

December 7, 2013

Mr Hulme,

John Anderson called yesterday afternoon to inform me of your instructions, and during the call, he suggested that I write you to convey the essence of the conversation I had with him.

Carla and I have appreciated the opportunities we have had over the past 15 years to serve in a variety of ways. Thank you for your part in that.

I must convey, however, that I can no longer agree with what we are doing and how we are functioning as an organization, and I can no longer support you as you would prefer.

There are primarily three issues at the heart of my concerns: governance, our approach to the gospel, and the Church's teaching on the United States and Britain in prophecy.

1. *Governance.* The issue at hand is not the proper *form* of government in the Church. The issue revolves around *the proper way to exercise responsibility and authority within the community of the Church*, to declare the truth and to prepare God's people to rule with Christ. It's about *the way we work together* to get the job done, and *the way we care for those who are a part of that effort*. It's about how well we reflect the way God the Father and Christ work together and care for each other.

I have approached you privately on several occasions about matters of unethical conduct among the ministry; so have others, such as Steve Andrews, Brian Orchard and Peter Nathan, also on several occasions. In addition, matters have been brought before the U.S. board. Finally, Steve Andrews wrote a letter appealing to you to consider these and other matters where members have suffered because we have not acted in accordance with the Scriptures.

Our hope was that in the multitude of counsel from men who care deeply about God's people, you would at least consider that more action was required. However, these appeals have now been met with two dismissals. The fear is that you have withdrawn into an autocratic style of governance that no longer reflects a concern for the real welfare of God's people.

God wants fruit (John 15:8). Our twofold commission demands that responsibility be exercised properly within our spiritual community to produce fruit in two areas: the declaration of the truth and the preparation of a people to rule with Christ.

What causes problems in the Church is when people get polarized around personalities (1 Corinthians 1:10–15). When we do this, we forget that it's not about any of us. Paul understood that (1 Corinthians 3:1–17). It's about what *God* is doing; it's *His* building, *His* field, *His* work, not ours.

Our collective work as a body of believers should be a collaborative effort of humble facilitators, working together within a hierarchical structure, to declare the truth to the world and to prepare God's people to rule with Christ, whose efforts respectfully support and help strengthen the direct connection God the Father and Christ have with those they have called and will establish with those they will call. I'm concerned that over the passing of time, you have lost sight of this.

2. *Our approach to the gospel.* The issue at hand here revolves around *the content of the message and how it is conveyed*. This has been the subject of debate for several years, and has more recently come to the fore. Mr. Armstrong made clear the four essential criteria for effectively proclaiming the truth to the world: address a relevant topic, consider the current thinking regarding it, ask rhetorical questions to get people thinking about the real solution, and then give them the truth, clearly and courageously. Paul did this effectively in proclaiming the truth to the philosophers at Athens. Remarkably, to those who were intellectuals with no Hebraic background, he declared that there is a God, that He is Creator, Ruler and Lawgiver, that He wants a family relationship with us, that

there is another way, and that things are going to change, and will be brought about by One that God Himself has charged with the task (Acts 17:22–31). Yet as time has passed in these 15 years since we came together again, our public proclamation has not effectively conveyed the truth of God to the world in a clear and courageous way. This too has been brought to your attention, but we continue to produce materials that fall short in that way.

3. *The Church's teaching on the United States and Britain in Prophecy.* The issue at hand here is *whether we believe what we once did* regarding this pivotal, long-standing teaching of the Church. Though a study group has been convened, your direct answer to one minister when he asked you whether you believed Ephraim was Britain was “no.” Others have heard you express similar ideas regarding this. Peter Nathan and Brian Orchard have appealed to you to consider your approach to the scriptures in this regard. Peter Nathan's objection to your unilateral approach to introducing changes in doctrine was characterized in the official announcement of his resignation as a different view of government. The issue for him had nothing to do with the form of government in the Church, but how we collectively arrive at changes in our understanding. Sadly, the official announcement has only served to send members down the wrong path of wondering what our official teaching on the form of Church government is, and wondering what Peter Nathan believes is the correct form of government, when in reality the real issue is what *you* believe about the Church's teaching on the United States and Britain in Prophecy.

For 15 years now I have devoted myself fully to the responsibilities that have been given to me. I know that I will answer to Jesus Christ for everything I have said and done, and will say and do. I have tried to support you as much as humanly possible during that time period. My ultimate desire is to serve God's people in whatever way God wants me to, and to focus solely on that. But issues like these have only served to make the fulfillment of my role more difficult.

Though I wish that I could believe that reconciliation was possible, and that you would consider the appeals of so many, I am concerned that this is no longer possible in light of your recent actions. Change is necessary on your part, and on the part of John Anderson and any who would support you in these areas. Is there a way to achieve appropriate change and reconciliation? You must answer that question.

If you feel, in light of my concerns, that you need to end my employment with the Church, I understand.

I leave the matter in your hands,

Bob Rodzaj