

February 25, 2025

Dear [Woman with a Dispute],

The majority of the women who served on the Second Women's Council for [MIQ] have met together several times via Zoom and through email to address your proposal sent to Stephanie Snuffer and forwarded by her to us on February 13, 2025. We will not be able to meet your deadline of meeting together by February 24 as your time constraints proposed are unattainable by our council. We are trying to prepare our response as timely as possible and ask for your patience and for you to extend your deadline. We will work through Stephanie to coordinate a day and time that works for as many of those from our council who are interested in meeting with you via Zoom. We will send you and Stephanie a link to the Zoom meeting once a date and time has been agreed upon by all who will be involved.

Our response to you is in three parts, with a conclusion. Part I contains questions and information we believe are important for you to consider. Part II is our statement regarding how we followed the Lord's guidelines found in the T&C and in *Preserving the Restoration* as we conducted the council we held on April 28, 2024 for [MIQ]. Part III is our response to the 7 complaints raised in your 54-page proposal which are specific to the **second council** on [MIQ].

Part I: Questions/concerns we believe are important to think through as we work to come to mutual agreement or at least understanding:

1. [Woman with a Dispute], your dispute with us to call [MIQ]'s second council illegitimate is going to set a precedent that all former and future women's council decisions are open to being audited, debated, questioned, and overturned by anyone who disagrees with the outcome. All it will take is one woman who does not like the outcome to cry "dispute." There are other men whose priesthood certificates have been suspended, including one that you were the organizer for, and they and their female supporters are waiting and watching how things proceed with your disputes with our council. These men and their supporters have also had serious disputes with the proceedings and outcomes of their councils.

2. Do you believe that disputing a women's council means that you as the disputer are entitled to receive the evidence/ recordings/ transcripts/ proceedings of a women's council? We believe this is a dangerous precedent to set. This would open the door for anyone who wants the details of a man's council to cry "dispute" in order to obtain the intimate details of a man's council proceedings. If you decide to proceed with a meeting with those of us from this council who agree to a meeting, we will not be providing all of the evidence/transcripts. Because of that, we will be unable to meet your main requirement to provide all evidence and transcripts.

You have stated that if we cannot meet your requirements, and if your requests are not met through mediation, you will take your dispute to the women's conference in April and allow the

women there to vote on the matter. This puts our council between a rock and a hard place. The Lord instructed that the council be *private*. Therefore, we do not feel that we can share the intimate details/evidence or the transcripts of our council. Yet, we feel that your requirements would cause us to disobey the Lord for any chance of successful mediation.

3. It is very difficult to get witnesses to testify and women to serve on councils because of threats and harassment that the man in question, and his friends, resort to. This is not a matter of “growing a backbone.” This is truly a matter of placing the safety of our families above the process of removing men’s priesthood certificates. Women in these councils do not have the same rights and protections that the Constitution and US legal system afford witnesses and jury members. We have no witness protection program. We have no ability, other than anonymity, to avoid “jury tampering.” We have no way to sequester a jury. In the legal system, a jury can be and usually is anonymous to protect them from threats and abuse. Witnesses can likewise be protected.

We have none of those provisions, yet many of us who have served on councils, whether as witnesses, council members, or both, have had serious threats and legal action leveled at us to the point that some have feared for their welfare and the safety of their families. We have lost and do lose witnesses and council members because they rightly choose to protect their families, jobs, and homes over participating in something so simple, that it only has power to suspend a man's public certificate.

In this particular council, our members have been subjected to a pattern of repeated harassment and hostile behavior and threats from you and [MIQ] (and [MIQ]’s lawyer who, according to [MIQ], wants “to sue each couple who participated in the council until they each lose their homes, etc.”). We have been subjected to public defamation, unkind and untrue accusations, threats, and deadlines if we fail to respond according to your desires and your timelines.

