

REPORT ON MATTERS PERTAINING TO ROANOKE, TEXAS, CHURCH OF CHRIST RELATING TO DUB MCCLISH

By DUB MCCLISH

Introduction

After close association with the Pearl Street Congregation in Denton, Texas, for approximately twenty-two years in various capacities (local preacher, missionary, elder), my family (Lavonne, our granddaughter [Paige Gibson], and I) left in May 2003. Our departure became necessary because of doctrinal error (i.e., belief in the Holy Spirit errors of Mac Deaver) that had infiltrated the Pearl Street eldership. After fighting this doctrine within the eldership for more than a year, when my voice was no longer effective (I was one of four elders), and there was no possibility of salvaging the eldership or the congregation, I resigned. The elders of the nearby Roanoke, Texas, Church (20 miles distant from our house in Denton) welcomed us and we placed membership there on May 25, 2003. The elders accepted oversight of my work, helped with our financial support, and defended us over the next year in the face of a withering series of slanderous attacks by the remaining “elders” at Pearl Street. Just as Pearl Street abandoned its campaign against me as a lost cause, Lavonne was diagnosed with a virulent malignancy (Mantle Cell Lymphoma). The Roanoke brethren also helped us through the dark days of her chemotherapy, followed by a stem cell transplant, which stretched over into the first half of 2005. We shall always be grateful for their support through those stormy times.

In February 2005, brother Lynn Parker (in his lecture at the Spring, Texas, Lectureship) exposed brother Stan Crowley’s errors on marriage, divorce, and remarriage. This speech enraged the Roanoke preacher, brother Bryan Braswell, a former classmate of brother Crowley’s at Southwest School of Bible Studies, in Austin, Texas. Brother Braswell falsely claimed that brother Parker unfairly attacked brother Crowley, and he was able to convince the Roanoke elders that brother Parker and the church at Spring were attempting to “divide the brotherhood” over an inconsequential doctrine. Both the Roanoke preacher and one of the elders (brother Cleatius Copeland) began to frequently criticize to me brother Parker, brother David Brown (preacher at Spring), the Spring Congregation, and *Contending for the Faith* (which brother Brown edits and co-owns with one of the Spring elders). I sought to defuse the situation as much as possible each time they approached me on the subject, but they were determined to be very vocal about the matter. I did not broach the subject to them, for I deemed them to be unreasonable concerning it. However, I did respond when they opened discussions with me about it, and I made them aware, as kindly as possible, yet unmistakably, that I did not agree with either their doctrine on the issue or with their attitude toward brother Parker or the brethren at Spring. (The beginning part of the document that follows these introductory remarks relates directly to the foregoing events.)

In May 2005, the news broke concerning brother Bert Thompson’s sins and consequent dismissal as Executive Director of Apologetics Press. As I sought

information and as information came to me concerning these matters, in an effort to separate fact from rumor, I prepared a brief “summation” of these facts. I sent this to only a very select few (including the Roanoke elders and preacher), never intending it to be further distributed. However, one or more of those to whom I sent it, passed it on via e-mail, and it soon was in wide circulation. When it reached brother Frank Chesser, preacher for the congregation of which most of the Apologetics Press employees were members, he reacted to what I had written with great wrath. He assumed (wrongly) that I had written my “summation” and had distributed it widely for the express purpose of doing harm. Accordingly, he wrote an extremely severe letter to and about me and mailed it to hundreds of brethren. The Chesser letter and my “summation” caused concern in the Roanoke elders. (My opinion is that, had I agreed with their criticisms of brethren Parker and Brown and their defense of brother Crowley, they might have been more supportive.)

Rather than giving me “the benefit of the doubt,” as one whom they knew well (I had been in close association with the Roanoke Church for many years before we became members there, filling in numerous times in absence of their preacher and preaching in a Gospel meeting there a few years earlier), they questioned my motives for writing the “summation” and, at least in the beginning of a two-hour meeting, they appeared sympathetic with the enraged sentiments of Frank Chesser. The July 9 meeting ended with a better understanding on their part of why I had written the “summation” and that I had not been responsible for its wide circulation. Nevertheless, they stated that from thenceforth, if I wrote anything for circulation that I “thought” might be “controversial,” they would like to see it before it was circulated. This statement “rule” involved pure subjectivism and could only amount to a form of censorship, regardless of denials to the contrary. I came away from that discussion acutely aware that I could not live and work with others looking over my shoulder second-guessing every word I wrote or said. It was clear that I no longer had their full confidence and that it would be in their best interest and mine for me to find another eldership to oversee my work. On August 11, I met with the elders and preacher of the Spring, Texas, Church of Christ, asking them to consider accepting oversight of my work, while allowing us to remain in Denton and help with the fledgling Northpoint Congregation. This arrangement would also allow us to remain near Lavonne’s doctors and treatment facilities. The Spring elders graciously agreed, and we made our exodus from Roanoke after the Sunday morning worship hour August 21.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO LYNN PARKER AND ROANOKE, TEXAS, ELDERS

From: Lynn Parker <lynn@lynnparker.net>

Reply-To: Lynn Parker <lynn@lynnparker.net>

Date: Fri, 24 Jun 2005 09:31:24 -0500

To: Kenneth Cohn <texankdc@sbcglobal.net>, Buddy Roth <roth.b@sbcglobal.net>, David Brown <jbrow@charter.net>, THE GOSPEL JOURNAL <tjg@charter.net>, Brethren:

Recently I had a conference call with the Roanoke, TX Elders. The preacher there was also with them during this call.

Because you were either explicitly (Dub, Michael, David) brought up by the Roanoke elders or implicitly mentioned by them (Buddy & Ken), I am sending you a copy of the letter sent to them this past Monday.

Hope you all are well.

Brotherly,
Lynn

Lynn Parker
1650 Gander Slough Road
Kingsbury, Texas 77638
(830) 639-4234
lynn@lynnparker.net

June 17, 2005

The Elders
C/O Roanoke Church of Christ
PO Box 737
Roanoke, Texas 76262

Dear Brethren:

I am in receipt of your check #9720 in the amount of \$900 for my support and travel fund. Sadly, I cannot in good conscience accept the check and am returning it to you (enclosed). To accept the money at this point (after seeing how you intend to handle the truth) would send the wrong signal and be inconsistent. We can survive without your support as the Lord continues to bless us in every way. And while you say that you are not (by your actions) withdrawing fellowship, there are strange (and contradictory) sounds coming out of Roanoke.

The tragedy in all of this was to see the attitude and conduct displayed by men whom I previously respected. I will elaborate.

1. Cleatius called an hour before the conference call to tell me that I would not be allowed to discuss the issue now dividing us. I was more than shocked when I heard this. I am quite familiar with such tactics by those who cannot sustain their positions and are fearful of exposure. I thought better of you men.
2. At the time of our phone conversation, you brethren had not even listened to Stan Crowley's lesson, yet you thought you knew exactly what was truth and what was error. Bryan Braswell defended Stan but had never spoken with (a) the elders at Buda-Kyle, or (b) the elders at Schertz. It would be convenient to say that what Stan Crowley did and taught at Buda-Kyle was "a Buda-Kyle matter" (that is, if you're determined to defend Stan Crowley regardless of damage he has done in the church) but would you do that if he was not a personal friend of

- Bryan Braswell, held in high esteem by your preacher? Was Max Lucado's teaching to be ignored because it was purely an "Oak Hills matter"?
3. I was told that you men had already reached a decision to terminate my support, and that you were displeased by the "attitude" I displayed in rebuking Stan Crowley, et al. Isn't it often the case that when one cannot answer an argument he turns to attack the man? I have seen such ad hominem attacks with denominationalists and liberals. I thought better of you men.
 4. You stated that I should have phoned Stan Crowley and talked with him before rebuking him publicly. Yet you brethren never had talked with me about the issue and expressly refused to do so! You were satisfied to read what I wrote. I did more than that with Stan Crowley (studying a cassette tape of Crowley at Beeville, a video tape made at Buda-Kyle, and previous writings of Stan including letters). Though often misapplied, you brethren violated the Lord's prohibition of Matthew 7:1ff by applying to others a standard that you yourselves violated. You sinned. You can claim all day long, (as you did Cleatius) "apples and oranges," but I noticed you never explained the difference. Cleatius, I might also mention that very recently you were in Spring and worshipped there. You had ample opportunity to speak with the Spring elders and David Brown about the bad attitude you allege is brewing in Spring but you were silent. Where is the consistency in this conduct? More will be said on this later.
 5. Perhaps the most telling statement made in all of this was in Cleatius own words, "I cannot go to Biblical passages that say you should have done that. I, I admit that openly." That statement speaks for itself.
 6. You all stated that you were not accusing me of sin. Yet, whatever conduct you did not like at Spring gave you "heartburn" and was serious enough that it severed any working relationship between us. Harmonize that if you can.
 7. You forbade me to address the issue at hand but never said a word of rebuke to Bryan Braswell when he brought it up (more than once). I had to ask if he wanted to debate the matter before he finally hushed. Apparently different rules apply, depending on which side you hold. Please study Matthew 7:1ff and perhaps Matthew 7:12 as well. (By the way, I did not object to it but this conference call was advertised as between the Roanoke elders and me. Interesting to see Bryan Braswell included in it.)
 8. You wrote to Kenneth Cohn stating that you wanted a private conversation with the Spring elders. You wrote (email of 05/23/05 to Kenneth Cohn), "*we strongly believe this needs to be a discussion with just the 4 individuals on this email. We are requesting that you confirm that the conference call will only have Buddy, Ken, Gene and Cleatius.*" What has become so secret now? Are we not all to be open and above-board in all our conversations? Again, you did not mind Bryan Braswell being involved. And by this time, surely you realize that these things will not be resolved "in a corner." It's beginning to sound like you men do not have much courage or conviction when it comes to the positions you have adopted.
 9. Bryan Braswell made statements he cannot support. He defended Stan Crowley's reputation by alleging that the elders in Schertz hired Stan knowing full well his doctrine on marriage, divorce, and remarriage. I notice that he had not talked with the Schertz elders. Such blind allegiance and respect of persons is

