

February 2008

Dear [Brother]

Greetings in Christ's precious Name.

This is with reference to the concerns that we discussed over e-mails and the telephone during The month of December 2007. I have wanted to write to you on this matter since the day of our last telephone conversation, but work prevented. There are several points that I felt needed to be expressed. I do this with much trepidation for it is painful, time consuming and because it is not clear whether you will give me a hearing. However for the sake of the Tabernacle's reputation and ministry as well as for the sake of our Lord and His gospel I am constrained to make a final effort, trusting the rest into the hands of the Lord of the church and the Judge of all the earth. Here are some of the salient points that come to mind:

1. Jeyakanth's Request- On the evening of the day on which we had our last conversation Jeyakanth phoned me. He told me in strong terms that I had done much tale bearing about him and defamed his character. That from that day onwards we are to regard each other as strangers; that he would tell any one who inquires about me that we do not have any contact with each other and so does not know any thing; that I should also do the same. His tone was that of an order. He also held the view that he comes under the supervision of the Tabernacle and that I had no business to interfere; that he would give an account to them. My reply was that we who are ministers of Christ are involved in public ministry and we need to maintain transparency; that he was denying the very spirit of the Reformation in telling me to repress my conscience; that when a Christian feels that the Name of our Lord is under threat and when the church is being weakened he has the freedom as well as the duty before God to seek to correct by speaking out; it is on this basis that Martin Luther, and at present Dr. Peter Masters, Pastors Bala of New Zealand and Poh of Malaysia- all for whom Jeyakanth has very high regard- expose and criticize publicly other ministers and churches. I explained to him that the stance that he was taking with me as well as with many fellow ministers here as well as those under his supervision is unchristian and dangerous. At the end of all this he told me to clam up about him. So am not sure whether he understood me.

2. Jeyakanth's Family's Involvement- In one of my telephone conversations with you with you I mentioned to you that a number of Jeyakanth's family members were engaging in lengthy telephone calls basically reprimanding me for having "accused" Jeyakanth to the Tabernacle without first checking out my information with Jeyakanth. In the space of 3 days the calls answering of the family's telephone calls occupied whole evenings till bed time. All were telling me that I was either being drawn into a sinister plot against Jeyakanth or was part of the plot! While I understand the anguish of the family and their freedom to talk to me as all of them knew me well and had good relationships with me, I seriously question the pastoral wisdom of Jeyakanth in having communicated something 1 New Section 1 Page 2 inaccurately to his family-1 had only informed the Tabernacle, the only church that has some pastoral power over Jeyakanth, of reports that I had heard, requesting them to look into them and settle them in a God glorifying manner. I told you these things. I also told this to Dr. Masters in a telephone conversation that he had with me. Both of you agreed that it was inappropriate for Jeyakanth to have disseminated information to his family in such a manner that they would put such pressure on me. You assured me that you would speak to Jeyakanth and see that such behaviour is not repeated. I do not know whether you spoke to him. The very aggressive call, dare I say threatening call, mentioned in 1. above is what I get at the end of all my efforts. Other ministers and believers have also told me of such threatening behavior. One such brother, of proven commitment to truth telling, told me that Jeyakanth had once during an

argument asked him whether he wished Jeyakanth to arrange for his being forced out of Trincomalee. It is tragic that a minister of Christ has learnt to operate at this level and survive with flying colours. You will understand that I would appreciate your using this information to help Jeyakanth without revealing my name.

