

# (#22 of WCL1) correspondence emails

1/20/24 2:05pm email from (#22 of WCL1) to council

Just sharing as asked.....

Amberli, since you have no time to talk to me until after the women's council is over, I will text you the same message I gave to \_\_\_\_\_. I will also text \_\_\_\_\_ this message. If there are other women on the council, in addition to the three of you, please share this message with them.

You cannot have a women's council comprised of 3 women (\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_). You have to have 12 women. There is no legitimacy to Phantom women. And if you decide to revoke [MIQ]'s certificate, all of the women on the council will need to sign some type of certificate representing the outcome of the council. There is no reason to meet unless the women are willing to make their identities known.

It takes courage to be on one of these councils. I realize it is a difficult assignment. That doesn't excuse you and give you permission to remain anonymous.

I do not have issue with you, calling a council for [MIQ]. But we do not have secret councils, and hide our identities from the man who is being called into question. You have an obligation to tell him who is on the council. If I were [MIQ], I would not respond until a council of 12 women with real names comes forth with questions.

Thank you,  
[DISPUTER]

---

01/20/24 7:55pm MST

(#22 of WCL1),

We are shocked and dismayed at what has transpired this afternoon as a result of your decision to "share as asked" [DISPUTER] scathing message on our group thread outlining her abrasive and uninvited disapproval of how we are running a council that she is NOT INVOLVED in. Though it was clearly directed at me and Jen B, she had the audacity to denigrate and name-call every woman on our council in the process.

You agreed to do this? You thought this was a good idea?

Just this morning you said, in an email to Jen B. and me the following two things:

- **"I think it's very possible that what you may be viewing in me as a defense and loyalty of [MIQ], could in reality be a defense and loyalty of the integrity and purpose of women's councils,**
- **You have my word that I will not say any more about your process.**

**-(#22 of WCL1)**

In doing what you did, which is that you used our very private, confidential group email thread in order to give [DISPUTER] access to all 12 of us so that she could harm all of us in the following three ways.

~ Shout at ALL of US about how wrongly we are running a council — one that she is not involved in.

~ Demean ALL of us as scared little "phantoms" (aka cowards) who hide from the accuser — which she informed us we do not have her permission to do.

~Make false and unfounded statements, demands, and commands that we must ALL sign ALL email correspondence with [MIQ] so he will know our identities. Otherwise, we are only a "council of 3," according to her, and thus, illegitimate. WHAT?!

Your decision to allow this harmful, subversive act to be perpetrated by [DISPUTER] on the whole group represents an egregious breach of trust.

Without you and your confidential access to the group thread (our names and email addresses), she could not have done such an underhanded and harmful thing.

But with your help, she assaulted and insulted all of us.

The fact that you enabled her to do this is grounds for us to recuse you. Especially after you gave us your word this morning (see #2) that you **"will not say any more about our process."**

So, instead of you saying any more about the process of our group, you invited [DISPUTER] up on stage and then handed her the megaphone with which she berated and falsely accused this council of a whole host of wrongdoing.

Additionally, your actions have grossly jeopardized the confidentiality of this group and are in direct contradiction to what you claimed to be doing earlier this morning, **"defending the integrity and purpose of women's council."** (see #1)

Even more problematic is how and why [DISPUTER] has ANY knowledge about who HAD or HAD NOT signed their names to the email.

How did she know it was just our three names? (Yours, mine, and Jennifer Bowlers).

Did you forward our emails or any correspondence to [DISPUTER]?

What did you divulge to her? How does she know anything about our council? And who signed what, and when? And what we decided about [MIQ]'s participation.

We expressly asked the women **to please not discuss ANY DETAILS of any kind with anyone other than their spouse.**

**Can you honestly say that you have complied with our very serious request?**

Last Monday, in our phone conversation, you admitted to me that you had texted [MIQ] the day or two before the council to tell him that in preparation for the upcoming council, you wanted to know about his marital status.

So clearly, you have ongoing and recent contact with [MIQ], someone you consider to be "like a brother" to you. That is a violation of our trust as well. How can you be objective when you are texting back and forth with the very man whose behavior you are called to judge?

