or intention to cover anything else, just ask your forgiveness, if you would please allow me to do this. I'm sure I don't perceive everything you've observed but I do hope what I do perceive of my sin at present will prove helpful in pursuing reconciliation between us. And my desire is not simply for our reconciliation. Somehow I am hoping that one day you will be able to return to Sovereign Grace where so many love you and where I think you belong.

Would you be comfortable trying to schedule this meeting? We could meet at the Charlotte airport for a few hours so this would involve a minimum of travel/time for you. Let me know what you think when it's convenient.

With appreciation,

C. J.

Here was my response to you. I was eager to meet and forgive you which is easy to do when sins are biblically confessed (2 Cor. 7:10-13). In our case, the remaining "unconfessed" issues will determine whether restoration and reconciliation are possible.<sup>2</sup>

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 4:18 PM  
To: C. J. Mahaney  
Subject: RE: Reconciliation

Greetings C.J.,

I hope your times with Metro Life Church and at the Ligonier National Conference went well and you were able to return home for a blessed Father's Day with your dear family.

I sincerely appreciate your desire to meet and ask forgiveness. I look forward to such a meeting and I am eager to forgive you. I am unable to meet with you at the present time, however, but I want to bring immediately relief to your conscience and minister grace to your soul. Therefore you are welcome to acknowledgment any wrong in this format rather than wait for a meeting. I want you freed of all guilt now through the precious blood of Jesus.

At the risk of being misunderstood, I must appeal again for a written response to my document that covers a plethora of important subjects. There is need for accountability. There is need for clarity. There is need for full disclosure. Therefore, I'd greatly appreciate if you were completely open and transparent about the matters I have raised with you.

In this regard, it is necessary to understand how you view the issues and concerns I've brought to your attention. This could go a long way in our pursuit of reconciliation and remedy. So while I sincerely appreciate your willingness to meet, and wish I could accommodate your request, I cannot do so until I have a written and plenary response to issues I have raised with you. This does not mean I cannot forgive you. You are welcome to ask my forgiveness by writing me.

In responding to the larger document, please be perfectly honest and share your thoughts in a comprehensive manner. For instance, what aspects of my presentation troubled you, helped you, or convicted you? What points do you agree with or disagree with? Do you believe there is a need for "a restoration of integrity, truth telling and justice in Sovereign Grace so there is no lying, spin, manipulation, lording, cover-up, or partiality?" Do you think others have sinned against me? Or do you believe I've sinned against them? You recently wrote for example, "I don't know how to accelerate the process since a number of others are involved and implicated in your document"? These are just a few questions to help you understand my appeal. I realize there will be

disagreements but those disagreements are important to understand in order to pursue reconciliation.

You say, "Somehow I am hoping that one day you will be able to return to Sovereign Grace where so many love you and where I think you belong." I'd love to return to Sovereign Grace Ministries but change must occur in order to restore my trust and confidence in its integrity. Nor am I currently welcome by you or acceptable to you. Gene counseled people to force my resignation before any evaluation, Bob has pronounced me unfit for ministry and in need of a lengthy rehabilitation, Dave has forbidden me from visiting all Sovereign Grace churches until I change, and you have said we cannot serve together because of your disagreements with me over doctrine and practice.<sup>3</sup> I am also reminded of Dave's words to Jenny and me that I "have not represented the values, leadership or doctrine of Sovereign Grace Ministries" during my years of service. As a result, a sense of belonging in Sovereign Grace Ministries escapes me.

I wrote the 128 page document as an expression of my love for you and Sovereign Grace Ministries. I am for you and not against you. I want to speak well of you, support you, and protect you for the sake of the gospel. But there must also be reform for the good of the same gospel. I hope it will be forthcoming.

Because of the Cross of Christ,  
Brent

Here is your response to me.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Friday, July 02, 2010 4:33 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Question

Brent,

Thanks for your encouragement about my time in Metro. Actually the second venue was the Southern Baptist Convention Pastors Conference. What a privilege it was to speak at this conference and I certainly never expected to speak at this conference. Go figure. There is much to commend and learn from our SB friends, particularly their love for the lost. And it's difficult for me to comprehend the numerical size of this denomination. Their Pastors Conference is huge and that takes place just prior to the convention where thousands more show up.



I am so very sorry to read that you'd prefer not to meet with me so that I could confess certain sins to you and ask your forgiveness. I hope at some point you can agree to allow me to do this. I am grateful for your desire that I not be affected by guilt. I appreciate your heart for me in this. Brent, I am not familiar with your approach requiring written communication, especially of such detail and length. It appears I have a different perspective than you (if I correctly understand your perspective) in that I think written communication on issues of this nature is less helpful and doesn't necessarily ensure accuracy. And I think tone of voice, facial expression, conversation and personal interaction are superior in every way to an e-mail when someone is asking forgiveness, pursuing reconciliation or communicating differences and disagreements. So, although I have a number of questions about what you've written, I think trying to address and resolve them in written form is unwise and would only prove unhelpful. Scripture seems to support this idea of people connecting for confession. And at this time I want to ask your forgiveness before I even begin to express any concerns I have for you personally or my disagreements with you. I am not sure how to proceed at this point. So I think it would be wise for me to pursue the counsel of those wiser than myself and more experienced than I am on this in order to determine the best way forward.

And as for reconciliation with the guys you list in your e-mail and any future return to Sovereign Grace, it is obviously going to be a lengthy process and I am not sure how to proceed with this as well. From what I read in your e-mail I think you have misunderstood and misrepresented Gene, Bob, Dave (and me)<sup>4</sup> in some of these things. And I am concerned that your heart may have been blinded by bitterness.<sup>5</sup> It seems like a mediator will be needed to make progress and I know all these guys would be eager to participate with a mediator you and they can agree on if you are open to pursuing this. Sovereign Grace would cover the cost of this in its entirety and any expenses involved for you as well.

Brent, I don't think Sovereign Grace in general or anyone I know in particular is "lying, covering up, manipulating, lording, etc."<sup>6</sup> Actually, at present, I'm involved with different pastors in different churches who are all acknowledging sin and asking forgiveness where appropriate. And this has been the norm in my experience over the years. But Sovereign Grace is made up of sinners who need a Savior beginning with me. And like every other Christian we can be blind to our sin. But in my experience we are desirous of perceiving our sin and where necessary confessing our sin by the grace of God. And we are pursuing reconciliation with folks in different contexts over the last 2 years<sup>7</sup> and I have been humbled by the graciousness of folks to forgive us and encouraged by the reconciliation that has taken place. But there is more to do

and by God's grace more we will do. And I sure hope this involves you and me sitting down at some point so that you might hear my voice asking your forgiveness and I might hear your voice express the forgiveness that I believe you desire to express.

And thanks for your closing paragraph. I believe you are for me, that you care about me, want to support me and protect me for the sake of the gospel. I hope you believe the same about me in relation to you.

In His grace,  
C.J.

I sent you this short note knowing my response would be lengthy. It has taken longer to respond than I anticipated.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 08, 2010 3:54 PM  
**To:** C. J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** Back to You Soon

Hi C.J.,

Thanks for your reply. I'll be back to you in next 2-3 weeks.

Brent

### Objections Answered

We certainly disagree regarding the importance of written communication in our situation. You "think written communication on issues of this nature [cf. RRF&D] is less helpful and doesn't necessarily ensure accuracy." More to the point, you think "trying to address and resolve them in written form is unwise and would only prove unhelpful."

I think written communication has been more helpful not "less helpful." Here's why. For the last six years, numerous individuals including myself have had many conversations with you regarding ways you sinned against me. None of these ever resulted in the acknowledgment of wrong doing. This is the first time and it is due to the grace of God and the 128 page document I sent you. You acknowledged this on June 20, "After reading your document I am aware of specific ways I have sinned against you." No conversation or meeting has ever produced this result. What I wrote was far more effectual than any meeting I've had with you.

You say written correspondence “doesn’t necessarily ensure accuracy.” It doesn’t guarantee it, but it sure can facilitate it for many reasons. A written response provides accountability which has so often been lacking, a reliable record versus “he said, she said” recollections (hearsay evidence), clarity because writing requires precise thinking, transparency because you can address all the issues with frankness in a non-volatile environment, and completeness by providing details (which are important) which you could not recall or have time to cover in a conversation.<sup>8</sup>

You say, “Brent, I am not familiar with your approach requiring written communication, especially of such detail and length.” I think I’ve answered this above but it is normal to prepare for meetings whether business, legal, medical, sales or otherwise, via written communication. Businessmen submit plans in advance for study, lawyers do discovery before oral arguments in the justice system, nurses/PAs do case histories before a patient meets with the doctor, salesmen provide sale reports before meeting with their manager. The same approach is true with Scripture. Oral tradition was inadequate for passing on divine revelation – too much room for error. Instead, God in His wisdom moved men to write things down (cf. Luke 1:1-4).

In your case, this is particularly important. You have always been prone to forget, repudiate or recast what you said or did in the past. This was a serious concern to Dave, Steve and me. We raised it with you on several occasions. Here is how Dave put it in his April 2004 summary to the Josh, Bob, Kenneth and Grant.

“[It] sometimes seems as if [C.J.] not recollecting may greatly diminish his pursuit and the utility of possible illustrations. Should C.J. accept responsibility for his words even when he doesn’t remember?”

You often rejected our illustrations of pride, broken promises, sinful judgments, etc. You’d dispute our recollections, claim you didn’t say or do something or change things and put them in a positive light.<sup>9</sup> As a result, this “greatly diminished” your “pursuit” of illustrations. In other words, we’d bring up an illustration and you’d dismiss it because you did not remember it or remembered it differently and often favorably. You’d also make promises but break them and then claim you never promised anything. It was exasperating for Dave, me and others. That’s why David asked the question above about whether we needed to hold you responsible for things you said and did. This happened frequently. It is one of the reasons you never asked our forgiveness for any of the illustrations we shared with you.

Writing can also be helpful in the resolution of conflicts. For instance, your recent e-mails have been nice. It is readily apparent you put considerable effort into what and how you wrote me. You chose your words carefully. This has not been true in person.

Therefore, I think writing is a better medium to begin a process of reconciliation if you'll also be revealing and forthcoming.

You said, "And I think tone of voice, facial expression, conversation and personal interaction are superior in every way to an e-mail when someone is asking forgiveness, pursuing reconciliation or communicating differences and disagreements." This raises an important point. I've not had the kind of positive experience you are describing. My meetings with you have typically been "inferior" in many ways. Why? Because your "tone of voice" and "facial expression" have not been gentle and kind. I've not had good experiences when you are "communicating differences and disagreements" with me. I've had bad ones and these meetings proved counterproductive.

I agree that "conversation and personal interaction" are great if they occur. I would not describe my experience in those terms. Words like entrapped, one-sided, and piled on are closer to the truth. I'll explain more latter. In the "conversation[s] and personal interaction[s]" I am thinking of, I had little or no freedom to disagree or share my perspective. So on the one hand, I am glad to meet hoping for better things. But on the other hand, I am reluctant to meet given my negative experiences over the years. You are in private who you are in public - generous, kind, insightful, encouraging, and empathetic - but you are more. When "communicating differences and disagreements" you are fearless, convinced, and intimidating. When corrected or held accountable you easily become resentful, angry and bitter. Let me share a few examples.

#### Asking for Input after the August 20, 2004 Meeting

When the August 20 meeting was completed, Josh, Kenneth, Grant and Bob all approached me. Each one commended me and thanked me for the job I did. Four days later I remained in good standing with everyone. Kenneth and Carolyn still felt I should take pastoral responsibility for the team. Josh also thought your proposal was a good idea.

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

Josh informed me that Kenneth spoke to Brent and Dave after our [August 20] 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... Carolyn [Mahaney] 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.

Things began to quickly change however. You stopped interacting with us as a team and began meeting with the CLC men. We constantly asked for dialogue and meetings with you and them but these requests were denied. In October, I wrote everyone asking for personal input. They had little to provide.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 7:52 AM  
To: Josh Harris; Bob Kauflin; Kenneth Maresco; Grant Layman; Pat Ennis  
Cc: Dave Harvey; Steve Shank  
Subject: Confidential - Critique

I'd appreciate it if each of you could send me a critique of any sinful attitudes, motives, words, or actions you have observed in me or any unwise, unhelpful leadership I've provided as it relates to C.J. and the process we have walked through.

Thanks gentlemen,  
Brent

Here are all the responses.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 13, 2004, 10:26 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Critique

Thanks for asking for this Brent. Not surprising, given your consistent humility in this.

I have nothing to add to our last conversation on this. There are some word/phrase choices that you have used that were not aimed as carefully as wisdom might dictate or CJ would need. But I see those as being peripheral issues and not reflective of any heart motivation within you.

Thanks for asking.

Dave

**From:** Joshua Harris  
**Sent:** Wed 10/13/2004 5:33 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler; Bob Kauflin; Kenneth Maresco; Grant Layman; Pat Ennis  
**Cc:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** Re: Confidential - Critique

Brent,

This is very humble of you to ask for! Thank you for inviting this. First, we don't have some kind of huge list. But, second, I think it would be best for us to just share these thoughts with you in our phone call instead of trying to do it separately via email.

Thank you!

Joshua

When I talked with Josh he had two observations. First, he thought it would have been better if I facilitated dialogue from the beginning of the August 20 meeting. Second, he felt I could have communicated with you more via conversations and less via e-mail. There were no adjustments of my character. Pat had no concerns.

**From:** Pat Ennis  
**Sent:** Wed 10/13/2004 11:09 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Critique

Brent,

I have no observations. I have been extremely grateful for your willingness to lead in the process, and for your love of CJ. Thanks so much for again being an example of humility for me!

Pat

Steve felt Dave and I were too hard on you. He agreed with us on all the principle concerns - he just thought we stated things too strongly. But he was also concerned for "an intentional turning" on me. Steve was aware this dynamic was already in the works.

**From:** Steve Shank  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 13, 2004 6:04 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential – Critique

Thank you Brent for asking... I would only elaborate on the things I have already introduced, but will think through them more precisely as to how they might reflect on your approach or leadership... please know you certainly have had the most unenviable chair in the house, and I wouldn't want you to feel that in your attempts to serve, there is an intentional turning on you... however, if in God's providence this process has provided a venue where you (and us!) can learn and thus serve God's people more effectively, then I would be glad to do so.

In less than two months you changed the focus to Dave and my sins as you perceived them. Now, we were put on the hot seat. This was an intentional turning and you were leading the charge.<sup>10</sup>

From: Joshua Harris  
Sent: Thursday, October 21, 2004 11:33 PM  
To: Dave Harvey; Brent Detwiler; Steve Shank  
Cc: Grant Layman; Kenneth Maresco; Bob Kauflin; CJ Mahaney  
Subject: Confidential

Brent,

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.

Second, CJ hasn't had the chance to sit down and organize his thoughts on all this. Which is something he really wants to do so that it is helpful and constructive. He does not want to delay the process but he does want to take to sufficiently consider what he shares.

All that to say we came away assured that he will make it his top priority to schedule this time with each of you as soon as possible. We feel this approach will ultimately serve him and you better.

Thanks!

Joshua

### Four Hours of Correction

When we met in Charlotte on November 19, 2004, you took four hours to correct me. There was no dialogue, just a monologue. I basically listened the entire time and didn't mind doing so. I wanted you to share your thoughts even though you were being hypocritical.<sup>11</sup>

In comparison, I had taken 1 hour and 20 minutes to present 7 years of material to Josh, Kenneth, Bob and Grant. I also left 2½ hours for dialogue after my presentation on August 20. We invited your disagreement. We wanted to know your thoughts. Nevertheless, you were offended by the amount of time I took to share our observations as an apostolic team. In retrospect, it would have been better if there was "conversation and interaction" from the beginning of the meeting. I acknowledged this with regret and asked your forgiveness.

What surprised me the most about November 19 was your hypocrisy. You were oblivious to the double standard. You took 4 hours. I took 1 hour and 20 minutes. You were offended. I was not. This contradiction never occurred to you. It was one of many examples I didn't share with you at the time given your anger toward me. Months later, I shared this perspective with Bob in the most understated way I could - "a bit curious or ironic" because you were very offended by the use of words like "hypocrisy" to describe your behavior. I pointed out the hypocrisy to Bob in case he elected to discuss it with you. No one ever got back to me.

What shocked me the most about November 19 was your fierce turning on me. You had set a new trajectory. In less than three months, the focus was on us and off of you. There had been no interaction with you since August 20. At that meeting we shared numerous illustrations but you rejected all of them pertaining to us. You acknowledged no wrong doing. You never asked forgiveness. You never filled us in on the input you were receiving from the CLC pastors. You never discussed any of our concerns again. These are categorical statements...but all true. After August 20, your doggedly pursued our perceived sin and not your sin in relation to us.



**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 2, 2005 1:16 PM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin  
**Subject:** Confidential: Dialog

When you asked me if my time with C.J. on November 19, 2004 was a dialog, I didn't want to make an issue of it or provide you a fuller response. Mainly because it was fine to me for him to come Charlotte with the expressed purpose of going through his list of concerns. I didn't expect to dialog over his critique. I simply wanted to understand his perspective. So I didn't struggle over the lack of dialog. It just wasn't the purpose of getting together.

Having said the above, I do find C.J.'s approach on November 19 a bit curious or ironic given his struggles over the lack of dialogue (which I regret) during the first part of the August 20, 2004 meeting.

### The Request for Chad and Vacation Days

Here is another example of "intentionally turning" the focus to me unrelated to August 20. It is long but important. I've chosen this particular one because it also involves Bob. It shows the way he enabled you, rather than helped you, by speaking the truth to you. Instead of addressing you, he corrected me. It is a clear example of Bob's bias and partiality.<sup>12</sup>

This example also demonstrates a predictable response. When you are corrected (or disagreed with and held accountable) you often become resentful.<sup>13</sup> You frequently judge the person bringing the correction with your "superior discernment" and claim to know the sin in their heart. Then you'll send a representative to reprove the individual and defend you. This is a pattern for you.<sup>14</sup> This is especially true if the correction addresses an area where you have a high opinion of yourself and a concern for your reputation.

RRF&D was 128 pages long but far from exhaustive. It was an abridged rendition with many points and illustrations left out of it. Here's is an example that introduces some new points while underscoring some old ones. It shows how you and Bob worked together in dealing with me when I sought to serve you by upholding our vacation policy while treating you generously and relating to you graciously.

This interaction occurred primarily in October 2005 or 13 months after our August 2004 meeting. I've included it because it was typical of your and Bob's treatment of me during the intervening time period.<sup>15</sup> It began by you e-mailing Pat on September 29, 2005 to ask if SGM could cover Chad's flight expenses. Note your reason for the request

- you did not want to be away from your son too much. Pat involved me in the matter. Given your distrust of me and bitterness towards me, I was trying to avoid any situation where I had to adjust you in the smallest degree.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thu 9/29/2005 6:38 PM  
**To:** Pat Ennis  
**Subject:** Traveling

Is there a way Sovereign Grace can pay for Chad's flight to Phoenix? Both Carolyn and I are going to teach and with all the traveling I do I am trying not to be away from my son too much and in this case both dad and mom are going.

I understand if this can't be done.

Thanks my friend,  
CJ

**From:** Pat Ennis  
**Sent:** Thu 9/29/2005 10:35 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** FW: Traveling

Brent,

If we agreed that granting CJ's request makes sense, we would need to give him a taxable bonus. What are your thoughts about granting this bonus for the [above] reason?

Pat

Your request was a hard one for me to process for several reasons. First, it was contrary to our written policy. Second, it seemed out of place since your high salary positioned you to pay for Chad's ticket. Third, I knew you traveled less and vacationed more than others including me. I confidentially made Pat aware of this dilemma. I didn't want the disparity to negatively affect my counsel. That's why I put the decision back in Pat and Tommy's court. I was happy to make an exception for you and commended your work ethic. Though I had these observations, I wasn't concerned you tried to circumvent the vacation policy for your own benefit.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Sat 10/1/2005 10:13 AM  
**To:** Pat Ennis  
**Subject:** RE: Traveling

Hard one to respond to. That is, this year I will do 95 days of ministry travel. C.J. 76. I will take 17 days of vacation. C.J. 29 [it turned out to be 30]. This is comparable to past years also. I am familiar with these numbers since I track travel and do the schedule.

Having said this, I can easily support whatever decision you and Tommy make on paying for Chad to go to Phoenix. We can make an exception for the team leader. He works very hard – at home and away!

Pat wrote me back the next day. He asked for more clarity and answered a question I had asked about Sovereign Grace vacation policy. In the process of reviewing your days of travel, I also noticed how many vacations days you were taking.

**From:** Pat Ennis  
**Sent:** Sun 10/2/2005 3:15 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Cc:** Tommy Hill  
**Subject:** RE: Traveling

Brent,

Tommy and I agree that this would need to be an exception to a current policy of not paying for children to go on trips. Do you think CJ's situation warrants an exception?

Also, our vacation policy for CJ would be the same as yours...4 weeks with two weeks carryover.

Pat

From the beginning of SGM, it normally fell to me to raise issues of collective concern for you. I think it is fair to say I also provided you the greatest measure of care, encouragement, honor, and affection. It was a joy and privilege to do so. Given this arrangement, other men avoided offending you by allowing me to lead or by quoting and referencing me. In this situation, I was trying to limit my involvement without compromising my integrity. I wanted Pat and Tommy to make the decision regarding money for Chad and to talk with you about unwittingly exceeding your allotted vacation time. I realized my concern for your vacation days and my answer to Pat's

question, "Do you think CJ's situation warrants an exception [for Chad]?" could come back to bite me. I still have the scars.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Sun 10/2/2005 4:36 PM  
**To:** Pat Ennis; Tommy Hill  
**Subject:** RE: Traveling

Doesn't seem to warrant an exception but I don't want to be the only one "quoted" on this. On the other hand, I guess Carolyn is also going so she will not be home with Chad. I've attached C.J.'s complete schedule for your examination. You have my support however you proceed. Below I've "cut and pasted" his vacation time. Will you talk to him about going over the allotted days? Do you want to let the team leader have 5 weeks off next year? The rest of us stay at four weeks?

C.J.'s Vacation Days

3 days	May 14-16	Anniversary Trip	The Inn at Perry Cabin
8 days	Jun 5-12	Anniversary Trip	Orlando & Sarasota, FL
2 days	Jun 13-14	Carroll Valley Golf	
		Retreat	Fairfield, PA
15 days	Jul 17-31	Family Vacation	Knoxville, TN
6 days	Sep 18-23	Vacation with Family	

34 days minus 5 Sabbath days = 29 vacation days

Pat wrote you back with his decision regarding Chad. He was willing to make an exception if a lack of finances prohibited you from taking Chad. I genuinely appreciated Pat's generosity but would not have agreed with his reasoning since you made over 150k in 2005. And if cash flow was a problem, you could have paid for Chad's flight from the honoraria you and Carolyn would receive from the ministry trip.

**From:** Pat Ennis  
**Sent:** Monday, October 03, 2005 8:59 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Brent Detwiler; Tommy Hill; Pat Ennis  
**Subject:** FW: Traveling

CJ,

Tommy, Brent and I have discussed your request, and we would prefer not to make an exception to the policy of not paying for children to go on trips with parents. However, at the same time, we understand your desire and reasons for wanting Chad to join you and Carolyn. If you are in a position financially that would not allow for Chad to go, I would want to move ahead with an exception, so please let me know if that is the case. If that is the case, I would want to move ahead with the exception while at the same time discuss with you and the Team the possibility of increasing your salary so that you could more afford such trips.

Pat

On the one hand, you asked for an exception to our policy. On the other hand, you did not want an exception. I was confused. I didn't know what was going on in your heart or mind. Did you feel an exception was warranted? Or, did you just forget about our policy?

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Mon 10/3/2005 9:17 PM  
**To:** Pat Ennis  
**Subject:** RE: Traveling

Not necessary. Don't want there to be exceptions.

Thanks,

CJ

I was relieved by the e-mail above. There was closure without contention or apparent offense. It turned out, however, that was not the case. The next day you wrote me, not Pat or Tommy, the following e-mail. You seemed extremely concerned for how I was viewing you.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 04, 2005 6:41 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Confidential

I would rather not pursue this by e-mail but please know that there is no need for any further consideration of Chad accompanying me to Phoenix. I completely understand and support your (Pat, Tommy) approach to this. From

the first e-mail I have informed Pat about my support but in his desire to serve me he has continued to pursue this. And if you have any concerns about my travel or vacation schedule I welcome your observations.<sup>16</sup>

I asked about Chad going with me not because of my travel but Carolyn's. And I will be glad to explain my perspective on this if that would serve you. But after I received Pat's e-mail I have already finalized everything for the trip Carolyn and I take to Phoenix and this has just further confirmed the limitations of future travel for Carolyn.

So let me know if you would like to talk about this. Sorry you guys have spent so much time on this. Won't happen again.

With appreciation,

CJ

Several things concerned me about your response. First, you said, "I asked about Chad going with me not because of my travel but Carolyn's." This was in direct contradiction to your stated reason when you wrote Pat. You were telling me something different. Here is what you asked Pat, "Is there a way Sovereign Grace can pay for Chad's flight to Phoenix...with all the traveling I do I am trying not to be away from my son too much." The original request was all about the amount of time you traveled and the amount of time you were away from Chad. This is another example of spin and the manipulation of facts.<sup>17</sup>

Second, I was taken aback by your comment, "And if you have any concerns about my travel or vacation schedule I welcome your observations." I had no concerns for your travel but I was mildly concerned for the amount of vacation time you took. I'll explain later. Unfortunately, Pat forwarded my "I don't want to be the only one "quoted" on this" e-mail to you. I only intended that e-mail for him. In that correspondence, I asked Pat several questions. One was, "Will you talk to him about going over the allotted days?" It seems, and I could be wrong, Pat forwarded my e-mail to you instead of raising the issue on his own. In any case, I didn't hear back from Pat about whether he'd talk to you.

Third, it felt like we were being "punished" as Dave frequently described your reaction in situations like this one. That is, our denial of funds for Chad resulted in "limitations of future travel for Carolyn." None of us wanted that as the outcome. I felt guilty for this development. And then your final comment which seemed to be self-pitying, etc. That is, "Won't happen again." What won't happen again? You won't ever make a similar request in the future? We didn't want that result either. Again, I felt culpable.

Why won't you do so again? Were you resentful? Did we do something wrong? Was it because we asked some questions and raised some issues?<sup>18</sup>

I was worried. I knew I was in trouble again. In addition to your normal increase in salary, I proposed an additional \$1,500 salary increase in 2006 to cover travel expenses for Chad even though I felt it unnecessary. That was shameful of me. I should have been truthful about my thoughts regarding your ability to pay for Chad. Please forgive me. I was also trying to avoid all conflict with you. I attempted to be honest but gracious in this next e-mail.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 05, 2005 10:58 AM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Pat Ennis; Tommy Hill  
**Subject:** Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

When asked for my counsel, I was provided with the e-mail below [i.e., the 09/29/2005 6:38 PM above]. It sounded like you were primarily asking us to cover Chad's flight because of your extensive travel and the resultant time you are away from him. By the way, I am glad you asked and I certainly appreciate your concern. I really wanted to say "yes" to your request, but I knew other guys travel more than you do and we haven't made such a provision for them.

I would encourage you to take Chad with you on these kinds of trips but I think it is better for you to pay for it. Since you could not afford to do this, I will recommend to the team that we increase your pay by \$1,500 (or more if necessary) so Chad can accompany you and Carolyn on similar trips in 2006.

As I was reviewing your travel schedule, I noticed you are taking 30 days of vacation time this year. (By the way, I assumed your personal retreats with Carolyn on Jan 4-7 and Mar 29-Apr 1 were work related. I did not count them as vacation time. Is that correct?). Our policy allows for 4 weeks or 24 days [actually 20 days for you under SGM policy, I was under CrossWay's policy and had 24 days]. Please know I am not concerned about your integrity. I assume you are not aware of the policy or the number of vacation days you have taken or some other factor I am not aware of.

Lastly, I didn't recommend we pay for Chad given the above but I conveyed to Pat and Tommy that I could easily support them if they wanted to do so for the following reasons. You are the team leader, Carolyn is going with, I empathize with you re: time away from Chad, and you work so hard at home and on the road. I also suggested that we consider increasing your vacation time to 5 weeks and keep the rest of us on the team at 4 weeks.

While I never thought you knowingly violated the vacation policy, I was still concerned for your and our example. Here are a couple reasons why. First, all the pastors in my sphere (60-70 men) carefully monitored their vacation time. Typically, they had to request time off and it would be officially recorded and monitored throughout the year. No one took more time than allotted by policy. As far as I knew that approach was true for everyone in the movement.

It was also true in corporate American. People in our churches didn't get to take three weeks off when they only get two weeks off. Nevertheless, I was not correcting sins of commission. I was not questioning your motives. I simply wanted to make you aware of the current policy and adjust it upwards for the sake of our witness and consistent application of our policy. Though you should have known the 20 day policy, and held yourself accountable to it, I was not preoccupied with these sins of omission. I was simply trying to serve you.

Second, we always said we wanted to be "squeaky clean" and not give any appearance of wrong doing. That is, maintain the highest standards of integrity. We talked about The Washington Post coming in to do an article and finding no inconsistencies in our conduct. We agreed to reveal our salaries, our benefits, etc. if this ever happened. So this was an inconsistency someone could take evil advantage of. That is, the President of the organization was not following his own vacation policy. The remedy I proposed, however, was to increase the amount of vacation time for you. This was no problem for me. I knew your normal work week. You worked six days and averaged 68 hours a week based upon the time studies I headed up for years. I knew everyone's hours. Our jobs were not 8 to 5.

Here is how you answered me. You claimed to know the vacation policy of 20 days. I still don't think that was the case. If it was then you ignored it or viewed yourself as an exception to it. I prefer not to believe this.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 05, 2005 11:06 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

There is no need to increase my pay in order for me to take Chad with me but thanks for the offer.

I am aware of the vacation policy and will be glad to explain to you my approach/understanding and if you disagree I will be glad to take less time next year.



I don't think there is any need to increase my vacation time although again, thanks for the offer.

And I would be glad to describe my normal work week for you if that would help.

I don't prefer to do any of this by e-mail.  
CJ

I fired off a quick but unclear response. I was trying to avoid any setting where I might have to disagree with you or question you. I was glad to move on. It was not necessary to me for us to talk. But it became clear your heart was not in the same place.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 05, 2005 11:11 AM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

Okay

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 05, 2005 11:49 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

I'd try to talk with you today but I am spending the day with Carolyn. I was in Chicago Monday and Tuesday so I am taking today off.

Do you have any available time to talk either Thursday or Friday afternoon?

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 05, 2005 12:25 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

Not at all necessary to talk. By "okay" I [meant] I am fine with things. Have a great [time] with Carolyn. Looking forward to hearing about your time with Lane and Justin.

I wrote Pat and asked him to follow up with you on Chad, work hours and the vacation policy if he thought it at all helpful. He wanted to drop matters also.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Wed 10/5/2005 11:10 AM  
**To:** Pat Ennis  
**Subject:** FW: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

Pat

I'll let you follow up with C.J. if you think that is advisable or even necessary. Otherwise, I am going to let the issue drop.

Tks  
Brent

**From:** Pat Ennis  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 05, 2005 11:17 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

I think we can let it drop.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 05, 2005 11:15 AM  
**To:** Pat Ennis  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

Okay

You, however, could not let things go. A litany of e-mails followed. I repeatedly said I had no need to talk. You appeared obsessed.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 05, 2005 12:36 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

My friend,

I am glad to answer any and all questions you have about this and any other topic.

Ask away!

Are you sure you don't want to talk?

CJ

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 05, 2005 12:36 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

Sure am...thanks.

Not content with my answer you continued to press but I had no questions or concerns about your vacations, travel, or work ethic. I simply wanted to bring the number of days you took for vacation into conformity with SGM policy but not because I thought you were knowingly violating it. As I repeatedly made clear, I thought it was a bad policy. More vacation time was merited. I wanted to change it for you.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 05, 2005 1:30 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

As long as you know I am available for any and all questions about my vacations, travel, work ethic and any other topic you want to ask about. And feel free to share any concerns you have with Bob or Pat.

I welcome any and all questions on any and all topics!

CJ

By this time, things had become clearer to me. You thought I had unfounded information and unjust concerns. You wanted me to share them so I could be corrected. You felt judged by me.<sup>19</sup> You were not content to move on. You began supplying answers to questions I was not asking. You began to address me. Here for example, you were concerned I counted your work retreats with Carolyn as vacation days. I did not and this was something I already addressed. You were bringing it up again. You were also confused about the number of vacation days.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 05, 2005 7:04 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

I read this again and realized that I didn't answer about my retreats with Carolyn. Those were not vacations. They were both retreats all about ministry. Do you have any concerns about those?

Also, I did learn from your e-mail that I had more vacation time than I thought. I thought I had 21 days each year.

CJ

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 1:27 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Tommy Hill; Pat Ennis  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

That's what I assumed. Thanks. I'll have Tommy clarify the policy for you. There has been some confusion re: # of days.

You continued to make a mountain out of a mole hill. What was motivating you? What was driving you? What were you craving? Vindication? Now you unnecessarily involved Bob. At first glance, it appeared you wanted Bob to be aware of these issues so he could question you or inquire of you. I appreciated your apparent integrity. In the end, however, the opposite turned out to be the case. Involving Bob was a way of positioning Bob to confront me. He never voiced any concern for your heart or your actions. You wanted Bob to know about my "questions" and "concerns" so I could be reproved.<sup>20</sup> This becomes clear in the end.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 10:09 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Confidential

Just wanted you to know that I passed along your e-mail to Bob. I want him to know about your questions/concerns.

