

Testimony to Trent and Teresa

Part Two - 12/14/13

An Examination of Doug Mitchell's assertion that the leading brethren at the 1990 Indianapolis General Conference Session accepted his "The Lord's Supper" presentation and that this event was in fulfillment of the 430-year prophecy of Ezekiel 4 in the year 1990 (as prophesied by Lois Roden in The Branch She Message from 1977 - 1984) and in the culmination of the Protestant Reformation and the continuation of the Branch Message.

Brother Trent and Sister Teresa:

About one month ago from the date of this letter (part two), I sent you a letter of testimony concerning the video presentation you released a few months ago of a telephone conference call with the brethren which you conducted just over a week after the passing of Brother Doug Mitchell, March 15, 2013. Even though I have not to date received any acknowledgement of my first testimony, I will continue with the examination and summary of the truth of the 1990 date significance and other matters relevant to The Branch body of believers. I present this continuing testimony to you in hope that the Voice of Reason and Truth on these matters might resonate with you.

As believers in Christ The Branch, we understand the required testimony of two or three witnesses for the matter of importance that is set before us today. This requirement is particularly important in light of Bro. Doug's claim to his personal fulfillment of the events prophesied for 1990 and as we consider the matter of leadership in The Branch, namely Doug's claim of leadership and then, upon his death, your public claim thereto. As I stated before, this is a foundational issue that requires careful examination by The Branch body members and those who are presently investigating The Branch message, from 1955 to the present.

Through an intermediate connection my wife and I have located the minutes of the 1990 GC Session in the General Conference archives (link below), and I have included in this testimony a small excerpt of the GC session that began on July 5, 1990. There is no record of a pre-meeting on July 1, the date that Doug stated for his claim of the 430 year fulfillment in 1990. Perhaps Doug was present at the meeting site on July 1, and perhaps he did speak to a few of the leading brethren who were preparing for the meetings, or passed out literature to a few, but there is no other witness to this purported event.

Interestingly, there is a section in the recorded minutes, for July 13, dealing specifically with the Communion Service, however there is no record of any presentation by Doug Mitchell at or previous to this date, or any subsequent acceptance of The Lord's Supper in the Communion service revision adopted at the session. Please read the meeting minutes for July 13 reproduced below and let us know what you think. This is a vital Present Truth issue. If you have any further information or documentation of this event that we have not considered or discovered, it would be helpful, even vital, to share it with us.

Evidence: July 13 minutes of 1990 General Conference Session at Indianapolis.

<http://docs.adventistarchives.org/docs/GCC/GCC1990-07.pdf>

90-1054
July 13, 1990 - GCS
ChMan/OCD088AC/88AC/298-88G/143-89G/90GCS to CBR
125-90G ANNOUNCING THE COMMUNION SERVICE -

CHURCH MANUAL REVISION
(The Communion Service—Announcing the Communion Service)
VOTED, To revise CM p 79, Announcing the Communion Service, to

read as follows:

Announcing the Communion Service. -- In most churches this service is conducted on the next to the last Sabbath of the quarter. On the Sabbath preceding the communion service, mention should be made of the importance of the forthcoming Communion. All members are urged to prepare their hearts and to make sure that matters are right with one another. Then when they come to the table of the Lord the following week the service can be of greater blessing to them. The church clerk,deacons, and deaconesses should attempt to notify those who were not present when the announcement was made.

126-90G lab COMMUNION SERVICE - CHURCH MANUAL REVISION
VOTED, To revise CM pp 78-82, The Communion Service, to read as follows:

The Communion Service

In the Seventh-day Adventist Church the communion service customarily is celebrated once per quarter. The service includes the ordinance of foot washing and the Lord's Supper. It should be a most sacred and joyous occasion to the congregation, as well as to the minister or elder. Conducting the communion service is undoubtedly one of the most sacred duties that a minister or elder is called upon to perform. Jesus, the great Redeemer of this world, is holy. The angels declare: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." Therefore, since Jesus is holy, the *symbols* that represent His body and His blood are also holy. Since the Lord Himself selected the deeply meaningful symbols of the unleavened bread and unfermented fruit of the vine and used the simplest of means for washing the disciples' feet, there should be great reluctance to introduce alternative symbols and means (except under truly emergency conditions) lest the original significance of the service be lost.

Likewise in the order of service and the traditional roles played by the ministers, elders, deacons, and deaconesses in the communion service, there should be caution lest substitution and innovation contribute to a tendency to make common that which is sacred.