And lastly, if you and [DISPUTER] are so intent on following procedure, then why can't either of you answer the one question that nobody, including [MIQ], seems to be able to answer about [MIQ]'s original certificate? HERE IS THE QUESTION:

**Why did [DISPUTER] remove her name from [MIQ]'s 2014 certificate, forcing him to get an entirely new one in 2022, when [WIFE] simply could have added her name?**

According to what you told me in an earlier conversation (phone) you are the one that counseled [MIQ] to get one in 2022 before going to Israel.

Why did you do that if he already had one? That's a big mystery!

Another big mystery that nobody can explain is why [DISPUTER] randomly scratched her name off [MIQ]'s 2014 certificate. Removing a name cannot be done without a council. Denver said that to me directly this week. He explicitly said that even a wife cannot just remove her name. It requires a council for ANY name to be removed.

So, if you were so intent on "defending the integrity and purpose of a women's council," why then weren't you helping us get to the bottom of these mysteries that only you, [DISPUTER], and [MIQ] can solve - instead of allowing [DISPUTER] into the sacred confines of a current, ongoing women's council so she can vomit her unfounded opinion and spurious accusations all over us, despite the irrefutable fact that she doesn't have one whit of power to moderate, interfere or intrude in our council in any way?!

She has ZERO power over any of our proceedings —regardless of heading up a women's advisory board that she founded and then appointed herself to be on.

This is not the LDS church. There is no correlation committee to consult. There is no power structure. There is no "policy handbook" for her to quote from and sermonize with.

As such, we have tried to train all of our focus on the despicable behavior of [MIQ] toward dozens of people— and not on the opinion of a few who would rather debate incessantly about procedure. The concern we have about the ongoing abuse of a woman in our group trumps your opinion of how palatable and kind our emails to [MIQ] are.

Let it be known, for the record, that we answer to God alone as to how we run our council - insofar as it complies with T&C. Which it does.

Anything more or less than this is an attempt to "Mormonize" and or "lawyer-ize" this council and we won't have it.

Feel free to pass that information along to her since you are the go-between. And why you are at it, please pass on to [DISPUTER] my earlier response to her scathing indictment of the group that you posted on our group thread—without including her email address so I could respond just to her.

For all the reasons stated in this letter, you are hereby excused from this council.

Amberli and Jennifer

---

1/20/24 11:21pm MST

Good Evening,

There are a couple of items of business at hand that need to be addressed.

**First**, I will send out the ZOOM invites tomorrow morning at 10 am to the council, the three male witnesses (\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_), along with the three alternates who have consented to participate in the proceedings. It has been explained to the alternates that they will not be voting unless one of the women chooses to abstain. Only then will they vote.

**Second**, I know that we have sent a lot of information out this week, and it's been difficult to wade through it all.

But please make sure you have read all the documents and are familiar with them. This will prevent a lot of undue confusion and contention.

Those documents include:

The three original witness reports that were sent out two + weeks ago.

[Wife's] written statement + her Protection Orders filed with the state of Utah.

And [MIQ]'s fifth and final rejection of our emailed requests for him to respond to our questions, including but not limited to the following questions:

Are you married or not? What happened to your original priesthood certificate? What do you have to say about the \_\_\_\_\_ incident that [wife] documents in her PO and in her written statement, (that you admitted to me, in my home on Aug 23, 2022). Those are a handful of the questions that we, as a council, asked, but he refused to answer.

**Third**, after much discussion, Jennifer and I made the joint decision to release \_\_\_\_\_ from participating in the Women's Council.

We both strongly feel, along with at least three other council members who reached out to us in dismay, that her decision to post a negative and accusatory message from [DISPUTER] (an unwanted, uninvited outsider) on our Council Group thread was a massive breach of trust and harmful lapse in judgment.

As you saw, in her message, [DISPUTER] condemned and criticized Jennifer Bowler, me and this ENTIRE council in the most egregious way possible. But without \_\_\_\_\_'s help she could not have done it. **For [DISPUTER] to push her way into our ongoing and confidential group dialogue required \_\_\_\_\_'s help.**

**That \_\_\_\_\_ aided her in this offense, breached the sacrosanct confidentiality and privacy of the group.**

Furthermore, it revealed that \_\_\_\_\_ is obviously discussing these matters with [MIQ]'s closest female friend (by his own admission) and fiercest ally, [DISPUTER]. **That is not okay.**

However, it does offer a plausible explanation about how [DISPUTER] knew that only three of us signed the email to [MIQ].