I welcome any other questions/concerns you would have my friend.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 1:25 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Not necessary to do this but I appreciate your integrity.<sup>21</sup>

You continued to obsess over being misunderstood.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 1:29 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

What information are you working from for my travel days, vacation days, etc?

CJ

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 1:29 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Attached

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 1:33 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Did you get this from Nora?

CJ

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 1:35 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

I've been getting your travel schedule from Nora for many years now. When I make schedule recommendations for team meetings, team retreats, conferences, etc., I compare them with your schedule to avoid conflicts. I also use it as a reminder for prayer and to ask you during team meetings, etc. about your travel.

Having twice answered your question regarding retreats with Carolyn, you followed up a third time. I had no concerns or disagreements. I understood they were work related and therefore paid by SGM.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 1:36 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

Well, if its 24 [vacation days] is there anything Tommy needs to clarify? I just don't want to waste his time.

Also, do you have any concerns/disagreements about the retreats with Carolyn?

CJ

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 1:55 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Tommy Hill; Pat Ennis  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

The policy says the Sovereign Grace staff gets 4 weeks of vacation assuming a 5 day work week. Technically, that means you have 20 days of vacation time. I've asked Tommy to revise it for men in ministry (vs. the general staff) knowing that men like you, Pat, Jeff, Bob, etc. work 6 days a week and often more. Therefore, I've used the number 24 instead of 20. The policy just needs to be revised to accommodate this change.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 1:58 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

Really glad for you to get time away with Carolyn.

I knew work retreats for you and Carolyn were important. I was happy for you and Carolyn to get undistracted time away for work. Now again for a fourth time, you asked me about the nature of these retreats. This was baffling. I had repeatedly answered your concern starting with my very first e-mail to you (i.e., October 05, 2005 10:58 AM). I stated "By the way, I assumed your personal retreats with Carolyn on Jan 4-7 and Mar 29-Apr 1 were work related. I did not count them as vacation time. Is that correct?" Soon after, you confirmed what I already assumed to be true. Yet, you continued to question me.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 2:04 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

But do you understand the ministry nature of these particular times away or do you think if we are away together it is a vacation from your perspective?<sup>22</sup>

Thanks,

CJ

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 3:34 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Chad / Vacation Time

Like I've said, I've always assumed ministry. The only reason I asked [the "Is that correct? question above] was the two retreats were not recorded on your travel schedule. They were on Carolyn's and referred to as a "Personal Retreat with C.J."

Even though they were recorded on Carolyn's travel schedule as "personal retreats with C.J.," I was confident they were work retreats. I treated them as such from the beginning. Why were so determined to know my thoughts? What did you believe

about me? Were you concerned, or had you concluded, I thought you deceitfully had Sovereign Grace Ministries pick up the tab for fun times away with Carolyn?<sup>23</sup>

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 2:08 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Just one more question. How recently did you get this from Nora?

Thanks,

CJ

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 3:30 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

I think Oct 1. [i.e., a week earlier]

I forwarded all this correspondence to Pat and copied Dave and Steve. I knew where this was heading. I wanted to make sure they were aware and involved.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 5:13 PM  
**To:** Pat Ennis  
**Cc:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** Confidential

I hope I've allayed his concerns and answered his questions. Thanks for your help Pat.

Brent

**From:** Pat Ennis  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 06, 2005 5:33 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

You are welcome. Thanks for answering CJ's questions.



For the second time I thought things were wrapped up. I was wrong.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 11:38 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Confidential

Question for you as to how you view vacation time. When I am away on vacation with my family for two weeks in your thinking is that 14 days of vacation or 12 because one's day off figures into any calculation?

My numbers for vacation and travel are different from yours and I think there are some differences in Nora's calendar that you might not be aware of. An example would be that she would have listed our anniversary trip as 11 days. But we were with the Orlando church for 4 days before we started our anniversary trip.

Thanks,

CJ

At your request, I provided a detailed and precise accounting of your vacation time and easy to follow explanations to your questions. From the beginning, I had factored in all the mitigating factors you were concerned about. Here again is the accounting. SGM policy allowed for 20 days of vacation time. You took 30. That was a simple matter of accounting. You disputed this but never provided any factual adjustment. There was none.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 12:14 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Good questions. In my calculation, I subtracted 5 days off and 2 holidays off when they occurred during your vacation time. I counted your June anniversary trip as 7 days of vacation time not the 11 days in Nora's calendar.

3 days	May 14-16	Anniversary Trip at The Inn at Perry Cabin	Saint Michaels, MD
8 days	Jun 5-12	Anniversary Trip	Orlando & Sarasota
2 days	Jun 14-15	Carroll Valley Golf Retreat	Fairfield, PA
15 days	Jul 17-31	Family Vacation	Knoxville, TN

6 days	Sep 18-23	Family Vacation at The Chatham Wayside Inn	Cape Code, MA
3 days	Nov 24-26	Family Vacation	Williamsburg, VA

The total comes to 37 days minus 5 days off minus 2 holidays = 30 vacation days.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 12:18 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Well, I don't think you have it accurate my friend.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 12:19 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Please adjust me. By the way, I'd still like to see you have 5 weeks of vacation (30 days). No one works as hard as you or puts in longer days.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 12:25 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Kind of you but I don't need any more vacation.

CJ

Nevertheless, I proceeded to get five weeks of vacation approved for you.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 12:34 PM  
**To:** Pat Ennis  
**Cc:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** FW: Confidential

Pat,

I'd recommend you get approval from Dave and Steve for 5 weeks of vacation (30 days) for C.J. Then at a later date put it into place. I can support this knowing C.J. is working very long days and likely doing some work on vacation. He is also the team leader and therefore I am glad for him to have more vacation time given the pressures and responsibilities he carries.

Thanks  
Brent

**From:** Pat Ennis  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 1:32 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Cc:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Dave & Steve,

Do you approve of what Brent is proposing?

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 1:42 PM  
**To:** Pat Ennis; Brent Detwiler  
**Cc:** Steve Shank  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Not sure I'm tracking this conversation and whether this is a real need or not. I would want to make sure we have accurate data to evaluate before we make an exception of this nature. If we wanted to pursue it, we could ask Brent to check his data with Nora. This way, we could find out whether an exception is really necessary and then decide.

**From:** Pat Ennis  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 1:50 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey; Brent Detwiler  
**Cc:** Steve Shank  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Brent,

Do you feel you have adequate data/knowledge to support your recommendation? Can you further support your recommendation with any additional data?

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 1:49 PM  
**To:** Pat Ennis; Dave Harvey  
**Cc:** Steve Shank  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

I do (attached).... If you did proceed, you could simply review the attached with Nora.

**From:** Pat Ennis  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 2:02 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler; Dave Harvey  
**Cc:** Steve Shank; Tommy Hill  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Actually guys, I could easily support increasing each of your vacation benefits to 5 weeks. I was at Fidelity for 10 yrs and I had 5 weeks. Fidelity did not have any carryover like we do here. How long have you guys had 4 weeks?

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 08, 2005 2:02 PM  
**To:** Pat Ennis  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Thanks for the thoughtful offer but I don't use up my current vacation time. We've had 4 weeks for a very long time...as long as I can remember.

I contacted Nora at Dave's suggestion to "triple check" my data regarding your travel schedule but not vacation time. That was already verified by her, you and Carolyn. For years, Nora and I worked together regarding your schedule. She'd tell you, I was the one who often had the most complete listing since I was in charge of master planning for the movement. As you know, I was always asking you about vacations, personal retreats, speaking engagements, times with Carolyn, etc. so I could coordinate everything we did as Sovereign Grace Ministries with your schedule.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 13, 2005 12:17 PM  
**To:** Nora Earles  
**Subject:** Travel

Hi Nora,

When you get a chance could you look over my travel schedule for C.J. and see if it is correct. Thanks so much.

Brent

Now, things begin to change for the worse. I followed up with Nora per Dave's request but it resulted in a "punishing" response for me and an unhelpful one for Sovereign Grace Ministries.<sup>24</sup> You no longer wanted me involved with your calendar or schedule, not just vacation time. Why was this necessary?

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thu 10/13/2005 12:55 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Confidential

Nora informed me that you want the information about my calendar. I am glad to meet with her and go back through the year in more detail in order to provide you with the information you desire. But I won't be able to do this until next week at the earliest.

In the future would it be possible for Pat and Bob to have responsibility for my schedule? [Not just tracking vacation days.]

Thanks,

CJ

**From:** Nora Earles  
**Sent:** Thu 10/13/2005 12:59 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Travel

Brent,

When I saw that your calendar had CJ's personal retreats, I asked CJ if he wanted me to track those. It was in that conversation that I found out that you are probably using my calendar to track in a manner that would not necessarily be completely accurate. I mainly keep this "itinerary" for the purpose of setting up a task list to purchase airline tickets in a timely manner and to keep Sovereign Grace abreast of when CJ is in or out of town.

So in answer to your question below, I will have to talk with CJ before I know whether your information is correct.

I trust this makes sense.

Thanks,  
Nora

Now, you had Bob contact Pat to keep things moving and remove me. You never attempted to explain why this would "simplify things." In reality, it complicated things.

**From:** Bob Kauflin  
**Sent:** Sat 10/15/2005 5:44 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Cc:** Pat Ennis  
**Subject:** Vacation

Brent,

I think it may simplify things if Pat started overseeing CJ's vacation time. Nora could pass on the information to him and he could follow up with him through care group, if needed. If that's okay with you, let me know.

Pat, if you're okay with that, let me know as well.

Thanks!

Bob Kauflin

You continued to disagree with my calculations and claimed you had "different totals" but never produced them even though I was very willing to see them. I said "I'd be glad to see the more accurate totals for travel and vacation." I gave you the benefit of the doubt.<sup>25</sup>

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Tue 10/18/2005 10:24 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Confidential

Just wanted you to know that in going through the vacation and travel days I would have different totals than you have in both categories. Nora has not (nor has she ever) kept my schedule with the precision you were asking for. So if it would help for me to provide you with my totals in both categories I would be glad to do so.

Thanks my friend,

CJ

In this next response from me, I attempted to respectfully and humbly address the various ways you were concerned for me or judging me.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tue 10/18/2005 5:32 PM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Pat Ennis; Bob Kauflin  
**Subject:** Confidential - Travel/Vacation

C.J.,

This is a response to several things in the e-mails [above].

It is not necessary for you to go over things with Nora. I just didn't want to misrepresent you in any way.

Please know I've never used your travel itinerary to monitor your vacation time. I just happen to notice it when asked about paying for Chad's plane ticket in light of your time away.

I am glad for Pat (and Bob) to receive your travel itinerary. With this change, Pat should assume responsibility for planning and maintaining the master schedule? Otherwise, it would be hard to do. I will send Pat the relevant information to serve him in this capacity.

I also want to assure you that I have never questioned your integrity or been concerned for any unethical conduct in relation to Chad or the amount of

vacation time. From the beginning, I have wanted to change the policy so you can take 30 or more days of vacation.

I am not struggling with you but I'd be glad to see the more accurate totals for travel and vacation.

Thanks  
Brent

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Tue 10/18/2005 6:04 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Travel/Vacation

Thanks for wanting me to have more vacation time! That is very kind of you but not necessary.

The decision to remove my access to your schedule had significant implications. We never talked about them. For years I painstakingly and precisely recorded your travel and vacation time. I did this so we could effectively master plan for the entire movement and avoid scheduling conflicts. I've attached the very document I was using at the time. As you must remember, I constantly checked with you on team retreats and worked closely with Nora behind the scenes. At the end of every year, I reviewed your itinerary to make sure it was perfectly correct. I wanted it to serve as a "journal" or "history" for you. I did the same for the movement.

You never told me what your justification was for the change. It was never discussed. You simply made the decision.<sup>26</sup> You appeared resentful and distrustful of me.<sup>27</sup> To the best of my knowledge, no one ever challenged you on this decision or ever asked you any questions about your heart.<sup>28</sup>

Removing me complicated matters and made planning more difficult. I felt no freedom to ask Nora for any information regarding your or Carolyn's travel schedule. This seriously hindered me in serving you and Sovereign Grace Ministries in our master planning. You never asked me why "it would be hard to do" the planning without access. For the next two years, I did the best I could.

**From:** Bob Kauflin  
**Sent:** Tue 10/18/2005 5:44 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Re: Confidential - Travel/Vacation



Thanks for sending this, Brent.

Can you help me understand what "responsibility for planning and maintaining the master schedule" is?

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tue 10/18/2005 6:12 PM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Travel/Vacation

Scheduling team mtgs., retreats, conferences, etc.

From: Pat Ennis  
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2005 11:07 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler; C.J. Mahaney  
Subject: RE: Confidential - Travel/Vacation

AAAAAHHHH!!!! Did I just get delegated the Master Schedule? Hope not!  
Brent is doing a great job with it!<sup>29</sup>

And, I don't know if I'm the best guy to keep track of vacation time for A-Team guys if we are going to be precise. I am not real precise with the guys that report to me (maybe I need to change) because I know they work hard and put in a lot of hrs. For example, if somehow Tommy Hill took all of his vacation by the end of Sept (which he doesn't do) and told me he and Elizabeth needed a few more days in November, I would tell him to take them because of how hard he works and how effective he is. If you guys think I would be wrong in doing that, please let me know.

Pat

From: C.J. Mahaney  
Sent: Wed 10/19/2005 7:53 AM  
To: Pat Ennis  
Cc: Brent Detwiler; Bob Kauflin  
Subject: RE: Confidential - Travel/Vacation

Pat,

Do not be concerned my friend! You are not to track all the guys or Tommy, just me buddy. So this isn't a Master Schedule responsibility being delegated to you upsetting your entire life, etc. Just track my vacation by asking Nora for a total number of days.

CJ

**From:** Pat Ennis  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2005 7:59 AM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Brent Detwiler; Bob Kauflin  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Travel/Vacation

Will do.

**From:** Pat Ennis  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2005 9:12 AM  
**To:** Nora Earles  
**Cc:** C.J. Mahaney; Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** CJs vacation days

Nora,

I would be grateful if you could begin to send to me CJ's vacation days.  
Thanks!

Pat

By Tuesday, October 18, I thought things had finally come to an end. I was relieved! But at 4:15 in the afternoon, I received an extremely troubling e-mail from Bob Kauflin. I had practically no interaction with Bob throughout this process. We had never talked about anything and we only had a couple insignificant e-mail exchanges.

In what follows, Bob served as a conduit for your thoughts. This was your normal practice in dealing with me since August 20, 2004. You'd send Bob (or someone else) to correct me on your behalf.<sup>30</sup> Though the e-mail came in his name it was also an expression of your heart and mind. I thought matters had concluded. I was wrong. You could not move on without having Bob address me.<sup>31</sup> I responded to Bob point by

point. I quoted him and then responded to him. Those responses are in blue lettering. I've added additional comments in red lettering.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 18, 2005 4:15 PM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin  
**Subject:** Confidential - Vacation

Hey Bob,

I've provided a response to your concerns below regarding C.J.'s vacation time. Though we lack agreement, thanks for raising these issues with me. I am glad for you to do so.

Brent

- "Regarding the vacation questions, thanks so much for even asking. I don't think I got all of the interaction between you and CJ."

All correspondence with C.J. is attached for your review.

Bob was confronting me on "vacation questions," but he hadn't even seen or reviewed all the relevant and important information.

- "He [C.J.] did mention that you at one point had referenced your own travel schedule. I would want to ask you questions about whether or not you thought that was wise, helpful, or humble. Again, I don't know the context, so I don't know the answers. Typically, if I had questions about someone's vacation days, I wouldn't bring up my own vacation time in the conversation, because I don't trust my heart."

Only very reluctantly and in private with Pat when he asked me whether C.J. should be considered as an exception. Never with C.J. or others for the reasons you set forth. This is the first time I've been made aware that C.J. even knew about this.

You provided Bob selective and misleading information. Why didn't you provide the context for him? The primary reason I told Pat about my travel schedule was so he knew I might not be objective in deciding whether to pay for Chad not because I was pridefully comparing myself to you or jealous of you. Why didn't you tell Bob this? Why didn't you tell him I never mentioned anything about my travel to you or anyone else? That I never brought up "my own vacation time" in any "conversation" with you.

It appears you withheld information from Bob, sinfully judged me, believed the worse about me and then impugned my motives to Bob.<sup>32</sup>

- “As far as the actual numbers ago, I would agree with CJ’s perspective that he is well within the vacation days allotted to him – given the number of Mondays he’s worked, the vacation days that fell on Mondays during his times away, holidays that fell on Mondays that he hasn’t taken, and his work ethic in general.”<sup>33</sup>

Other guys also work on Mondays and on holidays. Our policy, however, doesn’t allow for these days to be added on to our vacation time. I am open to changing the policy to include this stipulation. I think an easier and better solution is to increase his vacation time to 30 days (or more) and have you help him in taking days off. I did not count as “vacation days” any “days off” or “holidays” that fell on any of his vacations.

Bob didn’t have all the facts, didn’t understand how the policy worked, and didn’t understand how the totals were arrived at. Yet he confidently agreed “with CJ’s perspective that he is well within the vacation days allotted to him.” This e-mail from Bob made one other thing clear. You had no qualms about taking 30 days of vacation. Bob embraced and advocated your perspective but was misguided.<sup>34</sup>

A lot of men worked on Mondays and holidays. None of them added those days to their vacation time. It was contrary to our policy because we were supposed to take a day off each week and spend time with our family on holidays. Also, several men put in the same amount of hours as you. No one added vacation days as a result. If we worked on Mondays and holidays it was our loss. We were not allowed to add those days to our vacation time. C.J., it now appears you did for yourself what no one else was doing for themselves. Maybe this does come down to an issue of integrity and you feeling the “rules” do not apply. If you knowingly added 10 days to your vacation time without permission that was wrong. You can’t create your own policy which is different from everyone else.<sup>35</sup>

- “Your interactions make it sound as though you have genuine concern for him in this area, as though he’s seeking to take advantage of the rules. I don’t think you believe you think that, Brent, but that’s what it can appear like. This is due partly to the amount of detail you’re referencing, without looking at the overall picture (things I mention above).”

I think this is an unfair characterization but please help me to see where I give this impression (or worse). I’ve never had a concern that he was

“seeking to take advantage of the rules.” I have thought the Sov. Grace work and vacation policy needs to be revised so C.J. can come into conformity with it. My concern has always been “technical” not “personal”. Under the current policy he gets 20 days of vacation time. He took 30. When I discovered this discrepancy at the beginning of this process, I wanted to increase his vacation time knowing his work ethic, etc. I’ve been trying to do so. C.J. has not been agreeable to this.

I did look at “the overall picture.” That is why I wanted to change the policy (e.g., quote: “I’ve asked Tommy to revise it for men in ministry... knowing that men like you [C.J.], Pat, Jeff, Bob, etc. work 6 days a week and often more.”).

In my responses to his initiatives, [1] I never raised any concerns for him and [2] I never expressed any disagreement with him. Instead, [3] I affirmed his integrity from beginning to end, [4] assured him I was fine with things, [5] expressed understanding of his circumstances, [6] provided explanations for his questions, [7] asked to be adjusted on how I may have wrongly calculated his vacation days, [8] advocated favorable solutions, [9] sought to change our policy and [10] commended him for his unique work ethic.

Bob didn’t allude to any of these ten points in his e-mail to me. It was all about questioning my heart and probing for evil motivations. There was no acknowledgement of how I was trying to serve you. Bob uses “the amount of details” I supplied as evidence against me to suggest evil intent. Yet the details were always necessary in response. I was simply answering your on-going questions. I should also mention that Bob never responded to this last e-mail. He never addressed my concern for an “unfair characterization.” This was also paradigmatic.<sup>36</sup> I’d respond to concerns raised with me. You and Bob would not respond to concerns raised for you.<sup>37</sup> And I have no knowledge that anyone else ever raised any concerns for you during this process. This lengthy illustration shows your typical response to input when it affects your reputation or you feel judged.

### C.J.’s Superior Discernment

One of the main issues of pride that Dave, Steve and I addressed over the years was your superior sense of discernment by which you sinfully judged others and isolated yourself from input. You acknowledged this deeply ingrained tendency to us in July of 2004. You talked to me at Celebration Mid-South in Lynchburg, VA. We were

encouraged by this new conviction from the Holy Spirit but it was not accompanied by any specific confession. Later on August 10 you wrote us and said,

“In recent history this arrogance has been evident in the following ways. On numerous occasions I have not been easy to entreat or correct. I have arrogantly assumed the superiority of my discernment when corrected. I can be quick to disagree when I am being corrected.”

The next month at the August 20 meeting, you also acknowledged not receiving correction from Dave and me because you thought it was rooted in offense. This prideful sin, however, continued to entangle you.

You regularly rejected correction because you “discerned” the person giving it was proud or bitter or angry. Similarly, you regularly withheld sharing correction you were receiving from others because you “discerned” it inaccurate. As a result, you withheld vital information from those responsible for you. For instance, you disagreed with the multitude of examples Dave, Steve and I brought to your attention. You knew your heart and it was innocent. You also knew our hearts. They were arrogant, resentful, deceitful. You acknowledged in principle your sense of superior discernment but you never applied it to any of the examples we used to illustrate the point.

You also regularly claimed to know people’s heart better than they did. They were deceived while you were illuminated.<sup>38</sup> They needed to agree with your discernment. This often resulted in sinful judgments. We brought this dynamic to your attention on numerous occasions but you never made any real life applications to our input or the illustrations we used.

Bob says of me, “Your interactions make it sound as though you have genuine concern for him [C.J.] in this area [days of vacation], as though he’s seeking to take advantage of the rules. I don’t think you believe you think that, Brent, but that’s what it can appear like.” This sounds like one of those occasions where your and Bob’s superior discernment trumps all. I am simply not believed. You and Bob knew better despite all my assurances otherwise.<sup>39</sup> In my first e-mail to you, I emphatically communicated, “Please know I am not concerned about your integrity.” I could not have been clearer and I was not lying.

You simply didn’t accept it when I repeatedly said I never thought you were trying to take advantage of the rules. I chalked up your actions to ignorance not evil intent. You were not one to know policies and track vacations days. But my explanations were dismissed. In fact, Bob went so far as to say, “I don’t think you believe you think that, Brent.” In other words, I was self-deceived. Bob could read my mind and my heart but even more, he could discern the antinomies in my very being.<sup>40</sup> In other words, I believed one thing in my mind but the very opposite thing in my heart. With my mind,

I didn't think you were deceitful. But with my heart, I believed you were actively "seeking to take advantage of the rules."

C.J., this is dangerous and not an isolated incident. You (and Bob) have done this on many occasions.<sup>41</sup> It is one of the reasons people don't feel the freedom to disagree with you. You consider your "discernment" practically infallible and authoritative.<sup>42</sup> You did this with Dave and me on different occasions. You assuredly knew the sinful motives of our hearts. For instance, you claimed I was bitter over teaching less in the Pastors College. Dave was bitter over not assigning him books to write or a seminar to teach. You told Steve behind out backs that we were acting deceitfully and controlling and/or managing information. On my...the list goes on and on. C.J., this entangling sin becomes a license for many other sins and sets a terrible example for others. Gene repeatedly did the same thing with me. Like Bob, there is good evidence to indicate he was following your directives and imposing your "discernment" on me. More later.

I hope this vacation illustration helps you see how difficult it is to raise concerns about the simplest matters when your pride is offended. It is a risky and exhausting enterprise.

#### "I Know What Is Going on in Their Souls"

Here is another example of "superior discernment." I'll share it because of its succinctness. On May 5, 2005, you and Bob talked with me by phone. You requested the call and it was largely about adjusting me and defending yourself on numerous accounts. I'll spare you the details and just share one illustration.

You said you disagreed with Dave and my input from August 20 but didn't voice it at the time because you "didn't want to put us in a bad light."<sup>43</sup> You said, "I think we have a limited role in each other's lives." Bob chimed in, "Totally agree." Then you said to Bob, "I should be minimally involved with all three of them [Dave, Steve, me]" You added, "I am not clear myself what sin gets shared with team."

In a nutshell, you didn't want to be involved in our lives or pursue fellowship with us any longer. This was a stark departure from the past. At this point, Bob asked you, "How can Brent win back your confidence and trust?"<sup>44</sup> You answered "I know how they [Dave and Brent] view me and what is going on in their souls toward me. I hope that will change in time but I am not living for their approval." You put all the blame on us for the breakdown in relationships. We were the problem. Further, you claimed to know the evil ways we thought about you and discerned the bitterness in our souls that motivated us. Therefore, all our observations were dismissed and our input negated. It didn't matter what we thought. You were living for God's approval not ours!<sup>45</sup> Wow...we were had!

Bob was totally unconcerned for how you needed to win back our trust and confidence. That was a question he never asked.<sup>46</sup> All the issues addressed in RRF&D had taken their toll on us. We were wobbling. This never concerned you. You never attempted to understand the affect of your sins upon us.<sup>47</sup> Your focus was entirely on how we wronged you. Josh described the pattern this way on August 20 per Bob's notes. "[Josh] doesn't think "withdrawing" is the best word. It seems to be more resentment and distrusting. At times there is a strength of response in C.J. that seems to be resentful." Josh was right. It was evident you resented our input, distrusted our motives, and withdrew from us relationally.

A year earlier, Dave described "the beachheads where the battle flares." Your on-going resistance, hypocrisy, lack of integrity, and broken promises wounded us badly. They were a "growing factor."

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 18, 2004 2:31 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Confidential

One feature of my situation that I did not discuss with you (I realized it about an hour after we hung up) was how the situation is preying on my own confidence and trust [in C.I.]. This may have been assumed in some of the things that have been said and you may be surmising it, but I have found that it is a growing factor for me over this season.

I'm not looking to make an issue of this or to do anything with it [because Dave knew how you'd react]. But I do want you to remain sufficiently apprised of the beachheads where the battle flares for me. Having said that, I believe that God is in this and I believe that he will meet me, though at this point, I confess that I do not know how.

### Deceit and Independence - Ending New Attitude

Here is another example of lying and deceit.<sup>48</sup> Like other examples in this document, I share it not to condemn you but to help you. I'm trying to use representative illustrations that can bring illumination and conviction. This can lead to confession and cleansing. In June of 2003, you felt New Attitude (now called "Next Generation" or "Next") should be ended. So did Josh. You brought this to our attention but didn't think Dave, Steve or me should be part of the decision making process even though we had serious concerns about ending it. Here's what you wrote Dave.



From: C.J. Mahaney  
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2003 9:55 AM  
To: Dave Harvey  
Subject: RE: Confidential

We are still getting more information but let me know how you think this decision [to cease NA conferences] should be made because I am still confused at the different approaches (it appears) of different team members.

What would your approach be?

We had been addressing you for several years about being too independent in decision making and about the need for greater plurality on the team. Dave was very careful not to offend you in his response. He laid out a simple prescription but one you were not following.

From: Dave Harvey  
Sent: Thu 6/19/2003 10:13 AM  
To: C.J. Mahaney  
Cc: Brent Detwiler; Steve Shank  
Subject: RE: Confidential

Thanks for asking about my approach but feel free to lead in any way that serves you or Josh. However, if hearing my thoughts will serve you, my approach would be to decide whether I need the counsel of the team or not. If I think I need it, or if I believe this comes under the purview of the team because Sovereign Grace bears some responsibility for New Attitude, then I would need to offer more information so that I can benefit from 'informed' counsel from the team.

The approach I might suggest:

1. Decide if this is urgent.
2. If not, hold it for the next team meeting. At the team meeting, offer reasons for discontinuing NA, answer any questions and obtain the counsel you desire.
3. Josh then benefits from the counsel of the team without displacing the responsibility for making the decision.
4. This is more like the approach I believe we outlined [in previous conversations] and I don't think there is any disagreement [Steve, Dave and I did not have "different approaches"] among the team over it, but I could be wrong.

Thanks for asking.

You asked me if I agreed with Dave. I did with a "slight difference."

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2003 10:17 AM  
To: Dave Harvey; C.J. Mahaney  
Cc: Steve Shank  
Subject: RE: Confidential

Agree with slight difference on #3. Well stated Dave - thanks.

From: C.J. Mahaney  
Sent: Thu 6/19/2003 12:39 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Confidential

What would your slight difference with number 3 be?

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2003 7:36 PM  
To: C.J. Mahaney; Dave Harvey; Steve Shank  
Subject: RE: Confidential

Dave says, "Josh then benefits from the counsel of the team without displacing the responsibility for making the decision." I am not completely sure what Dave means by this. If he means it is Josh's sole decision to end NA I would disagree. I think it is a team decision. On the other hand, if Josh does not feel he is to do NA that is his decision. If so, we need to decide whether we want to continue NA without him (or possibly with him in a limited way) and who else would be involved.

From: C.J. Mahaney  
Sent: Fri 6/20/2003 8:41 AM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Confidential

Helpful. I would approach it differently than you.

Thanks for sending me this stuff.

Your blunt response was characteristic and so was the lack of any explanation as to why you differed with me. In the end, our arguments in favor of NA prevailed, at least for the 2004 conference, which was held in Louisville, KY for the first time over the New Year break.

The following year you talked again about ending NA. I wrote Bill Kittrell for his thoughts given their effective outreach to young adults in Cornerstone and at the University of Tennessee. I sent them to everyone.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Sat 2/14/2004 4:28 PM  
**To:** Steve Shank; Pat Ennis; C.J. Mahaney; Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** FW: New Attitude

I asked Bill for his thoughts below about us ending (at least for now) New Attitude. I'd assume many others feel similarly and are perplexed about why it is being discontinued. I know Josh can't plan it but maybe someone else could. Anyway...food for thought when we discuss conferencing at the [Feb 17-20] retreat.

**From:** Bill Kittrell  
**Sent:** Sat 2/7/2004 11:50 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** New Attitude

Brent,

Per our conversation here are my thoughts on NA.

In a perfect world... I'd be leading Sovereign Grace... and in that perfect world we'd still be having NA with a greater emphasis than ever on college age. Here's why:

1. It serves my church best;
2. We want to be around awhile as a movement, so it's smart to be intentional in reaching youth. My experience has been that other Reformed folks seem to think being reformed and effective with youth is unique and encouraging. NA seems to be a great tool for us to do this.

3. NA draws folks from all over. It's even more effective - in one way - than the leadership conference in allowing us to serve the broader body of Christ. There are some great testimonies out there of people coming to us through NA.
4. College age is uniquely open to the gospel and discipleship. I think we can bear fruit reaching 18-24 year olds;
5. Sovereign Grace itself seems to be heading towards having more and more college age people that are members. Why stop now? All these babies are going to be going to college before you know it;
6. This last conference may have been our best. I can't help but believe even the current 'fallen world' Sovereign Grace leadership is having trouble not doing that again! I think Dever (actually I talked with him), Mohler, Grudem are probably thinking "You're canceling this?" ...
7. It's the second best conference we do (Leadership Conference first...by a nose);
8. There seems to be some interest among Sovereign Grace people for campus ministry. I can't overestimate the value this conference has for a Sovereign Grace church who wants to do campus ministry. Campus Crusade has a Christmas conference...we used to... NA gives you something every year you can use to build the church locally with campus ministry! And if we focused more and more on this age... it would only be more effective.

I'm sure I could come up with more, but that's a few thoughts. Thanks for asking me to send it.

The next time we discussed the future of New Attitude was during our March 18, 2004 team meeting by phone. It did not go well. You wrote Pat that evening and asked if he had any concerns or observations for your attitude or approach to the conversation with us. Pat wrote you back the next day.

From: C.J. Mahaney  
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2004 6:37 PM  
To: Pat Ennis  
Subject: Phone call

-  
Help me out my friend.

Is there any suggestion you have about how I can lead us more effectively? Did you notice anything in attitude or approach that either concerned you or you would have an observation and recommendation concerning?

Please help me.

From: Pat Ennis

Sent: Friday, March 19, 2004 9:59 AM

To: C.J. Mahaney

Subject: RE: Phone call

Humble of you to ask. Is there something specific that you have question about regarding the call?

I thought it was wisdom in pushing further conversation about NA to another time. I think being more clear about why you thought it would be best that you talk about it another time may have served them (i.e., want to make sure my heart is right because I have a strong conviction about this). It seemed they may have liked to talk more about it then. Were you poised to seek further understanding of their position or did you assume you fully understood them already? You made a comment about not doing NA in the future after they made some of their points. I understood why you would say that (it wouldn't be same conference), but that is a big decision to be made that quickly with so many passionate thoughts being communicated. How was your heart when you made that statement? It was obvious you have a conviction regarding Team involvement. I did not hear you clearly articulate your reasons for being hesitant for the Team to have more of an imprint on that Conference. It seemed they were struggling to understand your perspective and how it differed from theirs. You made the comment that there were differing perspectives but I don't know that they understand yours and it seems they want to.

I had no concerns when I left in that you may have simply been exercising wisdom and decisiveness throughout.

Thanks for asking for help!

Here are official minutes from the March 18 phone meeting recorded by Pat. They are general but give a feel for the discussion also. Dave's comment at the end summed it up. There was no plurality regarding the future of NA.

**Brent/Dave:** Team may need to have more of an imprint on conference if it more becomes part of our strategy.

**Steve:** Should it stay as it is, or should Team assist in structuring so that it is more focused on our movement.

**Brent:** Possibly, we should have more input to messages.

**CJ:** I do not think we should change it [meaning you didn't think the rest of us should provide direction for New Attitude].

**Steve:** If using NA going forward is a venue where we keep continuity, then team may need to assist in structuring to be more focused on our churches.