- sinful (James 2:9; Acts 10:34). I noticed that you men uttered not a peep in rebuke of Bryan. Bryan apparently does not understand the issues, Stan Crowley's character, the history of this matter, or how to reason properly.
10. You wanted me to call Stan Crowley and talk with him. Have you men called Max Lucado or Rubel Shelly yet? As I told you, there will be no private conversations between Lynn Parker and Stan Crowley. He taught what he taught publicly. Now let him answer for it. He has stirred up difficulty for Christ's body in the past. This is nothing new for Stan Crowley. I've watched him on videotape from several years ago. Enough with these smokescreen accusations against Lynn Parker, David Brown, and Spring. You elders really should have studied and checked first. And Bryan may need to acquire some facts and experience before trying to offer his wisdom. But, more will be forthcoming.
 11. Cleatius wrote to David Brown (by email of 05-22-05), "We will pray for you and your attitude towards us and others." If David Brown's attitude is in such serious condition that it is the subject of your prayers, why don't you brethren answer Kenneth Cohn's email (of 05-22-05) that asked (among other questions), "Just exactly what is his attitude toward you all and the others?" It is inconceivable that one claiming to be a Christian and an elder would refuse to communicate with fellow elders in this matter, or demand secret communications. Do you brethren fear that your positions, actions, and words will not hold up to scrutiny? Do you suffer from guilt at the sinful way in which you have conducted yourselves? Why do you run from anything in print? Again, there are strange sounds coming out of Roanoke!
 12. It is possible for a person to teach a doctrine, implicitly, and yet not state the doctrine explicitly. You brethren did not understand that in our conversation. In regard to implication, Cleatius said, "*...there's reality and there's perception. And reality may not be right or real, but perception always is.*" I am not sure what that means. Regardless, implication is not a hunch or an insinuation. It is a valid aspect of reasoning. Stan taught error! Instead of listening to your preacher (with his obvious bias), you elders should have listened to Stan Crowley for yourselves. Stan Crowley was not misrepresented. But then, if you folks had done your homework, you would have watched some video and talked with others before coming to rash conclusions. Would it be necessary for Stan Crowley to send you three a registered letter saying he was a false teacher and had harmed the brotherhood before you came to that conclusion? Is that what it will take? Much more will be forthcoming on this.
 13. Brethren that hold your position (the "Explicit Only Doctrine") have been teaching this matter publicly and repeatedly. Division has resulted. I can document that. If there is division in the church, history will show that we responded to false teaching. In the words of Elijah, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of Jehovah..." (1 Kings 18:18).
 14. Stan Crowley has stated that he believes this doctrine was worth dividing the church. Witnesses heard him state that. His actions corroborate the charge. More will be coming out on this as well.

15. You brethren vainly tried to put words in my mouth and say I opposed Stan Crowley's false teaching because he taught that the sex act constitutes marriage. Stan's lesson was filled with much more error than that. The errors were myriad. You brethren obviously did not listen to or read anything very carefully. Gary Summers reviewed Stan's lesson in his bulletin months before the Spring lectures. Many others were discussing it. It caused no little concern, starting a ripple effect from Beeville outward. I will not agree with you that there was only one basic error in Stan Crowley's lesson. His lesson was filled with Biblical error, misrepresentation of the scriptures, logical contradictions, and poor hermeneutics. It was a novel position on a novel doctrine.
16. You brethren admitted that Stan Crowley's lesson contained error.
17. I am not at all willing to say that this is not a fellowship matter. The Lord determines that. If you folks continue to teach and push this doctrine on the brotherhood, it will be a matter of fellowship. If folks that hold your doctrine, including Stan Crowley, had hushed a while back, then my lesson would never have been presented.

You have been one-sided in your investigation and study. I wish, for your sake, that you had investigated more instead of coming to a conclusion and then trying vainly to rationalize it. You have displayed blind allegiance to one(s) other than Christ. You have sinfully judged and then violated your own standard. You have explicitly admitted that you did not have a shred of Bible to stand upon when dealing with me—only your “opinion.” It is clear that you men do not know the issue, the Bible teachings on it, or Stan Crowley. Did you act on emotion and out of anger?

If evidence shows that Stan Crowley taught error, was not misrepresented, and had been confronted previously on these matters, will you three brethren be humble enough to repent? If evidence comes out that Stan Crowley has been divisive, sinful in conduct, and impenitent, are you three brethren humble enough to repent? If evidence shows that brethren on the “other side” (“Explicit Only Doctrine”) have persistently taught their error on this matter in voice and print, are you folks humble enough to repent?

For the cause of Christ and defense of His gospel,

Lynn Parker

P.S.: I have no objection to this letter being distributed to others provided it is reproduced and distributed in its entirety.

CC: Buddy Roth, Kenneth Cohn, David P. Brown; Michael Hatcher, Dub McClish

I responded to Lynn as follows:

From: THE GOSPEL JOURNAL <tgj@charter.net>
Date: Fri, 24 Jun 2005 13:31:07 -0500
To: PARKER-LYNN <lynn@lynnparker.net>
Conversation: Letter to Roanoke, TX Elders
Subject: Re: Letter to Roanoke, TX Elders

Lynn:

I pray that the Roanoke brethren will carefully, prayerfully consider your letter. I have purposely moved slowly in my approach to them on this issue, trying to allow time for them to cool off from what I believe to be a “knee-jerk” reaction. I had an opportunity to mention Gary’s bulletin article to Cleatius about two weeks ago. I asked him if he was aware (1) that Gary had written it, (2) that he had written it last August, (3) that he had sent a copy of it to Stan as soon as he wrote it, and (4) that Stan has not responded to it thus far (at least he hadn’t 2 weeks ago when I was talking with Cleatius). I knew the answers to my questions before asking them, of course, because I know that their reaction on this matter has been done in haste and without such knowledge. I was glad when he asked for a copy of the article, which I promptly supplied him by e-mail attachment. He acknowledged getting it (although I had to ask him if he received it to get his acknowledgement about a week after I sent it). He has not responded to its content yet. Cleatius, Gene, and Bryan all seem to have respect for Gary, so I’m hoping they will consider his refutations of Stan’s errors. When I told Cleatius Stan had had the article since August and had not replied, he immediately responded that such was a mistake on his part.

My opinion is that Cleatius would never have reacted as he has (and I think Gene simply followed Cleatius in this) had Bryan not overreacted to your lecture and then stirred up Cleatius. That being said, Cleatius is still a grown man, and I would have thought he had sufficient maturity to realize that he needed to give some counsel to their young, immature, and inexperienced preacher. Unfortunately, that was not the case. I have tried not to let their reaction change my personal relationships with any of these men, knowing that I have no hope of helping them arrive at a more moderate position and attitude if I don’t. I have never indicated in any way my approval of the way they approached you or David, although I have expressed regret that what was once a friendly and mutually-respectful attitude has broken down. In one of our conversations a few weeks ago, I pointed out to Cleatius that Roanoke is supporting men on “both sides” of this issue, at which time I mentioned, besides myself, Wayne Jackson and Paul Vaughn (there may be others, but these were all of whom I was sure at the time). He acknowledged same and said they did not plan to discontinue supporting any others because they did not consider this issue a fellowship issue. As you point out in your letter, it is hard to reconcile their treatment of you with not making this a matter of fellowship, at least in your case.

I know you would not do so without my cautioning you, but you must not let Cleatius (the principal spokesman at Roanoke) even receive a hint (either from you or

anyone else) that I have confided any of these things to you. To do so would end any hope of my further influence with them. However, I thought that you had a right to know these matters, and I wanted you to know that I have not been inactive here regarding them. If things continue here in a radical vein on this subject, it will eventually become necessary for us to go elsewhere. However, I want to do what I can as long as I can to help these men see some things to which they are currently blind. In fact, I hope the right opportunity will arise for me to place the letter exchange between Eddie Whitten and me (I sent you the first installment this morning) in their hands. If (and when) I can do so, and if they are blind to the radicalism of Eddie's position, then I would count the situation hopeless. However, I don't think they are ready to read our exchange yet.

Godspeed, dear brother.

Dub

RESPONSE OF CLEATIUS COPELAND (APPARENTLY FOR HIS FELLOW ELDERS AT ROANOKE, TEXAS), TO MY EXCHANGE WITH BARRY GRIDER

From: Barry Grider bgrider@msop.org
Date: Fri, 29 Jul 2005 16:38:48 -0500
To: <tgj@charter.net>
Subject: false statement

Dear brother McClish,

In recent days I have received word of my name being circulated among some brethren regarding a supposed statement that I made to brother Bryan Braswell. The statement that I supposedly made indicated that Brother Cates had "already made up his mind" to seek your dismissal as editor of Gospel Journal before he left Memphis to attend the board meeting. This statement is not true. I know that brother Cates agonized for days and with tears over what to do concerning the problem that you caused with your "summation of Apologetics Press" email. At the time he left Memphis he was still not sure of the course of action that should be taken.

