



Monday, July 30, 2007

## "VOICE FROM THE FIELD-6"

*Dear Brother Frank:*

*I view myself among others, as a soldier of God through CFC, conquering territories for Him. I also take my operational command from my headquarters, the CFC Council. If that same HQ is under attack, I am duty bound to defend it. From the same HQ, I get my mandate and authority in my work in the field and in relating with my men and comrades (my brothers and sisters) on the ground (the provinces). Today, as I am writing this letter the CFC song "Fight the Good Fight of Faith" is echoing in my ears (...people of God, unstained and without reproach before the eyes of men, run the good race you sons of the most High.....). I stand for what CFC over the last 25 years stood for: pro-God, pro-family, pro-life, pro-poor. I understand what my CFC covenant is, it is good, it is difficult, but I will commit myself to obeying it. As a good catholic I must aspire to protect, promote and strengthen my family as my domestic church, to support the larger church; as CFC member I will do the same for CFC, continue my work and support the good order by supporting and aligning myself with the extant leadership.*

---

***(THE CFC COUNCIL HAD ISSUED A CEASEFIRE TO THE BARRAGE OF E-MAILS FLOODING THE INTERNET ON THE ISSUES BEGINNING JUNE 15 FOR GOOD ORDER. TODAY, AS THEIR VERY MANDATE IS QUESTIONED, THE NEED TO RESPOND IS IMMINENT AND NECESSARY.***

*I have inserted my comments in blue for clarity! Those in black color came from your group)*

From: Easter Group [eastergroup@gmail.com](mailto:eastergroup@gmail.com); Sent: Saturday, July 28, 2007 4:26:02 AM

**Subject: Truth Series 4.10 - WHY THE PRESENT COUNCIL DOES NOT HAVE THE MANDATE TO GOVERN**

***\* The source carried the name of the Easter Group. Looking at it closely, I sense the familiar writing style of our very own brother, Frank Padilla. I am personally addressing this response to him.***

### **Why the present Council does not have the mandate to govern**

The present Council insists on its mandate and authority to govern, having been elected by the Elders Assembly last June 22, 2007. Indeed they have been elected legally, but do they have a spiritual mandate and God's blessing to govern?

#### 1<sup>st</sup> point

The former Council decided last February 13, in prayer and discernment, to accept

command responsibility for the collective guilt of all of CFC. On February 20, only 3 actually resigned. This was agreed for the sake of continuing governance, by having a majority still in the Council. The 4 were thus interim caretakers.

But later, in having nominees for the new Council, the 4 included themselves but excluded the 3. The 3 were not consulted or even asked if they were available. So the 4 decided that since the 3 had resigned, they were no longer eligible. But were not all 7 supposed to suffer the consequence for collective guilt?

So did not God want all 7 out of the Council?

**\* *The Council does not insist. They are faithfully carrying out and continuing their mandate coming from the Elders Assembly, both for the June 2005 Elections and the recent June 2007 elections.***

***Let us set the record STRAIGHT! On the Feb. 13 meeting, Tony Meloto unexpectedly declared his resignation to resign as GK-E/D and as a Council member. Reason: Personal. He can take on attacks against himself in the CFC/GK work. However, his family was already included in the personal attacks. He wanted to protect them, especially Anna (wife of Dylan Wilk) his daughter, who is pregnant!***

***Your quick retort and reaction was: If Tony is resigning, then I am also resigning! Then TM added: Lachie A. should also resign because he is part of the problem. You, FAP added: Yes, mag-resign ka na rin. Thus, we have the 3 Council members resigning.***

***So, on Feb. 20 you went public. You exploded the bomb of resignation. Cameras clicked. Videos rolled. The whole CFC global community was asked, instructed and prevailed to welcome and accept your resignation.***

***Are the 4 who are left – interim caretakers? **Of course they are NOT!** They were duly elected and still a majority.***

***So, after all, you still wanted to be part of the Council! You hurt and pained the other Council members by resigning. They begged and prevailed on you **NOT** to resign. Yet, you **RESIGNED!** Then lo and behold, you still expected them to consider and include you in the list of nominees?***

***Suffering for the collective guilt in CFC is not only for the Council but also for every CFC member. Who said that you should monopolize that? We all are carrying our own crosses to Calvary, in CFC and personal lives, to follow Jesus.***

*Now you ask: Did God not want all 7 of the Council to resign? Praise God, **IF** you sensed Him telling you personally to resign! Which you did!*

***NOW, did God tell you also that you were His mouthpiece for the other 4 members also to resign? God is good! He is the Almighty One! He orchestrates things! Unbelievable BUT true, you resigned! Only an act of God can do that! Still, are you not pre-empting God by expecting that they also exclude themselves from the list since they are incumbent Council members?***

2<sup>nd</sup> point

After the resignations, the crisis started to unfold, beginning with the Council of 4 conducting a witch hunt against Lachie Agana. Months later, well before the nominees for the Council were decided, Frank Padilla called for all 7 of the former Council not to be available for the next Council. This was for the simple reason that the conflict was among the 7, and being unable to resolve things in the Lord, they lost their moral ascendancy to govern. The 4 did not respond, and proceeded to nominate themselves.