**Dave:** I think we may need to discuss our plurality regarding NA.

We were sharing our reasons for continuing NA when you abruptly and curtly expressed your disagreement and unilaterally decided to cancel it in 2005. This was discouraging. For years we talked to you about the need for greater team ministry and not acting independently when making important decisions. This was more of the same. Here again is Pat's description.

"You made a comment about not doing NA in the future after they made some of their points. I understood why you would say that...but that is a big decision to be made that quickly with so many passionate thoughts being communicated. How was your heart when you made that statement?"

Even more distressing was your lack of transparency. You asked for Pat's input but when it was unfavorable you did not forward it to Dave, Steve and me. This was extremely troubling because the three of us had talked to you about not keeping this kind of information from us.

At our next team meeting on April 21, we brought up the subject of plurality and your response to Dave and me on March 18. During the conversation Pat mentioned how quickly you reacted to us when we shared perspectives or observations you disagreed with.

After the meeting Dave checked in with you to see how you were doing, etc. We had shared our concern for your heart during the meeting. Here is your response to him.

From: C.J. Mahaney  
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2004 4:41 PM  
To: Dave Harvey  
Cc: Brent Detwiler; Steve Shank  
Subject: RE: Confidential

Kind of you to ask! I don't think I am weary, just tired but not exhausted. Pat said I looked joyful to him. And I think I have experienced joy throughout the day. So please don't cancel anything.

Up until yesterday they gave me April 30 as the due date and then it changed yesterday to April 26. But it is achievable and it concentrates the mind to have this new date.

I am sorry I had to end the meeting when I did but I hope you and Brent in particular thought/felt you were able to communicate your concerns. If you would like to do so again I would welcome hearing your observations and perspective. Though I would have a different perspective of what took place and why, I will consider what you guys said and pray about it and if I am convicted of sin I will definitely ask your forgiveness.<sup>49</sup> Again, I wish we could have continued but I just had to have a meeting with Josh before he left about the book (and it's date night) since I have a very important meeting with Multnomah tomorrow.

Thanks for your patience and understanding.

Even though you said, "I would welcome hearing your observations and perspective" this did not occur. You were never convicted of any sin. You never asked anyone's forgiveness. And you continued to disagree with Dave, Pat and my concerns for your heart and how you unilaterally made the decision regarding NA.

After the meeting, I e-mailed Pat asking for a clarification regarding his comment about how quickly you reacted to us.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2004 4:17 PM  
To: Pat Ennis  
Subject: C.J.'s Response

Were your observations re: C.J. responding "quickly" related to our discussion last time [March 18] about New Attitude or other things?

-  
Were your observations parallel to Dave and me re: his response to New Attitude?

-  
Thanks buddy.  
Brent

From: Pat Ennis  
Sent: Wed 4/21/2004 5:31 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: FW: Phone call

Brent,

This e-mail [the March 19 one above on p. 51] would better represent what my thoughts were at the time. CJ asked for my input the following day.

I followed up with Pat a few days later. I wanted the content of his e-mail shared with the team but I did not want to misrepresent Pat. I wanted to know what he attributed to a lack of wisdom and what he attributed to sin. I was putting him in a difficult position. I let him know I'd be forwarding his answers to you, Steve and Dave. I was doing everything above board and in the light.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Saturday, April 24, 2004 9:32 AM  
To: Pat Ennis  
Subject: RE: Phone call

I don't want to read into your e-mail to C.J. so could you clarify something for me. Did you feel C.J. simply could have handle the situation better as a matter of wisdom or were you concerned for how he responded to us as a issue of attitude or character. In other words, were you only concerned for how he led the discussion but not concerned there could be issues of sin in his heart and in response to us?

Thanks for helping me to understand.  
Brent

P.S. I'd like to forward your response to C.J., Steve and Dave.

From: Pat Ennis  
Sent: Saturday, April 24, 2004 10:03 AM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Phone call



Brent,

I had questions about CJ's heart in the situation due to some of his short responses, but not concerns, in that I have not observed any patterns of such behavior. I left the call having an opinion that he may have lacked wisdom in how he handled that section of the call. He gave you all much time to express your opinions about NA... I thought his responses were abrupt while disagreeable, and then he moved the call along as it seemed you guys were trying to understand his perspective... my opinion was that was not wise and I had questions about his heart in regard to the short answers. Hopefully, this is helpful.

Pat

Pat confirmed his observations of your leadership and heart. He thought you were unwise, abrupt, and disagreeable. Now, what was even more troubling was your misrepresentation of Pat to me the day before during a phone conversation between the two of us. You emphatically told me Pat had no concerns for your leadership, heart or attitudes at the March 18 meeting. You went further. You said he disagreed with Dave and me. But the day after your comments, I received the e-mail above from Pat. I wrote you and the other men. You lied and sought to deceive me.

From: Brent Detwiler

Sent: Saturday, April 24, 2004 7:02 PM

To: C.J. Mahaney

Cc: Pat Ennis; Dave Harvey; Steve Shank

Subject: Confidential - C.J. re: NA Discussion

I e-mailed Pat during our team meeting on Wednesday to get more of his perspective on the conversation at our March meeting re: the team's involvement in NA. It seems Pat has questions or observations similar to Dave and mine.

I did not receive Pat's clarification until after my conversation with you [C.J.] yesterday. During our conversation you said that Pat was in agreement with Steve's perspective as contrasted with Dave and me. That is, he had no concerns regarding your heart or attitudes.

You can re-read his March 19 e-mail and his April 24 clarification below.... Thanks my friend for your continued willingness to hear us and consider these issues.

I never received a reply and you never talked to us about this example. Four months later, I brought it up as an illustration at the August 20 meeting. The following is taken from Bob's official notes. Steve and Pat were in attendance and in agreement with what I said. They did not adjust my accounting or Bob's minutes.

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, 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 to support disagreement with the A-team's perspective.

We'd been talking to you even more purposefully about decision making and plurality for past six months when you decided to end NA regardless of our perspective during the April 21 team meeting. More seriously, two days later you said Pat disagreed with Dave and my concerns for you, when in fact, he shared those concerns. You withheld his "unfavorable report" and reshaped it like a nose of wax into a "favorable report." Steve also shared his perspective that on numerous occasions you'd cite others as a means of discrediting our observations.

#### New Policy: C.J. Must Present at All Evaluations

This is an example of controlling a process and hypocrisy.<sup>50</sup> A year before our meeting at the Covenant Life Church bldg. on August 20, 2004 you staked out a new and unprecedented position for yourself. You forbid us from having any interaction with Josh or the other pastors at Covenant Life Church to discuss issues related to your character or ministry unless you were present. You made this decision without consulting with us. You established this policy for yourself and for all others in the future.

This approach prevented us from freely interacting with CLC pastors. When I repeatedly tried to set up meetings with the CLC pastors, you and the apostolic team, the meetings were in every instance turned down by you or the pastors. I tried extremely hard on several occasions to get us all together. After August 20, 2004, we

never met again. We were effectively cut off from the pastors and you would not respond to our attempts at team retreats to engage you in conversation.

From: C.J. Mahaney  
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2003 9:52 AM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: Confidential

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. Two mistakes I made last year were meeting with your team and Dave's team without you guys being present. For a number of reasons I will never do that again.

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.

So let me know what you have in mind and who you want to be involved so hopefully I can benefit from the time.

Thanks,

C.J.

It was true - you entertained a number of sinful judgments against Dave and me because you excluded us from meetings and came to erroneous conclusions without talking to us. We were not doing the same. While we needed some freedom to interact with the CLC pastors, we were careful to update you, invite you to ask us questions and have the freedom to agree or disagree. Nevertheless, you positioned yourself as the sole mediator and controlled the flow of information. I agree with Dave's observations.

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<sup>51</sup> 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>52</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>53</sup>

I think CJ's position on not meeting apart from him is something he established, but never really discussed with us,<sup>54</sup> 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.... 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.]

- b. The reason why it may not be wise for CJ to meet with [pastoral] 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.

We were expressing concerns and asking questions about your new policy but we got no traction. It remained intact.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Fri 9/3/2004 11:33 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Clear Road Forward

I think that might be a good idea [that is, my proposal for all of us to meet]. However, even more important than their attendance would be our certainty of the role they are playing and the clarity they are bringing. I view this season to be one where we are establishing them [the CLC pastors] on the point and arming them with the necessary insights to serve CJ. If we don't clearly display that goal, then you and I will just look like we're badgering 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.<sup>55</sup> 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.

Later on February 3, 2005, Dave wrote Kenneth and copied Josh, Grant and Bob asking this question. "Can you help me better understand why it is important for CJ to be the exclusive courier of information 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?" This question was never answered.<sup>56</sup>

These illustrations show your determination to control and take over the process<sup>57</sup> in your case. But at least you committed to be equitable. You resolved never to evaluate Dave or me (or others by implication) without us being present to “hear, ask questions, agree or disagree.”

### A Kangaroo Court – Brent’s Assessment

In reality this new policy was never applied to me. I don’t know about Dave or others. I use the word “never” realizing it is a universal negative – a categorical statement. But beginning in June 2006 and up until July 2009 when I resigned from Grace Community Church, this policy was not followed by you, Dave, Gene or Bob.<sup>58</sup> Each of you habitually met without me to talk about me and came to all manner of conclusions regarding me. This more than any other example, underscores the extent of your hypocrisy. What you swore to “never do...again” you did constantly and flagrantly.<sup>59</sup> During my assessment last summer, I was given no opportunity to “hear, ask questions, agree or disagree” in the presence of those bringing charges or in the presence of those hearing the charges. Every meeting took place in my absence. I pointed this out this fatal flaw to Bob, Phil and Wayne and asked them to include it in their reports.

You appointed Bob to lead my assessment even though I asked he not be included on the assessment team.<sup>60</sup> What I experienced amounted to a kangaroo court. I was allowed “no defense at all” even though I was promised the opportunity to face each of my accusers. I was likewise denied all “due process rights in the name of expediency.” These statements are easy to substantiate. Here is an excellent description of what I experienced.

A **kangaroo court** or **kangaroo trial** is a colloquial term for a sham legal proceeding or court. The outcome of a trial by kangaroo court is essentially determined in advance, usually for the purpose of providing a conviction, either by going through the motions of manipulated procedure or by allowing no defense at all.

A kangaroo court’s proceedings deny due process rights in the name of expediency. Such rights include the right to summon witnesses, the right of cross-examination, the right not to incriminate oneself, the right not to be tried on secret evidence, the right to control one’s own defense, the right to exclude evidence that is improperly obtained, irrelevant or inherently inadmissible, *e.g.*, hearsay, the right to exclude judges or jurors on the grounds of partiality or conflict of interest, and the right of appeal. (Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia)

Under your leadership and largely due to your example and counsel in multiple situations, this kind of process has consistently occurred in Sovereign Grace Ministries.<sup>61</sup> More than I was aware. For example, several former sr. pastors in Steve's sphere claim to have experienced the same kind of treatment. In overseeing churches, no one's depended on your counsel more than Steve.<sup>62</sup>

### Repositioned Due to a Lack of Gifting<sup>63</sup>

This is a brief illustration but one many people have observed in Sovereign Grace Ministries. It is also a criticism commonly referenced in the blogosphere. There is truth to it. I don't deny that repositioning is sometimes necessary upon further evaluation of gifting. But when someone falls out of favor with you or someone like Dave or Steve, they often end up being repositioned on the grounds of gifting. Typically, this same person was formerly commended by you or them for their pronounced gifts when in good standing. Then something happens...conflict, disagreement, offense, dislike, etc. Rather than divulged your true feelings for the person they are simply repositioned. I believe this happened to me.

Here's what I mean. Dave and I talked by phone on May 25, 2007 regarding my future. He called on your behalf. During our conversation, he told me you decided to reposition me and curtail my responsibilities because of a lack of capacity and gifting.<sup>64</sup> Dave didn't indicate what these limitations were and he didn't tell me if he agreed. I wrote him to follow up. Unfortunately, my questions were never answered but changes were made.<sup>65</sup>

This was another example of you unilaterally making an assessment and a decision with no discussion as a team or with me as an individual. Ironically, I always received high marks on my performance evaluations by you and others every year. No one, including you, ever suggested a lack of capacity or gifting in the execution of my responsibilities which were second only to yours for nearly two decades. No specifics were provided. No objective illustrations were presented. I was repositioned with no explanation.<sup>66</sup>

This was not a surprising development given your disposition toward me. Over the years, I've seen you use "a lack of gifting" as a convenient excuse for demoting a person you no longer trust or like due to personal offenses.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Friday, May 25, 2007 2:03 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** Confidential

Hey Dave,

Thanks so much for the time today. A residual question came to my mind afterward. Where and how would C.J. see the adverse affects of my limitations in capacity and gifting in executing my current responsibilities? Would you agree or have additional observations. I am not attempting a defense - just love to know C.J.'s (and your) assessment of me. Thanks for providing it.<sup>67</sup>

Brent

### My "Legalistic" Teaching at a Men's Retreat

One main concern everyone has repeatedly brought to your attention is the matter of sinfully judging other people based upon little evidence, no evidence, faulty evidence or even contrary evidence. This has affected the movement. What follows is an example of sinful judging and having "back room" discussions contrary to your strongly avowed commitment to never do this or allow this again.

At our June 2007 retreat, I was falsely accused of legalistic teaching at the "The Making of a Man" conference in Lynchburg, VA on September 21-23, 2006. The erroneous information used for these charges came from Mickey Connolly and Larry Malament but was unflinchingly believed by you, Dave, and Steve. Behind closed doors you agreed to have Larry attend the retreat, in part, to confront me on these charges.

During one of our meetings, I was rather suddenly and strongly reprovved for my legalistic teaching. A case was made against me. I gave no answer to these charges. I should add that you and Dave added your own indicting comments. I remained quiet. I knew any defense would further condemn me. I'd be accused of being proud and unteachable.<sup>68</sup>

After the retreat I contacted Larry. In the end, he wrote you and asked forgiveness for being a false witness but there was no follow up by you with me. No, "I'm sorry" or "I apologize." And certainly no, "Please forgive me." Follow carefully.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2007 12:09 PM  
To: Larry Malament  
Subject: Joe and John

...Also, at the [June] team retreat you told the guys [C.J., Dave, Steve and Pat] that Mickey had told you that Gene needed to talk to all the sr. pastors from the



upper Mid South about concerns he had for my legalistic teaching at the Men's Retreat? Is that accurate?

Larry responded but gave a very different account than the one he gave us on the team retreat. He distorted and diluted his story beyond recognition.<sup>69</sup>

Larry Malament  
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2007 2:05 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Joe and John

From what I was told Gene wanted to make sure the men in his sphere were clear on principal vs. practice. It was not in direct relation to your messages at the men's retreat, but since your messages were on the practical side Gene wanted to insure that the men were clear on the subject.<sup>70</sup>

I responded to him seeking to understand the truth. I also asked him where he got his information.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2007 2:33 PM  
To: Larry Malament  
Subject: RE: Joe and John

That sounds quite different from what you shared at the retreat. I thought you said Gene followed up with each of the sr. pastors regarding my teaching at the Men's Retreat. What am I missing?

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2007 2:29 PM  
To: Larry Malament  
Subject: RE: Joe and John

Who told you this?

According to Larry, Mickey was the source of this bogus information. I don't know who else Larry talked to after his initial contact with Mickey.

From: Larry Malament  
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2007 3:20 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Joe and John

My initial conversation was with Mickey. I'll follow up with him. I don't want to assume I heard him correctly.

From: Larry Malament  
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2007 3:20 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Joe and John

My original understanding [from Mickey] was that Gene was following up with the guys in response to your teaching. When I talked with Gene he said it was not in response to your teaching but something he had wanted to address prior to your messages. I think I may have misunderstood the initial conversation [with Mickey].

This was an unsatisfactory answer. I don't think Larry was being transparent.<sup>71</sup> Nevertheless, I covered Larry and Mickey's apparent sin when talking to Gene. I did not reveal their identities.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2007 9:44 PM  
To: Larry Malament  
Subject: RE: Joe and John

I don't understand then. Why would you tell the guys at the retreat that Gene talked to all the sr. pastors after the Men's Retreat about concerns for my teaching? Gene told me this weekend he never did anything like that. That is, he never talked to any of the men about concerns for my teaching. He was very grieved that he was being represented as doing this. I did not indicate to him where I heard this stuff from [in order to protect Mickey and Larry]. I only mentioned to Gene that someone [Mickey] had told someone [Larry] who told C.J., Steve, and Dave that he had done this.

Larry talked to you about all of this before the June retreat began. You were fully aware and behind his confrontation of me at the retreat. In this e-mail, Larry expressed no uncertainty about what Mickey told him.

From: Larry Malament  
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2007 8:42 AM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Joe and John

Brent,

I'm very sorry about this miscommunication. I had heard this from Mickey and talked with CJ about this. CJ had been with Gene prior to our conversation and did not correct the perception I had been given. I've gotten back to Dave and corrected what had been said at the retreat. I've also spoken with Gene. I've yet to have a conversation with Mickey to find out why he communicated the information to me in the way he did.

*Larry*

From: Larry Malament  
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2007 8:48 AM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Joe and John

The only other person [besides C.J.] I spoke to about Mickey's comment regarding Gene was Dave. He encouraged me to mention it at the retreat. I sadly made a mistake of not getting to Gene sooner. Please know I don't want to have you wrongly accused or maligned<sup>72</sup> in any way my friend. I am very sorry about this. Would you please forgive me? I will certainly get back to CJ and Steve as well.

Larry changed his story back to the original version and asked forgiveness of you and Dave. I appreciated him doing so. I don't know if he ever got back to Steve and Pat.

From: Larry Malament  
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2007 9:00 AM  
To: C.J. Mahaney  
Cc: Dave Harvey; Brent Detwiler  
Subject: Brent

CJ,

A number of months back, from my recollection, Mickey shared with me that Gene E. felt as though he needed to follow up some of Brent's messages after their men's retreat in VA last year. From what I remember Mickey said Gene

felt like he needed to insure that the churches clearly understood the differences between principal and practice. It appeared to me that Mickey was communicating that Gene needed to do this based directly on concern for Brent's teaching. I'm sure at that point I formed some critical judgments<sup>73</sup> in my mind.

I mentioned Gene needing to follow up at your [June team] retreat in regards to Brent's preaching. I was able to speak to Gene afterwards and found out that his going to the churches was not directly related to Brent and any concern for what he shared. Gene said that for a while he was concerned that the churches in his sphere were not clear on principal vs. practice and in light of the practical messages Brent was sharing with the men he wanted to insure they knew how process and apply what Brent shared.

He did not share any concerns when asked about the messages Brent brought. I think I sinfully just listened to what Mickey shared<sup>74</sup> and didn't follow up like I should. I was surprised to hear Gene's perspective in comparison to what I remember Mickey saying. I haven't talked to Mickey yet about this so I'm not sure what this will look like in the end. Regardless I did poor job of following up and learning the truth. Would you please forgive me for sharing inaccurately as well as wrongly characterizing Brent's teaching.<sup>75</sup> I think I just pridefully assumed I had all the facts. And please know that I'm not laying the blame at Mickey's feet. I'm assuming I just didn't listen well to what he was saying. I'll let you know more once I follow up with Mickey.

A couple weeks later I followed up with Larry regarding what he heard from Mickey. Mickey took no responsibility for passing on faulty information to Larry.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2007 6:36 PM  
To: Larry Malament  
Subject: Legalistic Teaching

What did you discover from your conversation with Mickey?

From: Larry Malament  
Sent: Friday, August 03, 2007 4:31 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Legalistic Teaching

He didn't remember exactly how it was shared [with me].

This scenario has played out hundreds of times in your dealings with people over the last 30 years. It has reeked a lot of devastation in people's lives.<sup>76</sup>

### Recruiting for Church Plant During Sunday Message

Here is another example of how things worked with me. The Monday before our November 2007 team retreat began, Larry Malament sent the following to you, Dave, Mickey and me. I was heartbroken when I read his assessment of my Sunday message at CrossWay Community Church. Not because I thought it was a great message, but because Larry didn't wait to talk with me until after the retreat. Instead, he rifled off an e-mail. It was another blindside.<sup>77</sup>

Dave believed Larry's report without listening to the message<sup>78</sup> and brought it to my attention on the last day of the retreat. This is the retreat I resigned as a Board of Director. A couple weeks later on November 31, I met with Mickey, Larry, Jim Hawkins, Joe Lechner, and John Morrison. During that time, Mickey and Larry told me that I used the message to recruit more people for the church plant and that I was largely unconcerned<sup>79</sup> for the welfare of CrossWay Community Church. They passed these perspectives onto you, Dave and Gene. All of you readily accepted them.

Later, Dave and Gene confronted me for recruiting and not caring about the welfare of CrossWay<sup>80</sup> even though they had not listened to the message. They simply believed what they were told. Last summer, the Assessment Team actually listened to the message and had no such concerns. I hope they provided this perspective to you, Dave, Gene, Mickey and Larry. In any case, no one ever got back to me. I should also add not a single person went on the church plant because of my message or after my message.

These charges went to motive but I was not motivated to recruit and I cared deeply about the welfare of CrossWay. Later, Mickey went further and told me I should return to CrossWay on a Sunday morning and make a public confession of selfishness to the church.<sup>81</sup> If you have not, please listen to the message yourself. It was titled "Living for Him Who Died for Us" and given on November 18, 2007. It's on the CrossWay website. According to Larry it was biblically unsound, superficial, and ill motivated. Here is his e-mail.

**From:** Larry Malament  
**Sent:** Monday, November 19, 2007 2:34 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Cc:** Mickey Connolly; Dave Harvey; C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** Sunday

Brent,

I wanted to pass on to you my thoughts regarding Sunday's message. I know you have much on your plate as you prepare to travel but thought my observations might be helpful. First, thank you for taking the time to prepare and endeavor to serve the church. Sunday messages are always a labor of love and sacrifice and I know you worked hard to prepare. I was excited about the passage you had chosen and was looking forward to your exegesis of "the great exchange" (my understanding of your original title). I know e-mail is at best a mediocre way to communicate but knowing you're preparing to leave [for the SGM leadership team retreat] I'll have to move forward in spite of its limitations. Please know how much I love and respect you and my observations do not reflect a change in this.<sup>82</sup>

- First, I was concerned for your exegesis of the passage. It appeared to lack depth as well as precision. You initially commented that the primary context of the passage was one of reconciliation between us and God and yet you did not make that your *primary* focus. It appeared as your first main point, but then you quickly moved over to Bunyan's sacrifice and the need for us to sacrifice without returning to your main point about Christ reconciling us to God.
- Your focus then gravitated towards the sacrifice of church planting. I wasn't sure how church planting really applied to this passage and it seemed unnatural to bring the church plant in Mooresville into your message.
- In point two when you discussed being ambassadors for Christ, your illustration of the Kan's martyrdom ended with you saying, "*we're called to be ambassadors whether we're called to Pakistan or Mooresville.*" It made me think, "*what about being called to CrossWay as ambassadors?*" Why just mention Mooresville? Again, the focus seemed to gravitate towards what you were doing and not putting CrossWay first.
- I did appreciate your comment to the folks going on the plant that they should continue tithing to CrossWay until they leave, but other than that reference CrossWay appeared to take a back seat to what was about to take place in Mooresville.
- Instead of positioning folks to understand they are called to CrossWay and must hear a clear word to go, in essence you positioned them more on the 50 yard line, with everyone needing to consider the sacrifice of going. Brent, I don't think that's how a church plant should work. My assumption is that everyone is called to stay until God clearly speaks about going. Positioning them to believe that all should consider going seems counterproductive to the local church that is sending the church plant.

- Throughout your message, (as far as I remember) there were no references to the CrossWay pastoral team, how CrossWay is living as ambassadors for Christ, how we are being effective in evangelism, your appreciation of the pastoral team, and the sacrifices being made here locally.
- I know of no references where you've communicated your appreciation for the sacrifices we are making and will experience by sending out a church planting team. I trust you have said things but nothing that I'm aware of publicly.
- Overall to me it appeared that the message came across more as a pep talk about the sacrifice of going on the church plant to Mooresville and did little to honor and highlight this local church, or encourage them that most folks should be staying, not considering going.

Brent, I know this will be a challenging e-mail and one that would tempt anyone to discouragement, but please receive as one friend desiring to care for another. Over the past few months I have had some other observations and concerns about your approach but have held off thinking they were isolated moments. But Sunday I felt as though you unwisely used the pulpit.<sup>83</sup> Now please know, these are my thoughts - one's I've shared with Mickey, (and now CJ and Dave), but they are my thoughts just the same, and ones I don't assume are all correct. At some point I would love to talk about these things.

As always, your friend.

*Larry*

I use this as a typical example. You allow others to entertain uncharitable judgments against a person without holding them accountable. This is particularly true when you are resentful of the same person.<sup>84</sup>

### Eldership in the New Testament Cover

One of the false charges made by Dave and Gene to the Assessment Team and others had to do with the longevity of my "sin." That is, they were injuriously telling my friends that for "many years" I'd been adjusted by the apostolic team on pride, independence, and unteachableness. That was entirely untrue.<sup>85</sup>

The first time these issues were raised with me was at the June 2006 team retreat. Two examples of pride and independence were introduced. The first regarding my booklet on "Eldership in the New Testament" and the second regarding the church planting proposal I submitted in April of that year.

While in seminary, I wrote my Master's thesis on "Eldership in the New Testament." I gave a copy of it to you and Larry Tomczak on my first visit to Gathering of Believers in the summer of 1979. You commended it to all the pastors. It became the foundation for our understanding of eldership. For many years, I distributed it in the Leadership Training School and the Pastors College when teaching on ecclesiology.

I had made some revisions to the document to hand out at "The Summons for Called Men" - a conference two weeks earlier in Charlotte for men who felt a possible call to ministry. This document long predated anything Dave wrote on the subject. I brought copies to the June 2006 retreat. I thought you'd appreciate the revision. What happen next was totally expected.

Behind closed doors, you talked with Dave, Steve and Pat about this being an example of my pride and independence.<sup>86</sup> You were especially concerned about the cover which was like the Perspective Series booklets produced by Sovereign Grace Ministries. You believed I unilaterally decided to include my work in the Perspective Series without permission. During one of our sessions you confronted me on this. There were no questions. Just conclusions - that is sinful judgments. I was also told I was independent for using the Perspective series format and that I pridefully produced a book we did not need. That I should be using Dave's material on "Called Men," not my own.

There was no freedom to explain myself. It was an oppressive environment. Like many other occasions, I did not speak out against these false charges. In part, because I was trying to be humble.<sup>87</sup> In part, because I feared being told I was proud for disagreeing.<sup>88</sup> Here is an e-mail to Dave where I referenced this illustration.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2009 9:12 PM  
To: Dave Harvey  
Subject: Process

I think you are mistaken [about the longevity of my "sin"]. The process began at the June 2006 team retreat. It was flawed from the beginning. I could cite several examples. For instance, I am sure you remember C.J. meeting with you, Pat and Steve in private and talking about concerns related to me without me being present. Sinful judgments were entertained like the matter of me independently putting a Perspectives cover on my Eldership in the NT booklet. It was assumed I did this. When pressed upon me, I felt no freedom to correct your perception. Months later, Larry brought this to your attention. Other examples could be cited.<sup>89</sup>



More importantly, the private meetings during the retreat were contrary to C.J.'s emphatic declaration that he would never do that with anyone after what he claimed to have unjustly walked through with us (you, Steve, and me) from 2000-2004. That is, his assertion that we were wrongly talking about him without him being present.

You may think I am bitter in bringing this to your attention. I am not. I do think it is time to raise these kinds of issues given the consistent misrepresentations. If you have another opinion, I'd love to hear and gladly be adjusted.

Brent

I will come back to the matter of your hypocrisy regarding private meetings but first let me present the e-mail history regarding the cover. Nine months after our June 2006 retreat I received the following e-mail from Larry.

**From:** Larry Malament  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 06, 2007 11:33 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Talk with Dave

Would you mind at some point allowing me to mention how the cover [for *Eldership in the New Testament*] came about?

At this point, I contacted Nick Swan and Jeremy Oddy. I could not remember for sure which one of them produced the cover.

**From:** Nick Swan  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 06, 2007 3:30 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Re: Cover

I designed it. I just copied it from the other Perspectives books. I have attached what I have.

We had a great time as well. It is nice to know we will be seeing each other regularly in May.

Talk to you soon,

Nick

I never saw the cover until after the booklets were produced just two weeks before the team retreat. Larry followed up with me again.

**From:** Larry Malament  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 06, 2007 3:47 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Talk with Dave

I don't want to mention this if you're comfortable with me doing so, but why not? Do you think it will cause a problem? I certainly don't want to do that.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 06, 2007 3:52 PM  
**To:** Larry Malament  
**Subject:** RE: Talk with Dave

I've let these kinds of things go uncorrected in the process.<sup>90</sup> I don't want to major on minors by "defending" myself.

**From:** Larry Malament  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 06, 2007 6:01 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Talk with Dave

I understand. Wise thinking on your part. I don't have any clue whether or not it might be mentioned but if it does I would like to have the freedom to mention all the specifics.

Sometime after this Larry took the initiative to present the specific facts to you and set the record straight. I say the following without scorn, but in characteristic fashion you never got back to me and we never talked about this incident as a apostolic team.<sup>91</sup>

These kinds of experiences have a terrible affect upon people. I hope you gain a greater appreciation for the justice of God and the equitable treatment of his image bearers.

### The Church Planting Proposal - April 2006

I made Mickey the senior pastor and turned CrossWay Community Church over to him on December 15, 2002. A few years later, Mickey, Larry, Jim and I occasionally talked about the possibility of me planting a church. In the spring of 2006, I presented the

following proposal to Mickey, Larry and Jim at our senior staff meeting on Tuesday, April 11. They were unsurprised and intrigued. We discussed it merits. I did this knowing I'd have opportunity to talk with you that same afternoon during our monthly phone call. I also planned it this way since we had a team meeting the next day, Wednesday, April 12. I planned to submit my proposal to everyone for consideration.

Proposal for Church Planting  
04/12/06

### Training My Replacement

Over the past 6 months, I've been doing a lot of thinking about how to train my replacement on the apostolic team. Ideally, I'd like the person to be 20-25 years younger than me. If I turned over my responsibilities at age 60-62, I'd have 8-10 years to position such a person. In order to do this I think it will be necessary to plant a church in the greater Charlotte area. I'd endeavor to begin the new church with my likely successor.

### Training Future Leaders

This church planting would also create a context in which I could disciple and train future church planters and pastors. In time, I'd like to see other churches planted in the Charlotte area. This would facilitate even greater ministry opportunity for upcoming men while giving me easy access for the purpose of training.

### Model

I feel a need to build a church that reflects in greater measure my values, priorities, and theology.<sup>92</sup> CrossWay is a wonderful church and I respect the job Mickey has done these past 3½ yrs. I am also aware that differences exist in how we approach ministry and in the things we emphasize. I'd like to establish a church where I can continue to shape the church and influence the staff over the long haul.<sup>93</sup>

### Strong Functional Connection

In this church, I'd build a strong sense of identity with the mission of Sovereign Grace. Each staff member would have "Sovereign Grace" written into their job description. By that I mean I'd create a context where all the resources of the church were available to serve Sovereign Grace. The staff would be fully assessable to advance the larger mission. There would not be a division of labor.

## Strong Relational Connection

This church would allow Jenny and me the opportunity to be relationally “immersed” with the staff. It would become my base and we’d be identified with this church. We would receive pastoral care and also provide pastoral care and mentoring to the staff.

## Particulars

I would take the lead in planting the church but hopefully do it with a young named Nick Swan. He has been my personal assistant over the last 6 months. I’d like for him to attend the Pastor College this year. If he did well, I’d bring him back and further train him as a church planting intern. The goal would be for him to become the sr. pastor in the timing of God. We could plant the church in January 2008. If he excelled as a sr. pastor I would further train him for apostolic responsibilities. Nick may not be the man to replace me but you can see the concept I am working with.

During our personal conversation on Tuesday afternoon, you corrected me not talking to you first. It was a good point. In retrospect I should have done this though it was not my intent to act independently. I thought I was approaching the process of church planting submissively...first talk to the pastors, second talk to C.J., then talk to the apostolic team.

No one ever made the claim that I was independent until our June 2006 retreat. I’ve always been a team player. But it was during this time that you confronted me for the Perspective series book cover and the manner in which I presented the church planting proposal.<sup>94</sup> That is, for not talking to you about it first. In the later case, I saw how this was an expression of independence though unintended. I asked your forgiveness and everyone else’s.

This illustration [the church plant proposal] was repeatedly brought to my attention by you and those making a case against me for several years. It became a defining example of pride and independence in my life. This was wrong. When corrected, I immediately asked forgiveness. I didn’t deny the presence of pride and independence in my heart. I should have talked to you first but this wasn’t a major transgression and I quickly humbled myself. For your benefit, I hope you see the harsh and hypocritical way in which you conducted yourself.<sup>95</sup>

## Eager to Meet and a Final Appeal

Let me reiterate an important point I repeatedly made in RRF&D, subsequent correspondence and now again. I am eager to meet with you but I must have a written response to RRF&D, and now AFA, in advance. This is not a substitute for meeting but a precursor to meeting. On March 17, I wrote “I will gladly meet [with you] but first I need some assurance you have processed what I’ve written by providing a meaningful response. I do not expect complete agreement.”

I’ve been open and honest with you. I’ve put my thoughts and concerns in print. They are open to examination and scrutiny. I’ve been candid and I welcome the accountability such a format secures. I’ve also asked for your critique and invited your correction. To these I will gladly respond in print in advance of any meeting. In addition, you are welcome to show my response to others in preparation for any such meeting.