Individualism and independence of action and practice could become an expression of unconcern for church unity and fellowship on this most blessed and sacred occasion. Desire for change could neutralize the element of remembrance in this service instituted by our Lord Himself as He entered upon His passion.

90-1083
GCS - July 13, 1990

The service of the Lord's Supper is just as holy today as it was when instituted by Jesus Christ. Jesus is still present when this sacred ordinance is celebrated. We read, "It is at these, His own appointments, that Christ meets His people, and energizes them by His presence."--The Desire of Ages, p. 656.

Announcing the Communion Service. -- The Communion Service may appropriately be included as part of any Christian worship service.

However, to give proper emphasis and make communion available to the greatest possible number of members, usually it is part of the Sabbath worship service, preferably on the next to the last Sabbath of each quarter.

On the preceding Sabbath an announcement should be made of the service calling attention to the importance of the forthcoming Communion, so that all members may prepare their hearts and make sure that unresolved differences are put right with one another. When they come to the table of the Lord the following week, the service then can bring the blessing intended. Those who were not present for the announcement should be notified and invited to attend.

Conducting the Communion Service. -- Length of Service - Time is not the most significant factor in planning the communion service.

However, attendance can be improved and the spiritual impact increased by:

1. Eliminating all extraneous items from the worship service on this high day.
2. Avoiding delays before and after the footwashing.
3. Having the deaconesses arrange the emblems on the communion table well beforehand.

Preliminaries. -- The introductory portion of the service should include only very brief announcements, hymn, prayer, offering, and a short sermon before separating for the washing of

feet. More worshippers will be encouraged to stay for the entire service if the early part of the service has been brief.

Footwashing. -- Men and women should be provided separate areas for the footwashing. Where stairs or distance is a problem, special arrangements should be made for the handicapped. In places where it is socially acceptable and where clothing is such that there would be no immodesty, separate arrangements may be made for a husband and wife or parents and baptized children to share with each other in the footwashing ceremony. To encourage shy or sensitive people who may view the choice of a footwashing partner as an embarrassing experience, church leaders should be designated whose responsibility during the footwashing is to help such persons find partners.

90-1084
July 13, 1990 - GCS

Before the service deacons and deaconesses should prepare basins, towels, and water at a comfortable temperature for the footwashing. Soap and an extra basin should be available for washing the hands afterward.

Bread and Wine. -- A hymn may be sung during the reassembly of the congregation as the officiating ministers or elders take their places at the table on which the bread and wine have been placed, and the deacons their places on the front row of the church. The covering over the bread is removed. A suitable passage of Scripture may be read such as 1 Corinthians 11:23, 24, Matthew 26:26, Mark 14:22, or Luke 22:19, or a brief sermon may be given at this point in the service rather than earlier. This can be especially effective if the sermon emphasizes the meaning of the bread and wine so its message is still fresh in the minds of participants as the emblems are being distributed. Those officiating normally kneel while the blessing is asked on the bread.

The congregation may kneel or remain seated. Most of the bread to be served is usually broken ahead of time, with a small portion left on each plate for the elders or pastors to break. The minister and elders hand the plates containing the bread to the deacons, then the deacons serve the congregation. During this time there may be a choice of special music, testimonies, a summary of the sermon, selected readings, congregational singing, or meditative organ or piano music.

Each person should retain his or her portion of the bread until the officiating minister or elder has been served. When everyone has been seated, the leader invites all to partake of the bread together.

Silent prayers are offered as the bread is eaten. The minister then reads a suitable passage such as 1 Corinthians 11:25, 26, Matthew 26:27-29, Mark 14:23-25, or Luke 22:20. Leaders kneel as the prayer is given over the wine. Again, deacons serve the congregation. Activities such as those suggested during the passing of the bread may be continued at this time. After the officiating ministers or elders have been served, all worshippers partake of the wine together.

An optional method is for the bread to be *blessed* and broken, then the bread and wine are to be placed on the same tray when passed to the congregation. The worshipper takes both from the tray at the same time. The bread is eaten, followed by silent prayer. Then after prayer over the wine it is taken, followed by silent prayer. Where pews or seats are equipped with racks to hold the wine glasses, the collection of glasses is unnecessary until after the service.

Celebration. -- The service may close with a musical feature or congregational singing followed by dismissal. However it *closes*, it should end on a high note. Communion should always be a solemn experience but never a somber one. Wrongs have been righted, sins have been forgiven, and faith has been reaffirmed; it is a time for celebration. Let the music be bright and joyous.

