

RON CANTOR'S RESPONSE TO ELDER ACCOUNTABILITY RECOMMENDATIONS

"The first to state his case seems right, until another comes and cross-examines him." (Proverbs 18:17)

Since I was mentioned in the Elder Accountability Recommendations Report, and because it was so inaccurate, I wanted to send out my analysis. This document was confusing and contradicted what we know to be fact.

1. Changed Language to Favor Dr. Brown

The Line of Fire Board, representing the Ministry of Dr. Michael Brown, signed a contract with Firefly that clearly showed their definition of sexually abusive misconduct. It's likely that without having a background in these types of things, they read over it quickly and did not fully understand it until the Firefly report came out. Nevertheless, I do believe that what Mike Brown did was sexual, it was abusive and it was misconduct. I believe that is what the evidence shows, and I appeal to the board of elders to re-examine that. Was it at the level of a Mike Bickle or Robert Morris? No, it was not. But it was physical in a sexual way. It was highly abusive because it messed up Sarah's life for many years. And it was absolutely misconduct.

2. Where was the promised trauma-informed counselor?

What happened to the trauma-informed counselor? Not one of the Line of Fire elder team members is an expert in sexual abuse. They could've called on Diane Langberg, Dr. David Pooler, or Rachael Denhollander, noted experts in the field. Not only did they not have the promised trauma-informed counselor, but they are also giving their uninformed, non-expert opinion in a document that will be widely read and is supposedly conclusive. That is not to say that they are not qualified in other areas. But trauma-informed experts spend decades in research and study. We are arrogant when we think we can diagnose such a problem without them. I have repeatedly asked their board why there was no trauma-informed counselor, and they will not answer the question.

OUTSIDE TEAM OF ELDERS/LEADERS

Our board has assembled an outside team of elders and leaders who will be in regular communication with Dr. Brown and to whom he will be accountable during this process. This team will include at least one **trauma informed counselor**. The ones who have already agreed to serve on this team desire to keep their names anonymous at this time so that they can carry out their responsibilities without external distractions. It is our hope and desire that through their expertise and experience, they will help provide us with a roadmap as to how to proceed once the investigation is completed.

3. Matthew 18 Process was Attempted—by Me!

It is the position of the Elders Accountability Team that the LOF Board should have been officially contacted to seek a proper Mathew 18 process since these allegations resurfaced **5 years ago**. Instead, these allegations, which could have been resolved with proper Biblical Due Process, were relitigated with accusations, judgement and sentencing by a jury on social media. This process is unbiblical and has caused irreparable damage to Dr. Brown's credibility and ministry. We believe all who are responsible for this miscarriage of Biblical Due Process should search their hearts before God and pursue a biblical resolution to these unresolved issues.

This is not an accurate statement. When I heard about the accusations against Dr Brown, I did not go to Social Media. I went to Dr Brown. His first communication was that there was no truth to any of it. Here is a quote from Dr Brown to me:

"I did hear some crazy reports about six weeks ago with some **wildly false charges about me that allegedly were about to come out in an alleged report from Julie, but they were **completely untrue**."**

It was only when I revealed that I had knowledge of his relationship with Sarah that he addressed it. But he didn't mention Kim. It was several days later when I let him know that I knew about Kim that he addressed it. Looking back, it seems that he had no intentions of dealing with anything that I did not already know about.

As I continued to inquire, he told me about some foolish involvement with a young lady who was like a daughter to him. After I confronted him with point-by-point allegations, he confessed to most of it, but downplayed the severity, claiming most of them were one-time events.

With two other people, I urged him to

1. Submit this to a board of elders.

2. Repent to his former elders from 23 years ago
3. And take a break from ministry until this is resolved.

He rejected that. I then went to his board, just like the Elders Accountability Team recommended. However, Dr Brown had already given them a less than forthright version of what had happened, and they were not interested in discovering the truth. So I went on my own and met with Sarah Monk. After listening to her testimony, I sent it to the Line of Fire board. In other words, I followed exactly what they recommended. They seem to have forgotten that. It was only after the board read Sarah's firsthand account that they called for a third-party independent investigation.