For these reasons, I don’t understand your adamancy. Why are you unwilling to do the same? What might this reveal? Do you really think written communication will make things worse? Or, are you avoiding accountability? I don’t know. In any case, I need you to be open, honest, candid and accountable in print.<sup>96</sup> You’ve had months to think about RRF&D and talk to others about it. I am simply asking you to supply me what I have supplied you. I am not trying to “catch you” or “trap you.” I just want you to be transparent about your agreements and disagreements. This will help me immeasurably in preparing for a meeting. For instance, it still baffles me that you remain unwilling to share in writing what differences in doctrine and praxis preclude ministry in Sovereign Grace Ministries. I guess that question awaits heaven.

Finally, you said, “So, although I have a number of questions about what you’ve written, I think trying to address and resolve them in written form is unwise and would only prove unhelpful.” Trying and resolving are two different matters. Please try to address them in written form. And remember, my request for written communication has always been in preparation for meeting, not a replacement for meeting. I am not expecting total resolve via writing but it could go a long way in that direction. Please reconsider.

## My Biggest Concern – Integrity, Truth Telling, and Justice<sup>97</sup>

I wrote RRF&D with you in mind. I did not elaborate on concerns for others. I purposely limited the scope of my writing because change in those around you must begin with change in you.<sup>98</sup> By that I mean, there is little hope you can effectively help Dave, Steve, Bob, Gene,<sup>99</sup> et al. apart from personal illumination and reformation. They are a reflection of you. That is why I wrote:

“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.”

The issues I’ve raised are not obscure or difficult to discern. The examples are numerous and easy to perceive. I hope RRF&D and AFP serve your soul and result in public confession. I completed RRF&D and sent it to you three weeks before the Pre-Conference Gathering at Together for the Gospel in April. I prayed you’d take the opportunity to tell the Sovereign Grace pastors about the last 10 years (or longer) and acknowledge your hypocrisy. I didn’t hope or pray for these things with a desire to humiliate or embarrass you. I simply hoped you’d follow your own teaching and the example of other men who have publically confessed sin of a much less serious nature and often at your behest. I believe you know the right thing to do but I realize there are many temptations you must resist and overcome in order to do so.<sup>100</sup>

Therefore, I’d encourage you again, to be open and honest with the Sovereign Grace pastors and the movement. For instance, follow the humble example of your friend, John Piper. Here is a short excerpt of his public comments.

“I see several species of pride in my soul that, while they may not rise to the level of disqualifying me for ministry, grieve me, and have taken a toll on my relationship with Noël and others who are dear to me. How do I apologize to you, not for a specific deed, but for ongoing character flaws, and their effects on everybody? I’ll say it now, and no doubt will say it again, I’m sorry. Since I don’t have just one deed to point to, I simply ask for a spirit of forgiveness; and I give you as much assurance as I can that I am not making peace, but war, with my own sins.”

There is no greater service you could provide. A public confession would bring glory to God, protect the gospel, restore confidence in Sovereign Grace Ministries, bless the pastors, set an example for the next generations of leaders, and benefit your soul.

### The Case of North Coast Church

I also think you would benefit from the feedback of men who have left the movement. What I have experienced is unusual in degree but it is not new or novel. Here is another paradigmatic example. I’ve chosen this one because it exemplifies several

important points. Below is the letter you wrote Ken Roberts, Chet Fahrmeier, Mike Noble, and Mark Telepak at North Coast Church (NCC) on August 9, 1997. Two months earlier on June 13, 1997, they wrote “to officially and respectfully request NCC to be released from our long standing and valued relationship with the movement and ministry of PDI.” Since they were leaving PDI, you thought they should return a 5k gift from Covenant Life Church. This was your first interaction with them after receiving their letter.

August 9, 1997

Dear Ken,

[I] just wanted to communicate my appreciation for the return of the \$5,000. I do think that was integrity and I commend and respect you for doing this.

I am disappointed that the same kind of integrity has not been evident in the decision to withdraw North Coast Church from P.D.I. Unless there is an explanation I am not aware of (and please provide one if there is), I do not understand how you and the men you serve with can withdraw the church from those who originally delegated you this responsibility. I am sure Dave has communicated our disagreement and dismay, but this continues to be the most perplexing and disturbing aspect of your decision to me and those from Covenant Life Church and other churches who upon discovering the news have simply asked, “How can they do this?” My hope would have been that in light of your disagreement, we could separate peacefully and send you to begin another church in an agreed upon location.

Let me also communicate disappointment with how you have misrepresented the team’s theological position, our practice and our heart attitude through your letter and public communication. Sadly, this was confirmed when Dave and Steve met with folks from North Coast Church. Their perceptions of the team, how we build, and the recent transition were simply inaccurate. I had hoped this would not happen.

This letter contains nothing you have not heard previous from Dave, but I wanted to express my disagreement and grief with how you men have proceeded.

With sadness,

C.J.

I remember how troubled I was with your letter to Ken and especially when you sent it out to all the pastors in PDI on September 8, 1997 with a cover letter. It was harsh and errant in many respects. It put Ken, Chet, Mike, and Mark in a very bad light

I was embarrassed for you and concerned for them. Your letter was very different in tone and content from the one I first wrote on June 19 to all the PDI pastors about North Coast's decision to leave. Here is an excerpt from that 2 page letter.

“Greetings in the name of our sovereign Lord Jesus! C.J. is away on vacation. Therefore, I have been asked to write you on behalf of the apostolic team concerning developments with the church in Cleveland. Recently, the pastoral team of North Coast Church made the decision to leave PDI. This is not a rash decision on their part, nor have they made this decision with enmity in their hearts toward us. Indeed, they have sought to communicate their apperception for us. Though disappointing, the process we have walked through has been cordial and charitable.... We also have confidence in the sovereignty of God and affirm the genuine desire of the NCC pastors to serve the Lord as they move on. Our relationship with the NCC leaders (and church) has clearly changed, but it has not been severed. We affirm our love for them and have confidence in the blessing of God upon them.”

Ken wrote me back.

Dear Brent

Just wanted to say “thanks” for the letter you wrote on behalf of the apostolic team to all the PDI senior pastors. I appreciated the tone and clarity and thought it rightly represented all of us in this difficult decision and transition.

Thanks for your contribution into my life over the years...I pray God's continued grace upon you and those you serve.”

In respect,  
Ken Roberts

Ken, Chet, Mike and Mark provided you their perspective on how things were handled in an 8 page letter, dated April 1, 1999. Much of what they said was true. Here are some excerpts.

“I believe that the way the separation [from PDI] occurred is very important. I don't believe that this chronology has been communicated accurately or was accurately represented to others in the ensuing months. This issue is important because it speaks to areas of our motive in the separation. It was later made to



look like I “pulled the church out of the movement”. It was implied to people that I was attempting to avoid being repositioned or had something to hide and therefore quickly took the church of the movement. This couldn't have been further from the truth. Much of the confusion, suspicion of motives, and accusation could have been avoided if the way the separation came about had been accurately and forthrightly communicated, “ (page 4)

“After 17 years of relationship with the apostolic team and the movement, I [Ken] have been extremely disappointed with C.J.’s response. During those 17 years we/I have always attempted to submit, show respect, walk in truth, loyalty, integrity, discuss our differences, communicate, communicate, communicate, and be a positive contributor to the movement. However, once the dialogue regarding the separation began, I didn’t hear anything from C.J. at all [you resentfully withdrew from them] until we got a note [the one above] in response to our return of a financial gift from Covenant Life Church to NCC in December of 1995. Then his response was to question our integrity in walking through the situation. This was painful and inappropriate. I also didn’t, nor have I, heard anything from Steve Shank. It appears once you don’t agree with the apostolic team you no longer exist [p. 5]....

“[You] undermined the character, call, conscience, and convictions of the entire eldership, and North Coast Church. This is probably the biggest issue to me. Once the separation became apparent, the tactic of the apostolic team seemed to be to subtly but certainty discredit me [p. 5]. This is evidenced through:

1. Dave’s conference call with our entire eldership shortly after our meeting at Celebration.
2. Dave’s letter to NCC’s membership.
3. Private telephone conversations between Dave, Steve and Jim Walter with current NCC members.
4. Statements made and the presentation of the issues at the open meeting in Cleveland in July with Steve, Dave, and Jim.
5. Other conversation from various PDI pastors to NCC staff personnel.

It has also been confusing to all of us that the last time Dave was in NCC, (February 1997) he publically commended me (KR) and all the pastors of NCC before the congregation. It is also confusing to us why there were issues concerning me that were never addressed with me, Debbie, or NCC’s eldership and only surfaced later. At what point did the apostolic team’s commendation of my call and the qualifications of the entire eldership change and come into question? How did we go from being commended to our congregation in February of 1997 to being under suspicion in June of the same year?...

People were influenced to be suspicious of our motives, question our integrity, and subtly influenced to question our character. This caused people to question the rightful place of our authority in the local congregation and to question our leadership ability and dependability.... I believe this is a serious issue that the apostolic team needs to reflect upon! Once man begins to decide what is God and what isn't, what is God's will for others, what other people's motives, agendas, sins are...I think it's a serious issue. This seems to be a consistent pattern with the apostolic team.... I believe that it is in this area that the apostolic team has wronged us the most!" [p. 6]

They also expressed concern for Dave. They felt manipulated by him. Here are a couple examples.

"The last time Dave was in Cleveland was February of 1997. At a meeting with Dave and NCC pastors, we were discussing the reformation theology emphasis and direction, etc. I directly asked Dave if NCC pastors were the only ones within the movement questioning some of these emphases. Dave's answer to us was that we were the only ones questioning or struggling with this direction. It clearly appears that this was not the case then, nor has it been the case since then. We later found out from current PDI leaders and several people who have left PDI churches that reformation theology emphasis and direction was an issue and concern for many and still continues to be. I don't understanding Dave's answer to us....In hindsight, this response seems partial, misleading and inaccurate." [p. 7]

"At the conclusion of our Celebration 97 meeting. Mark Telepak asked Dave if he saw any sin with us in this process as we had been walking and working through issues as a leadership team with the apostolic team and movement. His direct answer to us was "no". Again, we were surprised at how things seemed to quickly change and areas of motive, personal agenda, mistrust, suspicion, etc.. started to surface. Again, we do not understand this seemingly inconsistent action." [p. 8].

I fundamentally agreed with Ken and the pastors. I was concerned for you and brought these things to your attention. Finally, three years after you wrote the harsh letter to Ken, you met with him and the other pastors to ask forgiveness for a couple of things. You also wrote Ken's wife, Debbie, on June 19, 2000, and said "When the separation occurred between North Coast and PDI, I sent a letter to your husband that I now realized was woefully inadequate and certainly not kind and gracious...The letter also should have been followed by a personal meeting with the pastoral team to primarily communicate my love and, only, secondarily my disagreement with the decision."

This was good and meaningful to them, but it didn't address the root issues in your heart or the other issues they brought up in their 8 page letter. Your handling of the situation was one of the reasons I began to press for changes in your life in December 2000. Soon after this situation with North Coast Church, we were addressing the same kind of issues in your relationship with Bo Lotinsky. It took seven years of constant input before you fully acknowledged your sin against him.

The NCC pastors had some good advice a decade ago. It still holds true today. There is a pattern in your life of reacting with sinful judgments, withdrawing affection, separating relationally, speaking harshly due to resentment and anger, misrepresenting others, undermining reputations, and dismissing input. Ken cites "twenty to thirty leaders" or "good men" who had this same kind of experience. The list is much longer today.

"If you really want input and candid observations from others concerning the movement, I would recommend that you send a standardized letter to twenty to thirty leaders who have left the movement. Ask certain questions and request input on specific topics in this letter. I know every situation isn't the same - guys leave for different reasons, under different circumstances, with different attitudes - I understand that. But I would venture to say that you would find very similar input for the movement through each of their own observations and experiences. Truth can be found from the observations of our friends, critics, and even our enemies. [p. 8]

Since leaving the movement, I have been amazed at the same observations and concerns for PDI from good guys who have left the movement, as well as national, and international leaders. Many of these observations have come to us unsolicited as people/leaders heard North Coast Church had left the movement. I think there are some very legitimate issues that are crucial and are very significant for PDI to pursue, discuss, and possibly address." [p. 8]

Over the last decade I've tried to "pursue, discuss and...address" these crucial issues with you. If you are interested in pursuing reconciliation and input from others, I can recommend the names of men from the past 30 years. Some very recent...some from long ago. Most left the movement. Some remain but are no longer in ministry. A handful continue in ministry within Sovereign Grace Ministries. Practically all of them have been loyal and often to their own detriment.

What I've experienced is analogous to what Ken experienced 10 years ago. These patterns of sin in your life are the best kept secret in Sovereign Grace Ministries. Yes, there were often issues in their lives, but these men could be helpful to you if you approached them with humility. I think they'd provide legitimate insights. Let me know if you are interested.<sup>101</sup>

## A Minor Example Illustrates Major Points - "Lambasted"

Here is an example of resisting input and sinfully reacting. During the August 20, 2004 meeting, Pat asked why you weren't being transparent with us. He wanted to know how you were processing the input you were receiving. He attempted to engage you in dialogue with us. You gave him a general answer which was more a deflection than a candid response. Everyone was concerned for the consistent pattern of holding back your real thoughts so they could be evaluated. This went to the heart of your pride in thinking you didn't need others to help examine your heart. Here are Bob's notes.

- 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.

No one in the room agreed with your perspective. Rather than reveal your thoughts, you concealed your thoughts in the name of self-control. Everyone wanted you to open up and be honest. Restraining yourself from sin was good, but withholding your honest thoughts was not. Like others during the meeting, Dave appealed for self-disclosure. He asked you to model what you'd taught others. He pointed out how you avoided accountability by "staking out something of a moral high ground" (e.g. don't want to interrupt conviction, you struggle with self-restraint) and controlling any process of evaluation. The end result was not walking in the light.

- Dave       Thinks this is an important point because this exemplifies certain places certain examples he has tried to build into us - self-disclosure, inviting others into our thought processes. CJ didn't bring up at a [apostolic] team retreat what we [CLC pastors] had talked about [with him]. 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. 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.

I was convicted the moment I used the word "lambasted" and almost immediately asked forgiveness. It was too strong and volatile a word. It was uncharitable and included an element of sinful judging. In other words, it was wrong to characterize how you might sinfully view our response if you shared openly. I was thinking of a recent statement you made to me on August 5. You said Dave and I would say "Aha! We've got him!" if you shared openly.

Nevertheless, I should have said "sinfully judged" not "lambasted." That was accurate and it was a great concern to you. A week before the meeting, I wrote Joshua and Dave based upon our August 5 conversation. Here's what I said in part. "C.J. acknowledged to me that he has been tempted to sin in relation to Dave and me re: our motives, how we've conducted the process and in light of character deficiencies he sees in us... He fears we will sinfully judge him if he shares his observations."

Kenneth continued the August 20 conversation and pointed out one of the main issues we'd been trying to help you see for years. You quickly dismissed Kenneth. But he was correct. You were consistently "comfortable" with your self-assessment and "uncomfortable" with everyone else's assessment of you. You'd judge those bringing correction and exonerated yourself. You were confident you could discern your own heart without the help of friends. Kenneth also raised your sinful response to me. Others followed. Josh expressed concerns for how you responded to correction or disagreement "in these moments and meetings" by taking charge and wanting "to be one to direct the focus of things." It was similar to Dave's comment about being "controlling." You also dismissed everyone when they raised concerns for your sinful reaction to me.

Kenneth Seems like CJ's comfortable with his own assessment.

CJ Says he's not comfortable with his own assessment.

- 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.
- 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."
- 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.
- 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 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.

Kenneth said it "Seems like CJ was offended with what Brent said.... 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 followed and said, "Sometimes CJ can get hooked on what people say and respond in a way that has a silencing, punishing effect on the person he's talking to." You immediately dismissed Dave and said you "Didn't see that in...response to Brent." Grant agreed with Dave but noted it was not the most pronounced example of "silencing" and "punishing." He said, "What happened today isn't the clearest example of this response. But there seemed to be some of it there."

Josh concluded with “Even if there wasn’t sin in CJ’s heart, that response [to Brent] doesn’t position CJ to position and hear.... That’s not the best way to get at the good content from Brent.”

This minor example illustrated major points. First, you disagreed with everyone’s assessment. All of us were wrong. You were right. This was the very issue we were addressing at the time. Second, you did not ask for any additional input to help you see what everyone else was seeing. Third, your “intense” reaction was typical. It had the effect of “controlling,” “silencing,” and “punishing.” Fourth, you did not ask forgiveness. Fifth, you missed the “good content” because you were focused on my sin.

Even though the illustration was not a big deal it perfectly illustrated many of the important points we had been raising with you for a long time.<sup>102</sup>

### Dave’s Missing Letter<sup>103</sup>

From August 20, 2004 (the meeting with the CLC pastors) to November 20, 2007 (my last day on the leadership team), you never again talked to us as a team about heart issues in your life. You withdrew from all of us. In January 2006, Dave wrote you a lengthy personal letter. You did not respond to the letter and you never told anybody about it. This was Dave’s last attempt at helping you see what his greatest concern was in terms of effect. That was the end of meaningful team ministry born out of sinful reaction to our correction. He strongly appealed that we talk about plurality and your isolation from us.

I had no knowledge of this letter until Dave told me about it during a phone call with him on April 29, 2008. That was 2¼ years (or 27 months) after he wrote it. 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.

Understandably, this letter was a big deal to Dave. The team had not been functioning in an authentic way. This was a last ditch effort to restore our relationships. In integrity, he had to share his perspective one last time before dropping it.

When Dave told me about the letter he had no lack of recall. He told me the following in vivid detail. First, it was a “lengthy private letter sent to C.J.” Second, he sent it “in January 06.” Third, it was “regarding the end of team ministry in response to our correction.” Fourth, he was “especially concerned for C.J.’s reaction to you [Brent].” Fifth, he “never heard back from C.J.” regarding the letter. I took careful notes as Dave describe the purpose and contents of the letter. None of this is made up.

I wrote Bob, Phil and Wayne about Dave’s letter 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.

If you are interested in understanding my perspective [that your disposition toward me changed after August 20], you should ask Dave for this letter and share it with those caring for C.J.

Bob was not interested in understanding my perspective so he didn't ask Dave or you for the letter in July 2009.<sup>104</sup> I never heard from Bob so I wrote him again on February 15, 2010. I inquired, "Did you ask Dave or C.J. for the letter? Did you talk to C.J. about it?" He had not.

From: Bob Kauflin  
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 5:51 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: Re: Follow Up with C.J.?

...I haven't asked for the letter, but that's something I'll be happy to do. Once I've read it and talked to CJ about it I'll get back to you...

The next day I asked Bob "if [he] would send me a copy of the letter Dave wrote C.J." Here's Bob's response.

From: Bob Kauflin  
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 9:23 AM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: Re: Follow Up with C.J.?

...I talked to both Dave and CJ and neither of them remembers the letter you're referring to. Dave remembers bringing up the issue of CJ's response to the correction a few times, but said that issue would have been secondary on his list of concerns for CJ. He also stressed that he didn't think CJ's perceived sinful responses were behind the changes or restructuring decisions he made in Sovereign Grace.



This probably isn't helpful, but it's what I was able to discover. Let me know if there's any way I can follow up.

I assume you don't, but if you have a copy of the letter you say Dave referred to, can you forward it to me? I know Dave and CJ would like to see it as well...

I was unsurprised you forgot about the letter. I was shocked Dave forgot. Maybe Bob's description of the letter was so wide of the mark that it did not trigger Dave's memory. Or perhaps, Dave's memory has deteriorated greatly. If so, he should be checked out by a doctor. This much is certain – the letter described above was written and sent.

Baring the above, I don't believe Dave forgot about the letter based upon the evidence. He told me about it 27 months after he wrote it. He had no difficulty remembering the details. But 16 months after our conversation, he can't even remember writing it. This does not compute.

This letter was extremely important to Dave. He told me so. I can't imagine he did not keep a copy of it. I was out of favor with you when Dave told me about the letter. That's why he informed me about it. He wanted me to know he had appealed to you one last time regarding your resentment, bitterness and anger at me. He covered other matters but Dave was interceding on my behalf. That may explain why it's gone missing. It certainly explains why you never shared it with others. When you received the letter from Dave it should have been discussed with the CLC pastors. You'd expect this of others. That is, transparency and accountability – not concealment.

This "missing" letter was simply a restatement Dave's concern that he repeatedly brought up over the past decade. That is, you sinfully reacting and pulling back from others.

### Jenny Never Heard from Carolyn<sup>105</sup>

In this regard you set a terrible example for your wife.<sup>106</sup> Let me illustrate. Less than three weeks after the August 20 2004 meeting, you told me "Carolyn had questions about the process" leading up to the meeting. You also asked for a private meeting with me to ask questions about "the large the body of material" I presented. This meeting eventually occurred on November 19 but it was not to ask questions. It was to provide correction.

Earlier over the summer months, Bob and Kenneth told me Carolyn was quite angry at me. I knew she didn't understand what had actually transpired. Given your comment about her, I wrote the next day offering to help her. You denied my request. I am not

sure why you wanted me to know she was struggling since it wasn't to meet with her and work things out. I wrote you the next day.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 09, 2004 10:11 AM  
**To:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Cc:** Joshua Harris  
**Subject:** Confidential: Carolyn

Please communicate to Carolyn that I'd be very happy to talk with her and answer her questions about the process.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 09, 2004 9:22 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential: Carolyn

Thanks my friend but it's not necessary. The guys here have been a more than sufficient help. They have just done a great job caring for us both.

I will let you know if it is necessary.

A week later, I had the privilege of honoring you at the Friday evening gathering with all the Sovereign Grace pastors and leaders during the Milestone Weekend at CLC. Before the official program began, I purposely made my way to Carolyn. I knew she was struggling with me and the affect of August 20 on the weekend.

The later was beyond my control. I did all I could to tamp things down after the August 20 meeting to allow space going into the Milestone Weekend. I was trying to put things on the back burner but you and Steve kept things on the front burner. Nevertheless, I sought to identify with Carolyn's disappointment knowing she blamed me. She was not amenable to conversation. She was visibility upset with me.<sup>107</sup> A few months later, Jenny talked to Carolyn by phone for the last time on November 16. Carolyn conveyed that she was "really struggling with the process."

Three years later in November 2007, Steve and I resigned from the core apostolic team but remained on the extended apostolic team. Much had changed in all of our relationships. In January 2008, Jenny and Janis received the following e-mail from Nora on Carolyn's behalf. This communication should have been done in person or by phone.

From: Nora Earles  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 4:45 PM  
To: Jenny Detwiler; Janis Shank  
Subject: Phone Calls with Carolyn

Dear Jenny & Janis,

Happy New Year! I trust that this year will be one in which God's grace will be even more amazing to you.

CJ & Carolyn recently met with Dave & Kimm and it was determined that Kimm will now take the lead in these phone calls and there will be a new format. Carolyn understands the need for this change but she is saddened that she will no longer touch base with each of you on a monthly basis.<sup>108</sup>

My understanding is that this will take effect immediately so the previously scheduled phone calls for January and February will no longer occur.

I, too, will miss contacting each of you. Please don't hesitate to ask if there is ever a way I can serve you.

*Nora*

Jenny was disappointed but took the opportunity to write Carolyn. She also wanted to thank her for the note and generous Christmas gift that she, Kimm, and Janis received.

From: Jenny Detwiler  
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2008 7:05 AM  
To: Carolyn Mahaney  
Subject: Thank you

Dear Carolyn,

First of all I want to thank you (and C.J.) for the very kind note and extremely generous gift I received before Christmas. You have always been so overwhelmingly extravagant in your expressions of thanks and friendship.

Secondly, I want to thank you for your friendship, care and the impact you have had on my life over these past 25+ years. I really don't have the skill to express it adequately. "Thank you" is so small compared to the life changing difference you have made in every area of my life by your example, teaching, and fellowship. I have so many fond memories of our times together and conversations that I will always treasure. I'm amazed that the Lord so kindly

blessed me with this season of interaction with you. You have been such a wonderful means of grace. Thank you for sharing your life with me.

With much gratefulness,  
Jenny

What I am about to share is not born out of offense. My wife continues to feel a debt of love to Carolyn. It is simply another example I hope you can benefit from. For many years, Carolyn referred to Jenny as one of her "dearest friends." Unfortunately, Carolyn never responded to this e-mail from Jenny. In the same way, I didn't hear from you for 18 months; so too, Jenny didn't hear from Carolyn for 18 months until their paths crossed at the Pastors Conference in April, 2009. Your wife followed your example and entirely cut off a friendship due to offense. Nor has Jenny heard from Carolyn since the Pastors Conference.

#### Dave Gives Up – Joins the Culture of Accommodation

Dave fought valiantly (and lovingly) but gave up in the end. The process had taken a toll on him. He was exasperated by you and lost faith to help you. He told us so. He was discouraged "coming up against a different understanding of humility and what leadership looks like" in his discussions with Bob and Kenneth. Dave was pragmatic. In his mind, it wasn't worth the effort any longer. He was also hindered by his idols. He often told you/us that he "can fear C.J. and crave C.J.'s approval" (May 13, 2003). Lastly, he was ambitious – something he frequently acknowledged to us. He didn't want to jeopardize his future in Sovereign Grace Ministries by continuing to offend you. All these factors came into play when he finally crossed over and joined, as he described it, the "culture of accommodation" – the very culture he believed insulated you in large measure. Here are a few e-mails to make my point.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 19, 2004 4:03 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler; Joshua Harris  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential – Retreat

I'm walking out the door, but I will throw you some quick thoughts:

1. I think I would appeal [to Josh] that meeting before or during [our upcoming team retreat] remain a priority. My sense from the CLC guys was that the [apostolic] 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).

2. Another thought: I think the process is now stalled unless we do move forward on these conversations.... Personally, I think moving this forward will serve the team health (and our mental health!) best.

**From:** Dave Harvey

**Sent:** Thursday, November 11, 2004 7:55 PM

**To:** Joshua Harris

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

**Subject:** Confidential

...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...

To summarize, the following is my best shot at a summation of my original concerns.... *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.*

A couple months later, we had a team retreat in Herndon, VA on January 11-13, 2005. Dave attempted to draw you out on your e-mail confession to us from October 13. You were unwilling to engage us in any discussion. Dave was distressed and wrote me the following.

**From:** Dave Harvey

**Sent:** Saturday, January 15, 2005 4:25 PM

**To:** Brent Detwiler

**Subject:** confidential

This would be my recommendation on how to proceed. What do you think.... Follow up with CJ's team to answer any questions and offer them our assessment on their participation in the process. Dave retires. Brent takes over

point. I hated leading that discussion, so your indebtedness to me should be huge.

Soon after this e-mail I had a phone call with Dave. He wanted to move on but I was having a hard time letting things drop. You had been unresponsive to us, taken over the process and turned the focus on us.<sup>109</sup> I asked Dave how he could move forward without compromising his integrity or violating his conscience. I purposely left Dave's answer out of RRF&D because I didn't want to tempt you or harm your working relationship with him. But at this point, I think it's important for you to hear Dave's answer. These are his exact words and his meaning in context. He was not being mean or satirical. There was no invective in his speech. Nor was he trying to be funny. He was matter of fact.

Simply put Dave said "we have to approach C.J. like a teenager." He went on to explain his meaning. Like with a stereotypical teen, we must "work to make our points" and "lower our expectations." In other words, when talking to you we needed to be as affirming and winsome as possible and be careful to avoid any language or expressions that might offend or tempt you.<sup>110</sup> In addition, we should not expect you to behave or respond like a mature adult but like a difficult teen. Lastly, Dave said "we don't have a position or role with C.J. like you do with a younger person [child]." This last point was important. In Dave's analogy, parents have a position or role that allows them to direct and correct a child; they don't have the same role with a teenager. In other words, Dave was now advocating a dumbed down and "hands off" approach to you. I don't say this to shame you. Dave was trying to help me adopt a new paradigm for relating to you.

Dave was also frustrated with Steve. He could not be counted on. In this same conversation, Dave said there are "only two of us throwing a flag on the field. Nothing can be done about Steve not confronting C.J. He will be satisfied with far less because he feels an indebtedness to C.J. that renders his discernment not sharp. Steve won't be able to sustain a challenge to C.J. because C.J. is in a defensive posture [i.e., you were defending yourself] to Steve. We should take him off the table."

On February 17, 2005, Dave wrote Kenneth with six questions regarding major concerns. He copied Josh, Grant, and Bob. Dave was treading water in the deep end of the pool and wanted to get out. He realized the CLC pastors were reluctant to address you on the kinds of issues Dave was raising, for instance your hypocrisy regarding the October 13 e-mail confession. Here is an excerpt.

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

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 October 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.... I really want to understand this paradox [hypocrisy]<sup>111</sup> better because I think it causes us to see his growth in a slightly different way than you men.

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.<sup>112</sup>

Dave talked with Kenneth and Bob about these recommendations. He filled Steve and me in on March 24. Dave told us that "C.J. and CLC guys had problems with the questions." Dave felt we were "coming up against a different understanding of humility and what leadership looks like." That Kenneth and Bob "saw [Dave's] questions as unhelpful" and "had more questions from the questions."<sup>113</sup> 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." For instance, "C.J. thinks we covered and talked about his October 13 e-mail confession." This never occurred.

As a result, 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." He wrote you the following.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2005 3:05 PM  
**To:** Mahaney CJ  
**Cc:** Steve Shank, Brent Detwiler; Kenneth Maresco; Bob Kauflin  
**Subject:** Confidential

Hey buddy. Hope you are feeling better.

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.... Please know of our faith in God and confidence in you as we entrust this 'process' to God and move forward into the future.

Dave

In March 2005, you made Bob, instead of Kenneth, your point man. The next month Dave wrote him regarding his thoughts about the future.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Date:** Sunday, April 17, 2005 08:09 AM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin  
**Cc:** Kenneth Maresco; C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

...I will be glad to circulate this to the team, but my sense is that we have determined to move on and that this might be best... Be glad to forward this to the guys though.

Dave asked me (and Steve) for my thoughts. He wanted to go silent and he was trying to bring closure.

**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?

Steve and I provided Dave our feedback. He wrote Bob back.

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

Our communication around these issues...does not appear to be producing the kind of clarity that justifies the time and effort necessary.... 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 think we should follow Bob and Kenneth's advice and pursue any conversation over remaining



concerns with CJ.... I think this step should be done individually (if at all) and not as a group.

Bob and Kenneth wrote back on September 8, 2005. We had resigned ourselves.

Dear Dave, Brent and Steve,

We have asked Dave what remaining issues he feels CJ has not addressed or would still concern him, and are still unclear which specific things he believes need further discussion. We're concerned that the team is moving on in a spirit of resignation rather than faith. Would you agree and if so, do you have any plans to come to agreement?

Dave wrote them back. They were not hearing our concerns or accurately processing our input.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Monday, September 12, 2005 7:38 AM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin  
**Cc:** Kenneth Maresco; Brent Detwiler; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

Your observations that I have been unclear are confusing to me 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.... 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.

So far as I know this was Dave's final correspondence with Bob and us. A few months later he wrote you "a more through response" in his "lengthy private letter" in January 2006. Otherwise, Dave joined the "culture of accommodation." He was willing "to allow closure on this note and live with the lack of clarity and/or disagreement." Therefore, I assume Dave is still relating to you "like a teenager" and keeping his concerns and disagreements to himself. But maybe RRF&D clarified the issues and the reasons for our disagreement with you, Kenneth and Bob. If so, I hope it produces good fruit in building an authentic "adult" relationship with Dave and others where they feel the freedom to speak openly without fear of your reaction.

Here is another example of Dave feeling helpless to address you. I met with Larry Malament on January 6, 2006. Larry filled me in on a recent conversation he just had

with you. He tried to help you see how you related to Mickey in a completely different way when addressing his sins than you did to me. For example, he pointed out how you were compassionate, merciful and patient with Mickey's sins but not with mine. Also, that you were encouraging of Mickey but not me.<sup>114</sup> He told you he thought this was due to your bitterness and anger at me.

You experienced no conviction and disagreed with Larry and the assessment of others. I wrote "King" David on bended knee. Pardon the humor. Your treatment of me was consistent with Larry's observations.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 10, 2007 2:36 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Cc:** Larry Malament  
**Subject:** Confidential

Dear "King" David,

For your information - my observations from the past 9 months re: C.J. would be analogous to Larry's observations.<sup>115</sup> Larry has shared these with C.J. on a couple/few occasions. C.J. has considered Larry's input but let him know he has not experienced any conviction or illumination regarding the relevancy of those observations. That being the case, I don't think it would be helpful for me to cover similar ground.

On bended knee,  
Brent

**From:** Dave Harvey [mailto:dh Harvey@Covfel.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 10, 2007 2:51 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Cc:** Larry Malament  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

There is no easy answer for this one buddy. It seems that we have all been faithful to raise the remaining questions we have for CJ.<sup>116</sup> Nevertheless, I believe it is in CJ's heart to take a humble step and ask you again. So you must pray and be prepared to respond, even if it is just to say what you mention below - your experience would be analogous to Larry's<sup>117</sup> [description] and there is nothing new to add. Or, to make it simpler, there is nothing new to add.

Sorry I can't be more helpful.

You and I ended up having a brief conversation.<sup>118</sup> I shared the same thoughts as Larry. You told me you remained unconvinced and were not convicted.<sup>119</sup> You needed additional help to see your heart but instead you were enabled to continue on in these sinful patterns.