I did speak briefly to brother Bryan the week prior to the board meeting. I expressed my concern and brother Cates concern over your "summation of the A.P." email. I had also received brother Chessser's letter, and heard from numerous brethren who, like me, were gravely concerned and disappointed in what you had done through the "summation of A.P." email. However, at no time did I suggest brother Cates had made up his mind concerning your continuing as editor of the paper. Had I suggested such it would have been a falsehood.

I have once more talked to Bryan to make sure he did not misunderstand me and to make sure that I did not leave him with the wrong impression. Bryan stated he knew what I said, and that I did not indicate a decision had been made by brother Cates as to

what your future with Gospel Journal should be. Hence, I do not know how this rumor started, but I would ask you to please help make sure it is not perpetuated.

While I strongly condemn your "summation of A.P" email and believe it did much harm to an already painful situation, I commend you for stepping aside as the editor of the Gospel Journal. I pray that you will take a more constructive course in days to come and encourage others to do likewise.

Sincerely in Christ,

Barry Grider

I responded to Barry Grider as follows, and Cced same to the Roanoke elders and preacher:

From: THE GOSPEL JOURNAL <tgj@charter.net>
Date: Wed, 03 Aug 2005 18:16:01 -0500
To: Barry Grider <bgrider@msop.org>
Subject: Re: false statement

Dear Barry:

I have responded to your message below in the attached letter.
Cordially,
Dub McClish

From: Dub McClish
August 03, 2005 6:27 PM

To: Bryan Braswell, Gene Brown, Cleatius Copeland, and Max Judge

Dear brethren:

Since brother Grider's letter pertains to matters relating to Roanoke, I thought you should see both it and my response to him (attached).

In Christ,

Dub

My letter to Barry Grider, attached to the foregoing e-mail message:

August 3, 2005

Mr. Barry Grider
Forest Hill Church of Christ

3950 Forest Hill-Irene Road
Memphis, TN 38125

Dear Barry:

Perpetuate implies continuation of something I have been doing. I could hardly perpetuate the rumor of which you wrote since I have never uttered or written it. You are therefore barking up the wrong tree if you suppose I have been circulating said rumor. I have never made any such statement because I have never been told that any such statement was made to Bryan by you or anyone else. Nor have I even implied to anyone that you conveyed such information. Since I have not spoken with Bryan directly about any of your calls to him, I do not know what you may have said specifically to him. My information came from one of the Roanoke elders who, in a phone conversation the evening of July 17, told me of your call to Bryan a week before the meetings took place. My impression from what he told me was that you at least indicated to Bryan some of the subject-matter of those meetings, directly involving me. I wonder if it has not occurred to you that such rumors relating to your phone call and the substance of said call would not be flying if you had not made that call to begin with. You would not have needed to make the follow-up call to Bryan to refresh your memory on what you told him had you not made the first call.

When I told Curtis in the Board Meeting about your call to Bryan, he appeared surprised, if not shocked. He apologized that you had done so (not once, but twice) and did so profusely, before the entire Board. He said he did not know how you knew about the meetings (which I find a bit incredible) and said you had no business making any such call, even with the possession of such knowledge. I agree completely with Curtis. I have been accused by some of tale bearing and gossiping. How would you classify your calls to Bryan?

You have obviously inserted yourself into some matters involving TGJ and me personally with an aggressive, "hard ball" attitude. You did not need to tell me you "strongly condemned" my "Summation." I was fully aware of that from various sources, not the least of which was your bulletin article of June 28, "A Time To Be Silent," in which you all but called my name. This fact was not lost on others, either. Doubtless, some applauded your article, but don't think everyone appreciated it. If you had been around when the prophets and apostles were writing, I suppose we would have an entirely different Bible, at least had they heeded the dictum you laid down in your next-to-last sentence. We would not know of the sins in Eden, of Cain's murderous act, of David's adultery, of Solomon's idolatry, of Peter's denials of the Lord and dissimulation at Antioch, of Judas' betrayal of Jesus, of the lies of Ananias and Sapphira, ad infinitum. The inspired writers had no problem writing the records of the sins (repented of or not), even of the Bible's greatest heroes, not just for some temporary, perishable medium, but for the Book of the ages. Surely, you did not think through your judgmental statement before you wrote it.

In fact, many (including not a few MSOP alumni and friends of considerable repute) have conveyed to me that they deeply resent your involving yourself in these matters as you have done, believing you to be totally out of place (just as Curtis indicated concerning your phone call to Bryan). Some of them have even repeated to me their nickname for you: "The Mole." They believe you have been putting your political science degree to effective use, not only in this latest fiasco, but in earlier situations involving MSOP as well. You, Frank Chesser, and others who have been so quick to condemn me for "judging" others have proved yourselves huge hypocrites in your quick judgments of my motives and of me and in your numerous totally unwarranted assumptions relating to my AP "Summation." You have done your best to shame and defame me, when you are the ones who should be ashamed. A simple phone call from Frank when he first got the copy of my "Summation" would likely have prevented all of the firestorm of alienation among sound brethren that has resulted from his bombastic, over-the-top, knee-jerk-response letter which he scattered to the four winds. He did so on the basis of his unwarranted assumption that I had done the same with my "Summation," which is simply untrue. In other words, he judged me by his own motives and behavior in writing and distributing his letter. You surely know by now the extremely limited distribution I fully intended for my "Summation," but it obviously makes no difference to you. I really believe that you and Frank (and a few others) have proved that you were/are not really interested in the facts anyway. You and others may judge me and my "Summation" any way you choose. Your opinion of it is not law or Gospel. I make no apology whatsoever for writing what I did. Frank obviously believes I sinned in doing so. You seem to agree. For whatever it's worth, I asked the TGJ Board if they believed I sinned in writing it. Curtis answered for the Board, "No," and said that they had never entertained the idea that I had done so in their discussions. Once more, in this I completely agree with Curtis and the Board.

I trust you have received and read my letters of apology to Bert and Rhonda Thompson for the extra pain the unauthorized circulation of my "Summation" brought to them. I truly am regretful over that. It should never have happened, and it never would have happened had someone to whom I sent the "Summation" in confidence not decided—with no good reason—to break that confidence. However, anyone who assumes that my letters to them were an apology for writing the "Summation" or sending it to a few interested parties or that I was confessing in those letters that I sinned in writing the "Summation," has made another unwarranted assumption. They have not read carefully what I wrote, but have engaged in eisegesis rather than exegesis. I guess brethren like you and Frank used up all of your forgiveness, compassion, and mercy on Bert. I surely haven't heard any from any of you toward me relating to my letters to Bert and Rhonda. I know some are waiting for Frank to distribute my letters to them as widely as he distributed his slanderous hate letter to me, but none of us are holding our breath. It appears that the mercy/forgiveness/compassion "stream" flows only one direction from you sweet brethren.

The position you, Frank, and all of the signers of the AP "Statement of Support" (including Curtis) are now in is both contradictory, absurd, and, worst of all, unscriptural. By signing your names you are bidding Godspeed to a false teacher (2 John 9–11). His

name is Dave Miller. The idea that one can promote an institution while not promoting or opposing its Director (and a Board member of same) is ludicrous, which is the "official position" the TGJ Board took when I questioned them about it directly on June 20 (to his credit, one of the Board members has now admitted that such a dichotomy is logically and Scripturally impossible). Curtis told me in an e-mail message (June 11) that he did not know Miller would be the new Director when he gave Miller permission to use his name. A "fly on the wall" has told me that both Curtis and Joseph Meador stated in the TGJ Board meeting on July 19 that, had they known this fact, they would not have permitted their names to be used. (Of course, there is a simple solution to that matter, at least for men of integrity and principle. They can easily issue a disclaimer if they are sincere.) Perhaps **none** who allowed their names to be used knew that Miller was to be the new Director when they gave their permission. However, some likely have had their heads so firmly in the sand that they were not even aware of his doctrinal errors. Again, some may know of, but may not even be concerned about Dave Miller's errors. Obviously, this was not true of Curtis and Joseph or they would not have indicated their refusals for AP to use their names had they known. I am confident that you had to know of Dave Miller's baggage from the time Bert made his stupendous, unbelievable coup in hiring him. Bert replied to the Miller objections he received from contributors (who immediately stopped their contributions) with either a perfunctory form letter or, in at least one case, with an irrational and irate denial of evidence offered, an unqualified defense of Miller, and an attitude of "how dare you question me, the great Bert Thompson" (no, this letter was not addressed to me). I wonder, now, if you, like Curtis, would say that you would not have allowed them to use your name had you known Dave was to be the new Director. If you would **not** have, will you allow them to "perpetuate" using your name as an endorsement?

I think I am safe in saying that the way to save a brother who teaches false doctrine is not the way so many brethren have been dealing with Dave Miller. Why should he repent when he is regularly invited to speak on various lectureships generally considered to be doctrinally sound (e.g., Spiritual Sword, Truth in Love, ETSOP, Polishing the Pulpit)? And what message does it send to a false teacher when other men known for their soundness go right on and speak on the same lectureships with him? The message to Dave is that he has nothing of which to repent. The message to brethren in general is the same—that Dave is completely innocent. This is hardly the way to bring a false teacher to repentance. It appears that if one gets a couple of masters degrees and a PhD, writes some good books, continues to deliver a conservative message, and continues to be used by faithful brethren, it just doesn't matter what errors he has committed (unless it was involvement in pedophilia, of course). But Dave can advocate grievous doctrinal errors and be given a pass, yea, even be promoted. Is pedophilia the only sin/error that is egregious enough to get the attention of the AP Board and the Palm Beach Lakes elders? (Of course, it doesn't hurt Dave's clout to himself be one of three AP Board members, but no one should even suspect any conflict of interest in that regard). A blind man, thinking rationally, can see the gross double standard regarding AP's treatment of Bert's error and Dave's errors.