Furthermore, they fail to comprehend that as long as this was private, Dr Brown refused to deal with it. There were at least 10 different confrontations over 23 years. It is only being dealt with now because of the public exposure. **The "irreparable damage to Dr Brown's credibility and ministry" is the fault of only one person: Dr. Michael Brown, who refused to deal with these issues any other way.** In fact, he indirectly chose the public forum by denying the private forum over and over again.

4. “Dr Brown made a sincere effort to follow biblical due process.”

IN THE CASE OF DR. MICHAEL BROWN: We believe that Dr. Brown made a sincere effort to follow Biblical Due Process as he understood it in both cases and has committed no sin for which he has not repented and received forgiveness and should, therefore, not be

Could the elder accountability board please explain how lying to or misleading 10 different people or groups of people who sought to bring accountability to Dr. Brown is following biblical due process? This one statement makes a mockery of their entire report. In 2002, Dr Brown was confronted by two leaders in Fire School and Church, and that night, according to testimony, one of those elders, who did not sufficiently believe Dr. Brown, was told by Mike and Nancy Brown he would have to leave the ministry. He was accused of trying to bring the whole ministry down. This is just one example.

If a leader is suspected of improper moral behavior, he should call his other elders and have them look into it. That would be due process according to 1 Timothy 5:19, not firing people who don't believe you.

5. Dr Brown's meeting with "Ray."

It was reported in FIREFLY and understood by the Elder Accountability Team that Dr. Brown was forthcoming and repentant in a personal meeting with the Wife and her husband. Nancy was in the meeting also. The matter seemed to be resolved to everyone's satisfaction and the spouses agreed that these actions should remain confidential among the four of them.

I'm not sure if they even read Ray's testimony. The wife, Kim, was not in the meeting. Hear Ray:

"It seems that once he led her to cross the line with their phone conversations, he thought it was time to push for another level. **Kim told me that Mike repeatedly demanded she meet him alone some place and she refused. Not only that, but he also demanded that she stop being intimate with me.**" Kim rejected Mike's requests.

"After speaking with Kim, ... I went alone to meet with Mike and Nancy, **and it took everything I could do just to get him to admit to certain things** ... Finally, "He fully admitted to it." **Ray says he admitted to everything—the erotic speech on the phone, asking her not to sleep with Ray, asking her to meet him privately somewhere, and touching her leg while driving.**"

Do we know if the elder accountability team is even aware of this account? After lying for 23 years, they took Dr. Brown's narrative and assumed it was true. That is the height of naïveté! They ignored Ray's testimony completely, but they clearly know it is out there.

6. The meeting that doesn't appear to have happened

It was reported in FIREFLY and understood by the Elder Accountability Team that before Sarah moved out of town, Dr. Brown and Nancy met with Sarah to apologize for Dr. Brown's inappropriate actions towards her. The Browns believed this matter to be resolved. However, Sarah denies the meeting ever took place.

This doesn't seem to be real. And it's provable. Dr. Brown wrote me that this meeting happened **eight months before she left** (which is **impossible** based on the timeline). But then he says that when she left, she told him over the phone that she was uncomfortable with his overtures, which hurt her spiritual life.

No one even saw the handholding until **May 2002**, according to a witness, and she left in September 2002. Sarah said that it was only after the handholding incident in the car that Dr. Brown began to get more and more physical. The relationship had only ended in

July/August 2002, and she moved to Texas in September 2002. It seems impossible that there was an eight-month period in between.

The only meeting Sarah talked about was when she confronted Mike with the erotic notes she found. In this meeting, she says they asked her to forgive Mike on behalf of the entire student body for his relationship with Kim, because Sarah found the erotic notes in his nightstand. They made her believe she had the authority to represent the entire student body. *Of course, then it would not need to come to light.*

The Elder Board quotes Dr. Brown's narrative as truth, despite the Firefly report's conclusion that he has worked hard to evade exposure.

From the Firefly report: "It is believed that over the past 25 years, BROWN has deliberately deflected questions about allegations of sexual misconduct involving IS #1 and IS #2 Sarah. This pattern of deflection appears to be a calculated effort to evade accountability, suppress the allegations, and protect his ministry's reputation. By maintaining silence and avoiding direct answers, BROWN has seemingly sought to shield himself from scrutiny, potentially enabling these stories to remain hidden and preserving his position within the ministry."