### Bob as Enabler

With the August 20, 2004 meeting at CLC only ten days away, you sent us an e-mail confession at our request. It was wonderfully encouraging. After many years, it was the first time you acknowledged categories of sin.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 10, 2004 10:04 AM

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

**Subject:** Confidential

My friends,

Below is my confession in this form for your critique and evaluation.... I am convinced this discipline was necessary because of the pronounced and pervasive presence of pride in my heart.... In recent history this arrogance has been evident in the following ways:

1. On numerous occasions I have not been easy to entreat or correct.
2. I have arrogantly assumed the superiority of my discernment when corrected.
3. I can be quick to disagree when I am being corrected.
4. I have disagreed with those correcting me before I have sufficiently understood the nature and content of their correction.
5. Too often I have failed to humbly ask questions and draw out the one correcting me.
6. I have not consistently made the individual correcting me comfortable by inviting and encouraging their correction.
7. I have failed to discern the effect of my disagreement upon the one correcting me.
8. I can be quick to find fault with the one correcting me thus revealing my self-righteousness.
9. I have not sufficiently perceived the effect of my words and decisions upon individuals.

10. There has been a pattern of sinful judgment toward those who are correcting me.
11. 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.

The above list is far from exhaustive. It is merely representative and there are many expressions of pride that can be listed under each one and sadly no lack of illustrations for each one. These numerous expressions of pride are offensive to God and particularly serious<sup>120</sup> because of my position. In my position and because of my position I should be an example of humility and very easy to correct. 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. That is unacceptable for a Christian and even more for a leader. So there it is as I presently perceive my sins. This is just a beginning and I am sure it is inadequate...

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. I am unworthy of your friendship and you certainly deserve better leadership than I have provided.

I wrote you a kind and encouraging note after I read this. You wrote back.

**From:** C.J. Mahaney  
**Sent:** Friday, August 13, 2004 7:44 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

The thanks is to you and all my other friends. It is because of your care, correction and patience that by grace I have been able to perceive my many sins. I hope you men can experience the reward of your care through changes you observe in my life.

You claimed to “perceive” your “many sins” against us and hoped we’d “observe” changes in how you related to us. You acknowledged:

“In recent history this arrogance has been evident in the following ways.... The above list is far from exhaustive.... And there are many expressions of pride that can be listed under each one and sadly no lack of illustrations for each one.... 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 .... I think these sins have been most evident to you [Brent, Dave and Steve] and sadly manifested the most toward you men.”

What you said was true. There were no lack of illustrations for each category. You had sinned against us in “recent history” on “many occasions” and in many ways. And yet, you never made any effort to confess particular sins, ask forgiveness for specific incidences or repair particular breaches in our relationships. In fact, you said it was unnecessary to get back to us on any specifics since you were acknowledging general categories of sin. None of us could believe your depraved logic on this point.

Four months later, I wrote Josh on December 17. You were unwilling to talk about the many ways you sinned against us. On the other hand, you were very willing to tell us how we sinned against you. This kind of hypocrisy was unprecedented.<sup>121</sup> Matthew 7:3-5 applied directly to you.

“Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother’s eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye? How can you say to your brother, ‘Let me take the speck out of your eye,’ when all the time there is a plank in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the plank out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother’s eye.”

Here is my December 2004 e-mail to Josh.

**From:** Brent Detwiler

**Sent:** Friday, December 17, 2004 1:12 PM

**To:** Joshua Harris

**Cc:** Bob Kauflin; Kenneth Maresco; Grant Layman; C.J. Mahaney; Dave Harvey; Steve Shank

**Subject:** Confidential: Joint Meeting at January Team Retreat

Thanks Josh for getting back to me and thanks for your willingness to consider a joint meeting. 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 [which was true] as a team over the last 12 months 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>122</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 of things that have never been addressed or explained...

As you said, there had been “many occasions in recent history” when you sinned against us. Yet, you never acknowledged a single one of them. In fact, you refused to talk with us about any of them when we graciously sought to engage you. Once again, you were controlling the process.

In February 2005, you appointed Bob as “point man.” This was a bad move for you and for the apostolic team. Bob was undiscerning and biased in his approach. From our vantage, he was on “point” but always pointed at us and never at you. This may sound strong, but like the co-dependent of an alcoholic, he enabled you to live on unchanged and unchallenged.<sup>123</sup>

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 17, 2005 7:16 AM  
**To:** Kenneth Maresco  
**Cc:** Grant Layman; Josh Harris; Bob Kauflin  
**Subject:** RE: confidential

...Kimm spoke with Carolyn yesterday and she mentioned that the Mahaney's are changing CG's and that the Bob may be their new Care Group leader. 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...

The following month which was six months after your August e-mail confession, I wrote the following to Dave and Steve. Each of the five points was entirely true. None of the following ever transpired. To this day the same holds true.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 3, 2005 4:39 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey, Steve Shank  
**Subject:** Confidential

To the best of my recollection I make the following general observations since the December 2003 Retreat:

1. C.J. has not initiated or engaged us in discussion as a team on any of the issues that have been raised with him.

2. C.J. has not informed us as a team of any input or illustrations shared by the CLC pastors related to issues of character raised with him.
3. C.J. has not asked forgiveness for any illustrations that have been share with him by us with the exception of the situation with Bo and Tyler.
4. C.J. has not acknowledged any sinful judgments toward us.
5. C.J. has not acknowledged any resentment, bitterness, or anger toward us.

Dave and I brought these points to everyone's attention. Nothing changed however. Bob continued to confront Dave and me and defend you. He required nothing of you in relation to us. In August, Bob and I had the following e-mail exchange.

**From:** Bob Kauflin  
**Sent:** Fri 8/19/2005 6:06 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Re: Confidential - Communication

Brent,

I wonder if this is part of the problem. You're looking for more specifics, but I'm not sure you're going to get them.

...I wonder if you place too much emphasis on the illustrations you've brought up and can't rejoice in what God is doing in CJ. There seems to be a hesitancy in your rejoicing in the fruit in CJ's life (at least that's what I sensed in our phone call with the three of us), which would be understandable if you think he's not responding to correction or making attempts to see his sin.

It is now August 2005, one year after the August 20 meeting.

**From:** Bob Kauflin  
**Sent:** Sat 8/20/2005 11:40 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Re: Confidential - Communication

Brent,

...Do you think my observation has merit - that you can sometimes fail to see or to rejoice in the changes in CJ's life because you're expecting a certain response?...

I so wanted to rejoice in changes in your life but there were none as it pertained to us. Your consistent responses after August 20, 2004 only discouraged us. I wasn't "expecting a certain [unreasonable] response." I would have been happy with any kind of a contrite response. A year earlier you said, "I hope you men can experience the reward of your care through changes you observe in my life." There were no rewards, only sadness.

**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, we haven't talked as a team about issues related to C.J. On the occasions when he and I have met in person, C.J. has provided me his critique.... 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.

After I wrote this e-mail to Bob I felt the need to be more open and honest about our expectations. I had in mind the five points from March 3. You had "not initiated or engaged us in discussion as a team on any of the issues," "not informed us as a team of any input or illustrations shared by the CLC pastors," "not asked forgiveness for any illustrations," "not acknowledged any sinful judgments toward us," and "not acknowledged any resentment, bitterness, or anger toward us." Though you confessed in writing (not in person) that you sinned against us on "many occasions and in many ways," you never talked to us about any of them.

Bob labeled my most rudimentary expectations "sinful." You never so much as said in person, "Hey guys I've made some mistakes...I am sorry." Bob was following your example of "silencing" and "punishing" with great hubris. I sought to write graciously and humbly but honestly. No one was holding you accountable. Certainly not Bob. I intended for it to be my last attempt - my final statement. I knew my days were numbered. That's why I said, "I...continue to count it a great honor to serve and encourage him in whatever ways the Lord permits in the future." I risked "job security" out of love and affection for you.



**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 expectations. It would be my view that C.J. has not responded well to us as a team since the August 20, 2004 meeting. 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.<sup>124</sup> 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. 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.<sup>125</sup> 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," not starting August 20 with dialogue]. 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, 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.

Bob continued to defend you and twisted the facts in so doing. Here are two examples The first about "not practicing fellowship." The second about "remaining issues."<sup>126</sup>

**From:** Bob Kauflin  
**Sent:** Thu 9/8/2005 5:27 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler; Steve Shank; Dave Harvey  
**Cc:** Kenneth Maresco; Bob Kauflin  
**Subject:** Confidential

Thank you for taking the time to give us feedback on how we might have served you better this past year....

It seems from our last phone call that our view of CJ's interaction and past practice of fellowship with the CLC pastoral team is very different from Dave and Brent's. We trust you heard us communicate that we don't believe CJ was at any point not practicing fellowship. Certainly, there are ways he can grow and has grown in this area, but as long as we have been involved with CJ, he has sought input from us and opened up his life to the men he serves with. We see the changes in CJ in the pursuit of fellowship as a matter of degree and not (*ex nihilo*) existence...

It seems as though there is lack of clarity and agreement on what issues in CJ's life are to be "covered over" in love and which ones are to be pressed through in the interest of integrity and unity of the team. Steve mentioned at least two items when we met at the leader's conference. Brent has indicated there are a number of important matters he feels are still unresolved. We have asked Dave what remaining issues he feels CJ has not addressed or would still concern him, and are still unclear which specific things he believes need further discussion. We're concerned that the team is moving on in a spirit of resignation<sup>127</sup> rather than faith. Would you agree and if so, do you have any plans to come to agreement?...

We would also like to forward this letter to CJ so he can be aware of our thoughts after meeting with all three of you men individually and together. Please let us know if you have any objections to this.

Bob was grossly misrepresenting us and the CLC pastors. Their concerns for a lack of "fellowship" were every bit as serious as ours. But Bob leaves out all reference to the later, builds a straw man argument, and then confronts us with a distorted view of reality. All the time he is acting on your behalf and at your bidding. You are directing him.<sup>128</sup> He (and Kenneth) continued to represent your arguments which were obviously offenses. After reading this letter from Bob, I wrote Dave and Steve the following.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Sat 9/10/2005 10:19 AM  
**To:** Steve Shank; Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** Confidential - Final Thoughts

There are numerous things in this letter I think are unhelpful and misrepresentative. For example, "Our view...is very different from Dave and Brent's.... We don't believe C.J. was at any point not practicing fellowship.... We

see changes in CJ in the pursuit of fellowship as a matter of degree and not...existence." Implication, we believe C.J. hasn't practiced fellowship with the men over the years and it is therefore non-existent. Of course, this is not our perspective. Neither, does this implication serve C.J. Furthermore, our concerns for C.J. in this area are based, in part, upon statements made by the CLC men. These statements have never been explained to us.

I don't think this letter will serve C.J. for numerous other reasons. For instance, "Brent has indicated there are a number of important matters he feels are still unresolved." Though true, I don't think it is beneficial for C.J. to hear this kind of thing again.<sup>129</sup> He may interpret it as me pressing for these things to be addressed. Actually, I have not raised any issues with C.J. [one on one in person] for a long time.

Though they thanked us for our feedback re: C.J. and the CLC men, Bob and Kenneth do not express any agreement with it or benefit from it. It they did, I assume they would include those things in this letter. On the other hand, perhaps their intent is simply to raise on-going issues with us and inform C.J. of the same.

These are just a couple of my thoughts. I am leaving it to you men to respond to Bob and Kenneth...

Dave responded and ask me to forward these thoughts to Bob and Kenneth. I followed through but knew it would cost me unless you repented.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 10, 2005 12:40 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Cc:** Steve Shank  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential - Final Thoughts

Thanks Brent. I think you should send them these thoughts, if only to clarify your concerns. I hope to send out an e-mail to them sometime in the next few days.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Mon 9/12/2005 9:46 AM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin  
**Cc:** Steve Shank; Dave Harvey; Kenneth Maresco  
**Subject:** Confidential - Final Thoughts

Here are a few thoughts that I expressed to Dave and Steve after receiving your “final thoughts” letter.

Thanks gentlemen,  
Brent

Bob wrote back.

**From:** Bob Kauflin  
**Sent:** Tue 9/13/2005 9:06 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Cc:** Steve Shank; Dave Harvey; Kenneth Maresco  
**Subject:** Re: Confidential - Final Thoughts

Thanks, Brent. This kind of feedback is helpful and clarifying. We’ll get back to you after we’ve heard from Steve.

While saying the information was helpful, Bob never got back to me. Dave also provided Bob some corrective feedback.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Monday, September 12, 2005 7:38 AM  
**To:** Bob Kauflin  
**Cc:** Kenneth Maresco; Brent Detwiler; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

...A few passing thoughts that I hope will bring clarity (“sure they will Dave!”)

I think the comment about CJ “not practicing fellowship” is a bit of a straw man. I don’t recall anyone advocating that position. The way I would summarize my perspective would be: I don’t believe that the clarity and consistency of input into CJ’s life was sufficient prior to this process. I think you men admitted as much when the two teams initially connected over these matters. Since that time, I think this is changing – due in no small part I presume to CJ’s change and the leadership of you two men – and for that I rejoice. 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 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. But I bring it up only to stir your recollection of the conversations we have had around my unresolved items...

In reference to forwarding the letter to CJ, I remember when I asked you whether you were going to be informing CJ about our dialogues, you indicated that you did not think this was wise at this time because it could tempt CJ. Has your thinking changed on this? While I want you & Kenneth to act in any way that seems best to you, I did wonder the same thing about forwarding this letter in this form and at this time. Could it tempt CJ in unprofitable ways? Does it really serve the goal of strengthening the team and moving us forward? Is it really representing our positions?<sup>130</sup> When we do have a chance to connect, I would also like to share why it seems letters like this have not been entirely helpful to the process.

Bob, I do trust you and Kenneth and I could come to faith if you decided you wanted to do it anyway, but I would appeal that you represent my perspective differently if you do. One way or another, I will review my perspective with you again when we are together, if you think that would be helpful.

Dave had been crystal clear with Bob and Kenneth on many occasions. I can't explain Bob's ineptitude. I guess he was so focused on correcting us and defending you, he wasn't listening to or remembering anything we were saying or writing. Here again are the "four questions" Dave asked going back to March. It was now September and these critical issues remained utterly undiscussed. You had not talked about these matters for over a year and you forbid CLC pastors from doing the same.

**From:** Dave Harvey

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 09, 2005 10:45 AM

**To:** C.J. Mahaney; Joshua Harris, Kenneth Maresco; Grant Layman

**Cc:** Brent Detwiler; Steve Shank

**Subject:** Confidential

#### **Remaining Questions for Discussion:**

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 and 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? How would the CLC guys and 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?

In August, Dave talked again to Bob and Kenneth about the four questions. Rather than benefitting, they had "concerns" and "problems" with his extremely relevant, legitimate, and important questions. Here was Dave's response to me about his most recent conversation with Bob and Kenneth.

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Mon 9/12/2005 11:44 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** RE: Confidential

No, we didn't talk about it on August 19<sup>th</sup>, but the purpose of that meeting was more for them to hear our concerns. There was another meeting that I had with Kenneth and Bob where they gave me some feedback on the [four] questions (I don't know whether that was before or after Kenneth talked with CJ and came back to us with concerns about the questions) but I seem to recall us talking mostly about the problems with the questions.

These four questions are still on the table.<sup>131</sup> I hope you'll answer them in writing in preparation for a personal meeting. They represent the kind of issues that must be addressed by you if reconciliation is your goal.

### The Need for Genuine Accountability<sup>132</sup>

Let me go back to April 2003 to further establish how errant Bob was in his assessment of us and how unaccountable you were to the CLC pastors. You wrote me the following about confessing sins.

From: C.J. Mahaney  
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2003 10:43 AM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: Confidential

Ideally I want to talk with you by phone about this but my schedule is so full right now I am not sure when I can make this happen. So in order to get this started I am sending this e-mail. You can be brief in your response.

Dave said to me yesterday (he indicated he had talked to you about this) that he didn't think I consistently confessed my sins to the team and that I am apt to make quick judgments.

Is this your observation of me or experience with me in the last year?

One benefit of yesterday is that I want to bring definition to who we are accountable to and who we are to be confessing our sins to, etc. I don't expect to hear about the sins of team members unless they are patterns, etc. because I think this is best done with the local guys. There is stuff happening here daily that I don't think it wise or necessary to keep you guys updated on. The ideal is that local pastors are holding each of us accountable.

Let me know what you think my friend.

Thanks,  
C.J.

Dave, Steve and I had always confessed our sins to you and considered ourselves accountable to you. The same wasn't true for you. During the past decade we and others pointed out how your acknowledgments in person and in preaching were typically vague. You'd reference pride or depravity in general but not give specific

examples. You'd say things like, "I'm the worse sinner I know." "I stumble in many ways." "All my works are shot through with sin." But you didn't share details or develop personal illustrations.

We were raising this concern with you when you began to change our methodology. You said we should be accountable to the pastoral team not the apostolic team. This was in response to Dave's observation about not consistently confessing sin. You said, "There is stuff happening here daily that I don't think it wise or necessary to keep you guys updated on." We knew you weren't confessing to us but we were glad you were confessing "daily" to the local pastors who were holding you "accountable." Or at least, that's what you told us.

The next month we talked about this at our Team Meeting on May 13, 2003. Here are Steve notes from our discussion.

CJ: Has it been my practice [to confess sin]? To the local guys? Yes. During the team meetings? No. Not as much with Dave...with Steve and Brent...

I confess to Gary, John, Josh, Grant and Kenneth, Carolyn... between them, they all know about my sin...

We took you at your word even though we had doubts. That's one of the reasons, I asked for written evaluations from Kenneth, Grant and Josh. Dave and Steve were in full agreement with the need to do this. After receiving the written reports, I followed up with phone calls with Kenneth on December 12 and Grant on December 13. I provided you their written evaluations and my notes from our conversations in advance of our retreat on December 16-18. I met with Joshua later on January 24 and he shared the same concerns as Grant and Kenneth. We brought up the topic again. Incredulously, you responded by emphatically stating, "I receive more accountability, correction and pastoring than anyone in the movement. I am always being corrected." No one corroborated your story. You had no witnesses in your defense.

A few days before the retreat Kenneth told me, "C.J. is not making me aware of input from others like the CLC pastors, apostolic team, and Carolyn. I don't know if he is receiving correction. I assume no one is bringing correction or things to him."

Before talking to Grant he sent me the following e-mail.



**From:** Grant Layman  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 13, 2003 9:44 AM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Re: Confidential - Job Review for C.J

Sorry for the delay in getting this back to you Brent. Let me know if the attached form [the written evaluation] that I filled out did not come through. My primary concern for CJ 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 unless there is something I am unaware of.

Hope this helps,  
Grant

Later that day Grant told me, "I am not aware of any correction C.J. is receiving from the apostolic team or others. This issue has always been concern for C.J. I have raised my ongoing concern over the years that C.J. receive pastoral care. I am not aware of anyone raising any issues or concerns with him in private. I've assumed it is happening with the apostolic team. I think C.J.'s self assessment may be such that he and Carolyn just don't require input."

Grant went on to say of the pastors, "We 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 the past year, correction of C.J. and confession by C.J. has not happened at all - there is no context for this to happen."

You mislead us.<sup>133</sup> You were not involved in a men's accountability group, had not been in a couple's care group for 1½ years, and did not participate in a couple's retreat for the last 3 years. You and Carolyn were on your own. I still remember how shocked I was to discover this deception.

The following summer on June 15, 2004, I followed up with Joshua regarding confession of sin. He said, "C.J. provides input for others and not the other way around. I am not in settings where C.J. confesses specific sin especially in marriage...more on the level of his schedule. Maybe C.J. doesn't sin as much as we do." He went to say, "C.J. recently confessed a specific sin related to his marriage in a [May 2004] sermon. That's the first time I can remember him doing so." Josh did not know we just talked to you on the retreat about specific confession in your sermons. The inclusion stood out to him.

Though I knew all of this going into the August 20, 2004 meeting, I was still alarmed by what I heard from the CLC pastors. They were barely involved in your life. There was

little to no confession of sin by you. This was a long standing issue brought to you many times. Here are Bob's notes.

Brent Wants to submit that CJ has a high view of himself in some ways that are now being challenged.... 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, and would think of himself that way, up until now. The CLC pastors communicated a different view of CJ's teachability.

Dave 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.

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.

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.... 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. 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.
- 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.
- CJ Would have assumed he was more accountable than he was. Looks back and sees that what he was doing was woefully insufficient. Hasn't just been sitting here, but has been convicted. Agrees immediately that he has a sinful craving for reputation.
- 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 Sees a whole lot of pride in the past. Wasn't lying to each group, trying to cover up.
- 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.
- Humility and confession of sin lead to accountability. They communicate a perception of need.
- 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.
- 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.

You never talked to us about this deception. You never asked forgiveness for your lack of integrity. You never got back to us regarding your hypocrisy. Instead you took control of the process, turned things back on Dave and me, and sent Bob to correct us. Here again is Bob's revisionist history. As the above proves, "our view" was identical to the view of the CLC pastoral team and not "very different." In fact, our view was largely based on the clearly articulated views of Josh, Grant, Kenneth and Bob. It appears you took these boys to the woodshed and they emerged with a very different story. Once again, Bob distorts the truth, misrepresents the facts, unjustly accuses, and defends you.<sup>134</sup>

**From:** Bob Kauflin  
**Sent:** Thu 9/8/2005 5:27 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler; Steve Shank; Dave Harvey  
**Cc:** Kenneth Maresco; Bob Kauflin  
**Subject:** Confidential

It seems from our last phone call that our view of CJ's interaction and past practice of fellowship with the CLC pastoral team is very different from Dave and Brent's. We trust you heard us communicate that we don't believe CJ was at any point not practicing fellowship.

Towards the end of the meeting, I wanted to make sure changes were put into place so you received the input and accountability you needed and everyone was else in the room enjoyed. At the August 20, 2004 meeting, I asked that one of the CLC pastors stay in touch with us and provide quarterly updates on your progress in grace for a year. Here are Bob's notes.

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...

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 whom 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.]...

Josh        We will definitely consider those things. Thanked the apostolic team for effectively caring for CJ and for us.

We never heard back from Josh or you about any of the above suggestions. We asked that one of the guys over the next year "fill the team in quarterly on how things are going, as part of the monthly team phone call." No such reporting ever occurred. For the next three years, from August 20, 2004 until November 17, 2007 when I resigned, there was absolutely no accountability to the apostolic team and we were never updated by the CLC pastors.<sup>135</sup>

### The Need for Public Confession<sup>136</sup>

Going into the August 20, 2004 meeting, we talked about the appropriate sphere for you to confess your sins. In the end, you confessed them to no one including Dave, Steve and me.

I initially recommended you confess to the entire pastoral staff at CLC and to all the men on the extended apostolic team (i.e., the men providing extra local oversight to churches). This was a gracious proposal. Under your leadership since 1991, you've had other men in the movement confess to a wider circle for less serious sins. Dave agreed. Steve didn't think we needed to include the extended team.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 17, 2004 2:31 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** Recommendations

I like to recommend the following on Friday [August 20]:

- C.J. make a confession to CLC pastors and extended team.
- Josh, Bob, Kenneth, or Grant join us for part of a team meeting [by phone] on a ¼ basis or as needed. We'd start the team meeting at 10 am.
- Josh, or someone he designates, e-mail us or call me if anything significant comes up with C.J. re: discussions of sin or incidents of sin so we can be informed or involved (if ever appropriate) in a timely way.
- Encourage Josh, or someone he designates, to ask us about any new developments with C.J. be they good or bad. In other words, draw us out on our on-going experience with C.J. and our observations of C.J.

Would you agree with these? Any other ideas or suggestions?

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 17, 2004 2:34 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** RE: CONFIDENTIAL - Confession

I considered this completely independent of you and came up with the same recommendation (confession) and one of the two groups you cited (the extended teams). Don't know whether that means that this is God but it does mean that I think it is a good idea.

Dave

PS: Since it would be odd to do it to the extended team and not to the CLC guys as well, I would also agree that they should be informed.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 17, 2004 4:35 PM  
**To:** Joshua Harris  
**Cc:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank; C.J. Mahaney  
**Subject:** August 20 Agenda

Here is a basic outline for our time together on Friday.

1. Encourage C.J. for what he is seeing and acknowledging.

2. Talk about remaining areas of concern not addressed in his confession.
3. Confirm the CLC strategy for the on-going care of C.J. and Carolyn.
4. Recommendations from the team regarding how to proceed in the future [e.g., a confession].

Any suggestions are welcomed Josh.

Thanks  
Brent

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 17, 2004 4:52 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey; Steve Shank  
**Subject:** CONFIDENTIAL - Confession

I'd like to recommend on Friday that C.J. make a confession to all the CLC pastors and to the extended team in Nov/Dec.? Do you agree that this would serve him and is a good and necessary thing to recommend?

**From:** Steve Shank  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 17, 2004 5:46 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler; Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: CONFIDENTIAL - Confession

At the moment, I do not believe it needs to go to the extended team... I believe we and the CLC guys are serving him well...

Steve's was not entrenched in his position. Dave felt a moral obligation to write him about the seriousness of the issues we were addressing in your life as the apostolic team leader and President of Sovereign Grace Ministries.

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

I may try to call you 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 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 - don't know whether that 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:

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

- a. CJ was pursuing correction about self - he was not
- b. CJ was humble towards correction - he was not
- c. CJ was talking to other people about the primary concerns being raised with him - he was not
- d. CJ was truly accountable in certain important areas - he was not
- e. CJ was responding lovingly to misunderstanding & pressing into his friendships for clarity & with affirmation - he was not
- f. 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
- g. CJ was seeing the need to illustrate his sermons with examples of his own weakness and sinfulness (this was weak) - he was not
- h. All the while teaching on humility, writing on it & referencing himself in regards to it when we were calling him to account.
- i. Been enormously troubling to us & personally grievous for me.

Because of the portrait that forms above, 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 team and the upper echelon of leadership in Sovereign Grace (extended teams) does not appear to me to be excessive. The groups are both highly contained and very mature (present company excluded!)

The last topic I raised at the August 20 meeting was this matter of confession.



- Brent 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? Does integrity require that they be informed?
- 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. Thanked the apostolic team for effectively caring for CJ and for us.

Once again, we never heard back from Josh or you. Dave, Steve and I all agreed you should confess to the entire CLC pastoral staff. If you had followed your own teaching and counsel to others, you'd have volunteered and confessed to the them, the Sovereign Grace managers, and the extended team (e.g., Danny Jones, Gene Emerson, Mickey Connolly, Jim Britt, Larry Malament). Incredulously, three months later on November 19, you wanted to know from me "why a wider confession of sin was necessary" especially since you have "historically confessed your sins to others." All our input had accomplished nothing. We labored in vain. It was obvious why a wider confession was necessary. And it was blatantly untrue that you had "historically confessed your sins to others." No one agreed with that lofty assessment of yourself. Everyone communicated the opposite was true in their experience with you.

There was a need for confession then and there is an even greater need for confession now. This greater need also necessitates a wider audience. That is why I wrote you the following in RRF&D on March 17, 2010.

“In your case, there has been no confession but there has been considerable damage control. 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.”

To date, you have expressed no interest or willingness to do any of the above. We’ve been corresponding for ten months. It is time for closure. Are you willing and ready to be honest and talk to the movement? This is extremely important so please provide me a response in the next week. You don’t need time to think about this or get counsel on this - you just need to do what you’ve had so many others do over the last three decades.

#### Nothing Caused Bob Any Concern

During my assessment last summer, I communicated my concern for your “sin focused” approach to me which began in earnest at the June 2006 team retreat.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Date: Sunday, July 19, 2009 1:28 PM  
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 to me] began with C.J. Then he conveyed it to Larry and Gene.

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 responded in the affirmative so I decided to send him some uninvited additional thoughts.

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. 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<sup>137</sup> 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>138</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?<sup>139</sup>

In addition, I wrote Bob to ask about the letter from Dave to you that I've already referenced earlier.

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 responses to our correction had adversely affected his relationship to the team and especially me. Dave told me C.J. never got back to him on it. Perhaps he shared this letter with those watching over his soul.

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

Six months went by with no response from Bob to any of the 4 e-mails above from July 19, 21, 23, 25. That was wrong. It was also predictable. These were important

questions. An “unbiased” counselor would have been careful to follow up with me. I wrote Bob again in February and included the earlier correspondence.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 5:09 PM  
To: Bob Kauflin  
Subject: Follow Up with C.J.?

Would you please refresh your memory and read the e-mails below and then answer a few questions?

1. Did you ask Dave or C.J. for the letter? Did you talk to C.J. about it?
2. Did you talk to C.J. about having no contact with me since I stepped down from the apostolic team?
3. Did you ask him about his disposition of soul toward me?

Thanks  
Brent

Here are Bob’s answers to my questions.

From: Bob Kauflin  
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 5:51 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: Re: Follow Up with C.J.?

...I have talked to CJ about contact with you since you stepped down from the apostolic team and his disposition towards you. There was nothing in his response that caused me concern, but I’ll revisit it with him. I know he really wants to work through any obstacles in your relationship. I haven’t asked for the letter, but that’s something I’ll be happy to do. Once I’ve read it and talked to CJ about it I’ll get back to you. I pray this leads to helpful conversations...

It was remarkable that Bob got your perspective but never asked Dave for the letter to get his perspective. How can this be? This is not pastoring. Bob was catering to you and shielding you. There was no effort by Bob to pursue the truth and discover the facts.<sup>140</sup>

I’d written him, “If you want me to explain my statement or provide you information to support my statement, I’d be willing to.” Bob didn’t want my perspective and therefore never asked for any information to substantiate my claims. He rested his case entirely on a conversation with you.

That is like a judge acquitting a felon based solely upon his own testimony and accepted it *prima facie* without examining any evidence against him. This was Bob's *modus operandi*.

Based upon your singular testimony, Bob had no concerns that:

1. You were focused on my perceived sins for three years.
2. You passed on this approach to Gene and Larry.
3. Your orientation to me changed after the August 20 meeting.
4. You cut off all contact with me for 18 months as a result.<sup>141</sup>

Bob wasn't serving you. He was protecting you from input and enabling you to go on unexamined. Bob handled you with kid gloves. I can only imagine what would happen if you raised the exact same concerns for me.

One other point on a different subject. On January 14, 2010 you said "Recently I was informed that you might have some offenses with me." I covered the deceptiveness of this statement in RRF&D but I want to restate my concern with greater clarity. Your comment is manifestly untrue in two ways.

First, you concretely knew I believed you sinned against me in multiple ways (cf., my July 19, 21, 23 and 25 e-mails to Bob which he talked with you about). There was no "might" about it. Second, you knew this for a long time, at least the last 6 years. There was nothing "recent" about it. This statement of yours is manipulative. It gives the false impression you are coming for reconciliation now because, only recently, you heard I might have some offense against you. This could hardly be further from the truth.

### No One You Know Has Sinned

I sent you RRF&D on March 17. I said the following on page 128 under the subheading, "Final Comments"

I'd love to see our friendship restored. I'd love to see some acknowledgment of wrong-doing. 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.

You refused to address these concerns in writing. I followed up on June 21 and asked, “Do you believe there is a need for “a restoration of integrity, truth telling and justice in Sovereign Grace so there is no lying, spin, manipulation, lording, cover-up, or partiality?”” You briefly answered on July 2 and said, “Brent, I don’t think Sovereign Grace in general or anyone I know in particular is “lying, covering up, manipulating, lording, etc.”<sup>142</sup>

I found this statement extremely helpful. It conveyed your perspective with clarity and conviction. There was no ambiguity or obtuseness, no doubt or reserve, no hemming or hawing. Your meaning was clear and that was refreshing.

Let me clarify one point. My concern has been for “some men,” not all men or most men (i.e., the pastors) in the movement. Those men I am most concerned about, however, are significant leaders whose example and actions have harmed and injured others. They are numbered among your inner circle and close friends. Though I carry concerns for the movement, these concerns are grounded in particular concerns for particular individuals.

But in contradistinction, you don’t know anyone who is guilty of duplicity, dishonesty, injustice, lying, spin, manipulation, lording, cover-up, partiality, deceit, sinful judging, unbiblical actions, or hypocrisy. All these were included under your “etc.” (lit., “and other things” or “and so on”). This assertion is alarming. It is a carte blanche dismissal of each and every one of my concerns.<sup>143</sup> In other words, no one you know has sinned in any of these ways. Especially not Dave, Bob, Gene, Mickey, Larry and Eric Kircher. This goes to show how far apart we are on the fundamental issues that separate us. You are totally unconcerned for my main concerns.<sup>144</sup> I’m afraid we live in different galaxies separated by light years. I hope this can be remedied in the future.<sup>145</sup>

In fact, your concerns lay in a completely different direction. To quote, “From what I read in your e-mail I think you have misunderstood and misrepresented Gene, Bob, Dave (and me) in some of these things. And I am concerned that your heart may have been blinded by bitterness.” I appreciate your honesty.

Clearly, you are focused on being misunderstood and misrepresented. You express no concerns for Dave, Bob or Gene. You reference mediation but there is nothing to mediate. I am the only guilty party. You exonerate all your friends.<sup>146</sup> Oh C.J., this is foolish and dangerous! It goes to the heart of the problem. You are not holding them accountable and they are not holding you accountable. The proverbial foxes are guarding the hen house and that is frightening. For so long, and in so many ways, you

have not held yourself accountable, not held others accountable (i.e., select friends), and others have not held you accountable.

This piggybacks on what you wrote on May 18, "I don't know how to accelerate the process since a number of others are involved and implicated in your [RRF&D] document."<sup>147</sup>

Here is what I said about these men.