[MIQ] has stated numerous times that God will curse each of us because of “things Denver has done for him which includes receiving the promise that God will bless those who bless him [[MIQ]] and cursing those who curse him.” Your recent 54-page document also includes the threat of going public again on your blog against us and taking this to a public forum (women’s conference). The protection of the women, and the witnesses who serve on these councils should be respected and taken much more seriously than it has been. It is not only the rights of men who should be considered, but the rights and protections of the women and their families who are trying to faithfully fulfill the Lord’s instructions to us in our day.

4. We have not, nor do we yet understand why you believe you have the right to make the demands of us that you have been making. With the Lord’s revelation on June 20, 2024, you are now embracing the “dispute” opportunity, however, the second council took place and was

completed months before this revelation was given. You have been making demands and requests of us since the first council was in its infant stages, and you have not let up, despite good faith efforts in the beginning to reason with you.

5. The majority of your 54-page proposal is based upon second, third, and fourth-hand gossip and hear-say originating from the first council held on [MIQ], which you use to condemn the second council. Hearsay and gossip are not admissible in courts of law as evidence and fact. Likewise, it is not admissible in women's councils either.

Furthermore, we state that the first and second councils were completely separate events: different charges, two different groups of organizers (working with only one organizer from the first council), different witnesses, different evidence, and six of the council members were completely new women, with two more who sat in on only the final session of the first council as alternates but did not vote on that first council.

Your disputes with the way the first council was organized and carried out are not germane to the second council. You are disputing the second council, not the first council as [MIQ] retained his certificate with that council and therefore we will not discuss any details or procedures of WCL1 with you as we contend there is nothing further to discuss. You have no jurisdiction and neither were you present for either council and therefore could not have been privy to any of the actual proceedings, recordings, evidence, or transcripts from the second council. Furthermore, [MIQ] retained his certificate from the first council, so any perceived injustice committed against him in the first council was vindicated on [MIQ]. Therefore, we respectfully request that you dismiss everything in your 54-page document that originates with or has to do with the first council and limit our discussion solely to the second one.

6. We do desire to reason together to find agreement, and if not full agreement, then mutual agreement, or at least understanding of each other. Yet your offer of agreement to us can only be satisfied if we fulfill your request of providing all evidence and documentation from both councils, and as long as we convince you that we fulfilled our obligation to hold women's councils correctly. Your offer states (page 26 of your document):

“An agreement: The original WCL members make the public claim [MIQ]’s 2nd WCL was illegitimate. OR agreement by me ([Woman with a Dispute]) that the proceedings were legitimate and the removal of my complaints. And a remedy: EITHER – Because a letter was sent to ‘the movement’ at large announcing [MIQ] guilt and priesthood certificate removal, a rectification letter needs to be similarly addressed and sent. The letter should announce the illegitimacy of the WCL process and the remediation of [MIQ]’s priesthood certificate. This letter must be approved by [Woman with a Dispute] and Stephanie Snuffer. OR – an announcement by [Woman with a Dispute] on her blog that she has dropped her complaints and acknowledges the legitimacy of the WCL and its outcome. For this WCL to be deemed

legitimate, I would also need you to provide [MIQ] with the transcript of WCL1 and WCL2. Upon reviewing the transcripts, [MIQ] may find new complaints. If he asks for my help and I agree with his concern, I would be willing to help him present those new complaints.”

We are concerned that your requests demonstrate an inability to truly reason together. We are concerned that any acquiescence to your requests will be feeding a spirit of disputing and giving into threatening demands. We ask that you please consider this as you decide how you proceed.

Part II: How we followed the Lord’s instructions as we conducted our Women’s Council for [MIQ]

[MIQ] was living with Leroy and Darnell Smedley during the time the first women’s council for [MIQ] was held. Soon after [MIQ] had moved into their home in November of 2023, they and their children had been subjected to behavior and conversations that caused them great concern. When they later heard from [MIQ] himself that there had been a council convened about him, they were shocked to learn that he had retained his certificate. After receiving a number of promptings over the course of several weeks to reach out to Amberli Peterson, Leroy finally called her at the end of January and shared their many concerns with her. Leroy had no idea that Amberli had been involved in the first council.