Frank Chesser well knows of Dave's doctrinal baggage from several sources; he has likely known of them almost from the time Bert hired Dave. As already mentioned, Bert was informed by several men of Dave's doctrinal errors at the time he hired him. The Palm Beach Lakes elders have been informed of Dave's errors, as have the other AP staff members. One is almost tempted to speculate that Dave must have some "goods" on all of these guys. Or maybe he has discovered the secret of creating an impenetrable force field around himself. Will it all come tumbling down on Dave one of these days, as Bert's "personal sins" of twenty years finally did on him? You say you want AP to survive and flourish, as do I. Are you to the point of accepting a means-justifies-the-end, whatever-it-takes attitude toward its survival? It surely seems so, not only with you, but with others as well.

I note a few ironies: You support a false teacher, but denounce me, not accused by any so far as I know (except radical enemies of the Truth) of teaching error. You have compassion for a confessed pedophile, but only abhorrence for me. You applaud a scurrilous letter written to and about me by an AP partisan who was beside himself when he wrote it, but you have nothing but contempt for a simple "Summation" I wrote concerning the AP scandal. You apparently hold me as a greater sinner than he who has confessed his 20-year addiction to pedophilia. You support AP with a false teacher at its head, but you vilify The Gospel Journal in which I have consistently taught and defended the Truth and exposed error in its brief 67-month life. As the expression goes, "go figure." Some day, perhaps, more calm and objective heads will see and admit that sheer emotion (as opposed to reason), brotherhood networking/politics, and fear of monetary loss have driven this hate campaign against me. It is a classic illustration of a mountain's being created out of less than a molehill.

Your commendation of my "stepping aside" as TGJ's editor was as undeserved as it was misplaced. Neither Dave Watson nor I merely "stepped aside." We were, in fact, **pushed** aside. The behavior of the Board on July 20 was graphically reminiscent of elderships that ask a preacher if he wants to resign or be fired, and then when he resigns, they say, "We didn't fire him, he resigned." Then, to add insult to injury, they absolve him of any sin or guilt and recommend him to high Heaven to other congregations. Parse or spin it any way you wish, the Board came there unhappy with our work and with us as Editors, and it breathed a collective sigh of relief when we "resigned." We simply saved their having to "fire" us, which neither Dave nor I have the slightest doubt would have occurred had we not "resigned."

The following information illustrates in the most graphic way possible the fact that when Dave Watson and I resigned, the Board got exactly what it wanted, whether or not it "had made up its mind" about us before the meeting: When Curtis and Joseph Meador resigned from TGJ's Board (7/11 and 7/12, respectively), the remaining Board members immediately got on the phone, imploring them to "unresign" (at least one Board member even offered to go to Memphis to appeal to Curtis in person). When Dave Watson and I resigned, not one Board member suggested we were too hasty in doing so, that this was a drastic measure, that we should talk about it, that perhaps we could work something out, or any other alternative, much less implored us to "unresign." We were

simply asked to leave the Board meeting while the Board went through the formality of “deciding” how they should respond to our resignations. It took every bit of ten–twelve minutes for them to call us back in and read the unanimous resolution of the Board to accept our resignations. Again, no questions were asked or suggestions made of any alternatives. One of the great ironies in all of this is the following: Through the claims of one (perhaps two) Board members, the remainder of the Board was persuaded (in the July 19 all-day meeting) that TGJ was dead if I remained its Editor. These same influences also convinced the Board that my “reputation” was “ruined” because of my AP “Summation” that had been circulated. The sad fact is that the Board’s action, taken under political pressure (and monetary threats in the case of at least one Board member) in allowing these sad events to transpire, has likely driven a dagger to the very heart of *THE GOSPEL JOURNAL*, from which I fear it will not be able to recover.

Please don’t mistake my words for bitterness. I am not the least bit bitter, but I am sorely disappointed in men who I thought were men of principle rather than of politics. You are mistaken if you think that the numerous brethren who are enraged at this turn of events are acting and speaking in defense of me, personally. They have the true sense that integrity, principle, and truth have been compromised and sacrificed, and they cannot bear to let it pass.

One more matter, and I will conclude. The final statement of your letter is condescending and patronizing at best, and insulting at worst. It hardly befits one who is young enough to be my son and who has not even one-fourth of the years of preaching experience that I have to lecture me on “a more constructive course.” I do not say it boastfully, but I was fighting the good fight of the faith literally years before you were born. You really ought to think a bit more about “paying your dues” down in the trenches where some of us have been fighting the battles for decades before you start lecturing us older heads about “constructive” behavior.

Yours for the one faith,

Dub McClish
908 Imperial Drive
Denton, TX 76209

PS Feel free to send this letter to whomever you choose, as long as you send it in its entirety. I plan to send yours and mine to various other interested brethren.

[Note: Since my foregoing letter to Barry Grider, new information has surfaced to the effect that Bryan Braswell **did indeed know in advance** that I was to be replaced as editor of *THE GOSPEL JOURNAL*, contrary to the claims of both Grider and Braswell. In “An Open Letter to My Brethren” (*Contending for the Faith*, July 2009), brother Virgil Greene, who was attending worship in Roanoke, TX, in July 2005, wrote that Bryan Braswell told him that I was to be removed as editor because I had “gone off the deep end.” Greene said Braswell related this to him **before** he (Greene) attended the Sunny Slope Lectures (Paducah, KY) on July 16-17. Greene said, in fact, that Braswell told

him “this change was to take place on the week following the lectureship at Sunny Slope at a scheduled meeting of The Gospel Journal board at Schertz, TX.” Both Grider and Braswell admit that Grider called Braswell sometime during the week before the Board meetings on July 19–20. This fact is further confirmed by the statement of Cleatius Copeland, one of the Roanoke elders, to me in a phone conversation Sunday evening, July 17 (referenced in my foregoing letter to Grider). I also told him I would likely no longer be editor of *TGJ* when I returned, then I casually added that he may already know this information, for all I knew. He replied that actually he was aware that these meetings were to take place because Barry Grider had called Bryan Braswell and told him about them. He also indicated that Grider had related to Braswell, and Braswell to him (Copeland) I was to be the subject of said meetings. So it appears that (1) Cates **had** “made up his mind” concerning my fate before he left Memphis, contrary to Grider’s claim, (2) Grider related this to Braswell when he called him the week of July 10, contrary to Grider’s claim, and (3) Braswell learned this information from Grider, contrary to Braswell’s claim, and passed it on to Greene (and likely to Copeland, as well).]

Cleatius Copeland’s (Roanoke, TX, elder) response to my Grider letter:

From: Cleatius Copeland
August 4, 2005
To: Dub McClish

Dub

Have you mailed this yet? If not, I would like to spend a few minutes talking about this before it goes out.

I will be back in DFW on Thursday night and available to talk Friday or Sunday evening when PJ and I return from Houston.

Thanks

CC [Cleatius Copeland]

My response to Cleatius Copeland:

From: THE GOSPEL JOURNAL <tgj@charter.net>
Date: Thu, 04 Aug 2005 10:27:22 -0500
To: COPELAND CLEATIUS <Cleatius.Copeland@clearorbit.com>
Subject: Re: false statement

Cleatius:

Thanks for your note. I sent it yesterday afternoon. Barry called last night and we talked awhile. I'll be glad to visit with you Friday or some other convenient time for both of us. Have a safe trip.

Dub

[Note: Brother Copeland was obviously not pleased with my response to Barry Grider, and I infer he would have sought to dissuade me from sending the letter I wrote. It apparently fell into the "controversial" class, as mentioned in our July 9 ,meeting. He did not respond to my note telling him my letter to Grider had already been sent and received. DM]

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN DUB MCCLISH AND THE ROANOKE, TEXAS, ELDERS, RELATIVE TO THE MCCLISHES' LEAVING

August 17, 2005

Dear Gene, Cleatius, and Max:

I am writing to let you know that Lavonne and I have decided we will join forces with the new congregation in Denton to see if we can help it get underway in the best possible way. We plan for this coming Lord's day morning to be our last one as members at Roanoke, after which (beginning Sunday evening) we will begin meeting with the new congregation. At present, Paige will likely continue to be a member at Roanoke. We have left that entirely up to her. I have secured sponsorship/oversight of my work from another congregation that will allow us to remain in Denton (near Lavonne's treatment facilities and doctors) and to assist the new congregation as much as we can while I continue my Gospel meeting, lectureship, and writing work. Those of us who will initially compose the new congregation (six families to begin with, it now appears) hope that you brethren will see fit to help this new work further down the line when we have formulated some concrete needs. We will likely need some financial help from other sources, as well. We hope there can be close brotherly ties between you brethren and the new Denton congregation.

Lavonne and I are grateful to you beyond words for providing a safe harbor during a very stormy and stressful period of our lives, involving the Pearl Street mess and her cancer diagnosis/treatment. We will always be in your debt for so doing. We also appreciate your financial support, which I will not expect you to continue as we move under the oversight of another eldership. I will notify our regular supporters as soon as possible to cease sending our support checks to Roanoke. I hope to catch them before they start sending checks for September. Please mail the August check at the end of this month (908 Imperial Dr., Denton 76209). If any other checks come in during September, it will be fine to wait till the end of the month to send a check for them. I know that keeping my account up-to-date, depositing the checks, copying the checks, and writing my check each month has placed an extra burden on Gordon. I appreciate his doing all of this extra work for me in such a fine way.