"I'd love to return to Sovereign Grace Ministries but change must occur in order to restore my trust and confidence in its integrity. Nor am I currently welcome by you or acceptable to you. Gene counseled people to force my resignation before any evaluation, Bob has pronounced me unfit for ministry and in need of a lengthy rehabilitation, Dave has forbidden me from visiting all Sovereign Grace churches until I change, and you have said we cannot serve together because of your disagreements with me over doctrine and practice. I am also reminded of Dave's words to Jenny and me that I "have not represented the values, leadership or doctrine of Sovereign Grace Ministries" during my years of service. As a result, a sense of belonging in Sovereign Grace Ministries escapes me."<sup>148</sup>

As the President of Sovereign Grace Ministries (a.k.a. the apostolic team leader) you should be concerned about my summary statements and express a desire to examine them. I am glad you've been helping "different men" from "different churches" over the past two years but your priorities are amiss. You need to spend more time at "home" helping key men on your leadership team and in your close circle of friends.

May I ask on what basis, on what facts, on what evidence did you conclude I misunderstood and misrepresented Dave, Gene and Bob?<sup>149</sup> What objective research did you do? Did you carefully investigate their words and actions? Did you ask me for clarification? Did you request support for my attributions? No, you did none of these things. Obviously you based your conclusions on what they told you and you did so without an unbiased inquiry. You believed their denials. I must say, this is so painfully predictable.

And of course, you must suggest a motive for why I said the things I did. It is not enough to dismiss them. A reason, a motive, an evil heart is likely behind my distortions. That is, bitterness, but not just ordinary bitterness, it is a blinding bitterness. C.J., this too is so painfully familiar. Does it ever occur to you that my concerns might be based in fact and motivated by genuine love? I want to help you. These men need correction and accountability. Yet, you are eager to believe anything against me without examination. You are happy to assume my guilt and presume their innocence. This is a well worn path especially since August 2004.<sup>150</sup>

My friend, I am not misunderstanding or misrepresenting you, Dave and Bob. I am simply quoting each of you and quoting you in context. Your meanings are clear. In Gene's case, I am effectively quoting four men. Of course, you can believe what you want but it is not rooted in truth. Let me make this point clear.

### Dave Harvey - Banned from the Churches<sup>151</sup>

Here is what I said to you.

"Dave has forbidden me from visiting all Sovereign Grace churches until I change.... I am also reminded of Dave's words to Jenny and me that I "have not represented the values, leadership or doctrine of Sovereign Grace Ministries" during my years of service."

Please allow a little facetiousness. I did misrepresent Dave. I presented him unfairly. I put him a light he did not deserve. How? He not only prohibited my involvement in any Sovereign Grace church, he also refused to meet with me or talk to me unless I changed my ways. If it weren't true, the claim would have me rolling in the church aisles. No lording in any of this, right? C.J., these are incontrovertible facts. They are not based on personal recollections or notes. They are based on perspicuous correspondence from Dave.

Here is some background. Dave and Gene had a conference call with eleven leaders from Grace Community Church the day after my resignation was demanded on June 3, 2009. I had no knowledge of this crucial phone meeting. Later, I was told that Dave or Gene referenced 25 years of serious concerns for me. I wanted to verify whether or not this was true. I was concerned for the effect of such an unfounded characterization. I wrote Dave and Gene for clarification.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 23, 2009 11:12 AM  
**To:** Gene Emerson; Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** Confidential - Confess and Reconciliation  
**Importance:** High

Did either of you reference 25 years of concerns for my character [during the June 4, 2009 phone meeting]?

Here is Dave's response. He condescendingly belittled, if I may say so, my request for clarification regarding the supposed statement as a "misguided investigation" about an



“obscure detail.” That is, what I was asking he deemed irrelevant, unimportant, and impertinent. It was also unwelcomed.

I was not permitted to ask questions or hold Dave and Gene accountable for comments that might be untruthful, inaccurate or partial. I was castigated and cut off by Dave for doing this. Before and after June 3, 2009, all kinds of evil things were being said and believed about me. There were no controls or restraints. It was open season. And Dave and Gene considered themselves above accountability in this regard.

From: Dave Harvey  
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2009 9:30 AM  
To: Brent Detwiler; Gene Emerson  
Subject: RE: Confidential - Confess and Reconciliation

Hey buddy, hope you are well.

As I have prayed about this and what may be other arbitrary calls to account based upon obscure details, it seems wise to me – for numerous reasons – to not respond to these e-mails. I see it as a lack of care for you because it encourages and enables you to maintain a misguided investigation of perceived deficiencies against you. I may be wrong here but I see that as the essence of the problem and not a part of the solution.

Should you desire to alter your approach and turn your attention to the practical steps you would need to take for involvement in an SGM church, or the practical steps necessary to re-qualify for ministry in SGM, then I would be happy to speak with you in person or via phone.

I remain grateful for you and indebted to you for the many ways you taught me as a new believer and befriended me over the years,

Dave

Dave’s was not willing to be accountable for anything. He claimed it would be a “lack of care” to answer any of these vital questions. To make sure I never asked any questions again, he banned me from involvement in all Sovereign Grace churches, pronounced me unqualified (just like Bob) for ministry in Sovereign Grace Ministries and refused to meet with me or talk with me. This was undiluted lording. This kind of control is abusive.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2009 10:20 AM  
To: Dave Harvey; Gene Emerson  
Subject: RE: Confidential - Confess and Reconciliation

Making a statement to the entire Grace leadership team in a phone meeting that I did not know about and Jonathan was forbidden to attend that you have been concerned for my character for over 25 years and therefore not surprised by the charges leveled against me is not an "obscure" detail. Such an "obscure" statement would have a major impact on your audience. You are not caring for me by avoiding the question. You are covering up and unwilling to walk in the light and be accountable for your words. Stop spinning things. Please be honest and answer this simple question. If not, I have no choice but to conclude it is true.

I provided an evaluation of you to the Assessment Team. They were supposed to pass it on to you and the SGM leadership team. Did you and the team receive it?

I followed up with John Schaaf who told me about the reference to 25 years.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Friday, September 25, 2009 2:29 PM  
**To:** John Schaaf  
**Subject:** Dave & Gene's Denial

Both Dave and Gene deny ever saying they've be concerned for my character for over 25 years. Are they being truthful? Were you using hyperbole?

From: John Schaaf  
Sent: Saturday, September 26, 2009 8:55 AM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: Denials

Brent,

I cannot admit to hyperbole on this one. I did not record the conversation, so you will have difficulty with the prosecution of this case. As you know, e-mails get me in trouble, so I'd be glad to talk in person.

John

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Friday, October 02, 2009 11:55 AM  
**To:** Dave Harvey; Gene Emerson  
**Subject:** Confidential - Dave & Gene's Denial

John Schaaf remembers one of you referencing 25 years. He doesn't think you are being truthful. In any case, Dave, you previously told Jenny and me the same thing in a private conversation with you. Oops, one other thing, thanks for banning me from all SG churches – that's a new one.

Using sarcasm, I chided Dave for his abuse of authority. No one has ever been excommunicated and relationally cut off for asking questions and appealing for justice. I assume he acted unilaterally and without your knowledge or support be it explicit or implicit. Is that true?<sup>152</sup>

I also alluded to a “private conversation” with Jenny and me over dinner at Bravo's Restaurant at Northlake Mall on August 29, 2007. At one point during the conversation, Dave told me, pointedly and directly, I had not represented the values of Sovereign Grace Ministries in my preaching, leadership, and character. The clear implication was throughout my many years of service. It was a devastating comment and solicited an immediately flow of tears from my dear wife.

In the context of the conversation, he appeared to be quoting you because he was primarily presenting your assessment of me. I don't know what kind of an assignment Dave was given by you but I can't imagine him making this statement without your knowledge and support. You often sent others (like Bob) armed with your “discernment” to do this kind of work. It appeared Dave was given an assignment to provide me your critique.<sup>153</sup> I admit to being rather devastated myself. There were no qualifying remarks. No equivocation. No balancing statements.

The comment was categorical and covered every aspect of my ministry. My life's work was in vain according to Dave. This was completely uncharacteristic of Dave. Up until that time, Dave had never said anything like this to me. To be honest, he had said just the opposite. This marked a radical change. The next day, Jenny wrote him a lengthy letter lamenting his assessment.

Less than three months later, I voluntarily resigned from the board of directors (a.k.a. the core apostolic team) on November 20, 2007. There was no reason to continue given your opinion of me. A little later, I voluntarily resigned from leading a regional team (a.k.a. the extended apostolic team) on January 28, 2008. Given your assessment of me, I could not continue with integrity as an employee of SGM. I announced all these changes to CrossWay Community Church on February 10, 2008. I could have spoken

up and shared the contents of RRF&D and AFA but I wanted to protect you, CrossWay, Sovereign Grace Ministries and especially the gospel. Ray Mulligan e-mailed me to see how I was doing. Here is my response. I provide it to establish the historicity of Dave's comments regarding my leadership, character and preaching.

From: Brent Detwiler  
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2008 3:19 PM  
To: Ray Mulligan  
Subject: RE: Care Groups

It has been very difficult but as I told my dear wife this morning, I was glad to make the announcement for the sake of gospel and secondarily for the well being of Sovereign Grace and CrossWay. I'd rather appear deranged than have the gospel or the reputation of SGM and CW suffer due to divisions or discord if another course was taken. I want to make every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit. In so doing, I hope I have honored God while maintaining some semblance of integrity. Some have told me I do not represent SGM in my leadership, character or preaching. From a human perspective, I know this is the reason for my "early retirement." I hope the Lord has a different assessment - at least in degree. On the other hand, I believe God has repositioned me. I am grateful for his mercies. So, the process has been like a slow death but I choose to believe that it will result in life because of his grace. God means it for good.

From: Ray Mulligan  
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2008 4:53 PM  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Subject: RE: Care Groups

I was sharing with my CG last night that the principle of John 12:24 "unless a kernel of wheat fails to the ground and dies, it remains only a single seed. But if it dies, it produces many seeds. The man who loves his life will lose it, while the man who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life."

If your character, preaching, and theology is not reflective of the movement, then the movement has changed, it can go on without me. Let us love the people God has given us, share the truth of the gospel, and glorify his name, to the best of our ability. Let us be humble and grow in our love for the savior, not for our own reputations!

I am re-reading JC Ryle's book *Holiness*, and have found it to be encouraging that this ground has been tread many times before by great men of the faith...

Let's get on with producing many seeds.

Announcement to CrossWay about the  
End of Sovereign Grace Responsibilities  
02/10/08

Good morning. I've been asked if I would take a few minutes and inform you about changes in Sovereign Grace and their impact on CW and myself. For our guests, CW is a part of a larger Christian organization. On March 30, CW will send out a group of people to start a new church in the Mooresville/Kannapolis region.

Over the years I have served on the leadership team of Sov. Grace Ministries. With the church planting that will be coming to an end. I am very grateful to God for the many ways I have been involved in our larger mission. Now however, I believe the Lord wants me to focus my full efforts on the starting and establishing a new church. I believe the Lord has sovereignty repositioned me for this task. I hope by grace to effectively serve in this new role for the remainder of my life.

Over the years, it has also been a great joy and privileged to have played a part in the life of CrossWay Community Church. With the church plant my involvement in CW will also be coming to an end.

My dear friend, Gene Emerson, who is the sr. pastor of the church in Richmond, has been asked to provide apostolic oversight to this church. I support this change...

Second, Sovereign Grace Ministries is currently undergoing a reorganization in order to create more manageable geographically spheres to accommodate future growth. With this in view, Gene has been asked to oversee all the Sov. Grace churches in TN, KY, WV, VA and NC. That will include CW and the church plant in Mooresville/Kannapolis. Gene and his wife are dear friends to the Connolly's and Detwiler's. Mickey and I look forward to his oversight and involvement in our respective churches.

Other changes are occurring also. Joshua Harris and Jeff Purswell will be replacing Steve Shank and me on the leadership team. This change positions younger and more gifted men to serve alongside of C.J., Dave Harvey and Pat Ennis. Except for Dave, each of them is a part of Covenant Life Church in Gaithersburg, MD. This is an advantage.

On the international front, Larry will begin to work with Pete Greasley instead of me with our efforts in Asia. Pete is based in Wales in the United Kingdom has been asked to head up all our international work.

Danny Jones, my dear friend and sr. pastor in Orlando, has also been asked to take on new responsibilities. He has been helping me in FL, LA and the Caribbean. Two weeks ago I turned over GA, AL, MS, and SC to him. This will enable me to focus my full attention on the church plant in region of Mooresville and Kannapolis.

It has been a great joy and privilege to serve both Sovereign Grace Ministries and CrossWay. But in this last season of life, I believe the Lord has repositioned me to start a church and return to pastoral ministry. I see this as a promotion not a demotion. I love being involved in a local church, caring for people and teaching the word of God. Our ways are not his ways and his ways are not our ways. Indeed, "How unsearchable are His judgments and unfathomable His ways!" (12:33) Thanks for all the wonderful years we've had together.

One more thing regarding Dave. I asked him if he received the evaluation I provided Bob, Phil and Wayne regarding his conduct. Here again is what I said, "I provided an evaluation of you [Dave] to the Assessment Team. They were supposed to pass it on to you and the SGM leadership team. Did you and the team receive it?" Dave never answered the question. He never got back to me. This had become par for the course. These were the types of questions he was unwilling to answer.

To make matters worse, Bob never passed on my evaluation to Dave, you, Josh, Jeff or Pat. He forgot. During my assessment, I provided Bob all the information above and much more regarding Dave. We talked about Dave's attitudes and actions on several occasions. He was aware of my "banning," etc. Yet none of it was forwarded to anyone and none of it was put in any written reports which I also requested. Oh my, how can this be forgotten? In my experience, I tend to forget the things I consider unimportant. Dave's behavior was barely on Bob's radar screen. If I did what Dave did, most certainly, Bob would not have forgotten to pass it onto to you!

Let me add that I met with Dave at a Starbucks near Concord Mills Mall on March 1, 2009. I told him I primarily resigned because he and you didn't feel I represented Sovereign Grace or Jesus Christ (whom I specifically mentioned) in my preaching, leadership or character. I quoted Dave back to Dave but also added "Jesus Christ." He did not object. Rather, he acknowledged his awareness that this was foremost in my mind and heart as the reason for stepping down. I also told him I had no hopes of serving in Sovereign Grace Ministries in the years ahead given this dismal assessment.

I just hoped to plant a church, preach the gospel and care for a flock of God's children. I had lost too much respect for you and Dave. This wasn't self-pity. It was a matter of principle.

#### Gene Emerson - Counseled a Conspiracy<sup>154</sup>

Here is what I said to you, "Gene counseled people to force my resignation before any evaluation."

Four friends declared me unfit for ministry with no process and demanded my immediately resignation for one reason. Gene told them this had to be done if SGM were to get involved in our local situation. Ray Mulligan, for instance, told me, Jenny and Jonathan in a meeting on July 23, 2009 with Bob Kauflin, Phil Sasser, Wayne Brooks, Eric Kircher, Roger Layman, and Jim Aldridge, that Gene counseled him to "fire" me. Eric, Roger and Jim concurred that Gene had given them this "bad counsel" as Roger put it. This is indisputable. All four men were completely convinced this action was absolutely necessary based on the direction they received from Gene. About this there is no debate. The four men repeatedly affirmed this was true.

The entire leadership team of Sovereign Grace Ministries was extremely concerned that people in the church, and outside of the church, not be told the truth about what really happened. Dave, speaking on your behalf and with your support, "recommended" no one be informed of Gene's involvement (which I didn't even know about at the time) or the sinful actions of Eric, Ray, Roger and Jim. I appealed that you be "open and honest" "less you be accused of a cover-up." Nevertheless, you counseled the concealment of everything surrounding my forced resignation. To this day, the church has never been told the truth.<sup>155</sup> Instead, you framed the issue under the guise of integrity. This entailed the gross manipulation of the leaders from Grace Community Church.

From: Dave Harvey

Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2009 1:33 PM

To: Ray Mulligan, Eric Kircher, Jim Aldridge, Roger Layman,

Cc: Brian Lloyd; Jonathan Detwiler; Mike Lukavsky; Jonathan Paul; John Schaaf; John Sutton; Brent Detwiler; C.J. Mahaney; Jeff Purswell; Gene Emerson; Pat Ennis; Joshua Harris

Subject: RE: Confidential

Gentleman, an additional point of clarification related to the public announcement to the church. We [Dave, C.J., Josh, Jeff, Pat] would not recommend that the church be informed of the request for Brent's 'resignation', but only of the request to SGM from the local team for an 'evaluation of Brent's leadership'. Since we are being informed from many parties that there is

growing speculation over these issues from within and outside the church. We believe this step will serve the church by framing the issue carefully and respectfully, quelling speculation, inviting prayer and reinforcing the desire of all parties to walk through this process with integrity.

Hope this point of clarification helps.

Dave

From: Brent Detwiler

Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2009 1:57 PM

To: Dave Harvey; Gene Emerson

Cc: Jim Aldridge; Kenny Cook; Brent Detwiler; Andy Elseman; Eric Kircher; Roger Layman; Brian Lloyd; Mike Lukavsky; Ray Mulligan; Jonathan Paul; John Schaaf; John Sutton,

Subject: FW: Confidential

I'd suggest you be open and honest about what has happen less you be accused of a "cover up" and indicate that the leadership team also asked to be evaluated by SGM per the statement below which says you desire "an open and outside evaluation of us all."

This appeal for truth telling was completely ignored.<sup>156</sup> No one addressed my profound concern for honesty and transparency.<sup>157</sup> I never heard back from Dave and Gene or anyone else.<sup>158</sup>

Later, I appealed to the Assessment Team and asked that this information be shared with Grace Community Church. In their final report to the church on July 29, 2009, they communicated an incomplete and watered-down overview of Eric, Ray, Jim and Roger's actions. Even worse, they never said anything to the church about Gene's crucial role. They withheld it from the church. In fact, they withheld the same information from me for nearly two months until the very end of the assessment. I found out from Ray two nights before I resigned. This was purposeful and strategic - not a mere oversight.

I was kept in the dark when I should have known about Gene from the very beginning. Oh, the duplicity! If I had known about his secret counsel to "fire" me, I would have spoken up. There was no "open and outside evaluation" of Gene. For this and other reasons, Gene should be removed from the Sovereign Grace leadership, step down as sr. pastor of KingsWay Community Church, be put on probation and required to make a public confession to the movement.<sup>159</sup>



## Bob Kauflin – Pronounced Unfit<sup>160</sup>

Here is what I said to you, “Bob has pronounced me unfit for ministry and in need of a lengthy rehabilitation.”

On July 25, 2010, Bob read the following to all the members and regular attendees of Grace Community Church.

“This request [for Sovereign Grace involvement] came as a result of four leaders asking for, and then rescinding, Brent’s resignation.... The local leaders had concluded Brent was unfit to lead the church and moved towards asking for his resignation.... But we also believe we have gathered enough evidence to say that the original concerns of the leaders are valid.... We recommend the call for resignation from the local leaders be upheld by the board and honored by Brent, and that Brent step down as an elder and board member of Grace Community Church, effective immediately.... Therefore, we recommend that a process of reconciliation and restoration be put in place for Brent, to be determined by the Sovereign Grace leadership team, hoping that Brent might one day return to pastoral ministry.... We recommend that Brent, along with Sovereign Grace, consider what church could best provide ongoing pastoral care and potential restoration.”

Bob made it crystal clear. I was “unfit” for ministry. He hoped that “one day” I “might return to pastoral ministry.” “Potential restoration” to ministry was a possibility but only if I moved to another church for rehabilitation. This pronouncement effectively destroyed my “livelihood.” As an aside, Bob never mentioned the possibility of restoration to me during the five week assessment until I brought up its total absence to Benny Phillips, who brought it up to Bob, two days before I resigned. It was never part of our conversation until the day before I resigned. Never... As a result, the comments above about “reconciliation and restoration” were added to the report the day I resigned.

At The Summit coffee shop in Davidson, NC on July 24, Bob told me this reclamation project would be a lengthy process of 1 to 1½ years in all probability. It would take that long before I could pastor again. He also said there was no possibility of me moving back into this area where all my children lived upon completion for ministry purposes.<sup>161</sup> I’d either be on staff in another city or be sent out to plant a church in another area. These are the plain facts. They made my decision to leave SGM easier since Jenny and I were not willing to leave our family. I wrote Dave regarding the same.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 22, 2009 2:34 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Subject:** RE: confidential

We left [SGM] for a lot of reasons. The clincher was no possibility of returning to the area per the Assessment Team after “rehab” in other church.

### C.J. Mahaney - “We Cannot Serve Together”

You also claimed I misunderstood and misrepresented you. Here’s what I said regarding you, “You have said we cannot serve together because of your disagreements with me over doctrine and practice.”

And here’s what you wrote me on January 14, 2010, “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.” There is no misrepresentation by me. I am practically quoting you verbatim. According to you, we are separated by doctrine and practice. We cannot serve together in ministry in SGM. That is your clear meaning. To say I misunderstood and misrepresented you is an example of the “spin” I am so concerned about.<sup>162</sup>

### KingsWay Community Church<sup>163</sup>

You recently stated you don’t know of any pastor in Sovereign Grace Ministries who is “lying, covering up, manipulating, lording, etc.” Yet this is currently happening in Midlothian, VA. Both Gene and Dave are involved in these types of activities and this has been brought to your attention. I hope each of them confess these sins to the church. Gene should not be overseeing churches in Sovereign Grace Ministries and he should not continue as senior pastor. Last year I brought my grave concerns for Gene to Dave and Bob’s attention. They effectively dismissed them when disciplinary actions were clearly in order. It is hard to describe how abusive Gene was in his dealing with me.<sup>164</sup> I tried to help him deal with pride over the years but with little success. Here is correspondence from this week.

#### Example 1: Gene Emerson

On Tuesday of this week, I wrote Gene the following corrective. I copied those centrally involved in his manipulation and deceit.

**From:** Brent Detwiler

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 05, 2010 1:03 PM

**To:** Gene Emerson

**Cc:** Bob Dixon; Steve Whitman; Bud Moreland; Aaron Campbell; Matthew Williams, Doug Wilda

**Subject:** Issues re: Steve Whitman

Please see the attached correspondence and notes. I am praying for your time with Peacemakers. Sorry to get this out the door so last minute.

Dear Gene,

I never heard from Steve after asking you to pass on my notes with an encouragement for him to e-mail me. As a result, I called him twice the end of September but didn't make contact. I left voice messages inviting Steve to call. We finally had a good conversation this past Saturday, October 2.

I find your response below deceitful and it is of great concern to me. I am afraid this has become a pattern in your life. It affects my trust in you. Let me explain in this instance.

You intentionally withheld this information from Steve after I requested you give it to him. What was your motive for doing this? I wanted Steve to have this material so we could talk through any differences between us. You blocked my attempts to provide Steve my perspective. You also failed to convey my happy willingness for him to contact me.

When Steve and I talked on Saturday, he had no idea I was glad to connect with him back in mid-September. This came up when I asked him if he had any questions about my notes that you were to forward. Of course, he was clueless. He didn't know of any such notes. I might also add these notes should have been supplied for his consideration in preparation for the "Peacemaker" meeting this week. He should not be surprised by them.

This is wrong Gene. You need to ask Steve's forgiveness for hindering attempts at peacemaking and defrauding him of my notes which I wanted him to have in his possession. Why didn't you give them to him? Why didn't you tell him I was happy to interact?

These are questions that require accountable answers. I am copying this e-mail to the pastors at KingsWay. I trust they'll bring the correction and accountability you need. I hope they lead you to repentance by the kindness of God. I've also copied Steve, Bob, and Buddy.

I'd appreciate if you wrote me back and answered the questions above. I am eager to forgive you when you repent. If this deception is part of a local pattern then it should be acknowledged to the church.

Let me go into some detail. You first e-mailed me on August 25. I was unaware of any turmoil in KingsWay. You brought to my attention "that some of [Steve's] offenses are against you [Brent]." You were concerned that I "not be misrepresented and have an opportunity to share if [I] have a different perspective." As a result, I reviewed my notes from the past regarding Steve and sent them to you with an accompanying letter. I asked that these notes be forwarded to Steve. I wanted to talk with him about any offenses. You prohibited this from happening.

C.J., what follows is some of the e-mail history between Gene and me. I have not included all of it. The comments between e-mails are from me to Gene. I hope you can follow.

**From:** Gene Emerson  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 25, 2010 4:13 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Steve Whitman's Concerns

Hi Brent,

I hope you are well. I've prayed for you so often and look forward to the day we can be restored.

I wanted to ask you to weigh in to a situation we're walking through right now with Steve Whitman. He has raised concerns about how he was treated during the Roanoke situation and we have sought to address those concerns both privately and publicly. I have asked forgiveness in both contexts for pressuring him to go to Roanoke.

It won't surprise you that some of his offenses are against you, and I have asked that your name not be used at least until you have an opportunity to respond. Specifically, Steve recounts a meal with you, Steve and Donna at an Outback before he left Roanoke where you forbade him from ever discussing his version of the events leading up to and during Roanoke with anyone. He also recalls you refusing to reconsider this in years following and, at one point, saying "Nothing could have possibly been done better" from your perspective and "I guess we'll know when we get to heaven that was right."

I'm sorry to raise this, Brent, but my concern is that you not be misrepresented and have an opportunity to share if you have a different perspective. Would you let me know your thoughts ASAP?

Thanks,  
*Gene*

I wrote you [Gene] back to ask about your recollection.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 25, 2010 4:52 PM  
**To:** Gene Emerson  
**Subject:** RE: Steve Whitman's Concerns

Do you remember me ever saying anything like this to you? I remember the meal but have no memory of these attributions. I am glad to check my notes and file on Friday. Tomorrow I'm tied up.

Thanks  
Brent

**From:** Gene Emerson  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 25, 2010 5:17 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Re: Steve Whitman's concerns

No but Steve says you said it to them without anyone else present.

I responded to you at length and included my notes regarding Steve. I asked you to greet Steve and Donna with my love. You did not do this. Why? I wanted them to know that though we may have differences; I cared for them, respected them, and thanked God for them. I also reminded you of my past caution to "be careful not to pressure [Steve] or tell him what he should or shouldn't do" with regard to moving to Roanoke. You did not convey my heart to them.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 28, 2010 6:03 PM  
**To:** Gene Emerson  
**Subject:** Steve Whitman

Greetings Gene,

First, thanks for asking that my “name not be used at least until [I] have an opportunity to respond” and that I “not be misrepresented and have an opportunity to share if [I] have a different perspective.” I gather from the blogs, the Kingsway Family Meeting, and your e-mail that erroneous and uncharitable statements are being made about me. If my “name” begins to be used (or already is) would you please make my views known to the church. Would you also forward this and the notes to all the pastors.

Second, please give my love and greetings to Steve and Donna. As you can attest, I’ve always had a fond affection for them in my heart. As I think back over the years, my heart is filled with gratitude for their devoted acts of service (e.g. Children’s Ministry at Celebration) and their love of others. I’ve always thanked God for the encouragement and kindnesses they provided so many people – me included...

After writing this to you [Gene] with the accompanying notes, you said, “I want to ask him [Steve] to contact you [Brent] personally so that he hears directly from you rather than through me.” You didn’t do this. Why?

**From:** Gene Emerson  
**Sent:** Friday, September 17, 2010 1:15 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Thanks

Thank you, Brent, for providing the information about your counsel to Steve. I want to ask him to contact you personally so that he hears directly from you rather than through me. Would it be OK if I gave him your e-mail address?

*Gene*

I requested that you give all my notes to Steve and that you invite him to write me.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Friday, September 17, 2010 3:03 PM  
**To:** Gene Emerson  
**Subject:** RE: Thanks

Please give Steve everything I sent you first. After he reads it, he's welcome to e-mail me if he wants to.

You [Gene] wanted me to interact with Steve to share my perspective. Did you hope I would correct him or did you hope we'd have a profitable conversation and resolve any differences? It appears you were interested in the former and not the later. If so, it is lamentable.

This past Saturday, Steve said he approached me four consecutive years and made mild appeals to reconsider our handling of him. I remember talking to Steve but not every year for four years (2000-2004). In any case, I did not take him seriously enough. I asked his forgiveness for this on Saturday. I should have given him serious consideration since these were the very issues I was trying to help you grown in. I regret this (thanks for your forgiveness Steve).

After talking to Steve this past Saturday, I immediately e-mailed you for verification.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 02, 2010 10:02 PM  
**To:** Gene Emerson  
**Subject:** Steve Whitman  
**Importance:** High

Did you give Steve everything I sent you? Did you tell Steve he is welcome to e-mail me?

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 03, 2010 1:26 PM  
**To:** Gene Emerson  
**Subject:** RE: Steve Whitman

I would appreciate a prompt response. Today if possible.

Thanks  
Brent

Your answer below is entirely irrelevant. It is an attempt at spin. You didn't respond to any of my questions. You avoided them. I wanted Steve to have the documents, feel I was accessible to him, and be assured of my love. These requests of mine had nothing to do with you and him. It was about me and him.

**From:** Gene Emerson  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 03, 2010 8:22 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Subject:** Re: Steve Whitman

Steve & I have been working through a number of issues unrelated to your involvement, and have agreed we need mediation. So a conciliator from Peacemakers is going to meet with us starting this week. I'm planning on bringing the documents you sent as part of the mediation process where a conciliator can study them objectively and help us both to respond appropriately. I think that will be the best way for all of us to move forward. Thanks for your patience.

I [Brent] should have been even more concerned for the pressure you [Gene] were applying to him [Steve] and the sin-centered approach you took after he returned. I'd regularly ask you how Steve was doing but I trusted your assessment too much. It sounds like you did little to help Steve get out from under the condemnation of returning to KingsWay and help the church fully accept him. He labored under great guilt for many years. I take some responsibility for this. Especially since I was bringing correction into your life regarding pride and the lack of grace in your treatment of others. As I've already said to you:

For my part however, I didn't pressure Steve to go, tell him to go, or say it would be sin not to go. You [Gene] may have done these things but this was not my approach or perspective. In fact, I cautioned you to be careful not to pressure him or tell him what he should or shouldn't do.

I also think I should have done more to protect Steve from Steve. I didn't want to prohibit him from going (lording) but maybe I should have done more to convince him to consider not going. Here's what I wrote Gary.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 25, 2010 10:25 AM  
**To:** Gary Stergar  
**Subject:** Steve

Hi Gary,

Thanks for the e-mails. I'm happy to try and contact Steve again. Leading up to the Roanoke decision I asked Gene not to pressure



Steve. After Steve returned I asked Gene about his welfare numerous times. I encouraged Gene to reach out to Steve. Gene assured me Steve was being cared for. I'm saddened to hear this was not the case.

Love in Christ,  
Brent

For many years, I [Brent] attempted to help you [Gene] grow in humility, kindness and love. Here are some interactions from the past but all very relevant in the present. If I understand correctly, these are the same issues being raised with you now by long term friends in KingsWay. I am concerned Steve experienced a severity of condemnation from you that I was not aware of, and therefore, I did not protect him from your sin focus and lack of compassion. Your assurances of care for Steve did not guarantee care. Given your propensities, I should have been more suspicious.

From: GeneEmer@aol.com  
Sent: Friday, January 21, 2000 3:33 PM  
To: Brent@abundantlife-nc.org  
Subject: Sin & other relevant topics

Brent,

FYI: I wanted to give you an update on some areas of concern that Steve raised with me. Steve & I have discussed these areas at length both together and including Aaron, and I think they're being addressed, but I wanted you to be aware and welcome your covering, input, and further correction.

1. I have not taken initiative in various ways of caring for and building relationally with Steve and Aaron. This includes making time to pray together and discuss personal issues. (The fall was particularly lacking in this, since office renovation, fundraising, and Randy's death consumed significant time and energy.)
2. Taking initiative with the church to confess areas of weakness & sin, especially during messages. The concern is that I am not sufficiently "walking with a limp." (I agree with his concern and am looking for opportunities to share this kind of illustration out of my life.)
3. An insufficient practice of plurality as we've made the shift from the leadership team to an eldership model. At times he's felt more

like a nuisance, especially when disagreeing with my perspective, than like a valued member of a team. (I agree with this concern as well and am seeking to draw Steve & Aaron more into all of our decision making.)

Brent, I covet your care and insight. Please feel free to follow up and share any insights you have.

We'll be taking an overnight retreat next Tuesday and Wednesday with the Whitman's and Campbell's. I'll be seeking their input there. I'll let you know what comes out of our time together.

Your friend,  
Gene

Subject: Update  
Date: 9/15/98 11:06:41 AM  
From: Gene Emerson  
To: Brent Detwiler

Brent,

Trust this note finds you well and enjoying God's grace!

I wanted to let you know that yesterday I shared "my list" with the church. Since we're in the midst of a message series on "Be Filled with the Spirit," I introduced my thoughts by reading from John 16 about the work of the Spirit in the conviction of sin and then shared about how that is being worked out in my own life. I was able to share personally with the church and share examples on each point in ways I've seen pride worked out in my life. After I spoke Steve & Bob shared ways in which they were encouraged in the process.

I've received quite a lot of positive feedback from people as well as a number of folks who have shared different ways my pride has affected them, enabling me to ask specific forgiveness. I think it went very well. A number of people shared with me how God used my sharing to bring conviction to their own hearts. I'm hopeful that we'll have a new sense of unity as a church.

Thanks for your support in this, Brent. I shared with the church how much you've meant to me through this process, in your care, in your

leadership, and in your own example. You mean so much to me. It is an honor to serve you.

With appreciation,

Gene

Subject: Update

Date: 8/18/98 11:37:54 AM

From: Steve Whitman

To: Brent Detwiler

Brent,

Greetings! I hope all is going well for you by God's grace!

