TO: JUDICIAL COMMITTEE  
BEENLEIGH EAST CONG.  

APRIL 6, 1991  
DEAR BROTHERS,

RE: REPLY TO LETTER INCLUDING ALSO PHONE CONVERSATION WITH DR. MONTY  
BY MEANS OF THIS LETTER WE WOULD LIKE TO CONVEY SOME OF OUR THOUGHTS AS A COMMITTEE REGARDING TO [BCH] AND HIS REINSTATEMENT PLEA.

SINCE WE RECEIVED YOUR LETTER WE HAVE ALLOWED TIME TO ELAPSE AND IN THAT TIME WE HAVE ALSO HAD A DISCUSSION WITH [BCI] (EX. WIFE)


IF [BCI] FEELS HE HAS PROOF OF MORE ACTS OF ADULTERY HE NEEDS TO PRESENT THAT PROOF. THE ORIGINAL COMMITTEE PLUS THE APPEALS COMMITTEE SAID THAT AT THAT TIME THERE WAS NO REASON FOR HIM NOR GROUNDS FOR HIM TO OBTAIN A SCRIPTURAL DIVORCE BUT HE WENT AHEAD WITH THIS COURSE AND THAT DIVORCE HAS BEEN LEGALLY TERMINATED IN ABOUT OCTOBER, 1990. IF WHAT [BCH] SAYS OR FEELS THAT [BCI] ONLY OWNED UP TO ONE ACT OR ONE TIME SLEEPING WITH THE OTHER PERSON BUT NOW [BCI] SAYING THAT IT WAS PERHAPS 3 TIMES THEN PERHAPS THERE WAS A TECHNICALITY THERE. YET WE REMEMBER THAT [BCI] AS MENTIONED BEFORE HAD BEEN FAITHFUL AND HAD SINCE BEEN BAPTISED.

IT ONLY SEEMS THAT WHEN [BCH] AND [REDAC] WERE GETTING TOGETHER THAT EACH STARTED TO LOOK AT DIVORCING EACH OTHER'S MATE. (BOTH NOW HAVE)

FROM THE COMMITTEES POINT OF VIEW [BCI] HAD GROUNDS TO DIVORCE [BCH] FOR THE GROSS WRONGS THAT [BCH] COMMITTED. SHE STILL WANTED HIM BACK WHEN THESE MATTERS OCCURRED.

A QUESTION THAT COULD BE POSED TO [BCH] IS WHY DID HE GO AHEAD WITH DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS AGAINST WHAT THE COMMITTEES HAD SAID? AT THE BEGINNING [BCH] SHOWED AN UTTER DISREGARD FOR THEOCRATIC DIRECTION DOES THIS PERHAPS SHOW THAT HE STILL WANTS THINGS TO GO HIS WAY.
WHEN WE THINK OF WORKS THAT BEFIT REPENTANCE AS FAR AS EJ IS CONCERNED HE MAY HAVE STOPPED WHAT HE DID IN THE PAST AND HE MAY BE DOING ALL THE RIGHT THINGS AS FAR AS OUTWARD APPEARANCES ARE CONCERNED AND HE MIGHT SAY ALL THE RIGHT THINGS BUT WE ARE VERY SCEPTICAL ABOUT WHETHER HE IS MAKING THINGS RIGHT WITH HIS FAMILY FOR WHAT HE DID FOR A PERSON WHO SAYS HE IS CUT TO THE HEART FOR THE WRONG DONE IS HE GOING TO THE EXTENT THAT HE SHOULD TO MAKE THINGS RIGHT THERE. AT THIS PARTICULAR TIME WE ON WHAT HAS SAID DON'T THINK SO.

YOUR POINT NO. 1 YOU DO NOT HAVE EVIDENCE THAT ARE PURPOSE FULLY MAKING CONTACT.

YOU MENTIONED A FEW TIMES THAT THEY MAY STILL BE KEEPING EYE CONTACT. TALKING TO BR. BERT HATTON HE MENTIONED THAT MAY BE WORKING VERY CLOSE BY.