Likewise, others who had also been witnesses of concerning behavior, (who were not privy to the first council’s proceedings, but because of your blog posts were made aware that it had taken place), also came forward with new allegations, testimony and evidence after the first council had concluded. With the new understanding that others had also witnessed and been negatively affected by [MIQ]’s harmful behavior, the Smedleys and other witnesses worked with Amberli to organize a second council. Amberli then reached out to Cherry Ann Redd and Whitney Horning, who had served on the first council as members, and asked if they would help her organize a second council.

The organizers were very concerned that this second council for [MIQ] consist of as many new women serving on the council as possible; that all of the charges were new; and that all the witnesses were new and/or testifying of new evidence; thereby making sure that the second council was an entirely new and different event from the first.

Our council for [MIQ], referred to as the second women’s council, was held on April 28, 2024, before the June 20, 2024 revelation. Not having that revelation yet, we followed the Lord’s instructions which had been given up to that point.

T&C 157:57 and 175:32: *“I have told you that to remove authority to use priesthood outside a man’s family requires a unanimous decision by twelve women. A council of twelve women must be convened, either in the man’s home fellowship among those who are acquainted with his daily*

walk, or in private at a general conference, also including among the twelve women from the conference those who are acquainted with his daily walk, so that no injustice results.”

Council of 12 women: We were cognizant that the council should be formed with as many new women as possible who knew nothing about council #1 in order to protect [MIQ] and give him a fair council. We struggled to get any women who wanted to be involved, not because they felt that what we were doing was wrong, but because very few women are willing to serve on women’s councils or have the time available to do so.

We convened a council of 14 women, intending that 2 be alternates at the outset, as one of our members was pregnant and due any day. We felt that 2 alternates would ensure that by the time the vote was taken we would have at least 12. In this, we followed the advice found [here](#). The day of the council, all 14 women were in attendance and all 14 asked if they could participate fully. This now presented a situation where we not only needed 12 unanimous votes, but 14. The following is a breakdown of the women who participated in the second council and how they were involved (if at all) in the first council:

Council members who served on both the 1st and 2nd councils (6): Amberli Peterson, Cherry Ann Redd, Whitney Horning, Mellody Fausett, Jessica Bowler, Joanna Briscoe.

Council Members who were possible alternates for the 1st council, brought on during only the final session but did not vote during that council, who served as council members on the 2nd council (2): Eva Gore, Alexandria Wilkes.

Brand new council members for the second council (6): Darnell Smedley, Ashley Noe Naegle, Corina Hughes, Tausha Larsen, Heidi Larsen, and Darcie Bishop.

Home fellowship: [MIQ] lived with Leroy and Darnell Smedley for months. He spent the vast majority of every single day in their home. He participated in family meals, activities, discussions, and even had his own room there. During this time, [MIQ] also presented himself as the husband of [wife]— (a fact that he also declared in writing to the first women’s council) though they were never legally married. Darnell, Leroy and [wife] all participated in this council, which fulfilled the requirement of home fellowship. Leroy participated as a witness, but did not vote. Because councils take time to organize, they asked us to wait to hold the council until after he left their home to avoid awkwardness.

Acquainted with his daily walk: In addition to [wife] and the Smedleys, who literally knew his daily walk for months, almost all of the women on the council know [MIQ], and have fellowshipped with him and/or been friends with him for years, and many have had him stay in their home and even traveled with him.

In Private: The council was held in private, it was not a public event.

The Lord's Instructions from Preserving the Restoration, pp. 511-512: *"Sustaining is by women, and removing authority to act within a community or fellowship is likewise to be done by the vote of women. If a man's worthiness to function is called into question, then a conference can be convened to deal with the question. In removing authority, at least two witnesses should speak against the accused, and he should be allowed to speak on his behalf and call such witnesses as he chooses. Men can be witnesses, but only women are allowed to vote."* (emphasis added.)