Can those who are the very cause of the conflicts and deep crisis be left with the task to govern? How can those who are the very cause of the conflicts be able to resolve the same conflicts? And so it is that the conflicts continue, because the 4 are still in the Council.

*\* The remaining council members absorbed all problems and issues you left after resigning. They met on Feb 21, re-organized themselves.*

- i. Rouquel Ponte (RP) replaced LA as Phil Mission Director*
- ii. RP replaced you Head for Evangelization and Mission*
- iii. Ernie Maipid replaced LA as Family Ministries Director*
- iv. Ernie Maipid replaced RP as Home Office Director*
- v. Joe Tale replaced FAP as GK Chairman.*
- vi. Joe Tale replaced FAP as Head for Pastoral Support*
- vii. Joe Yamamoto replaced Joe Tale as Social Ministries Director.*

*They got to work. The crisis unfolded.*

*You said a witch-hunt was conducted! What were the issues? Who acted as the witch, the hunters, and the victims? What triggered it?*

***My personal view:** CFC Elections was June 22. I arrived MLA on June 19. What's the crisis? I asked people around, members of the Elders Assembly, CFC office personnel, and office service crew. I was astounded by what I heard and learned: of unsound financial transactions, of perceived, circumstantial and suspected unchristian relationships leading others to sin, of hatred and anger, etc. in the CFC Head Office. It will probably not be lodge as legal case, but are*

*very much cases of “stains and reproaches before the eyes of men.” My consolation is that the 4-man CFC Council NEVER & NEVER brought that into the open or made their findings official. You were the leader. The 4-man Council had very deep respect, love and honor for you. They were constrained and agonizing to bring things out in the open. These issues happened under your command, your friends affected! You may be free and above these, but it happened under your leadership. Had you not resigned, these things were sealed and shut!*

*You know, in the spirit of Christian love for those affected, the Council held the issues under wraps!*

*Are you then now ready to face the consequences of the shattered lives of those affected (who are your friends) before the whole world to peruse? Can you be that hard-hearted to win your own battle, at their expense? They trusted and obeyed you, just like the whole of CFC, then; and for them, still. If these exchanges continue, inevitably details will surface! It is very destructive!*

*I am asking you now: **Please stand down. Let go and let God! Time to move on!***

*The problems with our pillars: we will work them out from within. In the same way that we have problems, nationally, regionally, provincial level, and down the line.*

*You had trained us well in CFC. Yet now, you have divided and hurt us enough in CFC already. Go! Form your own group or community! Just let CFC be. The Elders Assembly is responsible whom to elect as Council members.*

### 3<sup>rd</sup> point

Concerned parties came together in an *ad hoc* group and had 4 days (June 13-16) of intense discussion to try to resolve the conflict. Joe Tale, Rouquel, Lachie and Frank were there. Ernie came for the first day and no longer returned. Ernie and Joe Yamamoto showed unconcern for the deep crisis in the community by not participating in these crucial discussions.

Then there was a breakthrough, and all rejoiced, including the global family. Alas, it was short-lived. The Council led by Joe Tale did not really sell the agreement to the Elders Assembly and in fact even undermined it. We missed the win-win solution to the problem, acceptable to the bishops, and missed the one chance for healing, reconciliation, peace and unity.

Do the 4 who were unconcerned or who undermined the agreement deserve to be in the

Council? Should they govern over the community that by their actions is in disunity and disfavor from the bishops?