As you recall from [DISPUTER]'s missive, that was just one of her spurious and unfounded accusations —**that we are only a "Council of Three" and, therefore, not a "legitimate" council.** Then she went on to declare that [MIQ] should not have to answer to such a nefarious, secret, and illegitimate council as the one we are running. *That is simply inexcusable.*

The bigger question is, why was there any communication between \_\_\_\_\_ and [DISPUTER] about this council when we expressly asked multiple times in multiple emails, **to please not discuss any part of the reports or the proceedings with anyone but your spouse?**

Additionally, last Monday, in a phone conversation, \_\_\_\_\_ told me that she was in text communication with [MIQ] the day or two before last week's council. They were discussing questions related to the impending council.

I asked her to please refrain from discussing anything with anyone. She agreed to stop.

Then, after repeatedly registering her complaints throughout the week about how unfair she thought we were, I asked her to stop (via private email). I reminded her in my email that if she felt it was so unfair, she always had the option to recuse herself. She responded to my email this morning, giving me her word that she would no longer interfere or say any more about the process that the Council is trying to complete tomorrow.

But this afternoon, she broke her word by inviting [DISPUTER] into the "private council room," (our private group thread) and then handing her a bullhorn, with which she vomited all over all of us and our council proceedings.

That was the final straw.

Clearly, \_\_\_\_\_ was not satisfied with how things were being done. So, she sabotaged our efforts, thus preventing this Women's Council from doing what we are called to do. Which is to gather in strict confidence to discuss a man's daily walk to determine if he has violated the trust of the group with his actions.

We realize that despite all the ways she violated our trust and fostered discord, there will be some of you who feel that it was unfair of us to release \_\_\_\_\_. You are entitled to your opinion.

If you feel that this action or any other action/decision we have made precludes you from participating in a peaceful and productive way tomorrow, you have the option to recuse yourself. Being on a council is not an obligation. It is an option.

If you decide to preclude/recuse yourself from the council for this or any other reason we are asking you to please let us know no later than 10 am tomorrow.

Thank you,

Amberli and Jennifer

---

01/21/24 at 03:32:35 AM PST

**Subject:** Re: Breach of trust

Amberli and Jennifer,

I apologize for any aggravation you are feeling over [DISPUTER] and her communication with you and the current council, in particular my involvement in that. I have been and will continue to be forthcoming with you about everything I know. Here again, there are accusations being made without knowing the full story, however I'll make the assumption that you meant no offense so I will take none.

I received a call from [DISPUTER] yesterday asking if a text she had sent out to the three of us had been passed along to the council as she requested. I told her I had not been near my phone recently but when I checked, that NO I had not seen one. She asked that I please pass it on, which I did without thinking much about it as I am on vacation in Mexico. Also, it didn't strike me as particularly odd to do so because in previous councils I've served on, we posted and discussed any and all things as a group without censure or filter. Also, 1/2 of the people on the council are good friends of mine so there would be no reason for me to post anything hurtful. I figured we'd hash it all out on Sunday as part of the discussion. After reading both \_\_\_\_\_ and your responses to it, I can see that it struck a cord and was not well received. I guess that was poor judgement on my part and I apologize. I had no intention of allowing [DISPUTER] a bully pulpit or bull horn. I was unaware of her efforts to communicate with you and that you were purposely avoiding her, but seeing that now, I feel terrible that I put myself in the middle of that. I can solemnly swear that was not my intention.

**Even more problematic is how and why [DISPUTER] has ANY knowledge about who HAD or HAD NOT signed their names to the email.**



**How did she know it was just our three names? (Yours, mine, and Jennifer Bowlers).**

I did not have any correspondence with [DISPUTER] regarding this council until Jennifer inadvertently included my name on the letter that was sent to [MIQ]. Apparently [MIQ] has had correspondence with [DISPUTER] which is likely how she knew only three people had addressed [MIQ] in that email. She specifically called me to ask why my name was on the email.