If you brethren see fit, Lavonne and I will appreciate having the following announcement included in the regular announcements at the close of the worship hour Sunday morning:

Dear brethren:

When we asked to be accepted as members of the church here on May 25, 2003, you did so openly and lovingly. We have come to love you all, and it is with some sadness that we announce that this will be the last service we will be meeting with you as members here. For several months some faithful brethren who live in Denton have been discussing the need for a faithful congregation in that city, which plans we have been encouraging. A new congregation has now been launched and Lavonne and I will be joining that effort, beginning tonight. Paige plans to continue her membership here, at least for the present. We leave with good wishes toward all. We also leave with an expression of great appreciation for the support the elders and the church have provided for us these two years plus. We hope there can be a close and cordial relationship between the church here and the new congregation in Denton. May the Lord bless you richly as you faithfully serve Him.

Dub and Lavonne McClish and Paige Gibson

[Note: I sent the foregoing notice on a Wednesday morning. Cleatius Copeland is the only elder who acknowledged receiving my letter at Bible study that night. He was first upset that I had not met with them personally, instead to telling them we were leaving by an e-mail message. He was really upset when he asked me the name of my new sponsoring congregation, and I told him it was Spring (which I anticipated would be his reaction), since he had been so harshly critical of David Brown, *Contending for the Faith*, the Spring elders, and the lectureship at Spring since Lynn Parker's Spring lecture the previous February, in which Stan Crowley's MDR errors were exposed. Ironically, he had formerly been very complimentary of all of the above, and the Roanoke Congregation had been contributing \$200.00 per month to David's travel fund for his overseas preaching trips. When the Roanoke elders called Lynn and withdrew his support, Lynn immediately called David and me. David's reaction was to e-mail Cleatius and tell them they need not send any more support checks for him, for if their attitude toward Lynn was any indication, they would have the same attitude toward him (David). By the way, the elders ignored our request concerning the note I had written, instead barely making mention publicly of our plans to depart.]

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN ROANOKE, TEXAS, ELDERS AND DUB MCCLISH RELATING TO *THE GOSPEL JOURNAL*

On August 19, Dave Watson, my former associate editor of *TGJ*, and I wrote the following message to Tommy Hicks and Bced it to the Roanoke elders, among others:

From: Dub McClish <tgj@charter.net>
Date: Fri, 19 Aug 2005 11:04:55 -0500
To: HICKS-TOM <tomhicks@nts-online.net>
Cc: CATES-CURTIS <ccates3310@aol.com>, RATCLIFF-KEN-1
<tgj.1@sbcglobal.net>, MEADOR-JOSEPH <joseph@swsbs.edu>
Subject: URGENT! August TGJ Editorials

Tommy J. Hicks, Interim Editor
THE GOSPEL JOURNAL

Dear Tommy:

As **former** Editor and Associate Editor, respectively, of *THE GOSPEL JOURNAL*, we hereby notify you that you **may not use** our respective “Editorial Perspective” and “Associate Editorial” articles in the August issue. While our reasons for this notification should be obvious, we nonetheless submit the following:

1. To use our articles in this issue without qualification would be deceptive, implying that we still occupy editorial positions with *TGJ*, which, as you know, we have not done since July 20. Whether with or without qualification or explanation of our now-defunct Editorial roles, we **do not** want our articles to appear in the pages of any future issue of *TGJ*.

2. To use our articles in this issue would perhaps be confusing to hundreds of readers who already know that the Board relieved us of our respective roles with the paper a month ago (July 20). The use of our articles in the upcoming issue would doubtless cause some (perhaps many) to assume that we may have been reinstated, which assumption neither you, the Board, nor we would want to occur.

3. To use our articles will imply that Dub was responsible for all of the content of the August issue of *TGJ*. We do **NOT** want readers to be misled into believing that he edited the August issue and that he had any editorial control over the articles you may choose for its remaining empty pages. Also, we do **NOT** want readers to be misled into believing that he is responsible for whatever grammatical, typographical, stylistic, or even Scriptural errors that may be in it.

4. To use Dub’s “Editorial Perspective” **as if** he were still Editor would surely cause grave damage to *TGJ*—according to the Board’s assertion—and would doubtless result in a flood of subscription cancellations, since his name and reputation are in ruins—according to the Board’s assertion.

Further, we notify you that we want our names and photos **removed** from **any and every appearance** in the August and all succeeding issues of *TGJ*, with one exception: Our names may be used in the promised “**complimentary**” (your unsolicited promise in the Board meeting, remember) announcement of the Editorial changes (originally scheduled for the September issue). I kindly remind you that, in answer to a direct request from Dub, the Board also promised in the July 20 meeting that we would be allowed to see your prepared announcement of these changes **before it is published**.

Respectfully yours,

Dub McClish, founding and **former** Editor, *THE GOSPEL JOURNAL*

David B. Watson, **former** Associate Editor, *THE GOSPEL JOURNAL*

PS This message has been sent to numerous additional persons as a blind copy.

In response to the above, I received the following message (with a forwarded copy of our notice to Hicks) from the Roanoke elders, written by Cleatius Copeland:

From: Cleatius Copeland <Cleatius.Copeland@clearorbit.com>

Date: Fri, 19 Aug 2005 18:13:06 -0500

To: <TGJ@charter.net>

Cc: Max Judge <tide.roofing@pwhome.com>, BRASWELL-BRYAN-H <bngbraz2@sbcglobal.net>, <agbrown55@aol.com>

Subject: FW: URGENT! August TGJ Editorials

Dub:

As you can see, we are in receipt of the email you sent to Brother Tommy Hicks (and blind copied to others) [the message to Hicks will appear after this message] and I'm writing this note on behalf the Roanoke elders. I've talked to Gene and Max since I've arrived back from Canada just after lunch today.

A couple of points we need and request to be clarified:

Do you still consider yourself under the oversight of the Roanoke elders? It is our impression that you are until Sunday, 8/21/05. If so, we would respectfully request that these type of notes be held until you are under the oversight of the other eldership.

Why did David Watson and yourself wait until almost a month after the action of the TGJ board to write this note? It almost appears that this was done to delay and damage the paper you created and loved for a number of years. We trust that's not the case.

We are also confused. In point 2 of your note to Tommy Hicks, you mention that the board relieved David and yourself of your respective roles with the paper, a month ago (July 20). In our conversation a couple days later, you mentioned that you had been relieved of your responsibilities and that all board members had voted to remove you. We are now hearing (and read in Michael Hatcher's apology note [\[see below\]](#)) that you and David actually resigned before the board made the final decision or announcement. Rumors are flying around that are saying the board fired David and yourself. Surely there's a misunderstanding somewhere and requires immediate attention so the rumors are discontinued and replaced with the truth of the situation.

We need your input as to how we answer the questions that will arise once it's announced you are now under the other oversight of another eldership. We understand the working with the new start up congregation, but would appreciate guidance to the other point. Also, is it possible we be allowed to read the note you will be sending your current supporters before it is sent? This would be greatly appreciated.

Also, there is no one blind copied on this note and we request that this note not be forwarded to anyone or shared with others.

We wish you nothing but the best and look forward to seeing you on Sunday morning.

Respectively [*sic*],

The Roanoke elders

Cleatius Copeland

Note: Cleatius could not even bring himself to write the name of the Spring Congregation or Eldership, thus demonstrating his irrational contempt for David Brown, Contending for the Faith, and the Spring elders.

My response to the Roanoke letter:

From: Dub McClish <tgj@charter.net>

Date: Sat, 20 Aug 2005 13:15:39 -0500

To: COPELAND CLEATIUS <Cleatius.Copeland@clearorbit.com>

Subject: Re: URGENT! August TGJ Editorials

Dear Gene, Cleatius, and Max:

Thanks for your note. I shall be happy to respond to your questions.

1. Yes, until Sunday after morning worship, Lavonne and I still consider ourselves under the oversight of the Roanoke elders, and our contribution check will be in the plate as always. I will attempt to comply with your request, although "these types of notes" is certainly a very subjective description. I have not been given any standards by which to determine what you brethren consider "these types of notes." Had I waited longer to notify Tommy (I sent the note to him the moment it occurred to me, as indicated below), it would have thrown him even farther behind.

2. There is absolutely nothing sinister in the timing of this note to Tommy, as you imply. I have been concerned in my own mind for some time about the various things my editorial's appearance in the August issue of TGJ would imply (as Dave and I specified in our note to Tommy). I had not thought of any solution until yesterday morning, when it occurred to me that the simplest solution would be to tell Tommy not to

use our material, which will allow the entire issue to be his. I sent the message to him immediately upon thinking of the solution, not delaying at all. This is best both for *TGJ* and for Dave and me. Your assumption about our motivation is completely wrong, even unfair. Could I not be given the benefit of the doubt? The Lord warned us about not judging “according to appearance” (John 7:24). While I realize it will place an extra burden on Tommy, I still believe it is best for all concerned for us to take this course.