**\* Bro. Joe Tale called me up in Cagayan de Oro on June 17, Sunday about the compromise agreement. He asked me to let our members in Mindanao appreciate and support it. That same day, I sent e-mails to our EA members, expressing his intentions and directions. Of course in my mind, I sense that Bro Joe Tale, shifted from his initial position from the full election stance earlier. I accepted his explanation that he has not surrendered unity efforts and was looking for ways to comply with the Bishops recommendation. As far as I can sense him, he did his best to present his position, at the same time giving due respect to the authority of the EA.**

**I believe that one factor that you and your group failed to appreciate is the independence and personal choices of the members of the EA. You probably thought that because you, FAP had endorsed it, and that the Council pushed for it, the EA would accept it. I can just surmise that, since for the last 25 years what you, as CFC Director wants you get. Then, wasn't it just so natural that with your personal stance plus the endorsement of the 4-man Council will make the compromise agreement be acceptable and be approved readily? My personal conviction is that since you participated in the actual referendum during the election, you should readily submit to the decision of the assembly, whether you win or not. How then should the EA treat leaders or members like you who do not accede or recognize the CFC organizational structure and mechanics?**

**How I can figure your walking out and non-acceptance of the decision of the EA? Its mind-boggling. I cannot help but recall an example in our Parenting Training, (of Rene and Lily Perez of our dissolved FEED Ministry). They discussed cases and types of children for example who when they play ball and lost the game, they won't accept defeat. They even bring the ball to their home, "inuuwi ang bola".**

**Are you not being judgmental when you raise the question whether the 4 members deserved to be in the Council?**

**Do you have the monopoly and prerogative of selecting who are to be Council members or not? Isn't that the role of the Elders Assembly?**

4<sup>th</sup> point

Does integrity, being a man of one's word, still count?

Joe Tale and Rouquel, during the *ad hoc* group meetings (On June 14) said they will not stand for nomination to the Council if the group comes up with an agreement. Well the

group did come up with an agreement, which unfortunately was not carried out. But all the more, Joe and Rouquel should not have made themselves available for the new Council.

On June 20 at the Elders Assembly recollection, 2 days before the election, Joe Tale told Frank that if the Elders Assembly does not approve the agreement, he would withdraw his nomination. On election day, June 22, Joe reneged on his word and told Frank he would run for the regular elections if the agreement was rejected. Frank advised him that reneging would damage his credibility and seriously cause irreparable damage.

Would those who are the cause of such damage have the moral ascendancy to govern?  
Can those who do not stand on their word be trusted to govern?

**\* How true are you in telling us that brother Joe Tale reneged in his word?  
What was the context? Who knew about this?**

***It is very sad that after things are through, the lamentations pouring in. you lead us for 25 years. We stood by you. Joe is the leader then and now after you resigned. I believe and standby him!***

***What is clear to me is this: On June 21, captured by 2 video cameras, shouting to his lungs in a very sensitive microphone and very audible sound systems, addressing our very own Bishop Gabriel Reyes, a dedicated and committed CFC Missionary strongly announced: "Bishop, if any one of them (the then old 7 Council) is elected in the Council, I AM RESIGNING AS MEMBER OF COUPLES FOR CHRIST!"***

***Well, all the 4 Council members were re-elected.***

***What did you do: You heard him that evening of June 21. On June 23, the day after CFC elections, you re-organized the US CFC Council, and appointed this very same brother as a new Council member of CFC USA. Have you already given an acceptable explanation to a brother named S. Aguilin there?***

5<sup>th</sup> point

The Council showed great disrespect to the bishops.

- Telling everyone they had no right to intervene in our internal conflict. The bishops do not just involve themselves in petty matters, as they have better things to do than that.
- Telling everyone their involvement was solicited. There is of course no truth whatsoever to this. The bishops are discerning and do not get involved just like that.

- Misrepresenting what Cardinal Rosales said about the constitution and by-laws that are to be followed. The Council of 4 made this out to be the SEC by-laws, while what the Cardinal referred to were the CFC statutes.
- Scheduling Bp Reyes, who asked Joe Tale to speak to the Elders Assembly, on another day, the day before the elections, making him believe that that was the regularly scheduled Elders Assembly for the elections, such that Bp Reyes was able to address only a much smaller gathering of elders.
- Getting Fr Mario Sobrejuanite as Elders Assembly recollection speaker, who stressed that the bishops had no right to intervene.
- Writing to all about their meeting with Bp Reyes, making it appear everything was all right, but not telling us that Bp Reyes told them off regarding what they did wrong.
- Writing in that same letter that the bishops were just convinced to get involved unnecessarily.

Because of such disrespect, CFC is in trouble with the Church hierarchy. Our mission can be threatened. Even our official Church recognition, including from the Vatican, can be revoked. Should such elders now be trusted to relate to the bishops on our behalf in the right way?