BECAUSE THEY ARE IN THE LIMELIGHT EVERY MOVE THEY MAKE IS WATCHED AND WE MAY CONSTRUE IT TO MEAN THAT THEY ARE KEEPING THAT CONTACT. NEVER THE LESS BECAUSE OF THE WAY THINGS HAVE GONE OVER THE TIME SINCE THE COMMITTEE MEETINGS WE FEEL CAUTION IS THE WISE COURSE IT WOULD BE GOOD IF WE COULD FIND OUT IF THEY REALLY HAVE INTENTIONS OF STILL GETTING TOGETHER. WHAT IS OF GRAVE CONCERN TO US IS THAT THEY MAY STILL BE SCHEMING TO GET MARRIED AND BE IN THE TRUTH. SO FAR BOTH ARE DIVORCED, BOTH WANTED EACH OTHER, ONLY WAITING FOR TO BE REINSTATED. COULD THIS BE THE CASE? THIS IS IN OUR MINDS.

PHONE CONVERSATION BR. MONTY BAKER (THIS HAS ALSO BEEN CONVEYED TO BODY OF ELDERS LOGAN HOME WEST C/- BR. BERT HATTON)

JUST RECENTLY THE SON OF WHO HAS SINCE BEEN BAPTISED CAME UP TO THE ELDERS BECAUSE THERE WAS A MATTER THAT WAS TROUBLING HIS CONSCIENCE. HE FELT THERE WAS SOMETHING THAT WE NEEDED TO KNOW THAT HE WAS NOT ABLE TO SAY WHEN THE MATTER WAS BEING HANDLED BECAUSE HIS FATHER WAS ALWAYS THERE LISTENING TO WHAT WAS BEING SAID. THE SITUATION WAS STRAINED.

THIS IS WHAT HE RELATED-- WHEN THE TWO PARTIES LEFT FROM HERE TO MACKAY THEY WERE CAMPED IN A TENT. SLEPT IN THE TENT FOR THE NIGHT. AND WERE TOGETHER ON ONE SIDE AND SEPARATED BY BAGGAGE WAS ON THE OTHER. SAYS THAT AS FAR AS HE KNOWS NO IMMORALITY TOOK PLACE.

WE ONLY HAVE WORD ON THIS, BUT WE HAVE NO REASON TO DISBELIEVE HIM.

DURING THE COMMITTEE MEETINGS WE WERE ALL LED TO BELIEVE THAT THEY WERE IN SEPARATE ACCOMMODATION NOT TOGETHER AS NOW SAYS.

IT WOULD BE INTERESTING WHAT HAS TO SAY ABOUT THIS DURING OUR COMMITTEE MEETINGS DETAILS HAD TO BE DRAGGED OUT OF AND NOTHING CAME EASY, WE FELT THAT THERE WAS A LOT OF DECIET. THE REASON FOR OUR CAUTION.
As our Mag. on mercy brought out we want to see ones come back, and special provisions are made to contact these ones. The point though was still, are they repentant? BRS with BCH he seems to be wanting as the main point of his reinstatement to be the fact that he wants his divorce to be recognized as a scriptural divorce BCH talks about repeated acts of adultery. To clarify exactly what he means does he mean repeated acts with different partners or does he mean repeated acts with one partner? (BCH admits those 3 times with one person as mentioned before)

The main area that we look at are his works that befit repentance.

As one who claims to be like the tax collector in Jesus illustration is he concerned with the welfare of his family? This should be his concern yet he distances himself so far away, both in actual distance and in physical and emotional concern for the children. He seems not to want to have that responsibility.

Is that the way that he feels? As yet we don’t see evidence otherwise.

Even with child maintenance not much has been forth coming as far as BCI is concerned.

BRS we hope that the information within this letter will give you BRS a little more to clarify and a bit more of a basis to look at BCH reinstatement plea.

May Jehovah continue to bless you in your caring for the brothers.

And may he continue to give you the wisdom to discern the real situation with

We live in exciting times, and we are part of a wonder full organization where the majority of Jehovah’s people are remaining faithful to his principles.

Your fellow workers in the truth

R.W. De Rooy (Chairman)  Dino Ali  Zini Ali

If there is anything else you would like to know we are happy to help.