3. The TGJ Board can play with words all it chooses, but when the Board made clear to us early in our meeting on 7/20 that they sought our removal, Dave and I told them we would just save both them and us a lot of time, so yes, we “resigned.” They did not deny that they sought our removal. Cleatus, I suspect that in your business world employees would describe such a procedure as being “fired,” “dismissed,” “relieved of responsibilities,” or even “constructive severance” or “constructive termination.” The tenor of the opening resolution read to us was that both of us were under fire and might have to be replaced. The fact that when we offered our “resignations” not one Board member asked us any question, offered any alternative, suggested that our resignations were too hasty or anything of the kind, is telling. Rather, Dave and I were asked to leave the room while the Board discussed our “resignations.” After a maximum of 12 minutes, we were brought back in, and a “unanimous resolution” was addressed to us, in which our “resignations” were accepted, again, with no discussion with us and with “no questions asked.” Now, would you interpret that action as **wanting** our removal or **resisting** our removal? Contrast the way **our** “resignations” were treated with the way Curtis’ resignation from the Board (7/11) and Joseph’s resignation from the Board (7/12) were treated. The remaining Board could not move fast enough to beg them to change their minds, which both of them did. Now, if they didn’t want us out of the way and did not intend to remove us, they surely chose a peculiar way of letting us know, don’t you think? I know very well that the remaining Board members (and doubtless others very close to them) are telling that our “resignations” were totally up to us and that they had made no “decisions” concerning our staying or going, but one almost has to be smoking something to believe that. Even they know it is not so. So far, Michael Hatcher has been the only one with enough integrity to step forward and admit it. I really do not see in Michael’s apology anything to indicate that Dave and I just up and resigned out of the clear blue, with no provocation whatever. Read the apology again. What do “forced to resign,” “the Board bowed to pressure to get rid of him,” and “brother McClish was sacrificed” in Michael’s apology mean, after all? I am attaching a copy of Michael’s resignation statement from the Board, which he submitted to them before I had any idea he was even thinking of doing so. (Incidentally, he had made a motion to the board on 7/28 that the Board reinstate me.) In it he is even more explicit in specifying exactly what happened in the Schertz meetings in contrast to the “spin” the Board is now putting on it. Yes, there is a misunderstanding all right, perpetrated by the remaining Board members for the most part. I don’t claim to have my finger on the pulse of the whole brotherhood, but the almost incessant phone calls **to me** and the endless e-mail traffic coming **to me** indicate a great amount of outrage over the Board’s decision. It is not just in personal defense of me, although many of these men believe I have been treated unjustly without cause. They are outraged because they see integrity, honor, and righteous behavior compromised and sacrificed to carnal motivations. The two

motivations that people who contact me keep repeating—with no prompting from me—are “money” and “politics.” I believe they have “nailed it.” For whatever it’s worth, I have not been calling others and/or using e-mail to announce these things to others. I determined from the start that I would not do so. However, when the word got out, the calls and e-mails came streaming in, and they have not stopped. I have answered as many as 40 e-mails a day some days (between phone calls) and still have not been able to keep up with them. All the while my phone lines have been constantly busy, some days requiring 4-5 hours of time to handle the calls. The point is, I have not stirred this matter up. I did not need to. The outrage has been spontaneous. It would have been nice if the elders where I am a member could have felt at least some of this sentiment.

Perhaps the most amazing thing in all of this to me thus far has been the number of MSOP alumni who have called and/or written and who are extremely unhappy with the director of their alma mater. They understand that as President of the Board, he has led this campaign and they see the motives that have driven it—again, without any coaching from me. When I speak of alumni, I don’t mean unknown young men who graduated a year or two ago and are just getting their feet wet in their first preaching jobs. I speak of seasoned veterans, some of them elders in the congregations where they preach, and whose names are well-known among sound preachers, especially east of the Mississippi. Many of them have volunteered their own experiences of daring to cross Curtis and have warned that I should expect retaliation. (The funny thing about that is that I didn’t realize I had “crossed” him in any way. He had never had anything but the highest praise for my editorship. Only since I “resigned” am I hearing that he has been nursing a criticism of an article way back last November.) In all of the communications I have received, not one of them has been the least bit supportive of the President of the Board or of the Board’s action and behavior, either in the Board meetings or since. Many of these brethren have gone straight to the Board members by phone and/or e-mail and have heard “their side” of the story, only to come away almost sick at what they have heard, knowing it did not match what they have observed. Our brethren are generally smart enough to see through a ruse. That is exactly what they see (i.e., a ruse) in this lame story that Dave and I merely “up and resigned” with no pressure at all and without the Board’s having “made any decision” that we should do so prior to July 20.

Brethren, I had dedicated the rest of my life, as long as God gave me mental and physical ability to do so, primarily to making *THE GOSPEL JOURNAL* a powerful force for Truth and righteousness. I feel that we were well on the way to that goal and that our most effective days in the effort were yet to come. I didn’t accept what could be honestly called the demand of the Board that I edit the paper from the very beginning as just a pleasant pastime. I already had more work than I could do when I took it on, because I believe there was real need for it. It was demanding and rigorous, often requiring midnight-oil work that only one who has published a periodical of this size and quality can begin to appreciate. Other members of my family (Lavonne, Laurie, Andy) and others besides our family (Dave Watson, especially) devoted countless hours of work to the effort because they believed in the value of the effort and frankly, in part because they had confidence in me. I willingly did the work (including almost a full year’s work, getting ready to launch the paper 1/2000), long before the Board decided to pay me any

stipend. Even then, I did not ask for the pay. Mine was a labor of love that was taken from me for no righteous or even substantiated reason or reasons. The action of the Board is, in fact, reminiscent of the way elderships at times ask preachers to move on. They call him in and in effect ask him if he wants to “resign” or be fired. When he “resigns,” they then tell that he “resigned,” sometimes even saying they don’t know why. Then they praise him to the sky and recommend him to other congregations. Few men who really declare the who counsel of God over the span of several years are fortunate enough to escape such treatment somewhere along the line, some of them more than once. The great irony in all of this *TGJ* mess is that the President of the Board convinced the rest of the Board that my name and reputation were irreparably damaged and that my remaining as Editor would mean the death of *THE GOSPEL JOURNAL* (ah, but they hadn’t made up their minds in advance, remember!). In reality, the very action the Board has taken in ousting Dave and me has driven a dagger to the paper’s heart from which it will likely never recover. This is not my wish for the paper, for the Lord’s people badly need it.

4. The load of calls and e-mails have prevented me from preparing the announcement of our change of sponsors and my departure from *TGJ*. I plan to do this in our semi-annual *Work Report*, which is a bit overdue now. There is no way I can even begin to work on that project before sometime next week. I do not see why the simple statement I have requested to be read as part of the closing announcements should not suffice to tell the Roanoke Church about our leaving. Nor do I see why our changing sponsoring congregations at the same time we are moving to the new Denton congregation should even raise any questions. I expect most people will understand it as a natural part of the transition, unless someone raises questions in the minds of some of the members otherwise, which I most certainly do not plan to do. I do not understand the implied lack of trust I feel in your wanting to see what I write about this transition when I address those who support me. I assure you that I will have nothing but praise for the Roanoke congregation and its moral and financial support of us, even as I stated in my message to you last Wednesday. I meant every word of what I said, and we can never repay you for it. You seriously misjudge me if you think for some reason I may say something uncomplimentary about you, and that disappoints me greatly. In our meeting in which we discussed the Apologetics Press matters, I asked if you brethren were going to want to censor or approve everything I write before I send or publish it. I was assured that this was not the case, yet your suggestion here and the one with which you began your message implies your desire to do that very thing. Please trust me when I say that you will be pleased with my comments concerning Roanoke and her elders.

5. I cannot help being struck with the implied suspicion, motive judgments, and lack of trust in more than one of your statements above. Try to put yourselves in my shoes and see if you would not have the same reaction. These may not have been intentional, but they are there nonetheless. I believe you have made some judgments about these matters without the benefit of knowing almost countless developments and ramifications of the situation. I’m very sad that you seem to have prejudged me on these matters, even as you seem to have done on the Apologetics Press flap. All in all, my impression

is that you will not be too sad to see us move on. You obviously have not been comfortable with the attention I have attracted your way, although I have never done so intentionally. I have not copied/read your note to any others. You may feel free to pass along what I have written to you to anyone you choose, as long as you do so in its entirety.

6. My wish for you brethren and for all of the Roanoke Church is the same as what you expressed toward me. It is our earnest desire to leave on terms of brotherly love and sincere friendship in Christ. Also, concerning the new congregation, I repeat what I wrote in the suggested announcement of our leaving: "We hope there can be a close and cordial relationship between the church here (Roanoke) and the new congregation in Denton. May the Lord bless you richly as you faithfully serve Him."

In sincere Christian love,

Dub McClish

PS Last Monday (8/15) I learned that Tommy was planning to publish the Lubbock Lectures ad with my photo and name in it, as if I were still going to speak, in spite of the fact that I had notified him on 7/28 in a very courteous note that I would not be able to do so (see below). Consequently, I wrote him an admittedly firm note on 8/15 (see below) telling him I wanted him to change the ad before it was published and not to do so would constitute deceptive advertising. He wrote back the next day (8/16), beginning his note to me as follows: Proverbs 15:1 says: "A soft answer turneth away wrath, but grievous words stir up anger" (see below). He thus chided me for what he perceived to be anger in my words to him (which was not the case). I thought it interesting that two days later (Thursday), he sent the following note, reproduced in its entirety, to Michael Hatcher:

From: Tom Hicks [mailto:tomhicks@nts-online.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2005 1:56 PM
To: HATCHER MICHAEL
Subject: Annual Lubbock Lectures

Dear Michael,
You are hereby notified that your invitation to speak in the *Eighth Annual Lubbock Lectureship* is rescinded. Your name and picture will not be included in any of our advertisements, and your manuscript will not be included in the lectureship book.
Yours truly,
Tommy J. Hicks, Director
Eighth Annual Lubbock Lectureship

Michael Hatcher's statement of resignation from The Gospel Journal, Inc., board, as referenced above:

July 29, 2005

Brethren:

I know we have all been grieved of [*sic*] the events of the last few weeks. It has brought all of us great heartache and sadness. Much of the rhetoric has been high, which was to be expected. I do not plan on detailing many of the things in my mind at this time. However, there are a few points which I cannot allow to pass.