**\* Yes, we have problems with them. You call them trouble. I call them misunderstanding. We will work for their understanding and blessings!**

***The initial move that triggered to have the Bishops come in later in the conflict did not come from the Council. It came from women who used to be the liaison of CFC when you were still in command. This was about the CFC and GK issue. The 4-man Council only came to know about this move very much later in an email from your group that was intended for Gerry P. BUT was instead missent to another person named Gerry B, with all attached and forwarded info.***

***Do you want to make this document public? All of it? At the expense of your friends?***

***The truth will bear this out!***

#### 6<sup>th</sup> point

The Council incessantly pointed to the legality of the elections, according to the by-laws. Agreed. However, the Council dismissed the provisions of the CFC statutes, which stated among other things:

- That CFC in a particular country may establish itself as a foundation or corporation or formal association, in accordance with local and/or national laws, for purposes of conducting transactions as a juridical entity, but that such juridical personality does not supercede the more basic reality that CFC is part of the body

of Christ and is an international Christian community with its own organization, government and patterns of life.

- That CFC will live out its life and mission in communion with the bishops, and that CFC recognizes, defers to and actively submits to the authority of the bishop as shepherd of his particular diocese.

CFC is an integral part of the Church, led by our bishops. While we are autonomous according to our statutes, we are not independent or totally apart from the Church. While we have a juridical and legal personality, the more basic reality is that we are the body of Christ, a community of God's faithful. We look not only to a country's laws, but more especially to our status in and recognition by the Church.

**\* *Brother Frank, I have to be very frank with you. You never formally mentioned or introduced Bishop Gabby Reyes through the years, as our Spiritual Director. Over the years that I come to Manila at least during our regular January Leaders conferences and the June anniversary celebrations, I could not recall a single instance that you, our brother and top leader, mention his name or of his role upon in CFC. There were others like Archbishop Lagdameo, Bishop Rodrigo, Bishop Tagle, Cardinal Sin, among others, even Fr. Suarez (healing priest) who are well mentioned supporting CFC and invited to say the mass for CFC events.***

***Today our Council, steady in the midst of the crisis, is doing just what you are saying. They wanted to be in communion with them, the Bishops. How can they accomplish their task if every move, every letter, every step they do is challenged? Give them space! Endorse them to the Bishops if you will! Then you would have planted a fast growing sturdy mustard seed in our CFC church relations.***

#### 7<sup>th</sup> point

The bishops have pointed out that obedience to Christ is obedience to the Church.

The Council has pointed out that we are just accountable to God and as we pray, we are accountable for our own actions. This is defective theology. As the bishops have said, one cannot be considered obedient to Christ if one is disobedient to the Church.

Further, when there is conflict at the very top in CFC, where do we turn to? We turn to our bishops. They provide protection and proper guidance. We are precisely in this conflict now because the Council cut us off from the protective embrace of the Church.

Can the Council be trusted to act in the best interest of the CFC life and mission, including our very crucial relationship with our shepherds?

**\* *Aren't you shifting stance? As community, we are accountable to our leaders, to the body for good order! The Council oversee the CFC Community. They***

*appoint leaders for the work. They appoint all members of the Elders Assembly (EA). On the other hand, the EA elects the Council Members and the Board of Elders as well.*

*If you do not trust the Council, then isn't it that you do not also trust the EA who elected them? Aren't the CFC Board of Elders also included? The members trust in their leaders down the line!*

*Do you still consider yourself a true CFC member if you do not trust or obey the leaders?*

*Why are you still trying to address CFC membership if you cannot accept the direction and guidance of leaders? You wanted to wean them away from the Council? Do you think you will succeed? At what costs?*

*You have broken tradition, culture and loyalty among brethren as you are doing these things. You are destroying the relationships we had built through the years!*

*We need the bishops. On your part, you only invoked their presence when it suited you!!!*

*Had you, heading the Council then, formally and officially consulted the Bishops on the CFC GK issue before February 13?*

*Had you consulted the Bishops when you expressed your resigning on Feb. 13 as CFC Director considering the implications: your 25 years of leadership, the CFC global work, your membership to a pontifical commission, the internal state of the CFC home office, etc...?*

*Why don't you simply make up, set-up your own group and evangelize those unconquered? Many countries in Asia are yet unconquered, waiting for missionaries. For example, there are those countries with names ending in ".....stan"!*

Therefore

All the above point to the reality that the present Council may be legally elected, but is not spiritually anointed. It has no moral ascendancy to govern. Its mandate is questionable.

**\* You are coming in very loaded, pointing and condescending.**

*Let me remind you: Among your latest issue with the Council was: AGAINST the decision and warning of the CFC Council, your very own spouse, went ahead with the using of CFC-Teodora in the national campaign video of Senator Manny Villar during the last Philippine Elections in May 14. Governing? How is that?*

The Council does not have the blessings of the Church, and so does not have the blessings of God. In fact, the Council is the prime cause of our present difficulty with the Church hierarchy. The Council has endangered our relationship with our shepherds, and has threatened our very mission for Christ.

*dongb  
Cagayan de Oro, Philippines  
30 July 2007*