90-1085
GCS - July 13, 1990

An offering for the poor is often taken as the congregation leaves. After the service the deacons and deaconesses clear the table, collect glasses, and dispose of any bread or wine left over by burning or burying the bread and pouring the wine on the ground.

Who May Participate. -- The Seventh-day Adventist Church practices open communion. All who have committed their lives to the Saviour may participate. Children learn the significance of the service by observing others participate. After receiving formal instruction in baptismal classes and making their commitment to Jesus in baptism, they are thereby prepared to partake in the service themselves.

"When believers assemble to celebrate the ordinances, there are present messengers unseen by human eyes. There may be a Judas in the company, and if so, messengers from the prince of darkness are there, for they attend all who refuse to be controlled by the Holy Spirit. Heavenly angels also are present. These unseen visitants are present on every such occasion."--The Desire of Ages, p. 656.

"Christ's example forbids exclusiveness at the Lord's Supper. It is true that open sin excludes the guilty. This the Holy Spirit plainly teaches. But beyond this none are to pass judgment. God has not left it with men to say who shall present themselves on these occasions. For who can read the heart? Who can distinguish the tares from the wheat? 'Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.' For 'whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.' 'He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.' . . .

"There may come into the company persons who are not in heart servants of truth and holiness, but who may wish to take part in the service. They should not be forbidden. There are witnesses present who were present when Jesus washed the feet of the disciples and of Judas. More than human eyes beheld the scene." - -Ibid.

Every Member Should Attend. -- "None should exclude themselves from the Communion because some who are unworthy may be present. Every disciple is called upon to participate publicly, and thus bear witness that he accepts Christ as a personal Saviour. It is at these, His own appointments, that Christ meets His people, and energizes them by His presence. Hearts and hands that are unworthy may even administer the ordinance, yet Christ is there to minister to His children.

90-1086
July 13, 1990 - GCS

All who come with their faith fixed upon Him will be greatly blessed. All who neglect these seasons of divine privilege will suffer loss. Of them it may appropriately be said, 'Ye are not all clean.'--Ibid.

Unleavened Bread and Unfermented Wine. -- "Christ is still at the table on which the paschal supper has been spread. The unleavened cakes used at the Passover season are before Him. The Passover wine, untouched by fermentation, is on the table. These emblems Christ employs to represent His own unblemished sacrifice. Nothing corrupted by fermentation, the symbol of sin and death, could represent the 'Lamb without blemish and without spot.'" --Ibid., p. 653.

Neither the "cup" nor the bread contained elements of fermentation as on the evening of the first day of the Hebrew Passover all leaven or fermentation had been removed from their dwellings (Exodus 12:15, 19; 13:7). Therefore, only *unfermented* grape juice and unleavened bread are appropriate for use in the communion service, so great care must be exercised in providing these elements. In those more isolated areas of the world where grape or raisin juice or concentrate is not readily available, the conference office will provide advice or assistance in obtaining it for the churches.

A Memorial of the Crucifixion. -- "By partaking of the Lord's supper, the broken bread and the fruit of the vine, we show forth the Lord's death until He comes. The scenes of His sufferings and death are thus brought fresh to our minds." - -Early Writings, p. 217.

"As we receive the bread and wine symbolizing Christ's broken body and spilled blood, we in imagination join in the scene of Communion in the upper chamber. We seem to be passing through the garden consecrated by the agony of Him who bore the *sins* of the world. We witness the struggle by which our reconciliation with God was obtained.

Christ is set forth crucified among us." - -The Desire of Ages, p. 661.

Ordinance of Foot Washing. -- "Now, having washed the disciples' feet, He said, 'I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.' In these words Christ was not merely enjoying the practice of hospitality. More was meant than the washing of the feet of guests to remove the dust of travel. Christ was here instituting a religious service. By the act of our Lord this expression of humility was made a sacred ordinance. It was to be observed by the disciples, that they might ever keep in mind His lessons of humility and service.

"This ordinance is Christ's appointed preparation for the sacramental service. While pride, variance, and strife for supremacy are cherished, the heart cannot enter into fellowship with Christ. We are not prepared to receive the communion of His body and His blood.

Therefore it was that Jesus appointed the memorial of His humiliation to be first observed."--Ibid., p. 650.

