

CONFIDENTIAL: We don't intend to make this communication public, and we ask that you not make it public either.

Statement of Formal Charges and Issues - Mark Driscoll

By: Former Mars Hill Pastors Dave Kraft, Jeff Bettger, Phil Poirier, Jon Krombein, Jesse Winkler, Mike Wilkerson, Lief Moi, Adam Sinnett, Matt Johnson, Zack Hubert, Andrew Lisi, Kyle Firstenberg, Phil Smidt, Mark Bergin, Will Little, Matt Jensen, James Noriega, Aaron Mead, Tim Gaydos, Zach Bolen, Wesley Oaks

To: The Executive Elders of Mars Hill Church and the Board of Advisors and Accountability

Cc: The Full Council of Elders of Mars Hill Church

Introduction

We love the people of Mars Hill Church, and we are grateful for how Pastor Mark's ministry has impacted our lives in positive ways. He has taught us sound doctrine. Many of us have been connected relationally to Mark and his family, and they have regularly been hospitable, and generous. Yet we believe that Mark has also impacted us, the church, and the watching and listening world with a pattern of harmful ways. We feel responsible to submit these charges for the sake of the gospel, our own consciences and the future well-being of Mars Hill Church. In addition, we believe that Mars Hill Church, and each and every Christian church worldwide, belongs to Jesus, not to any one leader, or group of leaders. The reputation of Jesus in our communities and around the world, and the noble office of elder is to be upheld and respected, no matter how gifted the leader.

This document contains four main sections: formal charges, examples demonstrating the disqualifying pattern, supporting materials, and issues. Formal charges are stated with confidence and with the unified voice of all signers. Issues are questions being advanced for serious consideration, by some or all of the signers, but not necessarily charges. The answers to those questions could possibly provide cause for additional charges or further evidence to establish the current charges.

This document is signed by several former elders of Mars Hill Church. We submit these charges together and are prepared to stand as witnesses to these charges. In addition to these signers, there are 21 additional witnesses who stand prepared to testify to various charges when interviewed by the board. Their names have been omitted from this document for privacy and safety reasons both for themselves and for Mars Hill Church and/or because they have previously signed a non-disparagement agreement when exiting Mars Hill employment and are only prepared to be named within the context of an investigation in an effort to honor their prior agreement. They want their names and testimonies to be known by the board at the proper time. Once a proper investigation is opened, according to Article 12 of the Mars Hill bylaws, the lead investigator may contact Mike Wilkerson to get the names and contact information of these additional witnesses.

In May 2013, Dave Kraft submitted similar formal charges. To our knowledge, the witnesses who were at that time prepared to be interviewed during the investigation of those charges were never interviewed.

At the time Dave prepared these charges, some of the instances of disqualifying behavior to which the witnesses were prepared to speak had taken place within weeks. They were recent offenses, demonstrating a current pattern.

Formal Charges

Per Article 12 of the Bylaws of Mars Hill Church, we hereby file formal charges against Pastor Mark Driscoll, the primary preaching and teaching pastor for the Church that, if investigated and found to be true, could disqualify him from his position as an elder in the Church, based on the biblical requirements of an elder. As such, it is our understanding that these charges shall be referred to the Board of Advisors & Accountability.

We believe that Pastor Mark Driscoll has violated the following biblical qualifications of an elder as a result of an ongoing pattern of attitude and behavior.

He has personally sinned against some of us in these ways. Some of us have witnessed him sinning against others in these ways. We have witnessed these sins in the pulpit and other public teaching settings. And we are aware of similar offenses against others based on credible reports. We, the signers, are prepared to stand as witnesses to these charges. As such, we satisfy the biblical standard for multiple witnesses, according to 1 Timothy 5:19 and Deuteronomy 19:15.

Additionally, we believe that many more, if called upon as witnesses, would confirm these charges beyond any reasonable doubt.

Furthermore, we believe that letters already submitted to the board in response to the board's request in 2013 testify to these charges, including letters written by some of us.