The entire report is skewed heavily in Dr. Brown's favor—which is maybe one reason why ChatGPT thinks he had a part in 94% of the document.

7. "Dr. Brown forthcoming"? Not to me!

It was reported in FIREFLY and understood by the Elder Accountability Team that while Dr. Brown was forthcoming and honest about his sin in 2002 with those directly involved, **he never disclosed the details about either situation to outside parties unless specifically asked about them.** It seems this led FIREFLY to conclude that Dr. Brown had "deflected" (FIREFLY, pg.24) when asked for details by people not involved.

This is absolutely not true. Ten different people or groups of people confronted Dr. Brown, and he deflected. The board of elders has in their possession** a 15-minute phone call between Dr. Brown and "MR," who was "specifically asking about" the allegations, and Dr. Brown was dishonest with him—shockingly dishonest—to the point of portraying Sarah as confirming his version of an innocent father-daughter relationship to Kris Bennett when in fact, she told him that the relationship was inappropriate, **something that a married man**

should never have with a single woman. Furthermore, she explained how the relationship fractured her relationship with God.

As an eyewitness, I can affirm that when the Firefly report says that Dr. Brown deflected, it is because he deflected. The authors seem to be justifying lying about his inappropriate relationships because the people inquiring were not involved. Does that include Keith Collins and Niels Prip, elders? Or Londa Parker, whom **Mike called to meet with him** specifically to tell her that **nothing happened** between him and Sarah. Or three leaders, myself, and two others, whom Mike was asking to publicly defend him against the allegations.

To be clear, he asked us to defend him against true allegations publicly—having no regard for our own reputations.

** When I say they have it in their possession, I can only assume that the board member I sent it to shared it with him.

8. More false statements: There was no consistency

It was reported in FIREFLY and understood by the Elder Accountability Team that Dr. Brown was interviewed at least seven (7) different times by at least seven (7) former associates (Kris Bennett, Keith Collins, Robert Gladstone, Ron Cantor, Steve Alt, Michael Lubanovic, and a group of missionaries according to an unidentified witness known as IW #19) from 2020 to 2024 **and seemed to answer their questions consistently, but not to their liking.**

This is another false statement. In fact, it makes one wonder if the elder board is even remotely familiar with the Firefly report.

And it is easily provable. Compare what Dr Brown told me about his relationship with Kim with what he told Mike Lubanovic. He told me she had *said* something inappropriate. He told Mike Lubanovic that she *sent him* something inappropriate and that he and Nancy would confront her, which is why he wrote it down.

BROWN'S Response:

BROWN stated that he and Nancy were close with the [REDACTED] (IS #1 and IW #1) for a season. He explained that IS #1 would email him from time to time. But, at a certain point, she crossed the line with some things that were said via email, and it became obvious to him and Nancy Brown that these things were inappropriate. So, he took notes of those things on a note pad because he and Nancy Brown planned to meet with her and her husband to address her misconduct. So, essentially, he used the notes to confront her.

But he told me he wrote it down for an entirely different reason. Kim “said some inappropriate things to me, which I had documented in case I was ever accused of starting something with her.” Of course, I responded that that was good news, because now he was being accused, and whatever he wrote down, could exonerate him. He told me he never thought to save it—just after telling me that he wrote it down in case he was accused of something.

And why repent because someone said something inappropriate to you? Why was he weeping and writhing on the floor in repentance if Kim was the guilty one? Unless that's not at all what happened.

But when Kris Bennett confronted him in 2020, Kris said that Mike could not remember anything. Mike Brown has one of the most incredible memories of anyone I know. It's not conceivable that he didn't remember it, only to suddenly remember it a few years later when Mike Lubanovic and I separately asked him about it.

Then in the video, he confesses to an "emotional tie" and mentions nothing about Kim saying something inappropriate that he wrote down. It seems that when he could get away with it, he would blame everything on Kim—even to the point of saying that his role was to bring correction to her. Is that with the elder accountability team called *consistent*?

What Sarah found in the drawer were the erotic fantasies between him and Kim. So no, he has not answered questions consistently; he has told different stories to different people. The term you might be looking for is: ***inconsistent***.