3. Handling of the charge of a promiscuous relationship-I was seriously disappointed that you were put in a position where you could not speak to the husband of the lady with whom Jeyakanth is accused of having a promiscuous relationship. You were so sure that you had investigated and got to the bottom of the matter and were satisfied with Jeyakanth's plea of innocence. You know that I am not exaggerating your words. I am only quoting the salient essence of what was a much more involved statement by you. However all your sources were from Jeyakanth's and the lady's side. You were convinced that the lady's is a reputed, educated family with a close relative of her being the chairman of a local council and that the husband is an uneducated man. You were persuaded that this gave him an inferiority complex that led him to have a grudge against his wife and made him suspect wrong motives whenever she associated with other men. This chain of reasoning certainly "appears" to exonerate Jeyakanth. However is there any just basis for accepting the testimony of your one-sided sources? Both Biblical and General revelation would forbid this. God's concern that no man should be declared guilty without a fair opportunity being given for him to cite evidence and produce witnesses is one of the many gloriously attractive qualities of our God (Deut. 17 and 18). Christ our king never judges on surface appearances, but penetrates to the truth and judges with equity (Is. 11:5-6). The reality is that surface appearances are usually engineered by the rich and powerful. Thus God intervenes in history as the defender of the cause of the poor, the fatherless, the widow and the alien. From Genesis to Revelation the bible depicts its God and all His inspired servants as having an acute sensitivity towards the plight of the poor, down-trodden and deprived in the face of the exploiting injustices and sheer lack of the "hesed" (loving-kindness) of the Lord. As you yourself have discerned, the husband of this lady belongs to the category of the power-less. Jeyakanth, with his social status and his influence in all the segments of power, and this lady belong to the powerful. This man has appealed to you several times and through various means. Your refusal to meet him and give him a hearing truly shocked and disappointed me. Surely it is quite a distance away from the biblical spirit of mercy and justice. When I pointed these biblical arguments to you over the phone, after a lengthy discussion, you did not directly respond. After a long silence, you said that you really could not meet the man because you had given an undertaking to the lady's family that you would not see him. You had come to believe the version that your speaking to him would only create further misbehaviour by the husband and the further erosion of the family. After speaking to so many witnesses on one side without even speaking to the complainant or a single witness on his behalf we must conclude with regret that you were gullible to have given an undertaking not to speak to the complainant. Here is a man crying to the church for justice. If his complaint is true the offence caused by the pastor is a serious matter. Jeyakanth has openly gone on record to say that he is not accountable to any of the Reformed men here. Thus the Tabernacle has a responsibility before God as his supervising church to inquire into the matter. This is why I pressed for an opportunity to see you in Trincomalee before you left that place. But you wanted to be in Hatton the next day and wanted to meet me in a transit place. I felt that if our meeting was to be helpful to you and the cause of God it had to be in the Trincomalee setting where we would also have the opportunity to speak to witnesses if the need arose. You cancelled the meeting saying that we had talked over the phone enough for you to understand my concerns. I understand that you stayed on in Trincomalee and did not go to Hatton. If your priority was to clear 2 New Section 1 Page 3 the problems relating to the Thambalagamam ministry, my view is that you could have called me and told me about the change and I would have tried to come.

4. New Developments- Some of the developments during this new year throw very clear light into some of the concerns that I discussed with you. I will only raise some questions without going into detail for the sake of brevity; I also think that it will be better for you to verify these things independently without relying on my information. Why was Jeyakanth removed from his position as Chairman of Habitat for Humanity in Trincomalee? Why did the Trincomalee Government Agent order a ban on the operations of Habitat in that district? Why was it subsequently revoked only after negotiations and his removal? Was the name of the lady, mentioned in 3. above, also involved in the considerations that led to the ban? Please use sources independent of Jeyakanth to verify this. It is, as I pointed out to you for some-one from the Tabernacle to come exclusively to put the ministry on the right footing by clearing up. I raise these with regret. I feel constrained to do this because you expressed much confidence in your conclusions. As far as possible I have cross checked my information and my sources are authoritative, independent and reliable. It shows how vain it is to rely on the testimony of one sided sources even if they are on your side. I am not concluding that the husband of the lady is totally in the right. I also did warn you and Dr. Masters about the danger from the militant bhudists in the government to all Christian efforts if this style of operations without accountability continues. I am only pointing out that your method of investigation and amassing evidence could be a grievous injustice to the socially weak and poor and a succumbing to the ones with social power. As Reformed Evangelicals we should be extremely weary of this path. Spurgeon is a towering example of the best of this tradition whose familiarity with the word of God enabled him to climb out of his own dominating established social values to take many admirable stands for under-dog. Dr. Masters told me that by using strong language that communicated that he was convinced of Jeyakanth's guilt Pastor Joseph Manoharan had placed him-self in a position where Jeyakanth would not take any statement that came from him as being helpful. This is probably true. We must, however, accept that by being true to this tradition of Spurgeon his investigation brought out many facts that corroborate with these developments.