All of these requirements were fulfilled: We had about 6 witnesses testify of [MIQ]'s behavior. [MIQ] was invited to attend to speak for himself and invited to bring witnesses to petition on his behalf. Yet, due to your advice, [MIQ] chose not to attend the council and did not send any witnesses on his behalf. We had a mixture of male and female witnesses, however, only the women of the council voted. The vote was unanimous between all 14 women council members to suspend [MIQ]'s priesthood certificate.

Part III: Response to 7 Complaints in your Proposal to Us

Introduction to the 7 Complaints

We, the women of WCL2, have read through the list of Seven Complaints leveled against our council and have included our responses in the "rebuttal" section of each complaint.

It is important to note that you are disputing the second council, but are using 2nd and 3rd hand gossip and information from WCL1 to level your complaints against WCL2. Again, these were 2 separate and distinct events. When a person who was not in attendance at either council and therefore not an actual witness to any of the proceedings, was not privy to any of the evidence, and has no jurisdiction for either council, how can they stand in judgement and conclude the council was "unrighteous" or "illegitimate?"

Part of the reason you persuaded [MIQ] not to attend WCL2 is because you considered our council illegitimate. Now it seems that you believe the council was legitimate after all because you are disputing it.

Another important point to consider before reading our rebuttal for each complaint, is this statement from you:

"The Lord's June 20th revelation is directly addressing the topics of our dispute as my complaints are all regarding the fairness of how [MIQ]'s trial was held."

You directly state that your complaints stem from the June 20th revelation where the Lord counseled the women to consider the protections given in the Bill of Rights “*as they decide how to conduct councils involving those accused of transgressing the laws of God.*” (Denver Snuffer blog, July 19, 2024, Full Text of June 20 Revelation).

Although we did honor those protections in WCL2, we would like to remind you that this revelation was given after WCL2, so therefore we cannot be charged with not following the Bill of Rights, as stated in that revelation because that had not yet been given. At the time WCL2 was held in April, the direction from the Lord included what can be found in the T&C and in *Preserving the Restoration*, specifically pp. 511-512.

Even though your complaints are all based on your ideas of due process (rooted in the Bill of Rights—and therefore not even applicable at the time of WCL2) we are including our rebuttals to show that we did indeed provide due process to the best of our ability and understanding at the time.

We’d like to point out that you clearly state your complaints are really only about process, yet your proposed remedy is for [MIQ] to get his certificate back, without regard to the reasons for which it was suspended, and without following the process the Lord outlined for reinstatement of a certificate. The Lord has clearly outlined the process for restoring a certificate, and you are seeking to circumvent it.

You have no idea of the evidence presented during WCL2 or the women’s findings about whether [MIQ] is a threat to the community or not. As you state, “My complaints are all regarding the fairness of how [MIQ]’s trial was held.”

Your proposed outcome goes beyond merely overturning the unanimous decision of the fourteen women on the council based on your objections, but extends to making a public example of the women involved, requiring them to make a public statement that their council was “illegitimate”, and that [MIQ]’s certificate is “remediated.”

You also request transcripts for the specific purpose of reviewing them and seeking new causes for complaint, which you state could go on indefinitely. We have received no such objections or requests from [MIQ]. We remind all involved that [MIQ] made the decision to not attend the council or exercise his right to answer accusations, present witnesses, or attempt to clear his name. This necessarily left the council to judge the matter based solely on first hand witness statements and the evidence presented. We find it disingenuous for you to request the transcripts (and on behalf of [MIQ]) nearly a year later to look for “new complaints” when [MIQ] didn’t even care enough about it to defend himself when we asked him to.

Your Seven Complaints

Complaint 1: You state that the Lord's requirement for a women's council (WCL) to be held either in a man's home fellowship or in private at a general conference was not met.