9. False Narrative of December Video

It was reported in FIREFLY and understood by the Elder Accountability Team that Dr. Brown publicly confessed his failures and repented after the latest public relitigating of these accusations in December 2024 (see 10.0).

The repentance in December 2024 was hard to decipher because it wasn't clear what he was repenting for. That was only a week after he released a public statement where he denied everything with Sarah and pretended to be shocked, and didn't even mention Kim. He needs to repent for that public statement. And a day after that, he compared these allegations against him to an attack from Satan. That is severe gaslighting. As recently as April 1, he wrote his followers and told them that this was a trial to prepare him for greater empowerment and service, versus what it really was—"sexually abusive misconduct" according to the investigator. So, how can you say that he repented in December when his actions in April are not consistent with repentance? Where is the fruit of repentance?

He needs to ask for forgiveness from all the people who bravely tried to hold him accountable (Mike is incredibly intimidating), and he brushed off, denied, told stories, or downplayed the events. Not to mention all the faculty, staff, and students who followed him with the dream of revolution, only to discover 25 years later that he himself was not living according to his lofty ideals, which he demanded of them.

10. Burying the lead!

7.20 In mid 2023, Michael Lubanovic interviewed Dr. Brown about the nature of his relationship with the Wife and Sarah. **Dr. Brown answered the questions** and before leaving, asked Lubanovic for forgiveness for his "*poor judgment and the bad example he had set*" (FIREFLY, pg.23), which Lubanovic granted.

It is dishonest to bring up the Lubanovic confrontation, emphasizing that Dr. Brown asked for forgiveness, without pointing out that Dr. Brown blatantly lied to him, throwing the victim under the bus. **They also say Dr. Brown "answered the questions," but don't share that he lied!** Did they think we would not check the Firefly report? Again, here is what he told him, and it lines up with nothing else Dr. Brown has said about the situation with Kim:

BROWN'S Response:

BROWN stated that he and Nancy were close with the [REDACTED] (IS #1 and IW #1) for a season. He explained that IS #1 would email him from time to time. But, at a certain point, she crossed the line with some things that were said via email, and it became obvious to him and Nancy Brown that these things were inappropriate. So, he took notes of those things on a note pad because he and Nancy Brown planned to meet with her and her husband to address her misconduct. So, essentially, he used the notes to confront her.

How do they expect the public to trust this report when they cannot address a lie that is so obvious? One of the board members was offended that I said the report was dishonest. *But it is.*

11. They changed Dr. Brown's words for his benefit! They misled YOU!

7.22 In October 2024, Ron Cantor contacted Dr. Brown inquiring about the events back in 2001-2002. Dr. Brown explained he had not committed adultery with the Wife but did develop an emotional "soul tie" (FIREFLY, pg10) with her. When asked about Sarah, Dr. Brown described his conduct as "idiotic judgment" (FIREFLY, pg.11), but never sexual.

I'm trying so hard to give this elder board the benefit of the doubt, but here they are, clearly being deceptive. Notice how they put "soul tie" in quotes, describing it as emotional, but if they were being honest, they would've put the full quote in there. Here is what the Firefly report actually said: what Mike Brown wrote to me:

"I did not have an affair, but we developed a very unhealthy and sinful soul tie."

Elder board: **Why did you remove the words "very unhealthy and sinful" and replace them with a word that is not in there, "emotional"?** I'd really like to know, since you were quoting from my emails! They changed his actual words to make it less damning.

12. Publicly asking a survivor to meet with her abuser is WRONG!

8.5 Initiate for a Personal Meeting: The Board of LOF and Dr. Brown should extend an invitation to Sarah and the husband of the Wife for an in-person meeting with Dr. Brown to initiate a dialogue that might aid in the journey of healing for those most acutely impacted in these most unfortunate occurrences.

If you're wondering if this elder accountability board is qualified to deal with issues of sexual abuse, their suggestion that the survivors meet with their abuser answers the question—NO! They have no idea the trauma that survivors have suffered at the hands of the abuser. The very idea of running into the abuser is terrifying. Most survivors never want to see their abuser again. Having studied this issue for a year and a half, I can't think of one trauma-informed counselor who would encourage a survivor to meet with their abuser (who has lied about their relationship for 23 years and reportedly has a history of spiritual abuse and manipulation), unless it was the survivor's idea.