In the biblical passages cited below, we acknowledge that a single instance might not be a disqualifier from eldership; but an established pattern of such behavior supported and substantiated by eyewitnesses would be. We believe that Pastor Mark has a long-standing pattern of violating these eldership qualifications and has done so with dozens of individuals, including some of us.

1. Self-controlled and disciplined (1 Tim. 3:2, Titus 1:8) Self-control and disciplined are related and relevant to controlling one's emotional impulses. The Greek for disciplined is *enkrates*, which BDAG describes as "pertaining to having one's emotions, impulses, or desires under control, self-controlled, disciplined."
 - a. Pastor Mark exhibits lack of self-control by his speech and by verbally assaulting others.
 - b. He also demonstrates lack of discipline with his words and the judgmental comments he makes, and has made, about his own elders and other leaders. This may be characterized as slander. Scripture condemns speaking slanderously, or "speaking evil," of others (Rom. 1:30, 3:8; cf. Tit. 3:2).

If an elder—or anyone else—causes injury to others by speaking ill or evil of them to anyone, it should be regarded as slander. A single instance of slander might be confronted, repented of, forgiven, and reconciled. This does not necessarily disqualify an

elder. However, if there were a pattern of slander, we would have to ask: Is this elder self-controlled with his tongue? It is out of the abundance of the heart, after all, that the mouth speaks (Luke 6:45). The injury to others is serious. The pattern suggests something wrong, not only in the tongue, but in the heart of that elder.

2. Not domineering (1 Pet. 5:3): See examples from Sam Storms below, which we believe describe Pastor Mark's leadership.
3. Not violent, but gentle (1 Tim. 3:3, Titus 1:7).
 - a. Pastor Mark exhibits anger and ungraceful ways of dealing with those with whom he disagrees and who disagree with him. He does this by (among other ways) putting people down, caricaturing, and dismissing.
 - b. We believe that the way Pastor Mark leads has created a culture of fear instead of a culture of candor and safety. People are often afraid to ask questions or challenge certain ideas.
 - c. Pastor Sutton in a Full Council Elder's meeting on January 15, 2013 indicated that we have a culture of fear. We believe that Pastor Mark is the most significant contributor to those fears.
 - d. Pastor Mark is verbally abusive to people who challenge him, disagree with him, or question him.
 - e. Pastor Mark uses words to demean, attack or disparage others.
 - f. We believe that few (including Mark himself) would characterize him as gentle.

Some definitions for *plektes*, translated "not violent," include "pugnacious person, bully" (BDAG), "striker; pugnacious person, bully, quarrelsome person (ANLEX), "a person who is pugnacious and demanding" (Louw-Nida). Merriam-Webster defines pugnacious as: "having a quarrelsome or combative nature.

"The degrees of modes of violence that the word might express are numerous (bullying, verbal abuse, angry pushing, and shoving), and prohibition should be regarded as widely as possible" (Taken from Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*.)

It seems unlikely that one could establish a disqualifying charge of "violent" based on a single instance. The definitions clearly indicate a pattern of life, character traits that show up in various interactions with people. It's the pattern that results in disqualification; while it may well be that no single instance would warrant a disqualifying charge.

4. Respectable (1 Tim. 3:2). We can no longer respect Pastor Mark Driscoll and submit to his leadership as a result of his persistent sinful behavior toward others. We believe that an investigation would discover that a significant number of current Mars Hill elders, leaders, and members have also lost respect for Pastor Mark's leadership, in addition to the many who have left Mars Hill Church in the recent past.

5. Not arrogant (Titus 1:7). Pastor Mark has stated in public numerous times that he is guilty of pride. It is one thing to acknowledge sin, quite another to repent of sin and experience change through the power of the Holy Spirit.
6. Not quick-tempered (Titus 1:7). Many Mars Hill elders have witnessed quick-temper on numerous occasions.

Examples Demonstrating the Disqualifying Pattern

While the primary evidences for these charges are the personal experiences and testimonies of the signers and witnesses, we want to make it clear that these experiences are tied to many concrete events. The following is a small selection of examples that illustrate a pattern of disqualifying behavior. The signers of these charges and the additional witnesses are prepared to provide details for these examples along with many more examples when interviewed as part of the investigation of these charges.