90-1087
GCS - July 13, 1990

In the act of washing the disciples' feet, Christ performed a deeper cleansing, that of washing from the heart the stain of sin. The communicant senses an unworthiness to accept the sacred emblems before he or she experiences the cleansing which makes one "clean every whit" John 13:10. Jesus desired to wash away "alienation, jealousy and pride from their hearts. . .Pride and self-seeking create dissension and hatred, but all this Jesus washed away. . .Looking upon them Jesus could say, 'Ye are clean.'"--Ibid., p. 646.

The spiritual experience which lies at the heart of footwashing lifts it from being a common custom to a sacred ordinance. It conveys a message of forgiveness, acceptance, assurance, and solidarity primarily from Christ to the believer, but also between the believers themselves. This message is expressed in an atmosphere of humility.

Who May Conduct Communion Service. -- The communion service is to be conducted by an ordained minister or a church elder. Deacons, although ordained, cannot conduct the service; but they can assist by passing the bread and wine to the members.

Communion for the Sick. -- If any members are ill or cannot for any other reason leave the home to attend the communion service in the house of worship, a special service in the home may be held for them.

This service can be conducted only by an ordained minister or a church elder, who may be accompanied and assisted by deacons or deaconesses.

Adjourned.
K J Mittleider, Chairman
Samuel Young, Secretary
F G Thomas, Actions Secretary
Fay Welter, Recording Secretary
147

In light of the GCS meeting minutes copied above, and after reviewing Doug's claim to the 1990 date in his study "Dry Bones Extra" as well as your claim in your YouTube video, it is not a difficult matter to reach the conclusions I have summarized below:

- 1) Doug presented no Heaven-sent message that met the requirements of the Reformation time chart by Lois Roden, neither as to time demarcated in the year 1990 or as to relevance as per John Knox's reformation message of the Holy Spirit. Doug's claim to the 1990 date was not recognized until about two years later, by his own admission by his own claim, no one else saw this. His claim is not substantiated by credible evidence or by eyewitnesses. Doug was not truthful, --not even with you, Trent--, in regards to his "qualifications" for his 1990 date application in the 430-year prophecy.
- 2) Doug ignored organizational requirements as per The Leviticus of DSDA, Heaven's earthly laws for His Church, separating from the body of Branches. He disregarded the counsel of Brother Houteff that "every new truth brings a timely new name" (2TG34:25:1).
- 3) Doug never sought for any reconciliation with the Branch brethren who did not accept his claim of continuation of the message; and, even worse, Doug took brethren to court, not once, but many times. He was ruled against every time because the judges did their homework. The 2010 Colorado case Summary Judgment, the case in which I was involved directly, is included in this testimony as a separate attachment. We are clearly counseled NOT to go to man's courts in religious matters, asking the court to decide who is the leader, seeking the judgment of men, the judgment of civil

authorities, to decide who has a pure message, or whose claim is supposedly valid to the “original” message.

Doug had to know the courts would NOT decide in matters of religious controversy, to do so would be a direct violation of the First Amendment Freedom of Religion Clause of the U. S. Constitution. But Doug’s methods, his very personality, were those of using FORCE to achieve his objectives. The courts repeatedly ruled that they lacked “subject matter jurisdiction” in all matters of religion. Why did Doug fail to abide with this legal and spiritual reality and recognize he had NO CASE, no grounds to sue brethren, stealing time and money (for legal representation) from those he determined as “apostate”? His first case, in 1993-94 or thereafter, was with the Norwalk California SDA church for a claim of slander from the pulpit by the pastor in a sermon comment against Branch Davidians. What an unfortunate testimony Doug presented to that church in that legal action, adding fuel to the fire so to speak against Branch Davidians and making it look as if we are all militant legal antagonists, a direct violation of church counsels and Scripture. This case went all the way up to the General Conference legal department. The legal repercussions of that action caused the Norwalk church pastor, the well beloved pastor of that church, to be reassigned.

- 4) Doug retained the name BDSDA, regardless of the fact that we are told by Victor Houteff that after the purification (which occurred in 1993), the old name is to be dropped. Even if the “purification” is not complete, there is no counsel and no precedent for a new messenger to use the old organizational name of The Branch (BDSDA), the name given under Benjamin Roden. The SDA name itself has a curse attached to it now. The General Conference long ago TRADEMARKED that name. The General Conference Corporation legally OWNS that name and it cannot be challenged. That name will NOT be purified. The leading brethren conspired with the STATE in this matter as well as in the church-statecraft of incorporation and 501c status. Why did Doug retain that name? Can you tell me?