It just shows that they have no idea how deeply Sarah's soul was scarred by Dr. Michael Brown's actions. And I am quite sure that Ray would be very satisfied never to see Dr. Brown's face again, after he pushed himself into their life and defiled his wife (according to Ray's testimony).

They revealed themselves to be wholly unqualified, which is why they were supposed to have a trauma-informed counselor on the team, but for some reason, they did not. Why?

I asked a friend of mine, a nationally recognized trauma-informed expert in SA. I asked her if a trauma-informed therapist would ever encourage a survivor to meet with their abuser at the abuser's request—as is being suggested by the Line of Fire Elder Accountability Board. Here's what she wrote:

It would be inappropriate "unless there was first FULL repentance," *meaning that the survivors believed there was complete repentance—and in this case, they don't*—"and it would be after extending a request **to see what the SURVIVOR felt was important.**"

The elder board should have asked Sarah what she wants rather than making their own recommendations (which they would have known if they had employed a trauma-informed counselor, as was promised).

"In some instances," she continued, "the survivor felt that a mailed letter was safe. In one case, a survivor chose to speak via phone, and another actually came in person.

"But it was the framework of godly brokenness and repentance and seeking the way to express that, that was meaningful and safe for the survivor." The problem is that Dr. Brown's camp continues to claim that Sarah is lying or has false memories.

My friend clarified, "It also was not to 'help them heal,' as if the leadership was in a position to provide guidance or wisdom."

This board is not aware of the trauma that Mike Brown caused in the lives of the survivors. How do you think Sarah felt when the abuser pretended like he knew nothing about the abuse in December, claiming that he would do anything to make it right ... Then enjoying a standing ovation from pastors who were celebrating him in February, and releasing his autobiography in March, celebrating his life story. It is not the picture of brokenness that would precipitate a face-to-face meeting. It is a picture of the opposite—someone who was much more concerned about ensuring his autobiography gets out on time than the welfare of Sarah's soul. Abusers tend to lack empathy and be self-centered.

A trauma-informed counselor would never have agreed with their conclusions. They need to speak to this. This is a massive breach of trust (that they promised "at least one" trauma-informed counselor, and did not include even one). If there is anything we have learned in

the past few years, it is that New Testament eldership today is not qualified to deal with allegations of sexual abuse on its own. We need qualified trauma-informed psychologists to help. As more and more people ask this question, "What happened to the trauma-informed counselor?" hopefully, they will answer. I would encourage them to submit their conclusions to a psychologist who has expertise in clergy sexual abuse, like Dr. David Pooler or Dr. Diane Langberg.

I am appealing to the board to remove the present Elder Accountability Team Report and submit it to a trauma-informed counselor for their input.

OUTSIDE TEAM OF ELDERS/LEADERS

Our board has assembled an outside team of elders and leaders who will be in regular communication with Dr. Brown and to whom he will be accountable during this process. This team will include at least one trauma informed counselor. The ones who have

13. A sincere effort to follow Biblical Due Process is not what happened!

Again, as in the case with the Wife, it appears **a sincere effort was made to follow Biblical Due Process**, as those involved understood it, between the Browns and Sarah. The Browns

Dr. Brown is a scholar and was the president of a Bible school. As an instructor under him at BRSM, I can attest that we all understood that sexual sin is not dealt with between two couples if one of the offenders is the senior leader of the organization. We all know that sexual sin is an elder-level issue (see 1 Timothy 3:1ff, 5:19-20). Mike knew that. We all knew that. If I had committed a similar act when I was under his authority as an instructor at BRSM, of course, I would've needed to confess and submit the situation to the leadership there. The only other option would be to quit. If Dr. Brown did not want to submit this to

leadership to protect his wife, Ray, and Kim, he could have left the ministry. But once you cross the line with women under your spiritual oversight, the congregation and parents who will send their kids to the Bible school have a need to know about your behavior. Denying them that information was in itself a sin.

Furthermore, Ray drove to Dr. Brown's office to confront him, not the other way around. Ray said it was a while before Dr. Brown confessed. They failed to mention Ray's claim that Dr. Brown wanted to keep Kim from being intimate with her husband and asked her to meet him alone.