Our Rebuttal 1: "In private" requires a separate meeting than the "general conference" meeting. "General" and "private" are opposites. Therefore it's most logical to conclude that a private meeting can be called, and it may be most convenient to do so at a general conference that is already organized. In fact, PTR, p. 511 states that *"If a man's worthiness to function is called into question, then a conference can be convened to deal with the question."* PTR does not include the language regarding conducting the council either in a man's home fellowship or in private at a general conference. It simply states that a conference can be called to deal with the question.

Our Rebuttal 2: T&C 157:57 does include this language. It states that a council should be convened in a man's home fellowship or in private at a general conference. This requirement was fulfilled. Home fellowship: [MIQ] began living full-time with Leroy and Darnell Smedley in mid-November 2023 until he left for Egypt in mid-February 2024. During that entire time, and over the course of at least 2 years prior, he presented himself to the community of believers as the husband of [wife] also declared in writing to the first council that he is married to [wife]. You cannot get more "home fellowship" than the people you live and fellowship with daily, and the woman you claim is your wife. All three participated in this council which fulfilled the requirement of home fellowship.

Complaint 2: You state that the Lord's requirement for a WC to be held with women (plural - at least 2) acquainted with the man's daily walk was not met. Neither did WCL adhere to the qualifier "so that no injustice results."

Our Rebuttal: This requirement was met. Darnell Smedley became acquainted with [MIQ]'s daily walk as he lived with them for nearly 4 months. During that time, he actually spent most of his days and nights in their home, rarely leaving. [MIQ wife], also knew his daily walk. In addition to these two women, several of the women on the council have known [MIQ] for years and have been with and witnessed him in many situations and settings. Many of them have had [MIQ] stay in their home for days at a time.

Complaint 3: You state that [MIQ] was not afforded the opportunity to "speak on his behalf" to a full and fair capacity. He was also subjugated to witness restrictions that were in clear violation of God's instructions. As a result, this group failed to meet the Lord's requirements for legitimate women's councils.

Our Rebuttal: [MIQ] was invited to appear personally and to bring witnesses. He chose not to attend or bring witnesses. This objection is simply false. In addition, the Lord has given no provisions for labeling a council either “legitimate” or “illegitimate.”

Complaint 4: You allege: Due process violations: Presumption of guilt in matters of procedure.

What we believe your reasoning is: While statements about a person’s reputation are admissible in U.S. courts as part of character witness testimony, reputation can not be the basis for violating someone’s due process rights.

Interpretation of what we think you are trying to say: The fear of anger, retaliation, or violence toward the women were not valid at the first council. (Not applicable to the second council.)

Side note: Your contention that US courts do not take the reputation of the defendant into consideration is patently false. Defendants routinely appear in court in handcuffs and shackles, or even appear by video precisely because of a reputation of violence. Furthermore, the U.S. legal system has witness protection programs and jury anonymity to protect those who serve in legal proceedings.

Our Rebuttal: [MIQ] was invited to appear personally at the second council. There was no presumption of guilt as to character or as to the charges presented. All charges were presented and substantiated by first-hand witnesses. The women of the council heard all evidence, weighed it carefully, and voted to suspend [MIQ]’s certificate.

Complaint 5: You allege Due process violations: Predetermined Outcome and Jury tampering / Jury Bias

Your Reasoning applied to [MIQ]’s Women’s Councils: WCL2 was headed by the same organizer and contained 8 of the women from WCL1.

Our Rebuttal: The second council brought different charges, so there could not be a predetermined outcome. There is NO requirement anywhere that successive councils cannot draw from the same pool of women. Also, only 6 of the same women and 2 alternates from WCL1 were included in WCL2.

Additionally, it only takes one woman to retain a man’s certificate. Fourteen women who served on this council came to a unanimous decision. As stated [here](#): “It is hard to get unanimity. I think that is for a reason. It substitutes for a burden of proof, meaning that to get everyone in agreement would (should) require something like clear and convincing proof.”