Please note the recency of the events below. We have selected more recent examples to challenge a prevalent impression that while Pastor Mark may have sinned in these ways in the distant past, he has been a changed man in more recent years. To the contrary, we know of recent evidence that strongly indicates disqualifying patterns having continued into recent times. Dave Kraft's formal charges were submitted in May 2013. At that time, several of the examples listed below were current.

1. April 2010—Bullying and slander of a former Lead Pastor
2. October 2011—Mark said in a meeting that he did not want a certain staff elder (who was not slim) to take on a certain prominent leadership role because "his fat ass is not the image we want for our church."
3. April 2012—Slander of a former Lead Pastor
4. Early 2012—Slander about former Executive Pastor in a Lead Pastor's meeting
5. Early 2012—In a meeting with Lead Pastors, shaming and bullying of a Lead Pastor to break his conscience and cuss in front of the group. Sexual harassment of another Lead Pastor by way of inappropriate comment about his sex life. Threats of termination.
6. April 2012—Threatening and bullying phone call to a staff elder
7. May 8, 2012—In a meeting of the Full Council convened to vote on the slate of nominees for the new board of advisors and accountability, Mark was explaining to the elders that under the newly revised bylaws, the Full Council would have the right to review any changes by the board. One elder corrected Mark with his own understanding that the new bylaws, in fact, allow the board to make decisions without running it by the Full Council. Mark's response to that elder was bullying, with some elders present recalling language to the effect of: "I don't give a shit what you think. I'm trying to be nice to you guys by asking your opinion. In reality, we don't need your vote to make this decision. This is what we're doing."
8. June 2012—Slander about another former Executive Pastor in a Lead Pastor's Sync meeting
9. Summer 2012—Domineering and arrogant—In an all-MEDCOM meeting discussing his displeasure over the way the team had been marketing R12, Mark said, "You think you're the Resurgence. But, you're not the brand. I'm the brand!"
10. Early Fall 2012—Domineering: During a creative meeting with the Executive Elders Mark explained the brand of Mars Hill. He said that the brand of Mars Hill is a man standing in the pulpit with a large heavy bible in his hand. He also said that many things will change at Mars Hill, but one thing will never change: "it's me in the pulpit holding a bible."

11. Jan 2013—Domineering and bullying: coercing a Lead Pastor to terminate an employee unfairly.
12. Jan 2013 - Mark, during an EE/Creative meeting, gave feedback to a brand new staff member, paraphrased, "All of this [what you've presented to me about the future of Resurgence] is fine, but I need to be driving this thing. I can't have anyone else driving this thing or else it will go sideways."
13. Feb 2013 - Domineering - In a personal meeting between a MEDCOM staffer and Mark, he told the staffer that he now has to give notice to Mark if he "even starts thinking about looking for another job." He said that he can't have [the staffer] fishing his resume around unless he knows first.
14. Feb 2013—Slandered an ex-staff member who had been fired by his supervisor.
15. Feb 2013—Told all of MEDCOM that most of the pastors who left MH to plant a church nearby have been seeing very little growth as a result of leaving MH. "They just don't see the baptisms we see."
16. Feb 2013—In the same meeting, Mark slandered four recently-departed Central staffers by saying, "They were all working two jobs at once. They'd come in every day to work at Mars Hill and build their new business while they were here."
17. March 2013—Bullying and shaming comment to an elder at an elders meeting, where the elder asked whether Mark has considered sharing the pulpit more, and Mark's response likened sharing the pulpit to sharing his wife ("no one else sleeps with Grace").
18. March 2013—Domineering: manipulating a former Lead Pastor to move out of the Puget Sound area and threatening him if he didn't.
19. March 2013—Violence: Threatened to tear down a former elder's church plant, saying "I'll tear his church down brick by brick."
20. May 2013—At a Lead Pastor residency meeting, Pastor Mark spoke strongly likening the churches to his daughters and Lead pastors to sons-in-law. If you are a good son-in-law, you will be taken care of, but if not, there would be dangerous consequences. He spoke as if each church, and thus all of Mars Hill, is his and that if any Lead Pastor left for any reason they would be betraying the church.
21. April 2013—At a Lead Pastor's dinner meeting during Spring Training, Mark told the pastors that the churches are his daughters and the pastors are sons-in-law. Thus, leaving Mars Hill is effectively divorcing the church and giving his daughter back in worse shape, making a bigger mess for him to clean up. One of those LPs had been discussing plans to resign, but had not yet announced a decision. Mark addressed that LP before his peers in the meeting, saying, "[LP], you're giving my daughter back."
22. July 2013—Mark commanded MEDCOM staff to redirect marketing for R13 with the branding and messaging of his book, "Call to Resurgence." At least one staff member fought back on the principle of conflict of interest—Mars Hill, being a non-profit org, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to push a book that Mark makes personal profit from.)
23. December 2013—Gossiped about a current elder from the pulpit. Without using his name, he described how this elder was apparently not being generous enough, and that he was the only one out of the full council of elders.
24. March 2014—In a Full Council of Elders videoconference about purchasing a building, Mark reportedly said: "In all honesty I feel like most of you men use me instead of love me".
25. May 2014—Mark told elders that he was not aware of the ResultSource agreement but had chosen to admit knowledge of it for the sake of the team in his letter to the church, and that others had made the decision to work with ResultSource. He claimed that another elder and Mark's publishers made the decision to work with ResultSource without his knowledge. He insinuated that he had learned about the ResultSource