In our board meeting on the first day, we did mention many of the points brother Cates brought up in his email message (getting into the original purpose, not being "issue oriented," not being embroiled in local congregational issues, etc.). However, with the discussion of all these things, not all of them on the whole would have caused us to discuss the dismissal of Dub or David. The sole reason for that discussion was the reaction which some took [*sic*] to Dub's statement which he sent to 23 people. (Yes, I now believe that it would have been in the best interest of and the best wisdom to ask Dub to return as being editor.) Brethren, I do not believe Dub sinned sending out that statement; however, I do believe Frank Chesser did sin in his ungodly actions (which is being born out by the fact that he did not send out Dub's letter to him, nor his letter asking Bert and Rhonda Thompson to accept his apology). At this point in time, Dub was correct in the impression of the brotherhood that Frank Chesser has "won."

The "spin" that the board has put on this is just that—"spin." The fact is, everyone knows that it is also. While we are stating publicly that there had not been a vote taken (there had not) thus no decision had been made (technically there had not), we all knew that basically there would need to be a change made regarding the editor and associate editor. The differing terms used ("fired," "dismissed," "accepted their resignation") all boil down to the same thing, and brethren know that. Dub (and David) were placed in a position in which they were forced to resign (if you don't believe that, ask either one of them). While our spin is fine and technically true, everyone else realizes the situation also. (This is especially true when Brian Brazwell's [*sic*] understanding of what Barry Grider said to him and conveyed to Dub was the end result—that Dub is no longer with the paper.)

When I received brother Meador's response, I was both hurt and outraged. In my email making a motion to reinstate Dub McClish as editor (I did not mention reinstating David, only Dub), I had also mentioned discussing the situation with my elders and that they were not pleased with the action of the board in accepting Dub's resignation. Brother Meador mentions in his email that we are dealing with "a few who are in a small, but no less toxic, loyalty circle...a small negative faction, who if they gain control, will only rupture fellowship in the church even more than they already have." Since my elders here at Bellview are individuals who disagreed with our decision and expressed that disagreement to me, I have no alternative [*sic*] to understand that brother Meador has placed them in that class of "toxic, loyalty circle...negative faction." Additionally, many of my close friends and ones I trust totally (not just Lynn Parker, and I have not even talked to David Brown) have called expressing their objection and displeasure with the

board. These are brethren who regularly speak on the lectures here at Bellview and that I speak with at other locations. They are also placed in that "toxic, loyalty circle" by brother Meador. Additionally, since I believe the board should have asked Dub McClish to return as being editor, I guess brother Meador places me in that "toxic loyalty circle" as well. Brother Meador, I am calling upon you to repent of your attitude toward faithful brethren.

Whether brother Meador repents of such attitudes or not, I will no longer be a part of The Gospel Journal. I am tendering my immediate resignation from the board (including, of course, being the secretary of the board). In addition, the board will need to find someone else to be the temporary editor of the paper (I do not plan on editing the August issue). You can have whoever you choose to contact me concerning the articles and the part of the August issue that has been completed.

Brethren, it is with a sad heart that I do this, but as brother Meador said, "This is a matter of principle as far as I am concerned." I have enjoyed our association together. I still believe a paper such as The Gospel Journal is needed in the brotherhood, but I believe the board has destroyed the paper to such an extent that it will not be revived.

Michael Hatcher

My July 28, 2005 note to Tom Hicks, referenced above:

From: THE GOSPEL JOURNAL <tgj@charter.net>

Date: Thu, 28 Jul 2005 11:23:50 -0500

To: HICKS-TOM <tomhicks@nts-online.net>

Conversation: Lubbock Lectures MS

Subject: Lubbock Lectures MS

Tommy:

I have attached my MS for your book. I apologize for its being this late. I hope it will be at least somewhere near what you wanted on this subject. I sincerely hope that it has not unduly inconvenienced you. After thinking it over, I believe it will be best for all concerned for me not to attend and/or speak on the Lubbock Lectures. Please consider this by withdrawal from the lectureship. If you choose not to include my MS in the book, I will understand, although it does represent quite a few hours of work done under severe duress. I am sure that between now and October you can find another able advocate of the view I have set forth in the MS. You said at the Schertz meeting that you wanted me to come and speak on the lectureship "as always" and not feel "awkward" about doing so. Your very words indicated that you knew I could not avoid, given the events that transpired in the meeting, feeling "awkward" there. You and your fellow Board Members have change--perhaps with no possibility of repair--that "as always" factor. It does not exist any more. My presence there would invite constant questions of me about these sad developments regarding TGJ, which would not be pleasant either for you or for me and which would not contribute to the lectureship. My

guess is that were you in my shoes, you would be writing the letter I am now writing.

What you men are asking Dave and me to do is practice situation ethics, relating to you fellows differently depending on the situation. However, I am not able to compartmentalize relationships in the same way that you and other members of the Board apparently expect us to do. I deny that any of you can do so toward us except entirely superficially. The TGJ Board is either with me or not with me and vice versa. The law of the excluded middle allows for no third option. The Board has made it clear in the most effective way possible and at the most significant level of my involvement with TGJ that it is no longer with me, and not because I sinned, taught false doctrine, or was involved in something “wrong” (all clearly admitted to me in the Board/Editors’ meeting), but over--of all things--the “**perception**” of something I wrote. I cannot pretend that all of my other relationships with TGJ principals remain as if nothing has happened, when the major relationship has been utterly severed. If **only one** Board Member had stood up in your all-day meeting and said, “Brethren, you can dump Dub and Dave if you wish, but I will have no part in it. I resign.” Doubtless, this action would have stopped the runaway train of which Curtis was clearly the engine. Obviously, not one of you five men was willing to do so. All of the “years of friendship” I have treasured with so many of you (yours longer than any of the others, as you pointed out) and all of the “complimentary” words you men may now speak concerning me hardly offset the force of your actions. The behavior of the Board is graphically reminiscent of elderships that ask a preacher if he wants to resign or be fired, and then when he resigns, they recommend him to high Heaven to other congregations. Please don’t mistake my words for bitterness. I am not bitter, but I am **sorely disappointed** in men whom I thought were men of principle rather than of politics.

In Christ,
Dub

Dub McClish
Gospel preacher
908 Imperial Dr.
Denton, TX 76209
940.387.1429

My August 15,2005 note to Tom Hicks, referenced above:

From: Dub McClish <tgj@charter.net>
Date: Mon, 15 Aug 2005 22:33:28 -0500
To: HICKS-TOM <tomhicks@nts-online.net>
Subject: SS Lect. ad

Tommy:

Laurie just blipped me a copy of your lectureship ad, and I see my photo and my name on it. This is a new low. I **insist** that you take my picture and my name in the schedule off of the ad before printing. Not to do so will constitute nothing short of intentional deception on your part. If you don’t have a substitute speaker, just leave my

photo slot blank and the spaces where my name appears blank. You have had ample time since I informed you I would not speak (on 7/28) to at least remove my photo, if not to replace it with someone else's. You leave me little reason not to believe that you have intentionally left my photo and name in your ad to save yourself having to answer questions about my non-participation before the lectureship even begins. If it causes you extra trouble to redo the ad, that is not my problem. Again, I **insist** that my name and photo be removed before the August issue goes out (if it ever gets out).

Sincerely,

Dub McClish

PS With your leaving my name and photo in the ad, I am made to wonder if there might be others whose photos/names are in the ad, but who will not be speaking.

Dub McClish

Gospel preacher

908 Imperial Dr.

Denton, TX 76209

940.387.1429

Hicks' August 16, 2005 response:

From: Tom Hicks <tomhicks@nts-online.net>

Date: Tue, 16 Aug 2005 08:14:49 -0500

To: DUB McCLISH <tgj@charter.net>

Cc: McCLISH LAURIE <LMCCCLISH@aol.com>

Subject: RE: SS Lect. ad

Dub,

Proverbs 15:1 says: "A soft answer turneth away wrath, but grievous words stir up anger." You needed not to write to me as you did below. I meant no offense. All you had to do was to ask me to remove your picture and your name from the advertisement. That being your desire, it will be done.

I am not going to respond to your charges (i.e., "This is a new low" ... "intentional deception on your part" ... "save yourself having to answer questions about my non-participation ... etc.) except to say, if you really do in all seriousness think these things, you are wrong. I have neither hid anything nor deceived anyone. Actually, I have told a number of brethren (including virtually all the members at Southside) that you have withdrawn yourself as one of our lectureship speakers, and I have truthfully answered every question brethren have asked me about the situation.

Frankly, there were two main reasons I left your picture and name in the advertisement. One reason was that our brochures were set up before you withdrew (the inside two pages of the brochure make up the two-page ad in TGJ). My other reason was because I had hoped you would change your mind about speaking for us. Because of that fact, I have not attempted to find anyone to replace you as a speaker. And, you know very well that, as late as last week, I told you that I wanted you to speak on the lectureship and I specifically asked you to reconsider. Yes, you refused to even consider it, but I still had hopes.