**Did you forward our emails or any correspondence to [DISPUTER]?**

No, I have not forwarded any emails or group correspondence to [DISPUTER] or [MIQ]

**What did you divulge to her? How does she know anything about our council? And who signed what, and when? And what we decided about [MIQ]'s participation?**

I had not spoken to [DISPUTER] in many weeks until this week when she called and asked why my name appeared on a letter to [MIQ] without the rest of the council of 12 names. I was shocked to hear that my name was on anything as I had asked Jennifer to leave it off. At any rate, she asked me who else was on the council and I declined to give her those names. I did not then, nor have I since given any details about the council. Your guess is as good as mine to who or where she is getting information.

**Can you honestly say that you have complied with our very serious request?**

Yes, I can.

**Last Monday, in our phone conversation, you admitted to me that you had texted [MIQ] the day or two before the council to tell him that in preparation for the upcoming council, you wanted to know about his marital status.**

When I was first called to be a part of this council and preparing for it the upcoming night, the one question I needed to know from [MIQ] before I went

any further was whether or not he was still married, as this was the very reason we met with him and [wife] a year ago. I had not spoken to him in months as I told you before on the phone and decided it best to ask directly. He responded with “I have no idea \_\_\_\_”.

**And lastly, if you and [DISPUTER] are so intent on following procedure, then why can't either of you answer the one question that nobody, including [MIQ], seems to be able to answer about [MIQ]'s original certificate? HERE IS THE QUESTION:**

**Why did [DISPUTER] remove her name from [MIQ]'s 2014 certificate, forcing him to get an entirely new one in 2022, when [wife] simply could have added her name?**

I believe I partially know the answer to this but it was not asked of me so I felt it not my place to answer waiting for [MIQ] to respond. At some point a couple years ago, [DISPUTER] was so upset about the way the first women's council went, that following the conclusion, she systematically “removed” her name off any certificate she signed, including her husbands. I have no idea the rationale or basis behind this decision, and I suppose you would have to ask her to get a clear direct answer. I disagreed with her on this point many times through hours of discussion then and still do now. I have always believed that one cannot just remove a name without a council. We have agreed to disagree and left it there.

**She has ZERO power over any of our proceedings —regardless of her position on a women's advisory board that you founded.**

I agree with you that [DISPUTER] should have no authority or influence over this council. Again, I assume she and [MIQ] have had ongoing communication about it. I did not “found” any movement recognized advisory board, I felt impressed a few years ago to pool the collective learned wisdom of the first few councils to provide support....not oversight...to any who asked for it. There was never any intention to be a formal anything, just those who would like to participate.

As this pertains to the current council, if I had to render a guess, I would say [DISPUTER] asking to have her email forwarded to the council was more on a personal level than in any capacity she has with the advisory group as the current group of advisors was not asked for any help on this issue that I know of. I've not spoken to [DISPUTER] about this at all.

**...please pass on to [DISPUTER] my earlier response to her scathing indictment of the group that you posted for her on our group thread—without including her email address so I could respond just to her.**

I did not include [DISPUTER] email address on the thread because I knew that would give her access to everyone's email and assumed you had her email also since she sent the text to all 3 of us. I have not forwarded your response email to her assuming you had gotten it to her directly since it was addressed to her. As I said, it was not my intention to be the middle person and seeing now the trouble it caused would not like to add to the problem. If you have not sent it to her yet and do not have her email, it is:

---

Again, I regret sending the [DISPUTER] letter off to the group without first running it past you and Jennifer as you have clearly established that process by which information should flow to this council. I think the lines were blurred there when my name only was added to yours on the letter that went out to [MIQ]. Had that not happened, I don't think [DISPUTER] would have even known that I was on the council and the fallout that has ensued may have been avoided. I would submit that that inadvertent mistake was as intentional as the one I have made here and ask that you accept my apology as quickly as I accepted yours.

At the start of the meeting tomorrow, I would like the opportunity to apologize personally to the ladies for my part in that and own the mistake. From there, I really would like to see this through to the end and don't feel this one oversight in your process justifies having me removed. I've invested significant thought and prayer into the situation and feel I have a unique and valuable perspective to add when it comes to [MIQ]. I hold him as accountable as any man going into the council and have NOT come to a decision on the matter

yet, waiting upon tomorrow's discussion to help me make a final decision. However, if you still feel the need to recuse me, I will respect that choice although I admit I struggle to find historic or scriptural precedence.