agreement only after the story broke on World magazine. In fact, Mark agreed to work with ResultSource on the Best Seller Campaign for Real Marriage as early as July 2011.

Supporting Material

Sam Storms on Domineering

In his April 2011 lectures at Re:Train, Sam Storms provided a list of examples to illustrate what “domineering” might look like. The following are selected examples from his talk that I believe are an especially good description of way Pastor Mark has led over many years. (The full list of Storms’ points are available on Dave Kraft’s web site here:

<http://davekraft.squarespace.com/posts/2011/5/2/not-domineering.html>

- A man can “domineer” or “lord it over” his flock by intimidating them into doing what he wants done by holding over their heads the prospect of loss of stature and position in the church.
- A pastor domineers whenever he uses the sheer force of his personality to overwhelm others and coerce their submission.
- A pastor domineers whenever he exploits the natural tendency people have to elevate their spiritual leaders above the average Christian. That is to say, many Christians mistakenly think that a pastor is closer to God and more in tune with the divine will. The pastor often takes advantage of this false belief to expand his power and influence.
- He domineers by building into people a greater loyalty to himself than to God. Or he makes it appear that not to support him is to work at cross-purposes with God.
- He domineers by short-circuiting due process, by shutting down dialogue and discussion prematurely, by not giving all concerned an opportunity to voice their opinion.
- He domineers by establishing an inviolable barrier between himself and the sheep. He either surrounds himself with staff who insulate him from contact with the people or withdraws from the daily affairs of the church in such a way that he is unavailable and unreachable. Related to the above is the practice of some in creating a governmental structure in which the senior pastor is accountable to no one, or if he is accountable it is only to a small group of very close friends...

[Note: Our point here is not to question the motives of those friends or fellow elders, but to state that the creation of this governmental structure is an expression of Pastor Mark’s domineering.]

- He domineers by viewing the people as simply a means to the achieving of his own personal ends.
- Ministry is reduced to exploitation. The people exist to “serve his vision” rather than he and all the people together existing to serve the vision of the entire church.

- He domineers by making people feel unsafe and insecure should they desire to voice an objection to his proposals and policies.