We are having a leadership team retreat at the end of this week, so I wanted to give you a progress report on the issues we've been working through, and ask if it would be possible for us to speak by phone for a few minutes before that time (I certainly understand if that's not possible!).

We have seen some encouraging things happen in Gene's life as well as among the rest of the team. Particularly helpful was the article (Speaking Redemptively) you encouraged us to read. We took a morning to discuss the article, and God mercifully broke in upon us! He revealed significant areas of sin in each of our hearts, particularly among the three amigos (Gene, Bob & myself). The result was repentance and a breakthrough in our relationships that we hadn't seen before.

Also, Gene & I have met with Rick Nichols, Steve Teter and Brad Mitchell in the past number of weeks to allow Gene the opportunity to share the items of sin on his "list". The outcome of each of those meetings was very encouraging. Each of those guys expressed much gratitude to hear from Gene a more extensive description of his sins toward them. I believe these meetings resulted in far more restoration of relationships than any previous interaction had before.

As the leadership team worked through the issue that came up with Bob's tithing, more relational sins came to the surface which we worked through pretty successfully. On a slightly less encouraging

note, it came to light in discussing the tithing issue with Bob, that he indeed had tithed in 1997, and that in a number of settings Gene had called his integrity on that issue into question. I believe this might have had some impact on how you had evaluated that issue while you were with us. It might be good for us to chat about that one.

Well, that's it in a nutshell. I'd be very eager to get your thoughts on how we can continue to serve Gene, and make progress in our relationships. Thanks for being involved with us!

In Christ,

Steve

PS. If you'd like to arrange a phone chat, I'll be available anytime today and tomorrow, and until 1:30 on Thursday. Thanks!

Subject: Areas of Sin  
Date: 6/9/98 2:22:48 PM  
From: Gene Emerson  
To: Steve Whitman  
CC: Brent Detwiler

Steve,

As I have prayed and sought the mind of the Lord over the past week to clarify the issues we discussed with Brent, I believe God has graciously helped me to enlarge the list of sins I shared in the meeting and to be more specific about the root issues. I am very aware of God's conviction on each issue.

I hope this contributes to our discussions. I look forward to the input you and the other brothers can provide.

With appreciation,

Gene

## Sins of Which I'm Presently Aware<sup>165</sup>

1. Pride in self-righteousness.
  - a) Being large in my own eyes.
  - b) Not recognizing or communicating that I am "cut from the same cloth" as others.
  - c) Being slow to identify and confess my sins and weaknesses.
  - d) Not recognizing my need for others.
  
2. Pride in not honoring and respecting the men God placed around me.
  - a) Feeling superior because of position.
  - b) Not recognizing my need to be "pastored" by those around me.
  - c) Not seeking their input into my life and my family's life.
  - d) Considering my own judgment more highly.
  
3. Pride in a critical, legalistic attitude toward others.
  - a) Fault finding...being more aware of other's sins & faults than in their strengths.
  - b) Lacking love, affection and compassion for people.
  - c) Majoring on performance rather than motivating by grace.
  - d) Neglecting regular encouragement and affirmation.
  - e) Being an "agent of change" rather than a "means of grace" in leading and counseling.
  - f) Pressuring people to change rather than leading and entrusting them to God.
  - g) Withholding friendship or affection from people who are unresponsive or unteachable.
  
4. Pride in trusting in human effort to accomplish God's purposes.
  - a) Asking people to respond to my leadership rather than insisting that they respond to God.
  - b) Allowing people to respond by duty rather than by leading them into faith.
  - c) Trusting in counseling & leadership rather than in God to change people's lives.
  
5. Pride in placing my agenda before the interests of others (being self-serving).
  - a) Basing my relationship with others on their performance rather than on grace.
  - b) Valuing accomplishment over relationship.
  - c) Leading as a director rather than as a shepherd.

From: Gene Emerson  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Date: 6/4/98 6:06:08 PM  
Subject: Re: Feedback

In a message dated 6/4/98 12:56:23 PM Eastern Daylight Time, Brent Detwiler writes:

“If you can E Mail me ASAP your recollections of your confession or acknowledgment of wrong doing with Steve T. and Brad M. it would be helpful. When and what did you acknowledge to them? Thanks my friend for continuing to humble yourself and grow as a result.”

Brent,

Thanks for leading me so well in this endeavor. I just finished listening to your two recent tapes on pride from CLC...very, very helpful! You are a great example to me in this.

Steve checked with Rick and his recollection is of me asking how I had offended him but not confessing specific sin at the outset. Given my poor and prideful memory, I feel less certain of what I said to Steve or Brad.

I think I met with both during our last trip in to Franklin last July. My recollection is that I began by confessing the manifestations of pride that I was aware of at the time which would have included pressuring them, withdrawing my affections (friendship) if they didn't respond, valuing performance over relationship, and having a critical spirit in dealing with people. I recall both Steve & Brad sharing illustrations of how these sins had affected them and taking time with both to ask specific forgiveness. Brad gave me less feedback than Steve because I dealt with him far less. Brad did share a concern about going back to Jack at some point, which I'm planning to do.

My recollection is that both men expressed gratitude and were very gracious in forgiving me. Both Liz and I felt our time there that weekend went very well and I think Steve gave you similar feedback.

Since Rick didn't recall specific initial confession, I certainly hold out the possibility that I remember wrong. I'm looking forward to getting with Rick in the near future to address those issues. If either Steve or Brad feels I

didn't adequately cover these issues with them, I'll be glad to get with them at Celebration or when I'm in Franklin in August.

Thanks again for your covering, care, and friendship!

With appreciation,

Gene

Subject: Saturday Team meeting  
Date: 5/28/98 12:29:29 PM  
From: Gene Emerson  
To: Brent Detwiler

Brent,

I mentioned to you earlier that it would be helpful if you could help us as a leadership team work through a few issues. I wanted to provide some more information to make you aware of the basic issues to expedite our time together.

For the past couple of years I've been sharing with you areas where God has ongoingly convicted me of pride. As I've become more and more aware of these areas, this has been a painful process and one that seems endless at times. But I am deeply grateful for the mercy God has shown me in revealing my sin and extending the gift of repentance.

I've also sought to keep you abreast of issues in which the brothers, particularly Steve [Whitman] and Bob [Dixon], have shared their concerns with me. By way of review, their concerns are as follows:

Steve: Pride as applies to idolatry of leadership and in relationships in ministry.

Bob: Lording over people's faith, arrogance, manipulation, intimidation, valuing function over relationships, using relationships as a means to an end, being condescending.

We spent some time discussing these issues at our last retreat in April. I asked their forgiveness for not valuing their input in my life. I realized, particularly in light of Benny's letter, that I had not adequately sought out their input in my personal life and in my family's. I also

recognized that I have not adequately valued their input on leadership issues. They were gracious in forgiving me and that confession formed the foundation for a good retreat together.

As we discussed the specific issues Bob & Steve have raised, they communicated that they have seen significant growth in these areas, but continue to carry two concerns:

1. Though they have seen me change over the past nine years in how I relate to people, etc., they (Bob & Steve) haven't been satisfied in my repentance because they haven't observed sufficient "brokenness" in my life in regard to past sins.
2. They (Bob & Steve) believe it is very important that I acknowledge these past sins to the church and ask their forgiveness. Doug and Claude would have a different perspective since neither have experienced this from me. Since Doug arrived the year after the church was started, he particularly questions how many people in the present membership of the church would be aware of these issues.

Brent, I am well aware that my leadership in the past (dating back to CLC and Franklin) was characterized by pressure, using people as a means to an end, etc., and have repented to the extent I am aware of these issues. I am also aware that these sinful methods of leadership were rooted in pride. To that end I am glad to ask forgiveness of people in whatever way would be most beneficial to those involved. In fact, I've already asked forgiveness of people who I particularly sinned against (including Steve Teter, Brad Mitchell, Rick Nichols, Bob D. and Steve W.). I think your input would be very valuable in knowing where to go from here.

It is so important that we be able to come to one mind as a leadership team on these issues and move on, because I think the undercurrent of disagreement prevents us from really being at peace with one another (especially between Bob, Steve & me) and in biblical harmony. There's still a lot of baggage in the three of our relationships with one another, and I'm convinced God wants us to deal with these issues biblically so we can move on with one heart together.

I trust God will use you to help us and want to open my heart to you for your observations of remaining areas of pride and other sins in my life. Should make for a fun weekend!

Thanks so much, Brent, for your counsel, care, and friendship.



With appreciation,

Gene

Subject: Pride and other sins

Date: 98-04-08 22:02:44 EDT

From: Gene Emerson

To: Brent Detwiler

CC: Liz Emerson

Brent,

I've been listening to your tapes from CLC on pride. They have been so helpful and convicting. I am grateful for the work God has done and continues to do in your life, which is both an example and an inspiration to me.

I want you to know that I was deeply convicted on some additional manifestations of pride during the Leaders & Wives Conference. Due, I'm sure, to the work of the Spirit in my life, the theme of humility seemed to run throughout the conference. But I was especially aware of the pride in my life during the time CJ was being honored. I realized that I was not small in my own eyes and that, in fact, I was very aware of my own contribution.

I was also convicted about the critical nature of my heart in majoring on evaluating people and seeking to identify and address areas of weakness, sin, and needs. My fault-finding and preoccupation with people's needs has largely precluded my awareness of evidences of grace in the lives of others, starting with Liz and the men I work with. This has had a significant detrimental effect on my effectiveness in building friendships and in extending a genuine, merciful care to others.

I shared these areas with Liz and the men on the leadership team and they have been great in helping me to clarify these issues and repent of them. But I wanted you to be aware as well and very much welcome your input on any of these areas.

Thanks again for setting the pace, Brent. I am committed to living for God's glory alone in my life...to worship Him and serve others.

I'll be in DC this coming week taking Homiletics from CJ. Then I'll see you the following Tuesday in Charlotte. Liz and I are really looking forward to being with you and Jenny and the other couples. Please let me know if there's any way we can serve you during our time together.

Your friend,  
Gene

From: Gene Emerson  
To: Brent Detwiler  
Date: 97-07-23 10:17:56 EDT  
Subject: Re: Pride

Brent,

Thanks for your note and for your interest in these issues of my life. Your covering means a lot.

The primary way I have seen evidences pride in my life has been in my relationships with others, particularly with Liz and the Leadership Team. I have noticed an excessive amount of tension and quarrels lately among the Team. In inquiring of the Lord as to the origin, saw the contribution I have made by sinful behavior such as:

- Preferring myself
- Considering my judgment more highly than others
- Being impatient in giving and receiving correction
- Withholding unconditional acceptance of others
- Placing a higher priority on communicating correction than communicating care
- Lacking love, compassion, and mercy in dealing with others
- Focusing on people's deficiencies rather than on their strengths

I am also realizing that I have not been nearly as suspicious of my own heart as I ought. Thus, I have not been faithful in recognizing and confessing my own sins. Liz has ongoingly communicated to me her desire that I live aware of my own weaknesses and confess them more freely.

The brothers on the Leadership Team agree with the issues above and have shared with me their concern that I have "lorded over people's faith" by:

1. Being more concerned about expedience than leading people into faith.

2. As a result, telling people where we are going rather than setting a direction and inviting people to come with me there.

They have pointed out that the result of this form of leadership is for people to feel unimportant in the process and that in essence this form of leadership calls people to put their trust in leaders rather than in the Lord.

I see the fruit of this issue and have become much more sensitive in calling people to focus their faith in God on issues. To whatever degree that comes through repenting of pride and embracing humility, I trust God will lead me into the good of godly leadership.

Bob also feels that I have “a need for power, control and authority.” Steve and Doug wouldn't define these issues that way; but, based on the issues above, I can see why Bob believes that. To the best of my knowledge, I'm not motivated by a need or desire to control others.

Brent, I feel like an onion being peeled back layer after layer by the Holy Spirit only to reveal another. Though I am deeply grateful for the work of the Spirit, it is painful and, at times, discouraging to see the ugliness of my heart and the effects of my actions on others. For example, though I know they brought their own sin to the party, I'm sure I could have dealt with Jack Vogel, Roy Simmons and Bryan McCrea much better if I had shown more care for them and less concern for their sin alone.

I know that I've caused Steve Teter to struggle more than he should have had to. (I shared about these issues with Steve this past weekend and asked his forgiveness. He was gracious in forgiving me and sharing his encouragement about God's work in my life...)

Brent, I'm sure you've noticed these areas in my life and I welcome your observations as I seek to understand and repent of them. I know my heart is deceitful and I'm sure that even now I only see a part of my offense against God. I would appreciate any thoughts or corrections you have to offer.

With gratitude,

Gene

In my opinion, these issues of character in your [Gene's] life are the real issue and not disputes or differences with Steve. A decade later, I continue to carry these concerns for you.

C.J., you and Gene share common characteristics. Gene can be very affable, kind, encouraging and generous. He is capable in many respects. I've worked with Gene on all the issues above for over a decade but I did not know how serious they were until you placed him over me and assigned him to deal with me. I admit to being shocked. I thought he had made more progress.

Gene first confronted me with your assessment and on your behalf in March 2008. Up until then Gene had been empathetic toward me. But his disposition suddenly changed as a result of conversations with you and counsel from you.<sup>166</sup> A one time friend began to act more like a pit bull than a pastor. At the end of his first confrontation, I asked Gene if he thought I even loved Jesus, so harsh and condemning were his words.<sup>167</sup> He didn't answer the question.

Example 2: Dave Harvey<sup>168</sup>

Dave's recent comments to KingsWay Community Church illustrate a number of egregious sins including manipulation and lording. He should return to the church and publicly confess and ask forgiveness.<sup>169</sup>

**From:** Brent Detwiler

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 05, 2010 1:11 PM

**To:** Dave Harvey

**Cc:** Bud Moreland; Steve Whitman; Bob Dixon; Aaron Campbell; Doug Wilda; Matthew Williams; Gene Emerson

**Subject:** Tyranny of the Aggrieved

Hi Dave,

I've attached some correspondence regarding your message at KingsWay on September 5, 2010. I hope you find it helpful to your soul and it results in good fruit for the church and Sovereign Grace Ministries.

Thanks

Brent

Dear Dave,

A couple of weeks ago, I was asked to listen to the message you gave at KingsWay Community Church on September 5, entitled "Peter, Polity and Us" from 1 Peter 5:1-5. There were commendable points in the message but they

were overshadowed by your final section when you talked about “the tyranny of the aggrieved.” I found these remarks extremely troubling.

As you know, three weeks earlier on August 15, Gene Emerson confessed to the church his sin against Steve Whitman. Yet in this message, you correct Steve, though not by name, and those raising legitimate concerns. This only caused more division.

Here are my questions having listened to your message. I’ve been told Bob Dixon, Steve Whitman, and Buddy Moreland were provided a copy. I assume you’ve seen them also. If not, you’ll find them below.

It is critical for you to answer these kinds of questions.<sup>170</sup> You don’t have to necessarily answer my exact questions but you must answer any questions Steve, Bob, and Buddy pose to you. I’ve also provided a transcript of your relevant comments and some of Gene’s below.

In my opinion, you need to return to KingsWay to publically ask forgiveness for violating Scripture regarding peacemaking, acting hypocritically, further dividing the church, exercising authority you weren’t given, and manipulating the saints. Please don’t attempt to avoid this kind of accountability. I trust the pastors at KingsWay will help you in this regard. I hope you’ll correct the harm you’ve done to this precious church.

Dave, my love and affection abides but you and others have continued down the slippery path of deceit, hypocrisy and spiritual abuse. Please hit the emergency brake before Sovereign Grace derails. Each day these kinds of sins go unacknowledged, the ministry suffers an increased loss of reputation which hinders the glorious gospel. I don’t want that for you and all my dear friends in Sovereign Grace Ministries.

C.J., here are Dave’s relevant comments from his message.<sup>171</sup>

“I count it a privilege to be here today not only because I get to be with a pastoral team that I respect, and a church that I love, but it seems to have pleased God for me to join you in a time of turmoil as a local church. As I approach, let’s see next June is 25 years of ministry I want to confess from the outset – I am not unfamiliar with turmoil in local churches. Like individual Christians, every church goes through pruning, every church goes through refining, every church goes through turmoil...

“Now for the benefit of our guests, we haven’t had an opportunity to meet yet and I appreciate that. While I do formally serve this church on behalf of SGM, I

have no authority in this church whatsoever. The elders are the final authority of this local church. The church is connected to SGM, the SG family of churches, they are there voluntarily, not by contract, not by compulsion, though I would want to say our partnership together does involve a voluntary accountability and counsel and that's something we unite for. We unite for the purpose of mission, we unite for the purpose of accountability. Well, I guess what I am trying to say is I am not assuming I have something unique or prophetic to say to you this morning or that everyone here even wants to hear what I have to say this morning. Your pastors have certainly not asked me to address this. In fact they are probably more nervous than you are right now...

"Whether it be the pastor or whether it be the people, humility means that we are looking first to our own heart. It doesn't mean we don't look out beyond our own heart but we look first and primarily to our own heart. That means that as Gene is confessing or as you are confessing in your small group or in your marriage to whatever issues might be coming up; the effect of that confession should not be to stir suspicion but to provide an opportunity for us to look to ourselves - us to examine where we too might be doing that. And then to look out and seek to serve those that are confessing. But humility means we look first to our own heart and we don't assume that our perspective on other people is infallible.

"Humility means that we avoid over deference to elders. And that we take the necessary steps to humbly share our opinions, our observations and our grievances. Let there be no excessive deference to elders that silences us from sharing the things that we need to talk about. But when we do that we do it in a biblical manner and in a way that strives for the unity of the faith always asking this question. Does my approach on this issue unite the church? That is the question God is asking. Does my approach on this issue unite us together? Does it unite people, does it unite the church?

"You see one of the things I love about this local church is that there are areas where you're ahead of most other churches in this country. There are areas where you are ahead. In other words, you agreed 4 or 5 years ago to actually define how you going to do conflict in your relational commitments. This church has relational commitments. In 2006 [you] came out with them. That was a wonderful step and it is an extraordinary step for local churches. I mean, if you called any conciliation agency or ministry, any mediation ministry and asked them how many churches in the US have those? - they'd say, "Well, not many." In fact, my counsel to your pastors, and my counsel to this church this morning is simple. Just from here follow what you agreed upon. Follow what you agreed upon.

“Because believing others, whether it’s a leader, somebody in your small group, or it is you; believing others have failed doesn’t free us from applying Scripture. It doesn’t free us from doing that. The recourse there is the same. We appeal to the sinner, we cooperate humbling with the process, if we are unable to move forward we continue to seek to preserve the unity of the faith by involving other people, involving more objective people if necessary in a mediation or reconciliation assessment process. And then if none of that works, and then our conscience is still affected, then we depart upholding the unity of the faith.

“So humility means we avoid that over deference to elders and we humbly share our opinions. Humility also means that we avoid the tyranny of the aggrieved party. We avoid the tyranny of the aggrieved party. Now, may God help us to wisely care for victims of pastoral weakness and pastoral sin. May God help us to do that even more effectively in the future. You know like every family, like every church family, Sovereign Grace is full of sinners, and those sinners include pastors, and I actually spend a portion of my job just helping leaders to shepherd better. But I just want to see God help us to do that without wrongly assigning authority to someone because of how they have been sinned against. That can be a challenge at times.

“For those of you that are here and you may have sinned against, sinned against in this process, sinned against in the past, sinned against in your marriage, sinned against last night, maybe you can relate to the challenge that I experience when I am sinned against. When I am sinned against here’s my temptation. I want to assume a higher moral ground than the person who sinned against me. I want to assume that my recollection of the past is 20/20 and absolutely crystal clear. I want to assume that my heart is pure and that my perceptions, because I have a pure heart, my perceptions are accurate and therefore authoritative. I want to assume all of those things which in effect insulates me from any questions being asked, any observations being brought, and makes my position unassailable.

“And the challenge is that for most that approach and those assumptions reflect a heart not moving toward reconciliation. I know when it happens to me it is not moving toward reconciliation at all. Most of the time it is moving toward vindication. Not reconciliation but vindication. I want a hearing. I want to be vindicated. And that is a dangerous place to be. You see, humility does it differently, humility always speaks aware of our words, always speaks aware that our words uniquely reveal our heart. Again, my temptation is there are times where I want to speak and just not have my heart evaluated and in particular the times I want to speak and not have my heart evaluated are the times when I feel sinned against. And I think I am right. And I don’t want the

hassle of considering that I might be wrong in the way that I am evaluating the situation. I just want my situation saluted by other people.

“I’ve noticed over time, in being a husband, in being a father, leading a local church, being involved in many other local churches, I’ve noticed that the true measure of my grasp of the gospel can be clearly seen in how I respond when I am being sinned against. The true measure of my grasp of the gospel, whether I get it, is best displayed in how I am responding when I am sinned against and whether I think I am accountable for my words. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks. Or whether I just feel I am in a heart free speech zone. We are always speaking, we are always responding before the audience of One even when we have been sinned against. So humility means we avoid the tyranny of the aggrieved party.”

C.J., here are Gene’s relevant comments after Dave’s message.

“Now some of you have asked the question, what does accountability look like for an eldership. And I am so grateful that you are asking that question. It speaks of your care for us. I don’t know if you picked up on the point that Dave made at the beginning of his message when he spoke of voluntary accountability. One of the things I’ve appreciated about Sovereign Grace is our willingness, our commitment as a movement, to the reformation principal of always being reformed. So God has brought refinement in our understanding of extra local ministry. We understand that while authority resides in the local church it provides us the opportunity to voluntarily submit ourselves to Sovereign Grace Ministry for their evaluation and accountability. And Dave is serving us here this weekend as an expression of that deeply meaningful care.”

Here are the questions I sent to the leaders in KingsWay Community Church and Dave.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 19, 2010 6:40 PM  
**To:** Gary  
**Subject:** Dave Harvey

I’ve attached some thoughts for you.  
Brent

Hi Gary,

I listened to Dave’s message yesterday. I transcribed some of it below along with a few of Gene remarks at the end. Here are some questions you could ask yourself, Dave and Gene. I hope you find them helpful.



1. Did Dave's message increase or decrease the turmoil in the church?

Dave: "It seems to have pleased God for me to join you in a time of turmoil as a local church.... Your pastors have certainly not asked me to address this. In fact they are probably more nervous than you are right now."

2. If it increased, should Dave ask the church's forgiveness for adding to the turmoil instead of advancing understanding and peace?
3. Did the Kingsway pastors agree with Dave's comments about the tyranny of the aggrieved and the approach he took in correcting them?

Gene: "Well I want you to know that the pastors didn't ask Dave to bring that message but are very grateful for the message he brought."

4. Did Dave preach with an authority he does not have when he corrected a segment of the church without the approval of the pastors?
5. If Dave acted on his own, did he exercise authority he said at the beginning of the message he does not have?

Dave: "While I do formally serve this church on behalf of Sovereign Grace Ministries, I have no authority in this church whatsoever."

6. Did Dave examine his own heart first and ask himself why he made these comments in this way during a Sunday morning message he did not run pass the elders?

Dave: "But humility means we look first to our own heart and we don't assume that our perspective on other people is infallible."

7. Does Dave think his assessment of the "aggrieved" who are tyrannizing the church is infallible?
8. Do the pastors agree with Dave's perspective regarding the aggrieved in the church?
9. Did Dave talk to the aggrieved tyrants in private and share his concerns for them before publically rebuking them?

10. Was Dave angry or resentful towards the aggrieved and therefore spoke out of the abundance of his heart? Was he preaching in “a heart free speech zone?”

Dave: “Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks. Or whether I just feel I am in a heart free speech zone.”

11. Did Dave sin against these people? If so, is he willing to come back and ask forgiveness of them?
12. Did the pastors talk to Dave in advance about what he would share with the church? Or were they totally in the dark as Gene seems to imply? Did they know Dave would reprove a significant number of people? Or did Dave act on his own and violate SG polity?
13. Did Dave’s comments have the effect of silencing people for fear they will be viewed as offended and tyrannical?
14. Did Dave’s comments promote greater honesty and openness from the church with the pastors? With Sovereign Grace Ministries?
15. Who does Dave think is stirring up suspicion? Did he talk to them in private? Does a comment like the one below tend to manipulate people and silence them?

“The effect of that confession should not be to stir suspicion but to provide an opportunity for us to look to ourselves.”

16. Did Dave follow the Kingsway’s relational commitments which he exhorted the church to follow or did he act hypocritically?

Dave: “In fact, my counsel to your pastors, and my counsel to this church this morning is simple. Just from here follow what you agreed upon. Follow what you agreed upon.”

17. Is Dave an aggrieved party? Did he use the pulpit to “tyrannize” those he disagrees with?

Dave: “Humility also means that we avoid the tyranny of the aggrieved party.”

18. Does Dave feel there are people in the church that should leave? Did he run this exhortation past the pastors? Do they feel the same way?

Dave: "And then if none of that works, and then our conscience is still affected, then we depart upholding the unity of the faith."

19. Does Dave assume a higher moral ground, a pure heart, that his perceptions are accurate and authoritative and his position unassailable?

Dave: "I want to assume a higher moral ground than the person who sinned against me. I want to assume that my recollection of the past is 20/20 and absolutely crystal clear. I want to assume that my heart is pure and that my perceptions, because I have a pure heart, my perceptions are accurate and therefore authoritative. I want to assume all of those things which in effect insulates me from any questions being asked, any observations being brought, and makes my position unassailable."

20. Did Dave's comments move the church toward reconciliation?

Dave: "And the challenge is that for most that approach and those assumptions reflect a heart not moving toward reconciliation."

21. Did Dave comments and approach unify the church?

"Does my approach on this issue unite the church? That is the question God is asking."

Here is the follow up correspondence between Dave and me. Enough said..

**From:** Dave Harvey

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 05, 2010 4:20 PM

**To:** Brent Detwiler

**Cc:** Bud Moreland; Steve Whitman; Bob Dixon; Aaron Campbell; Doug Wilda; Matthew Williams; Gene Emerson

**Subject:** RE: Tyranny of the Aggrieved

Hey Brent, thanks for sending along your thoughts. Actually I had already received these questions, although I was not initially made aware they were from you. But I've urged Bob to forward them to the mediator and I welcome the mediator's evaluation of my motives and message in this process.<sup>172</sup>

I think of you often my friend. Hope you are well.

Dave

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 05, 2010 4:26 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Cc:** Bud Moreland; Steve Whitman; Bob Dixon; Aaron Campbell; Doug Wilda; Matthew Williams; Gene Emerson  
**Subject:** RE: Tyranny of the Aggrieved

Have you already provided a response to the questions? I'd like to know what your self evaluation is.<sup>173</sup> If you did, could you send a copy? If you didn't, could you write one up? I am more interested in your perspective than that of a mediator. Did you share these questions with C.J. and the local eldership?

**From:** Dave Harvey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 05, 2010 4:40 PM  
**To:** Brent Detwiler  
**Cc:** Bud Moreland; Steve Whitman; Bob Dixon; Aaron Campbell; Doug Wilda; Matthew Williams; Gene Emerson  
**Subject:** RE: Tyranny of the Aggrieved

Nope, been waiting for the mediator to get involved and I would urge you to do the same thing. CJ and the guys are all aware of the questions and I will be happy to answer any questions the mediator thinks are helpful.

**From:** Brent Detwiler  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 05, 2010 5:03 PM  
**To:** Dave Harvey  
**Cc:** Bud Moreland; Steve Whitman; Bob Dixon; Aaron Campbell; Doug Wilda; Matthew Williams; Gene Emerson  
**Subject:** RE: Tyranny of the Aggrieved

I think you missed a great opportunity to humble yourself and be transparent by answering the questions, or similar ones, without needing an assignment from the mediator. That kind of initiate would go a long way in rebuilding trust with the church and leaders. You should examine your heart and tell the men what you see.<sup>174</sup>

## Final Remarks

Because God is just (Deut 32:4), he never condemns the innocent, clears the guilty, or punishes with undue severity. I love this quote from my former mentor, Dr. J. Rodman Williams.

“Justice emerges from righteousness, not as describing God in Himself (as righteousness does in part), but in His relationship to man whereby He is first of all, fair, and equitable in all His ways.” (*Renewal Theology: God, the World & Redemption*, Volume 1, p. 62)

Justice serves alongside righteousness as the “the foundation of his throne” (Psa 89:14; 97:2). Like love it rejoices when people are 1) treated fairly and 2) afforded due process. It 3) shuns hypocrisy and 4) despises partiality. It 5) plays no favorites and 6) shows no bias. It 7) holds people accountable and 8) presses for truth. Yet its 9) judgments are equitable and 10) based on evidence. It 11) does not turn a blind eye to wrong doing. It 12) hates the manipulation of others and 13) does not cover up iniquity. It 14) treats all people the same. It has 15) no double standards. It is 16) integrity in heart and 17) truth in action.<sup>175</sup>

In “Response Regarding Friendship and Doctrine” I said the following. It bears repeating.

“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>176</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.” (p. 3)

The same is true of “A Final Appeal.” There has been a degradation of justice, truth and integrity in the movement. I’ve written out of my great love and affection for you. That’s why I’m laboring for reform. A pertinent Scripture comes to mind from Micah 6:8, “He has told you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?”

Last April at the Sovereign Grace Pastors Conference you 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."

I hope you will follow your own counsel and put an end to damage control by you and those related to you. Your strenuous assertion that damage control is not occurring, and will not occur in Sovereign Grace Ministries, is a form of damage control itself. You have knowingly lied, covered up, and concealed many times.<sup>177</sup>

I've not written exhaustively - many significant illustrations remain unshared. But I have written extensively. This is to persuade, not to condemn. My heart is not filled with bitterness. I have great affection for you. I don't live with feelings of animosity. I have researched my illustrations in order to recall them. They are not my bedfellows.

I've also written in detail knowing your propensity to dismiss, distort, and forget past events and conversations. I've endeavored to only make assertions I can support with facts and evidence. I have no interest in libel.

That is one of the reasons I've asked you to respond in writing over the last 10 months - a request you have adamantly refused. I am happy to be corrected. This is my final appeal. You are welcome to provide me an objective response of a similar nature to these documents. But I must hear from you.

What I've written is an exposé in the proper sense of the word. That is, "an exposure or a revelation of something discreditable....a formal exposition of facts" (The Free Dictionary). This is not tabloid journalism. Nor have I written an invective or a jeremiad. I am not predicting doom and this is not a vendetta. I desire your good and that of Sovereign Grace Ministries.

Two simple questions remain. First, are you willing to provide a thorough response to "Response Regarding Friendship and Doctrine" and "A Final Appeal." Second, do you see the need for a public acknowledgement to the blogosphere, a general confession to the movement, and a more detailed confession to the Sovereign Grace pastors and staff? Are you ready and willing to publically acknowledge your sins and explain the long process we've been through? This can be done in varying degrees depending on the audience.<sup>178</sup>

I'd also like to make two suggestions. First, share these documents in private with friends who are national leaders (e.g., Powlison, Piper, Dever, Mohler, etc.)<sup>179</sup> so they can encourage you and correct you when necessary. I made this same suggestion at our

August 20 meeting in 2004. Second, you should seriously consider a substantial sabbatical in order to pursue reconciliation with a host of individuals and help others to do the same.

C.J., you read several books a week so it is a small matter for you to promptly read this manuscript. At this point, you don't need additional counsel to answer the questions above. They are the same ones I've asked over the past seven months. Thus far you've repeatedly said no to the first and steadfastly avoided the second. I hope you'll reconsider. Please provide me definitive answers to the questions in the coming week.

My friend, I remain eager to meet but cannot do so unless you agree to the conditions above.<sup>180</sup> If you do, I am glad to talk through "Response Regarding Friendship and Doctrine" and "A Final Appeal" in private. We can also discuss how, when and where you will make public acknowledgments and confessions.

Over three decades, I have patiently, privately, and protectively brought to your attention the concerns covered in these papers. Please humble yourself for the sake of gospel and respond to my appeals in a thorough going, written and public manner.<sup>181</sup> If you do, it could have a tremendous impact on a large number of people, result in reform for Sovereign Grace Ministries and relational restoration in many other quarters for the glory of God.