Regarding your "PS"--to date, you are the only one who has withdrawn himself as one of our speakers. Pertaining to this, the only other person I have heard from is Wesley Simons. He called me this afternoon (i.e., Monday afternoon) to let me know that he is undecided about coming. I anticipate that others may decide not to come, however, if they have already made that decision, they have not informed me of it.

I am sending Laurie a copy of this message so she will know to hold the ad until I can make the appropriate changes. The Lord willing, I will send her an updated ad tomorrow. I am also going to have the brochures reprinted so that they reflect your desires.

Your brother in Christ,
Tom

[Note: Only two days after chiding me for writing so harshly, he wrote his curt note to Michael Hatcher, as copied above. Although at the time, he claimed I was the only one who had notified him of their withdrawal from Lubbock Lectures, some eleven eventually did so, and a few others who did not withdraw, went with the specific purpose of confronting brethren Hicks, Ratcliff, Meador, Cates, Taylor, and others.]

Roanoke elders' response to my response:

From: Cleatius Copeland <Cleatius.Copeland@clearorbit.com>
Date: Sat, 20 Aug 2005 16:24:36 -0500
To: Dub McClish <tgj@charter.net>
Cc: BRASWELL-BRYAN-H <bngbraz2@sbcglobal.net>, Max Judge <tide.roofing@pwhome.com>, <agbrown55@aol.com>
Subject: RE: URGENT! August TGJ Editorials

Dub

Thank you for taking the time to answer the points in the note from Gene, Max and myself. Please be assured that the note was thoroughly discussed and agreed to in advance by the eldership of Roanoke and not just from Cleatius.

A couple of points regarding the note and hopefully, this will help.

Point 5

There are no implied suspicions, motive judgments or lack of trust in our statements. That was not the intent and if it came across as such, it was not our purpose in asking the questions. We had questions after reading the note and thought it best if we ask for clarification, instead of jumping to conclusions. It's that simple.

As to us not being comfortable with the situation, we've ask and discussed when necessary and I'm not aware of discomfort you have caused by your presents at Roanoke. I (speaking as Cleatius) am very thankful for the time we've enjoyed together and for the fact we've got to know you, Lavvone and Paige as well as we have over the past couple of years. I believe I've told you that in conversation a few times. We are very thrilled that Paige has made the decision to remain at Roanoke. It does personally makes me sad your moving to another congregation, but fully understand and

appreciate your willingness to help the start-up congregation.

As to the AP issues, we had our discussion on that Saturday AM and we all felt better about that after that meeting. It was done and over with as far as we were concerned. We did ask for a "pre-warning" of any thing going out like or similar to that letter in the future. If you remember, you ask if we wanted the ability to edit what you wanted to say and we told you no. We simply requested knowledge in advance of any potential controversial letters going out. We also realize that it's sometimes hard to know what will cause a potential controversial situation.

As to the language of the resignation vs termination, in the business world, it's termed, "seeking other opportunities". Which, by the way is what our CEO did yesterday at about 4:00 or so. He did not know until that time was about to seek an another opportunity.

We do appreciate you and pray for quick resolution to the problems within the brotherhood at this time. As you know, it's hard to convert a lost sinner if we are focused on internal problems.

Again, thank you for the note and we look forward to seeing you in the AM.

Your brothers in Christ

Gene, Max, & Cleatius

My last response to Roanoke, on the eve of our departure:

From: Dub McClish <tgj@charter.net>

Date: Sat, 20 Aug 2005 17:52:02 -0600

To: COPELAND CLEATIUS <Cleatius.Copeland@clearorbit.com>

Conversation: URGENT! August TGJ Editorials

Subject: Re: URGENT! August TGJ Editorials

Dear Gene, Cleatius, and Max:

Thanks for the note. I appreciate its congenial spirit. I also appreciate your assurance that no suspicions, etc., were behind your message. Due to various circumstances, many of which we had no control over, our two years and four months at Roanoke have been some of the most stressful of our lives. I wish we could have been with you under more relaxed conditions. I again express our thanks for to you for your support of our work and for the time we were able to spend with you. It has been good for us to get to know you and your families better. If ever I can be of service to the congregation there, I hope you will not hesitate to call on me. I look forward to seeing you all tomorrow, Lord willing.

Yours in the one faith,

Dub

SEQUEL TO THE ABOVE, RELATING TO FELLOWSHIP BETWEEN THE ROANOKE AND THE NORTHPOINT (DENTON, TX) CONGREGATIONS

[Note: When the Northpoint Church first began meeting, Roanoke donated approximately 20 old songbooks for our use. The Roanoke elders, through Cleatius Copeland, had indicated to me that Roanoke would strongly consider some financial assistance for the new Northpoint Congregation in Denton, upon receiving notice from us of some of its specific plans and needs. The Northpoint men sent the following letter to the Roanoke elders relating to these very things, especially announcing our first Gospel meeting and the need to borrow some chairs. Our letter was never acknowledged and not one person from the Roanoke Church attended or supported our meeting in any way (our meeting places are only 23 miles apart). Nor has there been any other gesture of assistance or even fellowship to the present (7/27/09).]

February 3, 2006

The Elders
Roanoke Church of Christ
P.O. Box 737
Roanoke, TX 76262

Dear brethren Copeland and Judge:

At the recent funeral of sister Myrtle Serren, various members of the Roanoke Congregation inquired of some of us about progress at the "new congregation" (i.e., Northpoint Church of Christ). We appreciate this interest and inquiry and thought it would be appropriate to provide a brief update for your information.

As you know, our first meetings were late last August in the home of Shawn and LaDawn Hale, where we continued to meet while seeking a more suitable place. We found such a place in the assembly room of the Greenbelt Business Park, three miles east of Loop 288 on US Highway 380. We signed a year-long contract at the very reasonable amount of \$400.00 per month (utilities included), and began meeting there Wednesday night November 2. This new facility is furnished with comfortable chairs. The seating capacity is fifty (with some spill-over room in the hallway), so it will likely give us sufficient room for growth in our first year.

We were saddened to lose the Hale family in December. They were from Kentucky, and when LaDawn got a good job offer there, they couldn't turn it down. However, since that time two others have placed membership with us to replace them. We had our largest attendance thus far on Christmas day, with seventeen present, and two of our number were out of town for the holiday weekend. We averaged nine in attendance for Sunday morning worship during January. It is not unusual for more to be present Sunday evening and/or Wednesday evening than on Sunday morning due to the unusual work schedules of some.

We planned our first annual budget the first week of January. It calls for an average weekly contribution of \$350.00. We averaged \$307.00 per week in January. Since we are paying no salaries and have not had to buy any furniture (except an

inexpensive speaker's lectern), our only "overhead" at this point is the lease on our meeting place. Thanks to the generosity of you and other brethren, we have not had to spend money on songbooks or communion ware.

Brother Dub McClish preaches every Sunday morning and evening when he is not elsewhere preaching in meetings or lectureships. In his absence, the three other men in the congregation rotate the preaching load. At this point, we have only one Bible class each Sunday morning and Wednesday night, and four men rotate the teaching responsibility a month at a time.

We have received some contributions from brethren (none of which any of us has personally solicited) in various places, all of which we have placed in a building fund. We plan to add any such additional contributions to this fund. We have also included in our budget the transfer of \$500.00 each month to serve this purpose. We will soon begin "window shopping" for suitable raw property on which to eventually build or for property with existing improvements that we can renovate for our use. With the Lord blessing our efforts, we may be able to limit the contract on our present lease to its one-year duration.

We have not yet done any local advertising, so those who have visited with us have come because they heard of us by some other means. However, we are in the planning stages of beginning some ads in the local paper for the purpose of letting people know about the existence of Northpoint and for letting people know in very brief, but understandable terms, basically what we stand for.

We have our first Gospel meeting planned for April 2–5, with Lee Moses of Mammoth Spring, Arkansas, preaching. As you may remember, he and his wife were converted at Pearl Street about six years ago, and we encouraged him to prepare himself to preach by attending Memphis School of Preaching (I believe Roanoke helped with his support). He is an outstanding young preacher and is delighted to be coming back to Denton. We are in the planning stages of publicizing this effort, which we plan to do by means of the local newspaper, door-knocking in the area nearest our building, and writing letters. (Our meeting room has only thirty-five chairs, and we want to prepare for capacity crowds. This means we will need to buy, rent, or borrow fifteen additional chairs for this effort. We would much prefer to borrow them, since it will likely be many months before we need them on a regular basis. We ask at this time if the Roanoke Congregation could lend us this many folding chairs for this effort? We will be most grateful if you can. Also, if we have some who want to obey the Gospel, either during the meeting or at some other time, we will appreciate it if we can use your baptistery.) We will send you more detailed information on this effort as the time draws nearer. We hope there will be many from Roanoke who will want to attend.

While we are saddened at the reasons it was necessary to begin the Northpoint congregation, we are excited and encouraged at the prospects for its development and progress. We are interested in numerical growth, because each person has an immortal soul. However, we will steadfastly resist any temptation to attract additional people just for the sake of increasing our attendance and contribution figures. In our prayers in our assemblies, we regularly pray for growth that is pleasing to God. We will appreciate your prayers for our efforts to build a strong, stable, and faithful congregation in our city, and we bid you Godspeed in your faithful efforts to serve Him.

Yours in the one faith,

Rick Beauchamp

James Ingraham*

Dub McClish

Jerry Smith

*Because of a factious spirit that caused division in the body, it became necessary for Northpoint to withdraw fellowship from James Ingraham on May 27, 2007 and from his wife, Barbara, on July 22, 2007.