Ed Stetzer Blogs

We believe that Ed Stetzer's blog series on The Resurgence, "Considering (and Surviving) Unhealthy Christian Organizations" clearly describes the environment at Mars Hill Church. We believe this is due to Pastor Mark's behavior and attitudes as demonstrated in the way he leads. (These blogs are available here):

1. <http://theresurgence.com/2012/09/19/considering-and-surviving-unhealthy-christian-organizations-part-1>
2. <http://theresurgence.com/2012/10/04/considering-and-surviving-unhealthy-christian-organizations-part-2>
3. <http://theresurgence.com/2012/10/18/considering-and-surviving-unhealthy-christian-organizations-part-3>

Here are some main points from Ed's blogs on The Resurgence that We think should make you sit up and take notice:

1. People often know of the glaring character problems of the leader, but no one can speak truth to power.
2. Many times, the leader gets a pass for the fruit of his/her leadership because of some overwhelming characteristic: preaching ability, intelligence, ability to woo others, or more.
3. People rationalize that the good they are experiencing is worth the abuse they are receiving.
4. The organization has to be willing to listen to its constructive critics.
5. The organization has to admit that sometimes unhealthy cultures come from unhealthy leaders.

We would encourage those considering an investigation to read these three posts by Ed Stetzer in their entirety.

Mike Wilkerson's Research Survey on Workplace Bullying

The following are some especially noteworthy points from the research. (Refer to the research brief for full source citations.)

Examples of bullying:

- Unwarranted or invalid criticism
- Blame without factual justification
- Being treated differently than the rest of your work group
- Being sworn at

- Exclusion or social isolation
- Being shouted at or being humiliated
- Excessive monitoring or micro-managing
- Being given work [with] unrealistic deadlines (Washington State Department of Labor & Industries)

Additionally:

- Power differentials. We were constantly reminded of our place. Mark's statement of himself as highly elevated over the elders, requiring the need for outside accountability with folks at his level.
- We have heard multiple reports of Post Traumatic Stress-like symptoms among former staff members.
- Addressing grievances involving bullying rarely resolves well.

Some key excerpts:

While bullying may be associated with dramatic physical threats, the research shows that, in fact, "bullying is initially characterized as consisting of highly covert and indirect behaviors" (Keashly and Nowell).

"The core problem of bullying at work is that it undermines the target's sense of being a valuable and competent person living in a safe and caring environment. Distressed and dissatisfied with themselves, victims may focus on and magnify potential threats from their surroundings" (Matthiesen and Einarsen).

"[B]ullying often takes the form of subtle and indirect behaviour such as withholding information and slander. Hence, third parties may be unable or unwilling to perceive and label something as bullying until it has reached the stage of direct aggression" (Nielsen, Notelaers, Einarsen).

"Using perpetrators to assess bullying may also be somewhat problematic. One problem is that some perpetrators do not perceive themselves as such because they may not understand or wish to admit that their behaviour can be considered bullying" (Nielsen, Notelaers, Einarsen).

Victims tend to find reasons to blame themselves as an ironic way to retain a sense of self-worth and rationality as they try to make sense of the violence. In our more theological parlance, this would be similar to saying that the experience of being bullied makes one susceptible to believing lies about himself.

"Where national customs and practice allow victims to file a complaint or a grievance, then any subsequent investigation and/or hearing will tend to be time-consuming and a drain on organisational resources because of the commitment of all those involved. Without proper policies and procedures in place, cases can remain unresolved for years, with organisational indecision and paralysis contributing to partiality and increasing animosity and internal conflict. However, even in cases where procedures are strictly adhered to and where cases are brought to a conclusion within a reasonable timeframe, the process tends to be destructive for all those concerned" (Hoel, et. al.).

If our grievance procedures do not make provisions for mitigating the risks perceived by complainants, we develop a blind spot as a result of “false negatives”. In this case, “no news” is not “good news”; it’s “bad news”. It would mean that our problem is so bad that those who should be speaking up perceive so much risk involved in speaking that they choose not to do so.

“Among potential organisational outcomes of bullying, turnover has been of particular interest to researchers, with a number of studies reporting a positive relationship between bullying and intention to leave and turnover respectively” (Hoel, et. al.).

When employees get the sense that bullies “get away with it”, a “climate of fear” may be the result. It may be that management knowing about the bullying and failing to correct worsens the situation.

We would encourage those considering an investigation to read the rest of this research brief.

Dr. Diane Langberg’s Lecture

In a lecture from Diane Langberg, she addresses some personality traits in church leaders and cultures that are related to the elder disqualifying charges of *violence*, *arrogance*, and *domineering*.