Why is it that this elder board takes Dr. Brown's word on something that he covered up for 23 years, but doesn't take Ray's word? Why don't you believe Ray? When Fire elders sought to initiate Due Process in 2002 by speaking with Dr. Brown, he was not honest about his relationship with Sarah. He did not tell them that he supposedly met with her and apologized. Or that he smacked her rear end. *Mike misled them; he had nothing to apologize for—just showing too much fatherly affection in front of other people*, he claimed. And when one of the leaders sent an email that their relationship was *inappropriate*, Mike took issue with using the word *inappropriate*. He said it was not inappropriate. Yet, this elder team sees this as a sincere effort on Mike's part. It's hard to take them seriously at this point.

A sincere effort to due process would have been to gather the elders and confess. That did not happen. To say this was a sincere effort at due process shows that the general public is more aware of the details than the elder board.

14. Missing words: "POWER DIFFERENTIAL"

There were two words that I did not see in the entire Line of Fire Elder Board report: "POWER DIFFERENTIAL."

Dr. David Pooler (see more below) writes: "The person with more power is always the one responsible for maintaining boundaries."

They failed to articulate the lack of power and agency of a 20-year-old female assistant before an internationally recognized revivalist, author, pastor, and Bible school leader—not to mention her boss! As a former faculty member at BRSM back then, I can attest that the students viewed the faculty almost like the disciples of Jesus. And Dr. Brown was the leader of the faculty. He was adored. He would often receive standing ovations when just giving an announcement. If he ate at a restaurant, it was common for students to pay his bill. And he loved it.

These were not two equals—not even close. And I'm not talking about this in terms of value—Sarah is highly valued—I'm talking in terms of raw power. Dr. Brown used his God-given power to injure the soul of a 20-year-old disciple. Only now is she finally being restored!

Please consider this slide from Dr. David Pooler's message at the recent Restore Conference.

Adult Clergy Sexual Abuse

(Oxford, 2012; Pooler & Frey, 2017; Pooler & Barros-Lane, 2022)

- Use power, position, role, to exploit and sexually abuse an adult who is trusting and relying upon them.
- Perpetrator uses scripture, spiritual admonitions, spiritual authority, touch (e.g. prolonged hugs) to blur and break down boundaries (takes months, sometimes years)
- Consent is not being sought or obtained. When consent is not given, a pastor is imposing their wishes and needs on a congregant without their agreement. This is coercion.
- Perpetrator keeps victim under his control (sometimes for years)
- The person with more power is **always** the one responsible for maintaining boundaries

15. Another misrepresentation

(FIREFLY, pg.18). Sarah denies this meeting ever took place. However, IW#24 testified of overhearing a phone conversation between Dr. Brown and Sarah where she was confronting him about his “*inappropriate actions*” (FIREFLY, pg.18). Regardless of the occasion, before Sarah moved away, it seems she did make the Browns aware of her feelings and the relationship apparently continued on friendly terms as Dr. Brown had another phone conversation with her in November of that same year (FIREFLY, pg.19) and had occasional interactions with her as late as 2015 (FIREFLY, pg.18), giving the impression to the Browns that the issue had been resolved.

In November 2002, IS #2 Sarah reported receiving a call from BROWN, during which BROWN warned her that IW #15 John Cava would soon contact her. According to IS #2 Sarah, BROWN advised her that IW #15 John Cava might question her about the nature of their relationship and the rumors surrounding it. IS #2 Sarah felt that BROWN was indirectly urging her to deny that anything had happened between them when speaking to IW #15 John Cava.

We’re left with two options. This report is dishonest, or they were fed information. Nobody with a clear conscience could write what they wrote.

In the elder team report, they wrote: "IW#24 testified of overhearing a phone conversation between Dr. Brown and Sarah where she was confronting him about his 'inappropriate actions.'"

As someone who heard her testimony firsthand in November 2024, that was not a sweet conversation where Sarah was gently explaining that she was uncomfortable. This is how Mike described the meeting to me:

“About 8 months later, she started talking about moving to Texas ... and she wasn’t doing well spiritually. That’s when she told me that it was connected to the contact we had and I sought to minister to her.”

