

**United Church of God, *an International Association***  
**Council of Elders Meeting Report**  
**Dec. 10, 2009—Cincinnati, Ohio**

Chairman Roy Holladay called the meeting to order at 9 a.m. by asking Victor Kubik to open with prayer. All members of the Council, except Jim Franks and Doug Horchak, were present. A number of guests were also present.

**Review of Proposed Amendments**

**Consideration of Changes to the Bylaws—Amendment Schedule**

Bill Eddington reported that he, along with Rick Avent, chairman of the Amendment Committee; David Johnson, secretary; and the Roles and Rules Committee recommend an amendment to several sections of Article 12, Section 12.2, “Manner of Amending Governing Documents.” The suggestions would change the yearly schedule to begin five days after the Last Great Day. Under the suggested schedule the Council must review the proposed amendments on or before Dec. 15, and then all days after Dec. 15 are a fixed number of days. The Council members present were in agreement with the proposal. A formal amendment proposal will be prepared accordingly.

**Proposed Amendment by Greg Sargent**

Bill Eddington then discussed one of the two amendments submitted by members of the General Conference of Elders, this one by Greg Sargent. Mr. Sargent’s proposal would amend the Rules of Association to require all tithes and offerings be sent to the home office, with none collected locally. Aaron Dean said that he is opposed to the amendment, because there are still people who lack trust, but, as that trust builds, more do send their funds to the home office. If this passes, he believes there will be a loss of income.

Darris McNeely said that he cannot support the amendment either. He stated that you cannot legislate unity. He also pointed out that there may be a question about the manner in which the Rules of Association are amended. He mentioned that, since it was the Council of Elders that prepared the Rules of Association, he believes it should be the Council that proposes amendments to it. Bill Eddington pointed out that it was also the national councils that had to ratify the Rules of Association. Roy Holladay said that his congregations have just recently stopped collecting donations locally. Robin Webber commented that he cannot support this proposal.

Melvin Rhodes said that, in his area, those who are paying locally are retired—they do not need to pay tithes on those funds—but he was inclined to believe they would not send their donations to the home office, thus losing those donations. Victor Kubik mentioned that he would rather see people naturally migrate to sending their funds to the home office, rather than make it a requirement. He agreed that there could be a loss of income if this is approved. Scott Ashley said that we need to show individuals freedom of choice in where those funds should be sent.

Bill Eddington asked if any members of the Council support the proposed amendment going forward, and there were none who did. The secretary reminded the Council that he needed a Statement of Concern by no later than Dec. 14.

### **Proposed Amendment by Jack Hendren**

Bill Eddington then discussed the second proposed amendment, this one submitted by Jack Hendren. Bill Eddington originally misread the Amendment Committee's decision with regard to support for this amendment, but pointed out that, by three to two, that committee did not support this amendment going forward. Darris McNeely mentioned that he does not support this proposal going forward. He stated that the concerns expressed in the Statement of Justification have never been established. He said that the Church has a study paper on the casting of lots, and this proposal is in conflict with that study paper. He said that, beyond the choosing of Matthias, there is no mention of casting of lots in the New Testament, including no mention of how the apostle Paul gained the appointment to apostle. He commented that, if the election of Council members were done by casting of lots, then we would have to make the assumption that God selected those men. Then how could we choose four other men the next time? He said that this could lead to something like appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court where it is an appointment for life.

Victor Kubik said that this has been looked at from the very beginning of United. He mentioned that there were "lots" drawn when it came to establishing the terms of the initial members of the Council of Elders, but that was it. Robin Webber asked, where does this end? Does it just end with the choosing of members of the Council, or does it trickle down to other appointments? Scott Ashley asked, if this is done, do you cast lots for the budget, Strategic Plan, the president, managing editors of the various publications, etc.? Melvin Rhodes said that he believes there is a likely possibility that even more elders would not participate in the selection process if we went to casting of lots.

Bill Eddington asked, and there were no members of the Council present who supported this proposal.

### **Interpretation of Bylaw 8.4.3**

Bill Eddington then discussed the application of Bylaw 8.4.3. He stated that precedent was established by the Council previously. He also mentioned that this particular section of the Bylaws is poorly constructed and needs to be amended.

David Johnson stated that the Church's legal counsel, Larry Darden, has certain ideas with regard to this and he (David Johnson) would like the Council to hear those ideas first before a final decision is made. (At that point Doug Horchak joined the meeting.)

Victor Kubik mentioned that in a conversation legal counsel Larry Darden said he would support whatever the Council decided. Roy Holladay asked the Council, and 10 members supported the precedent and one member (Doug Horchak) abstained. Therefore Bylaw 8.4.3 is interpreted by the Council that, any time an individual steps into a vacated seat on the Council, the General Conference of Elders must ratify that individual at the

next annual meeting of the General Conference of Elders to continue serving in that position the following year(s).

### **Facilities Study Proposal**

Roy Holladay then read from a document, “Facilities Study Proposal,” presented to the Council by the president and treasurer. Mr. Holladay asked Jason Lovelady if phase one is being considered for the next fiscal year. The treasurer said that it depends on the requirements needed to put the television programming into place.

The chairman then suggested that the treasurer take the Council on a tour of the facility to better understand what is being proposed. The suggestion was agreed to and the treasurer took the Council on a guided tour.

### **Meeting With Ambassador Bible Center Students**

The Council conducted a “town hall” type meeting with the ABC students before breaking for lunch. The students were then invited to have lunch with the members of the Council for further discussions and questions.

### **Facilities Study Proposal Revisited**

Chairman Holladay returned briefly to the “Facilities Study Proposal” and asked if the Council supported the general idea behind phase one within the proposal. No Council members expressed any concerns, and the administration was given approval to begin working toward phase one of the proposal.

The balance of the day’s meeting was in executive session.

*-end-*

Gerald Seelig  
*Council Reporter*

© 2009 United Church of God, *an International Association*