5. Contradiction and Confusion in Method- Your satisfaction at what you had gathered on 3. above was mainly based on the testimony of the hindu family members of the lady. In the first of your telephone conversations with me, however, you were quite disdainful of giving any weight to the testimony of Pastor Balanathan because he was a charismatic. I pointed out this contradiction to you in our second conversation. More-over you had, according to him, taken Jeyakanth as the translator when you went to talk to him about his charge that Jeyakanth had arranged the abduction of his child. He says that you did not give consideration to his objection to this. He also claims that he could understand from his limited English that Jeyakanth had not properly translated all that he said; also that you posed to him mainly "yes" or "no" as answer questions and repressed many attempts of his to explain further. Then you had stated your conclusion at near mid-night after a visit to the police station. I explained to you that in our context the testimony of the police cannot be taken as conclusive. If all this is true your investigation with its summary handling of the opponent, does not satisfy biblical standards and pastor Balanathan needs to the opportunity to be heard properly. As far as I could understand from this distance it does appear that pastor Bala's evidence is insufficient. But the fact remains that he went through the trauma of having his child abducted and is the next door neighbour and close ex-associate of Jeyakanth. Jeyakanth supervised his work for some time and has preached in his church several times.

6. Incompleteness of the Handling of Pastor Murali's Grievance of Being Roughly Threatened- Pastor Murali's version of your visit to his home with pastor Jeyakanth is that at one point in the discussion Jeyakanth apologized for the threatening behaviour. Then you had asked him whether he would show commensurate good will by accepting that he had done wrong in giving pastor Joseph Manoharan the telephone number of the husband of the lady. When Murali had said no, you would

not give him an opportunity to explain why he felt he had not done wrong. Both you and Jeykanth had apparently told him that if he was not going to accept his fault and apologize you were not prepared to go any further and closed the discussion. You pointed out to me with the air of having been proved right in your action, that Murali's wife had agreed that Murali must apologize. But Murali cannot be expected to apologize without freely feeling in his conscience that he had really done wrong. It is unchristian repression. That kind of handling is surely not good for the Tabernacle. 3 New Section 1 Page 4 More-over, if Jeykanth had admitted to his resorting to threats and if there are many other charges of the same behaviour is it biblically safe for him to be shouldering all that authority without corrective measures and a system of accountability?

7. Judgment of Pastors Based on Biased Evidence- You told me of your conviction after your investigation that the lady and her husband have made up and getting along fine now; that it was pastors Murali and Joseph Manoharan who had by their repeated contact with the man had disturbed him and messed up the family by turning him against his innocent wife. If true, it is a shameful crime by two senior pastors, one of them a student and former member of the LRBS and a long-standing disciple of Dr. Masters about whose Theological position, as well as pastoral and ethical performance you have had very high respect. How-ever on whose testimony is this based? Have you had a testimony from the husband or one of his witnesses? I need not elaborate. You will recognize the enormity of the unfair bias that you would have carried against these brethren. This is why I tried to alert you to the handicap that you have as against a local from this culture. Many donors to third world countries are orchestrated by their agents into believing the opposite of reality. This is the danger that Jeykanth is courting to his peril if he continues to operate without tight local accountability. Of course if fair investigation proves some of these charges to be true, then some-thing more would be required. I have written this as a final effort to bring about God's honour. And good to all concerned. It is now up to you. I trust the outcome into the hands of our faithful God.

Yours in Christ,

Jothy Hoole