ADDENDUM  
C.J.'S TRAVEL ITINERARY  
2005

Date	Event	Location
Jan 4-7	Work Retreat w Carolyn	
Jan 11-13	A-Team Retreat	Herndon, VA
Jan 30	Sovereign Grace Fellowship	Minneapolis, MN
Jan 31	CBMW Conference – Different By Design C.J. and Wayne Grudem	Minneapolis, MN
Jan 31-Feb 2	Bethlehem Pastors Conference	Minneapolis, MN
Feb 3-5	Vision New England Congress	Boston, MA
Feb 6	King of Grace Church	Boston MA
Feb 10-11	CBMW Board Meeting	Orlando, FL
Feb 17-21	Resolved Conference	Valencia, CA
Feb 27	Grace Community Church	Ashburn, VA
Feb 28-Mar 2	Meeting w/ Al Mohler, Ligon Duncan, & Mark Dever	Louisville, KY
Mar 27	Grace Community Church	Ashburn, VA
Mar 29-Apr 1	Work Retreat w/ Carolyn	
Apr 1	Sanctity of Life Ministries Banquet	Reston, VA
Apr 7-9	Desiring God Children's Ministry Conference	Minneapolis, MN
Apr 10	Capitol Hill Baptist Church	Washington, D.C.
Apr 17	Capitol Hill Baptist Church	Washington, D.C.
Apr 20-22	Sovereign Grace Leaders Conference	Hunt Valley, MD



May 8	Covenant Fellowship Church	Glen Mills, PA
May 14-16	Anniversary Trip at The Inn at Perry Cabin	Saint Michaels, MD
May 17-19	Pastors Colloquium with Dr. D.A. Carson	Trinity University Chicago, IL
May 22	Solid Rock Church	Riverdale, MD
Jun 2-5	Metro Life Church	Orlando, FL
Jun 5-12	Anniversary Trip	Orlando/Sarasota, FL
Jun 14-15	Carroll Valley Golf Retreat	Fairfield, PA
Jun 26	Grace Community Church	Ashburn, VA
Jul 4-8	Brighton Leaders Conference	Brighton, England
Jul 10-13	Christian Booksellers Association Convention	Denver, CO
Jul 17-31	Family Vacation	Knoxville, TN
Aug 7-9	CBMW Board Meeting	Little Rock, AR
Aug 18-22	Grace Community Church (John MacArthur)	Sun Valley, CA
Aug 28	Sovereign Grace Church	Fairfax, VA
Sep 4	Sovereign Grace Church	Fairfax, VA
Sep 9-11	Bible Church of Little Rock (Lance Quinn)	Little Rock, AR
Sep 18-23	Family Vacation at The Chatham Wayside Inn	Cape Cod, MD
Sep 25	Grace Community Church	Ashburn, VA
Sep 26-27	Meeting with Mohler, Dever, & Ducan	Louisville, KY
Sep 30-Oct 2	CrossWay Community Church	Charlotte, NC
Oct 3-5	Meeting with Lane Dennis & Justin Taylor	Chicago, IL

Oct 13-16	A-Team Retreat	Osprey Point, MD
Oct 23	Grace Community Church	Ashburn, VA
Oct 27-29	Small Group Leaders Conf. - East	Gaithersburg, MD
Nov 10-12	Small Group Leaders Conf. - West	Phoenix, AZ
Nov 16-18	Evangelical Theological Society	Valley Forge, PA
Nov 24-26	Family Vacation	Williamsburg, VA
Nov 27	Sovereign Grace Church	Fairfax, VA

## 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 those responses, you treated lightly or passed over a lot of crucial material. As a result, I've added endnotes to highlight what you failed to address or addressed inadequately.

<sup>2</sup> You didn't address this critical point in your responses. That is, why you skipped over so many important issues and illustrations. The "unconfessed" issues were determinative.

<sup>3</sup> These were all statements of fact. You refused to comment on how unwelcomed and unacceptable we were to you. You also refused to address any of these individual comments or actions including your own. At no point have you ever expressed any concern for Gene, Bob, or Dave.

<sup>4</sup> You never provided any proof to show how I misunderstood or misrepresented the four of you. That's because there was none. These summary comments were true, accurate, and presented in proper context.

<sup>5</sup> This is your default mode. Not just with me but with people in general. Concerns, criticism, or correction are typically viewed as rooted in bitterness (or pride). Therefore, they are unworthy of consideration because the person bringing them is blind. They can't see or see straight. In this case, my synopses are dismissed as unfounded implications when they are in reality, statements of fact, not perspective.

<sup>6</sup> You never addressed "covering up, manipulating, lording" in your responses. You denied ever lying. These four continue to be non-issues for you. No one you know has been guilty of these sins.

<sup>7</sup> In part because the blogs, Sovereign Grace Survivors and SGM Refuge, were putting tremendous pressure on you to deal with people who were speaking up about faults in Sovereign Grace Ministries.

<sup>8</sup> By leaving so much unaddressed in your responses, you avoided accountability, a reliable written witness, clarity, transparency, and completeness.

<sup>9</sup> You didn't address this common occurrence.

<sup>10</sup> In your March 11, 2011 reply you denied doing the obvious.

<sup>11</sup> You didn't address this example of hypocrisy.

<sup>12</sup> You said nothing about Bob's bias or partiality and how he enabled you in sin.

<sup>13</sup> You didn't acknowledge being resentful toward me regarding vacation days.

<sup>14</sup> You didn't address this pattern of using others in your defense or for the correction of people on your behalf.

<sup>15</sup> A very important point and something you didn't address or acknowledge.

<sup>16</sup> This was mere lip service. My observations were not welcomed. In fact, you were terribly offended by my observations which were simply practical and not even personal.

<sup>17</sup> This was a lie, spin, manipulation, cover-up, whatever...you manifestly misrepresented the truth. You skipped over this example of deception.

<sup>18</sup> You didn't answer any of these questions either. You skipped this section on "punishment" and "self pitying" also.

<sup>19</sup> Your humble sounding requests were intended to create a setting whereby you could correct my perspective, defend yourself, and address the bitterness in my heart you thought was motivating me. In your Dec. 16, 2010 you acknowledged sinfully reacting to me and sinfully judging me but didn't develop your meaning.

<sup>20</sup> You did not address this guise for getting Bob involved. You feigned humility as a pretense for self vindication by having Bob reprove me. That was the real reason for letting him know about my questions and concerns.

<sup>21</sup> You fooled me. Here are some relevant definitions. Feint – a deceptive act or an assumed appearance, often of the nature of an artifice (trickery). Pretense – an aim, an endeavor to arrive; applies to that which is falsely or deceitfully held out as real or true. Deceit - 1. making a person believe as true something that is false; deceiving; lying; cheating 2. a dishonest trick; a lie spoken or acted 3. the quality in a person that makes him tell lies or cheat

---

<sup>22</sup> You were convinced I was judging you.

<sup>23</sup> You didn't answer this question.

<sup>24</sup> You skipped over this. You didn't acknowledge the punishing (and detrimental) response that followed your sinful judgments. Unfortunately, this kind of sinful reaction is typical, not exceptional. Heads can roll when you are crossed. A lot of people have gone missing over the decades. You must come to grips with how you treat people when you are bitter at them. You didn't do this with me in either of your responses. In fact, you denied any ill treatment of me.

<sup>25</sup> This entire illustration points out the contrasts in how we related to each other after August 20, 2004.

<sup>26</sup> Unilaterally to suit your own desires.

<sup>27</sup> You didn't acknowledge any resentment or distrust.

<sup>28</sup> Bob was supposed to be pastoring your soul. Instead of asking you questions, he was asking me questions fueled by your judgments. By this time, Dave had stopped bringing up issues of the heart. Steve continued his pattern of not differing with you.

<sup>29</sup> I don't know about that but it was an important and significant responsibility. Pat was aware of the repercussions.

<sup>30</sup> You didn't address this sinful pattern.

<sup>31</sup> You made some brief comments in your Dec. 16, 2010 reply to this 29 page illustration regarding "The Request for Chad and Vacation Days" about how you judged me, made it difficult for me to interact with you, and didn't appreciate my care, concern or encouragement. You didn't cite your specific judgments or the particular ways you made it so difficult. Your comments were general. Much more importantly, however, you didn't address the issue of sending Bob to confront me. This was not the first time and it would not be the last time. Each time constituted a serious abuse of authority.

<sup>32</sup> Once again, you didn't address your deceitful activity in withholding information from Bob or the defiling effect of your evil report upon Bob.

<sup>33</sup> Bob was clueless but confidently asserted his agreement with your calculations which were seriously in error. Furthermore, his rationale was extremely flawed. He justified a custom made vacation policy for you. No one else abused the system in this way. Of course, Bob got his defense for why this was okay from you.

<sup>34</sup> You didn't say anything in your responses about the ungodly occasions when you used Bob to reprove me nor did you express any concern for Bob. This was another case of lording it over me. That is, using Bob in a heavy handed manner for your own selfish benefit at my expense.

<sup>35</sup> At this point, I must conclude you knowingly violated our vacation policy. You added 10 days of vacation because you felt entitled to them. You justified this action but it was a clear violation of our policy. You never asked for exceptions or adaptations in your case. You acted on your own without our knowledge. You said, "I'd also encourage you to contact Tommy Hill, as I have reviewed your documents with him and to date he has no concerns about this matter." If Tommy has no concerns it is because you did not provide him all the data necessary or he is unclear regarding the issues at hand. I will send him your travel itinerary for 2005 which I've added as an addendum.

<sup>36</sup> Bob judged me in many serious ways. He never got back to me to ask forgiveness. You never directed him to ask my forgiveness. Bob was supremely arrogant in his sinful assessment of me. My ten points should have resulted in his immediate contrition and repentance. Instead, he held himself above evaluation and never responded to me. This was "paradigmatic" or a predictable pattern. Like other experiences with Bob, it was also a harbinger of things to come - worse things. That is, when he headed up my assessment 20 months later in June/July 2009 and declared me unfit for ministry.

<sup>37</sup> That avoidance of accountability continues to this day.

<sup>38</sup> Bob did the same thing. This resulted in lording.

<sup>39</sup> And not simply verbal assurances but an abundance of written assurances (i.e., evidence). Facts were irrelevant to you and Bob. This practice should scare you. Please desist and get real accountability.

<sup>40</sup> It is hard to overemphasize how self-exalting Bob was in this declaration of sin. He was practically omniscient and someone who thinks of themselves this way is impossible to convince otherwise. Bob

---

helped me plant and build the church in Charlotte beginning in 1991. He was later sent out from the church to work for SGM in 1997. I am genuinely grateful for Bob and Julie's labors during those six years. I could not have done it by myself or been as effective without the Kauflins. They contributed so much good to the church and my indebtedness remains. But during those years, I came to see the extent of Bob's messianic complex. It led to his mental, emotional, and physical breakdown – something he has openly shared with the public. I respect how Bob battled this condition and recovered from the symptoms. But during those six years, I was regularly on the receiving end of Bob's anger (rooted in his self righteousness) which was not due to any provocation from me according to Bob. In the past, Bob has expressed his regret to me on several occasions for his sorrowful conduct and simultaneously expressed his gratitude for my patience, forgiveness, long suffering, and kindness toward him.

<sup>41</sup> This kind of lording behavior should be confessed to the pastors and movement. Your "superior discernment" leads to the abuse of people. It needs to end.

<sup>42</sup> There is no room for disagreement with you (and Bob) because you are always right and see deep into the inner workings of man's sinful hearts.

<sup>43</sup> That was a far cry from your answer to Pat's question on August 20 about why you wouldn't share what you were thinking. At the time, you said because you didn't want to interrupt the conviction that was taking place in your heart. You should have been honest about Dave and me at the August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. Afterward, you had no problem putting us in a bad light with the CLC pastors and keeping that information from us.

<sup>44</sup> I couldn't believe what I was hearing. Bob was confronting me on what I must do to win back your confidence and trust while you were on the phone affirming his points. He had it completely backward! As is now obvious, this question should have been directed at you. I was staggered by the audacious nature with which I was being manipulated. I was cornered like an animal without an escape. I was dead meat. Not surprisingly, you didn't address this conversation in either response.

<sup>45</sup> Hardly...when Dave and I did not give you our approval (i.e., the worship you craved) we were figuratively thrown in the fire.

<sup>46</sup> From August 2004 to November 2005, Bob asked all the wrong questions.

<sup>47</sup> Neither did Bob.

<sup>48</sup> You denied lying in your Mar. 11, 2011 response. You didn't address the matter of deceit. You acknowledged no independence. Just, "Perhaps here is another example of how I sometimes led by expedience and not process."

<sup>49</sup> This was typical. You disagreed with all of us and remained unconvicted. You never got back to us.

<sup>50</sup> You totally ignored this example in your responses.

<sup>51</sup> Something Dave rarely does in print.

<sup>52</sup> That was exactly what you did. You had a tight rein on the process in order to protect yourself. You effectively controlled everything that happened. You misused your position in order to accomplish this feat.

<sup>53</sup> That was understatement.

<sup>54</sup> It was another example of independence and autocracy.

<sup>55</sup> Here we are seven years later still reaping the bad fruit that resulted from your control and manipulation of the process.

<sup>56</sup> This amounted to a cover-up. We couldn't penetrate the fortress you erected.

<sup>57</sup> You denied doing this in any fashion.

<sup>58</sup> At no point in your Dec. 16, 2010 and Mar. 11, 2011 responses, did you express the slightest concern for Dave, Gene or Bob. In contradistinction, you expressed concerns that I wrongly implicated them.

<sup>59</sup> You totally skipped over this "more than any other example" of extraordinary hypocrisy. Your word and promise were worthless. Reconciliation will never be possible until you, Dave, Bob and Gene come to grips with this flagrant hypocrisy and disregard for due process.

---

<sup>60</sup> From the beginning, because Bob was leading my evaluation, I had little hope for a just outcome. If you were remotely concerned for objectively you'd never have put Bob in charge. Of course, my request to not involve Bob in my assessment was denied.

<sup>61</sup> This needs to be spelled out to the movement and the pastors. I've progressively shared my experience with you out of necessity given your lack of transparency and responsiveness. I've not included or researched the stories of others whose experience parallels my own. Why is this important? Because the issues I've raised have impacted large numbers of people. They are not only germane to you and me. So I've used my experience and referenced myself but it is for the good of others. As I've said before, this is not primarily about you and me. That is secondary. The issues, concerns and observations I've brought up are much broader in their relevance and applicability.

<sup>62</sup> Steve is a reflection of you and your directive input.

<sup>63</sup> You didn't address this section either.

<sup>64</sup> Once again you used an intermediary. This time it was Dave (not Gene, Bob, Kenneth, or Jeff). What he told me was a complete surprise. You had never talked to me or expressed any concerns to me for a "lack of gifting and capacity."

<sup>65</sup> You've done this kind of thing so many times to so many people. You make huge decisions that adversely affect people but don't personally communicate with them or explain your actions. They are left holding the bag; confused and hurting. Furthermore, you introduce these kinds of changes by e-mail or the use of other go betweens.

<sup>66</sup> Dave, Steve and Bob should have required that a formal evaluation be done before changes were made in my job description. More importantly they should have challenged your heart motives and given me the opportunity to understand your perspective. But you were above accountability for your decisions and actions, and these men were unwilling to address you. The culture of accommodation had grown by this time. My trust and respect for you were further eroded. Six months later, I would voluntarily resign from the apostolic team. One of the reasons, I could no longer represent you with a clear conscience.

<sup>67</sup> I never heard back from Dave.

<sup>68</sup> This too is a common response by you and others. The bitterness card and pride card are frequently played under this type of circumstance. They silence people.

<sup>69</sup> One of the most shocking aspect of the last six years has been the willingness of close friends to lie, slander, and deceive in order to save face, protect their positions, or curry your favor.

<sup>70</sup> This was spin of the worst kind.

<sup>71</sup> That is, honest or truthful.

<sup>72</sup> This was not the first time, nor the last time, Larry wrongly accused and maligned me. He was able to get away with this because you, Dave and Steve were happy to hear and believe anything Larry told you regardless of its accuracy.

<sup>73</sup> That is, sinful judgments that translated into evil reports.

<sup>74</sup> Larry "sinfully...listened." True. He was looking for things that could be used against me. This is something he has always been prone to do with people. It has resulted in many offenses. Larry can be a not-so-pastoral "bull in a china shop." This was a description I used with him. It was an area I worked with Larry on for over 20 years. That is, relating to people with grace and truth not harshness and sinful judgments. In the end, looking good in your sight was more important than our friendship. I was betrayed by my long time friend on several occasions. Of course, it did not help that you encouraged this betrayal, for instance, by having Larry send you secret "sin" reports about me.

<sup>75</sup> "Sharing inaccurately as well as wrongly characterizing" (not only my teaching) is what I'm talking about in regard to Larry.

<sup>76</sup> You didn't address this example.

<sup>77</sup> This type of thing repeatedly happened.

<sup>78</sup> It became the norm to believe the worse about me without any inquiry, research or interaction.

<sup>79</sup> These were both horrible judgments by Mickey and Larry. Sadly, Jim, Joe and John also provided tacit support.

---

<sup>80</sup> I was confronted by Dave and Gene for something that was untrue, unfounded, and unwarranted. I brought this to their attention but they were not open to any adjustment. Their charges were based upon evil reports from Larry and Mickey. They had not listened to the message.

<sup>81</sup> All the pastors were present when Mickey made this request on Feb. 28, 2009 (different than the occasion referenced below in Endnote 82). It was a tragic meeting. Not everyone spoke but all agreed in advance with the verdict. I was misled by Gene to believe our meeting was a time for discussion. Instead it turned out to be a tribunal conducted by the CrossWay“ pastors with Gene’s hearty approval. There was no room for dissent.

<sup>82</sup> I think Larry included this statement knowing his heart and attitude had in fact changed toward me. He was extremely angry at me for supposedly recruiting and putting people on the 50 yard line. He gave vent to his anger in the lobby after the Sunday meeting while talking with John Schaaf. Two weeks later on Nov. 31, 2007, I was confronted by Mickey and Larry for recruiting and handling the church planting process in a selfish manner with little concern for the well being of CrossWay Community Church. Jim, Joe and John were also present and supported Mickey and Larry in this chastisement.

<sup>83</sup> This horrendous message per Larry was a really big deal and he used as a launching pad for his sinful judgments; all of which were readily accepted as true. His judgments were also passed onto the CW pastors and caused considerable offense and difficulty. This was a primary example of my sinful and selfish motivations.

<sup>84</sup> You made no mention of this example and expressed no concerns for Larry or the sinful judgments you embraced.

<sup>85</sup> This constituted malicious slander. The intent was to harm, damage and ruin my standing before friends who had a high regard for me and played a critical role as leaders in the church. Here is how the Bible describes what happened. Proverbs 16:28 A perverse man spreads strife, and a slanderer separates intimate friends.

<sup>86</sup> This is painful to recall. One feels so helpless. So dominated. So abused. Oops, now I’m playing the part of a victim! And of course, you skipped over this example in both of your responses.

<sup>87</sup> To a fault, I was obeying 1 Cor. 6:7 which says “Actually, then, it is already a defeat for you, that you have lawsuits with one another. Why not rather be wronged? Why not rather be defrauded?”

<sup>88</sup> This is the other way you commonly quench disagreement. People don’t want to be labeled as proud so they remain silent or withdrawal their voice after unsuccessful attempts to raise concerns. In the later case, they may leave a conversation having been corrected by you (or others) and think their concerns were crazy. Then they live with confusion regarding their observations and how to interpret their bad experiences. They tend to assume they are wrong and maybe nuts. They think, “How can C.J. be deceitful, wrong, judgmental, bitter, hypocritical, lording, unaccountable, harsh?” But often they are correct.

<sup>89</sup> Dave never got back to me on this example and, of course, no one was interested in “other examples [that] could be cited.” Only now are you hearing about some of them.

<sup>90</sup> As a matter of fact, not pride, I let numerous examples of abuse go by the wayside.

<sup>91</sup> We still haven’t. You failed to address this sorrowful experience. Here’s the obvious point. You, Dave, Steve and Pat sinned against me. Larry pointed this out to you but you showed no concern for your transgression or for its effects upon me. There was no follow up or accountability for your actions.

<sup>92</sup> Mickey resented this statement. He told me I was sinfully motivated in wanting to plant a “real church.”

<sup>93</sup> I was unexpectedly “exiled” after I turned the church over to Mickey.

<sup>94</sup> These were the first two, and only two, examples of independence brought to my attention. They were presented by you as major illustrations of my pride and independence. The first was completely unfounded. The second contained truth which I owned.

<sup>95</sup> Seriously, if the manner in which I presented the church planting proposal was such a terrible expression of pride and independence, then how should you (and the SGM Board) view the countless

---

examples of “expedience” in your life and ministry? Further, this example regarding the church planting proposal has been used against since 2006 to prove my independence.

<sup>96</sup> While meaningful, helpful, and significant, the Dec. 16, 2010 and Mar. 11, 2011 responses fell well short of this goal. You chose to leave unaddressed the majority of illustrations and the most important points.

<sup>97</sup> You expressed no concern for any lack of integrity, truth telling or justice in Sovereign Grace Ministries or your personal life and ministry. Therefore, you see no need for restoration or reformation. My biggest concern is of no concern to you.

<sup>98</sup> It is hard to overstate the importance of this statement. It has been my fervent prayer and hope that you would lead by example. I’d love see a response characterized by honesty and transparency. Where there is no obfuscation and nothing is covered up even if this sets the ministry back 2 or 3 years. Ken Sande asked me what I thought you might be fearful of in this process. That’s easy. The truth. Don’t worry about image, reputation, and looking good. Don’t fear the loss of people or income. Don’t hide the truth about yourself. Openly acknowledge it and contritely lead others to do the same.

<sup>99</sup> All of these men (Dave, Bob, Steve, Gene, Mickey and Larry) need to follow your example in making public confessions. Your repentance and confession should inform their repentance and confession. They are imitators of you.

<sup>100</sup> You expressed no interest and saw no need for a public confession.

<sup>101</sup> You didn’t address the analogy. Regarding NCC you said in the Mar. 11, 2011 response, “I think you’re aware that I eventually perceived how poorly I handled this, and that I sought to be reconciled with Ken Roberts, met with the pastoral team, asked their forgiveness, and was graciously forgiven. If there is more you think I need to do, I would be eager to hear that.” There is more to do. You never grasped “how poorly” you and Dave handled the situation, but I address that further in Part 3: Concluding Remarks.

<sup>102</sup> You didn’t acknowledge this illustration.

<sup>103</sup> You didn’t address this example.

<sup>104</sup> This was a remarkable expression of Bob’s bias and unwillingness to pursue the truth wherever it led him.

<sup>105</sup> You skipped this also.

<sup>106</sup> You said nothing about the effect of your resentment upon your wife. Her withdrawing and distancing from Jenny was a mirror image of your withdrawing and distancing from me.

<sup>107</sup> I stated this mildly. Carolyn’s bitterness toward me ended her friendship with Jenny.

<sup>108</sup> Correction – should read, “No longer touch base with Jenny ever.”

<sup>109</sup> In the responses, you agreed with the first point, but disagreed with the second and third points.

<sup>110</sup> Dave did not speak or write with “unvarnished honesty.” He addressed you, Bob and Kenneth like teenagers. Note the understated or sugar coated way he interacted in the following e-mails. Dave sometimes crosses the line and is dishonest or manipulative in what he writes. He will also use flattery to attain his desired end. Job 32:20-22 (ESV) I [Elihu] must speak, that I may find relief; I must open my lips and answer. [21] I will not show partiality to any man or use flattery toward any person. [22] For I do not know how to flatter, else my Maker would soon take me away.

<sup>111</sup> Here is an example of dishonest speech. This was not a paradox or apparent discrepancy. Dave knew we were dealing with hypocrisy but avoided the use of the word.

<sup>112</sup> These discrepancies were not “apparent” to Dave. They were evident to him. See pages 29-30 and 75-77 in RRF&D.

<sup>113</sup> Honestly, this was an incredulous response from Bob and Kenneth.

<sup>114</sup> You didn’t address this example of favoritism with Mickey.

<sup>115</sup> I did not need to list “Larry’s observations” of you for Dave because he was familiar with them (i.e., partiality and favoritism; little to no compassionate, mercy, patience or encouragement; bitterness and anger). I copied Larry on this e-mail. We were all in agreement and shared our concerns with you.

<sup>116</sup> Which included all the things mentioned above.



---

<sup>117</sup> Meaning analogous or parallel to Larry's input for you. That is, we were all saying the same thing and expressing the same concerns.

<sup>118</sup> Which you also didn't remember.

<sup>119</sup> Which continues to this very day. You remain unconvinced and not convicted. Amazingly, you skipped over this entire illustration; yet, you said the following in your Mar. 11, 2011 response. "You also note that numerous individuals expressed concerns that I was resentful and bitter toward you. Brent, I am sorry but I am unaware of who these people might be. If you are comfortable, please let me know who they are—perhaps their perspective could be helpful to me. I would be eager to talk to them." Wow...you could start with Dave and Larry. Ask Dave to produce his January 2006 letter. I hope they will be integrous and not change their story.

<sup>120</sup> Three months later you confronted me for saying your sins were serious. Bob and Kenneth did the same thing in the ensuing months.

<sup>121</sup> Your hypocrisy is almost as pronounced and pervasive as your pride (cf. "I [C.J.] am convinced this discipline was necessary because of the pronounced and pervasive presence of pride in my heart."). Yet, you cited only one example of hypocrisy in your responses. Otherwise, you repeatedly denied being a hypocrite of any stripes. For your own good, I hope you embrace this truth about yourself and stop suppressing what you know to be true. It will liberate you. You were very willing (and committed) to tell us about our sins but completely unwilling to tell us about your sins. You must deal with this unprecedented expression of hypocrisy.

<sup>122</sup> It was also an unprecedented methodology (to put it nicely) and one I hope is never repeated again. You manipulated controlled the process and manipulated the people around you.

<sup>123</sup> You found no fault with Bob. You expressed no concerns for Bob. You acknowledged no enabling by Bob.

<sup>124</sup> I was trying to use some of Dave's sugar coating. Many things were unaddressed.

<sup>125</sup> All my observations and concerns were rejected but my conscience was clear. By God's grace I obeyed the Lord and not been silent. I found no pleasure in testifying that your deeds were evil (see John 7:7) but no one else was willing to speak up at this point. Dave just removed himself. I think he was in a triage unit. ☺

<sup>126</sup> You ignored these two examples and offered no comment regarding Bob's defense and twisting of the facts.

<sup>127</sup> True. Given your intransigence, and Bob's incompetence (among other things), we were moving on in a spirit of resignation.

<sup>128</sup> This was yet again other example of lording which you did not address.

<sup>129</sup> You were already so resentful.

<sup>130</sup> Bob's leadership harmed the team and reinforced your prideful resistance. If not for Bob, we might have helped you and avoided the last six years. Bob should ask forgiveness for a lot.

<sup>131</sup> Bingo...you did acknowledge these should have been discussed and answered! But, clear the board, you did not say anything about Bob and Kenneth's sinful obstruction or your ungodly use of them to block us from getting legitimate answers.

<sup>132</sup> You didn't address this entire section. You were largely unaccountable but led us to believe you were extremely accountable. This involved deceit and hypocrisy on your part.

<sup>133</sup> You skipped over this example of deceit and made no comment.

<sup>134</sup> Someone needs to reprove Bob and hold him accountable for his actions. He also needs biblical counseling so he can understand his sinful cravings and deceitful heart, etc.

<sup>135</sup> This story should be told to the movement as a way of acknowledging your deceit, hypocrisy and lack of accountability.

<sup>136</sup> You addressed this section by saying you will do whatever Dave, Joshua and Jeff advise.

<sup>137</sup> You denied any such "change in...disposition toward me."

<sup>138</sup> You denied this "breakdown in relationship" had any bearing on your (or others) subsequent treatment of me.

---

<sup>139</sup> You didn't say anything about the 18 month period during which you totally withdrew from me. It went unaddressed.

<sup>140</sup> You didn't address this.

<sup>141</sup> Bob's total lack of concern was so foolish.

<sup>142</sup> You continue to hold this position and perspective. No one you know has lied, covered up, manipulated or lorded it over. You maintain the same view of yourself.

<sup>143</sup> Nothing in either response indicates any change whatsoever on this point. You continue to hold this position and perspective. No one you know is guilty of duplicity, dishonesty, injustice, lying, spin, manipulation, lording, cover-up, partiality, deceit, sinful judging, unbiblical actions, or hypocrisy. You also maintain your own innocence in all these respects except for sinful judging and one occasion of hypocrisy.

<sup>144</sup> Your total lack of concern continues as do our differing places of residency...galaxies separated by light years.

<sup>145</sup> There is no remedy unless you come to see the seriousness of the situation.

<sup>146</sup> This continued in both your responses. You expressed no concern for any of your friends. The only concern you expressed was for me in relation to them.

<sup>147</sup> You repeated this concern in your Mar. 11, 2011 response when you said, "You also implicate numerous other individuals in the events leading up to and surrounding your departure." In stark contrast, you voiced no concern that anyone has ever wrongly implicated me.

<sup>148</sup> Each statement in this paragraph is factual and fair. You did not address any of them in your responses.

<sup>149</sup> You refused to supply any kind of an answer to these questions. You made assertions but were unwilling to supply any evidence in support of those assertions.

<sup>150</sup> You addressed none of this in either of your responses.

<sup>151</sup> You addressed nothing in this crucial section! You ignored it and passed over it. Moreover, you expressed absolutely no concerns for Dave. How can this be?

<sup>152</sup> You didn't answer the question.

<sup>153</sup> You provided no clarification. You need to provide clear answers.

<sup>154</sup> You also addressed nothing in this crucial section! You ignored it and passed over it. Moreover, you expressed absolutely no concerns for Gene. How can this be?

<sup>155</sup> Something you need to do as the President of Sovereign Grace Ministries. You knew about and signed off on this cover up.

<sup>156</sup> Which continues to this very hour. If you were interested in truth, this would have been addressed openly and candidly a long time ago.

<sup>157</sup> That's because the truth was being cover up.

<sup>158</sup> Which was a typical and purposeful way to evade accountability. It still is. That is one of the reasons I asked you for an open, honest, and thorough response in print to RRF&D and AFA. You chose not to provide such an accounting in preparation for face to face meetings.

<sup>159</sup> You have taken no disciplinary action with Gene but I'm afraid the Lord has. Over the last two years, 450 good people have left the church. I find no joy in this tragic development. They were dear folks and fine servants. I knew many of them. So the church has gone from 700 to 250. That means two out of three people have left. Why? They lost trust in Gene and Sovereign Grace Ministries. In large measure this was due to the patterns of sin identified in Gene's life by me and others but ignored and rebuffed by you and others. So many people have been devastated as a result.

<sup>160</sup> You addressed nothing in this crucial section! You ignored it and passed over it. Moreover, you expressed absolutely no concerns for Bob. How can this be?

<sup>161</sup> Was Bob authorized by the Board of SGM to lay down this harsh requirement or did he act unilaterally and independently of you and the Board? Whatever the case, you did not address this abuse. I assume it was of no concern to you. Well, it was and is of concern to me. Since when does someone like Bob have

---

the authority to determine where you can and cannot live and minister? Since when can someone like Bob impose his will upon a family and separate them from each other? Holy cow!

<sup>162</sup> I have brought this issue up again and again. You have never answered any of my questions. You just ignore this crucial subject and refuse to respond except to say I have misunderstood and misrepresented you. You have yet to give any explanation whatsoever. In this context, I was most concerned for your manipulative and deceptive about face. Of course, you didn't address this particular example of "spin."

<sup>163</sup> You didn't address any of the issues in this section.

<sup>164</sup> You expressed no interest in knowing more about Gene's abusive ways. Not even a single follow up question.

<sup>165</sup> Many of the sins mentioned in this section were on prominent display in Gene's dealings with me beginning in March 2008 when Jenny and me visited Richmond.

<sup>166</sup> Gene was now loaded for bear having been armed with your sinful judgments of me.

<sup>167</sup> And yet you have no concerns for Gene. This was one of the worst experiences of my life - Jenny's too. How many other people has Gene treated in the same way? I confess, I did not care for Gene adequately. I am partially to blame for his abuses. God forgive me.

<sup>168</sup> You provided no comment on this example regarding Dave.

<sup>169</sup> Something so clearly warranted but never done. As a result, many more people left the church. If Dave had humbled himself and acknowledged his fault, this could have been prevented. Instead he was the cause of division.

<sup>170</sup> To my knowledge Dave never answered any of these questions. If he did, he never provided them to me, Steve Whitman, Bob Dixon, or Buddy Moreland. Dave ducked all accountability for his sinful actions. You allowed this to happen. It should be corrected.

<sup>171</sup> I wanted to make sure you were fully informed. I hoped you would take action. You took none.

<sup>172</sup> If Dave made an evaluation, Gene never shared it with the church.

<sup>173</sup> Of course, Dave never provided me his "self-evaluation."

<sup>174</sup> This was never done with Steve Whitman, Bob Dixon or Buddy Moreland and to the best of my knowledge it was not done with the pastors. You and the SGM Board should insist that Dave provide written answers to these questions. Then direct him back to Kingsway Community Church in order to share those answers with the church in an accountable and transparent fashion. Otherwise, this is just another example of cover-up. The people in Richmond might not agree with Dave's answers but they'll appreciate his candor.

<sup>175</sup> This 17 part definition of justice sums up my concerns for you and some key leaders in Sovereign Grace Ministries. This may be the most important paragraph I have written in either document. But it is of no relevance to you and receives no comment from you. Why, because you have little awareness of injustice in your life or the lives of leaders you know in Sovereign Grace Ministries. How can I say this? What is the basis for such a statement? Well it's simple. At no point in your Dec. 16, 2010 and Mar. 11, 2011 responses to RRF&D and AFA, do you express the slightest degree of concern for injustice (except sinful judging by you). Should one conclude then that there is no unjust treatment or denial of due process for critics; no hypocrisy or partiality by leaders; no favoritism between leaders towards those who liked/well connected or bias against those who are disliked/less influential; no lack of accountability for senior leaders; no indifference to the truth and its application in leaders lives; no sinful judgments of people bringing correction based upon hearsay evidence; no unwillingness to correct fellow leaders for wrong doing; no spin or love of reputation; no cover up, no preferential treatment of leaders based upon position or social status; no reduction in standards for some well liked/well positioned leaders; and no lack of integrity or honesty in word or action by you and key leaders in your service? Of course, I realize you wouldn't rule out in entirety the possibility of these sins, but they are not a concern to you. As you've said before, you don't know anyone who is guilty of these sins.

<sup>176</sup> At no point did you talk about your love of reputation.

<sup>177</sup> Damage control (e.g., lying, covering up, concealing), self-preservation, and love of reputation all go together. You said nothing about them.

---

<sup>178</sup> You were unwilling to provide a thorough response and expressed no need for a public confession.

<sup>179</sup> As a means of grace to you, I hope this has already occurred. I wish it had occurred in 2004 as recommended. These men must be informed.

<sup>180</sup> You have not agreed to these conditions. Therefore, we have not met.

<sup>181</sup> You are unwilling to do this so we've come to the end of the road!