The actual encounter between the two of them was not at all like Mike explains. She was furious; a light had turned on. She suddenly realized that she was a victim. This was her state of mind before that phone call.

“That is when it started going through my head, ‘Wait, this is wrong, why am I letting this happen? How dare him! He’s done this to Kim ... he’s in ministry ... he preaches against this all the time, and it’s condemned ... everything that was embedded into our heads (as students) about a relationship ... you’re married, she’s married...’ I was so angry.”

In the phone call she says, **“I called him out on touching my butt, holding my hand, kissing on the lips—everything.”** And her sister overheard that conversation where she brought up being kissed on the lips and the relationship with Kim. She was yelling at him, telling him that she knew what he did to her.

My question for the elder board is this: **if you’re going to admit that Sarah’s sister overheard this conversation, why don’t you believe her that she confronted Mike about kissing on the lips? Maybe you would like to interview her? Don’t you want to know firsthand what she heard?**

It is ridiculous for this group to conclude without even asking Sarah about the claim that their relationship ended on friendly terms. What are they basing this on? Something that is written in the Firefly report—what they *wrongly portray as a friendly conversation*. Nothing could be further from the truth.

They failed to mention that **Dr. Brown called her two months later to warn her that John Cava, a Fire School leader, would be calling her to ask about her relationship with Dr. Brown. Sarah understood that Dr. Brown did not want her to tell the truth.** How do we know that she did not tell the truth? Because in the overheard phone conversation above, she confronted Mike with the truth (inappropriate physical contact) but told John Cava that there was nothing more than a father/daughter relationship.

Dr. Brown is not calling her as a friend to shoot the breeze; he's calling her as the powerful leader of a church and Bible school, an internationally known author and preacher, to make sure that Sarah did not tell John Cava the truth about their relationship.*

Did these esteemed elders not read the part in the Firefly report that they quote, where it says, "Sarah felt that Brown was indirectly urging her to deny [to Cava] that anything had happened between them"? Yet, they portray this conversation as proof that they remained friends.

What they should be asking is,

1. Why is this internationally known preacher still calling on the phone a woman with whom he has had an inappropriate relationship (what Firefly called “sexually abusive misconduct”)? The abuser is seeking to control the victim for his own benefit. How can they not see that?
2. Why does he need to let her know that John Cava is going to be calling, if there's nothing to hide? The only reason to warn her is if there is something to hide.

Throughout the report, they refer to Dr. Brown's efforts as sincere, but an influential leader in his mid-40s calling up a 21-year-old former employee, warning her that someone is going to ask about their relationship, is anything but kosher.

Which is why the Firefly report concluded that Dr. Brown sought to cover up his relationship with Sarah for the sake of his reputation and his ministry. It said:

"It is believed that over the past 25 years, BROWN has deliberately deflected questions about allegations of sexual misconduct involving IS #1 and IS #2 Sarah. This pattern of deflection appears to be a calculated effort to evade accountability, suppress the allegations, and protect his ministry's reputation. By maintaining silence and avoiding direct answers, BROWN has seemingly sought to shield himself from scrutiny, potentially enabling these stories to remain hidden and preserving his position within the ministry" (p. 24).

*According to Sarah's testimony, which I believe.

Conclusion

Sadly, this report seems to have one goal: to get Mike back in the ministry. Five people, none of whom are trained psychologists with experience in Clergy Sexual Abuse, are telling 5,000,000 people that this is over.

CONCLUSION:

It appears clear to the Elder Accountability Team that throughout this process, dating back 23 years, Dr. Brown has been repeatedly questioned about these two situations and has answered his interrogators consistently with honesty and remorse. The Elder Accountability Team believes it is time to finally put this matter to rest and allow these transgressions to remain where they should be – nailed to the cross of Christ, cast as far as the east is from the west and no longer used against him.

A friend of Dr. Brown texted me the next day and said that we should work together, now that this is over, to restore Mike to being an apologist. I was told that he is broken and ready to deal with his issues. But where is the repentance to everyone he lied to, gaslit, and fired (Niels!)?

I hope he is broken and ready to do the long and hard work of making amends. I told this mutual friend that if I believed he were truly broken, I would drop everything and fly to Charlotte to help him. Repentance is a word. But one must show fruit to prove the repentance. I hope we see that very soon.