The 1993 judgment at Waco was the purification of The Branch movement, the fig tree judgment of Luke 13:7. It was certainly the prophetic event answering to Ezekiel Nine, where “men, maids and little children all perished,” “by the spirit of judgment and the spirit of BURNING” according to the Isa. 4:4 prophecy. The SDA church name is a curse (1SR155:1), and it has been “proscribed” (Ellen White’s dream in 1T578, 579). I can tell you why Doug retained that name, the same reason why he kept Ben Roden’s organizational name--to support his claim of being the true leader of the “original” organization in the purview of man’s court system. The courts did not buy Doug’s repeated argument of continuity of the message, his claiming to hold to the “original” doctrine of the original organization. He was ruled against every time for “lack of subject matter jurisdiction”. But he never ceased his efforts with the courts of man. Apparently, to the day of his death, he was reviewing his legal paper work, court case rulings etc. ; looking for a defect in the judgments and pleadings; looking for a new legal angle upon which to reopen the case. Doug did not understand that it was over; that he had no case; that he had no right to associate his legal actions with those of Ben Roden’s in the early 1960s through which Bro. Roden gained the right to buy back the remaining 77 acres of New Mt. Carmel. Doug’s actions were not based upon Divine will and were certainly NOT in harmony with Divine character and Divine prophecy in relation to the antitypical Zerubbabel (see Zechariah 4:6, “not by might or by power...”). In this matter, Scripture counsel is clear:

[1Corinthians 6](#) -

6:1 Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?

6:2 Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters?
 6:3 Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?
 6:4 If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church.
 6:5 I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren?
 6:6 But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers.
 6:7 Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather [suffer yourselves to] be defrauded?

5) I suppose what was most disheartening about Doug's spirit, his mission and his ministry, was his attitude towards anyone who disagreed with him. He immediately determined in his mind and by his words that they were an "apostate" and in a state of justifiable dis-fellowship without due process per Matthew 18; therefore, they were NOT "brethren". He thus felt justified in excising them, making accusations about and against them, and, if need be, taking them to court if he felt the matter warranted it. For the record, I know from sad personal experience of Doug's typical emotional response to basically any who disagreed with him. He would, in fact, bear false witness by misrepresenting the truth of an event or by maligning a brother or sister, both generally and specifically. I repeat, Doug would BEAR FALSE WITNESS in the facts of events when it was convenient for perceptual advantage. I do not bear this testimony lightly, please understand. Many of us in the movement experienced just such attacks from Doug for over the last twenty-five years. How can these actions and the spirit behind them be justified? Especially when he made "The Daily" the central theme of his message while at the same time ignoring the Scriptural requirements of "the ministry of reconciliation" by never seeking any reconciliation whatsoever? I cannot state this issue any more clearly. This, along with the sheer silence of any supporting testimony and witness of his claim to the 1990 date fulfillment, ... well, this pretty much sums it up.

One case in point here,-- while attending the Atlanta General Conference session in the early 2000s, a well-known Davidian, Eric Edstrom, met Doug on the street passing out literature. Eric accepted the literature and engaged in a conversation with Doug that quickly ended in a heated personality clash on Doug's part. Sometime after this event Eric found me on-line, called me, and told me about this incident, -- quite curious as to whether all Branch believers were like that. Eric and I had several long, pleasant phone conversations, some of which were not even doctrinal in nature. He at least understood my spirit was quite different than Doug's. In my conversations with Eric, my final summation was that 'Doug did not represent The Branch'.

Trent, do you think it was wrong for me to somehow communicate that sentiment to Eric?

Sister Roden communicated these very same words and sentiments to Teresa Moore in a phone conversation about a year before Sister Roden's passing, when an incident took place at Teresa Moore's home in Pennsylvania, during a meeting with a group of Branch believers, in which Doug was present. You don't need to take my word for it. You could hear it from Teresa herself, as we did offer you her phone number some time ago. But, from what I have seen so far, I don't think you are interested (in any other testimony) because you know what you know and that is all that you want to know-- as taught by Doug.

Teresa Moore was one of the two Branch sisters listed in Lois Roden's last will to carry on the publishing work. I have a copy of the will. Teresa Moore was actually Lois Roden's best friend in the message. Sometimes they called each other several times daily during Lois's last few years. Teresa does not make things up. In my long friendship with her, I have found her to be trustworthy, a worthy

personal friend and respected elder sister. This, Trent, is how we older ones in the message regard each other in our long friendships. We respect each other, listen to each other's point of view, even if we don't agree all the time. We are brethren, always friends, fulfilling Yahshua's command to "love one another."