Complaint 6: You allege: Due process violations: The Right to a Public Trial - or at least transparency for the accused.

Your Reasoning: The constitution guarantees the right to a public trial, thus ensuring accountability and transparency. The accused has the right to be present at trial and also to receive any transcripts or recordings that exist. In a letter written “to the movement” WCL2 makes a public statement informing the community that they had voted to remove [MIQ]’s certificate. This is sufficient to prevent [MIQ] from performing ordinances in public and is therefore all that the WCL should be divulging publicly about a hearing they claimed to want to keep private. The actual charges should not have been stated.

Our Rebuttal 1: Obviously the Lord’s command of privacy prevents divulging the details or content of a council. [MIQ] was invited to attend and chose not to do so. He has no right to demand the information a year later when he didn’t care enough to show up to hear it and defend it in person when he had the chance. And you have even less right to demand it on his behalf.

Our Rebuttal 2: The statement to the movement had purpose beyond merely preventing [MIQ] from acting without a valid certificate. The women involved also felt the need to inform the movement at large that [MIQ]’s actions presented a danger to the community. Using your own courtroom logic, charges and convictions are a matter of public record for this very purpose. Further, certain crimes that threaten community safety require extraordinary notice to the community (for example offender registries). No details of [MIQ]’s actions were given, but the charges were entirely appropriate to make known for the community’s protection. There is nothing in the Lord’s directions preventing a WCL from taking steps to protect the community by making general information about offenders known.

Complaint 7: Due process considerations: Statute of Limitations & Double Jeopardy

Your Reasoning: [MIQ]’s ex-wife of 15 years was contacted in an effort to dig up further evidence to support a guilty verdict. [MIQ]’s own daughter testified “a lady named Amberly” repeatedly called her mother “because she was on a ‘mission’ to ‘bring down’ and ‘expose’ our dad.”

Our Rebuttal 1: This is a false statement. Amberli called her one time to ask her a question about some very concerning financial schemes that [MIQ]’s was involved in which had come to light after the first council concluded.

Our Rebuttal 2: Where has the Lord placed limits on what can and cannot be done to investigate a man’s behavior? Further, where has the Lord limited how far back in time a man

can be investigated when there is a pattern of ongoing, long-standing behavior that must be understood?

In general, statutes of limitations are put in place to prevent bringing charges against a person for crimes committed “too long ago.” While the idea could certainly have a place in women’s councils (e.g., where a person could have changed their ways in the 15 years since something untoward was done, or been rebaptized as a sign of repentance), it did not apply to any of the charges addressed in the second council. All were related to very recent events.

Double jeopardy refers to the legal principle that protects individuals from being tried more than once for the same crime based on the same conduct. Once a person is acquitted, they cannot be retried for the same offense. In this case, again, the charges in the second council were distinct from those in the first. It was not a second consideration of any of the same charges that had been presented in the first council.

Our Rebuttal 3: Is it Righteous to “be on a mission” to “bring down” and “expose” wickedness among us? Or is it merely Virtuous? “...*that we should waste and wear out our lives in bringing to light all the hidden things of darkness wherein we know them.*” (T&C 139:15) Perhaps there are things about [MIQ]’s behavior that you simply don’t know, that needed to be brought to light. In fact, the more evidence that has been presented regarding [MIQ]’s harmful behavior, the more evidence comes to light.

Conclusion

It is a terrible, daunting task to organize and conduct a women’s council. We are very aware of our shortcomings and that there are things we could have done better. We on this council are not perfect, nor are the women on any other women’s council that has convened. We do not like the responsibility of calling a man’s “worthiness” into question. In fact, we abhor the responsibility. Depending on the outcome of a council, the council members are often criticized, condemned, challenged, accused, threatened, harmed, doubted, mistrusted, defamed, reputations destroyed, and even hated.