-(#22 of WCL1)

---

01/21/24 10:36am MST

Ladies,

Late last night I received an email from Amberli and Jennifer Bowler notifying me of their decision to recuse me from the council. I spent the night responding to their accusations and sent it off at 3am. I assume they did not pass those comments on to you and feel it is important you hear them from me. Their email to me is found at the bottom with my response here at the top. I will pray for all of you to have wisdom and prudence today as you proceed. Know my heart and thoughts are with you today.

With love,

-(#22 of WCL1)

---

1/21/24 11:56am MST

\_\_\_\_\_,

I am saddened to read your erroneous and entirely unfair take on all the efforts we have all made to be fair to all parties, the dozens of hours of time away from our families and jobs, and suffered health issues for with these words of yours:

"No one here wants to drag things out or to create drama. But we all want to be free to express our viewpoints and if something pricks our conscience we need to be able to voice that without worrying that we might get kicked off the council for saying something that someone finds offensive."

For the record, nobody, including \_\_\_\_\_, was kicked off the council for saying something that someone found offensive.

Did you not read her apology?

She acknowledged her wrongdoing in sending [DISPUTER]'s offensive words to all of us. She regretted doing that.

Those words were NOT \_\_\_\_\_'s "offensive" words. They were [DISPUTER]' words.

Did you not follow the email thread?

How did you come to the conclusion that \_\_\_\_\_ was kicked off the council for saying something offensive?

Initially, she was excused NOT for what she said, but for allowing [DISPUTER] to barge into our sacrosanct space and call us all cowards who do not have her permission to proceed the way we are.

Apparently, you are not aware that we have been in communication with \_\_\_\_\_ and have asked her to rejoin. Nor have you read the email where I stated such.

As for the perfectly ran Women's Council you have been on, please share more about that today. I, for one, would love to know how to run a perfectly smooth, no-drama women's council.

According to Whitney, Jennifer B., Cherry Ann, and everyone else who has ever been on one, they are an absolute train wreck of drama and trauma. So, I think we will all appreciate any tips you can give us on how to run it perfectly.

Thanks!

Amberli

---

1/21/24 12:28pm MST

Ladies,

I'll be sending the ZOOM links momentarily. \_\_\_\_\_ will be rejoining us in the council today.

On behalf of all of us, we thank her for her apology and appreciate her reaching out to help us understand how things happened and why.

I hope you saw \_\_\_\_\_'s email, with [MIQ] response. That will obviously be a big point of our discussion today.

I am very frustrated that he sent it last minute despite repeatedly telling us he refused to send anything and WOULD NOT send anything, only to contradict himself and throw it at us 4 hours before we are meeting.

Some women won't even have time to read it, like \_\_\_\_\_, who is \_\_\_\_\_.

I have my grandkids over that I am watching this morning. Whitney is with grandkids this morning as well.

That is why we gave him a deadline of 12 noon on Friday. So we would have time to read it and be able to digest it and speak intelligently about it.

And we gave [the wife] the same deadline.

She complied with it. He did not. In fact, earlier that morning he ASSURED us he WOULD NOT respond.

Now he is in control, once again, by throwing us into a tailspin as we frantically try to read it and assimilate it?

It all seems like a strategy of denial and deflection. He could have sent this a week ago, or even two days ago.

I am so weary of his games and rude dismissals of our time, energy, and the process we take seriously as a task given to us women by the Lord.

The most unfortunate part of this whole process for me is that of the many dozens of hours Jennifer and I have spent putting this together, 95% of the time has been focused on concern for [MIQ] and fending off criticism and strife from within the council, and such little time on what matters most, which is determining the pain and suffering he has not only caused his wife and his children, but dozens of people in this peace-seeking community.

\_\_\_\_\_ said it best last week. Either he violated the terms of his priesthood certificate or he didn't. Those principles are spelled out in the plainest terms possible:

**“That the rights of the priesthood are inseparably connected with the powers of heaven, and that the powers of heaven cannot be controlled nor handled only upon the principles of righteousness.**

**“That they may be conferred upon us, it is true; but when we undertake to cover our sins, or to gratify our pride, our vain ambition, or to exercise control or dominion or compulsion upon the souls of the children of men, in any degree of unrighteousness, behold, the heavens withdraw themselves; the Spirit of the Lord is grieved; and when it is withdrawn, Amen to the priesthood or the authority of that man.”**

See you at 2:00 pm

Amberli