When Ben Roden was given the mantle of leadership after Victor Houteff's passing, and after he hesitated and delayed his initial Divine promptings, he was told "audibly" one evening to write a letter to Florence Houteff and her Executive Counsel. After Ben had written the letter, he told his Divine Prompter that he could not sign the letter with his own name because he had not truly written it, other than as a human instrument. So Yahshua, The Branch Himself, told Ben to sign it "The Branch". Ben Roden's Divine commission came directly from Yahshua Himself, not from a man or a fellow servant.

Brother, you have assumed a mantle of which you do not understand. In verity, it is not something to be desired, as all past messengers have likely recognized eventually. It is an immense responsibility and one of personal liability if you fail or if you have been presumptuous. In fact, being the leader of a movement of Divine proportions is the most undesirable job in the world, even in light of the admonition that we are to seek earnestly for the best gifts of the Spirit.

It is clear that you haven't investigated the other branches, or reached out, to the rest of "the family", as I would call them. Indeed, we have been ignored until we tried to be the conciliators, seeking the ministry of reconciliation before and after Doug's passing. I've offered the phone numbers of the other branches, some intimate close friends of Lois Roden's, yet you have no interest. Is this attitude a result of Doug's warnings to you about certain people, certain brethren? You knew of us, but you didn't reach out to get to know us and find out who we are. Teresa Moore was left in charge of the publishing for The Branch, republishing the writings of Ben and Lois, as it turned out. She was very close to Lois. She is a nice lady in our long experience with her. Even Stephen Kraner knows her, has spoken to her on the phone, but you seemingly have no interest.

Finally, Trent, as I have previously presented my very brief synopsis of the fulfillment of the 1990 date of the Reformation in my first testimony, a month ago, in contravention to Doug's unproven application in his study "Dry Bones Extra", we should all understand there must be a valid statement of truth and fulfillment for this important subject. The application I shared with you in summary of the 430-year prophecy ending in 1990, is an application in harmony with Lois Roden's last teaching on the Bride of Christ, coming out of Her "closet", in truth and in the fullness of Her ministration in 1990, for The Branch movement, initiating the Executive phase of the Judgment for the Living.

For any messenger to claim a continuation of The Branch message, the continuation of Revelation 18:1, there must be a basis of historical evidence and prophetic application to substantiate the claim. I regret to belabor the point, and this will likely be the last time.

I am asking this evidence of you, Brother Trent, because I am concerned for you. I am concerned for those who are supporting you and for whom you have made yourself responsible. Most of all, I am concerned for the sake of "The BRANCH".

Long ago, I saw a charismatic young man, not unlike yourself and about your age, come along in the movement and swept the people up in his charismatic personality and personal charm. He had a considerable talent to teach and to make music and to hold the attention of the ones who accepted his long studies. I saw what it did to the Branch movement. I lived through this event. I saw it up close and personal. I saw him separate many brethren, cutting off friendships and fellowship in the message,

and yes, even broke up families. Many that I knew as friends perished in 1993. Vernon Howell , aka David Koresh, pushed Lois Roden aside and greatly disrespected her. He finally told his new followers to throw out all of the Branch Davidian teachings, the Spirit of Prophecy books, the firm platform, and to listen only to him as the living word (supposedly).

My concern is that now, thirty years later, as I see it, you are not building on the platform of The Branch message. Rather you are building upon the platform of Doug Mitchell's version of The Branch message, upon his private interpretation of The Branch message. It is clear that Bro. Doug had no evidence for his claim of his calling for the prophetic ministry. Doug was even banned from representing The Branch by Lois Roden in the report of the 1985 meeting in Pennsylvania, as conveyed by Teresa Moore.

If my experience in these matters and the information that I have presented are of no interest to you, if you have it all figured out, if you know all that you need to know, then, Trent, I accept that. But I assure you, that the counsels of Heaven tell us plainly to search out a matter, to wait on HIM, and to not move in haste.

From here on it is between you and The BRANCH, I have done my job. I will still regard you as a brother and will always be open to meaningful communication and reconciliation with you. May the Holy Spirit lead you and Teresa to reconsider your position on these matters for our overall mutual blessings. For when we humble ourselves, we increase in Wisdom. The Heart of Heaven is in the ministry of reconciliation.

For the sake of The BRANCH, Their Body and Their Sacrifice.

Shalom,

Tom Caldwell
Your Fellow Servant

In accord:
Linda Caldwell
Margaret Tow