Sometimes it is hard to understand why the Lord gave this responsibility to us. Many women will not even take on the responsibility of participating in a council because of all of the above-mentioned abuses. We have to at least take comfort in Denver’s conclusion in PTR regarding women and priesthood that “In all such matters it has been my experience that, with time, how the Lord orders things proves to be exceptionally wise, even if we do not immediately see it.” We certainly do not immediately see many positives regarding this responsibility.

We, the women of WCL2, declare that there is no righteous way to have this council overturned. That would set an awful precedent for past councils and future councils. If a council can be overturned due to perceived technicalities in process by those who have no jurisdiction in the proceedings, then how can any women's council perform the function they were called to do? There will be a wave of men calling our councils into question and more conferences being convened to deal with their questions. We cannot imagine what the fallout could be if this council is overturned, or our decision completely invalidated because of one person's desire to have it overturned. This act could put all women's councils on trial and faith in the process destroyed. It was the Lord who gave this trust to women. The women must allow each other to discharge this duty in good faith, according to the Lord's instruction, and not seek to undermine their efforts.

Do we have the responsibility to keep the community from peril or not? The Lord seems to believe he gave us that responsibility:

"I say to you, if a man has been suspended for adultery, and then been reinstated, and return again to adultery, he shall not be reinstated again, for to do so places my community at peril. These words were to guard so that no injustice results. I ask, is there injustice if my people cannot become one because of disobedience? Even a single disobedient soul who breaks the hearts of others by his sinful disobedience can destroy the peace of all my people. I say again, Each of you must equally walk truly in my path, not only to profess, but to do as you profess. You shall not show mercy to the disobedient when to do so results in injustice to the people who seek to become one. You shall not forgive the adulterer and welcome him into the community when he has been forgiven and returns again to his sin. You shall not place the community at peril by embracing the willful and unrepentant among you, to leave your little ones at peril of injury, harm, and destruction.... Do as you are bidden and you will have peace in this troubled world, which will be your first reward." (Relevant Excerpt T&C 179; Revelation given August 8, 2022, Answer on Forgiveness, see full revelation for ellipse/context)

We would like to remind all involved questioning the validity of WCL2 that in the very revelation laying out a new procedure for dealing with questions pertaining to past women's councils the Lord reminded us:

"Hear me now: Let every person take care in how they use my name, as if I had part in their every dispute, for many things provoking arguments among the people are born from pride, stubbornness, aspiring for control, and reckless indifference toward me and one another. I bear with the people still, and patiently await the return of natural fruit in my vineyard. Do not be misled by my patience, for the time is quickly approaching for the harvest of my vineyard. Amen." (June 20, 2024 revelation)

We do not want to dispute or contend or argue. We just want to faithfully perform the awful responsibility given to us. We would also like to become the natural fruit so that we are protected from the coming harvest.

We, the undersigned women of [MIQ]’s second council, humbly attest that we conducted this council in good faith, doing our utmost to uphold and adhere to the guidelines the Lord had provided us at that time for how women’s councils ought to be conducted. We earnestly seek peace, and an end to the hostility, jarrings, accusations, and contention that has surrounded this council from the beginning.

We believe questions can be asked, and processes can be discussed, but overturning an entire council could produce devastating results. The Lord gave no provision for overturning a council. In fact, to overturn councils would be in complete opposition to His instruction. The Lord has laid out the process of how to proceed after a women’s council has concluded with a unanimous decision to revoke. He said, *“Reinstatement of the man’s authority must be considered by the same council of twelve women when the man petitions for the decision to be rescinded, and requires seven of the twelve to agree upon his reinstatement, which can occur at any time.”* (T&C 157:57). We invite [MIQ] to come to repentance, and encourage him to petition us directly for reinstatement when he is ready.

Signed,

Ashley Noe Naegle
Darnell Smedley
Corina Hughes
Alexandria Wilkes
Jessica Bowler
Darcie Bishop
Whitney Horning

Eva Gore
Heidi Larsen
Amberli Peterson
Tausha Larsen
Joanna Briscoe
Mellody Fausett
Cherry Ann Redd