We have found that Langberg captures some of our experiences with Mark and Mars Hill with her descriptions of these traits:

- “...the enduring attitudes: ‘I am bigger. I am better. I am far more superior to you or anyone else. I have no understanding or interest in grasping my impact on you, except insofar as how you affect me, feed my ego, or support the beliefs I have in myself.’”
- “He believes these things—[affirmation, approval, success, power, adoration]—are rightfully his and owed to him. If they are denied, rage or utter disregard will follow.”
- “In [others] he finds limits he cannot face in himself, and he will stop at nothing to make sure [each one] continually tries to correct those flaws. In actuality, [the other] may be exceedingly intelligent, but has so fully developed feelings of ineptitude that he is incapable of believing in his own possibilities.” (Quoted from *The Unthinkable Thoughts of Jacob Green*, by Joshua Braff).
- “the shame and humiliation that must be repaired by others, no matter the cost.”
- “One can be easily fooled with emotional language laced with spiritual words, but if you listen carefully...you can hear that there is no empathy, no understanding of impact, the attempt to still maintain control and regain what is lost to the [self] image in the exposure...when people want to orchestrate their own repentance, that’s rather the height of arrogance.”

While our focus in this document is on charges against one individual, we believe that an unhealthy system has formed around him. In her lecture, Langberg also addresses traits of such systems, especially churches, including their tendencies to protect the individual at the center of the system, and for individuals within the system to feel threatened when they perceive the one at the center to be threatened. This systemic impact on many people heightens our sense of urgency and informs our beliefs that merely private, personal reconciliation will be inadequate to bring true healing to the church.

Dr. Langberg's lecture is available here, in five parts:

1. <http://globaltraumarecovery.org/narcissism-and-the-system-it-breeds-part-15/>
2. <http://globaltraumarecovery.org/narcissism-and-the-system-it-breeds-part-25/>
3. <http://globaltraumarecovery.org/narcissism-and-the-system-it-breeds-part-35/>
4. <http://globaltraumarecovery.org/narcissism-and-the-system-it-breeds-part-45/>
5. <http://globaltraumarecovery.org/narcissism-and-the-system-it-breeds-part-55/>

Please note that while the term “narcissism” is used in her lecture, we acknowledge that we are not qualified to diagnose and we do not intend to do so by citing this material. However, we do find Langberg’s descriptions to be relevant and helpful in understanding our experiences. We would encourage those considering an investigation to review this video series to see if it might resonate with your own experiences at Mars Hill.

Letters Submitted by Former Mars Hill Staff

We have reviewed several of the letters submitted to the board in the Summer of 2013 by former Mars Hill staff members at the invitation of the BoAA. We believe that these letters, along with further interviews with their authors, will show ample evidence to substantiate these charges.

Issues

1. Have the public communications to the church about elders who have recently left reflected the relevant truth of the matter, or have they covered up significant concerns and/or details? If the latter, has this been sinfully deceptive?
2. Does the legal document that staff members have been asked to sign upon exit amount to a “gag order” that perpetuates a cover up?
3. Is Pastor Mark guilty of slander because of the way he’s spoken about John Piper, Tim Keller, John MacArthur and other Christian leaders in elder meetings?
4. When Mark has been confronted with personal sin by those he’s deeply hurt, has he expressed genuine repentance and sorrow, and sought their forgiveness? Has he offered genuine confessions that indicate understanding of his sin, acceptance of personal responsibility, empathy for the hurt he’s caused, and a means of restitution?
Consider the following material:
 - <http://theresurgence.com/2014/05/14/the-practice-of-repentance>
 - <http://theresurgence.com/2010/07/05/7-counterfeits-of-repentance>
 - <http://theresurgence.com/2011/06/23/rediscovering-restitution>
 - http://www.peacemaker.net/site/c.aqKFLTObpH/b.958153/k.7417/Seven_As_of_Confession.htm
5. With the exceptionally high amount of turnover in recent years at Mars Hill Church (especially among lead pastors and elders), should this be of concern that something is not right at the heart of who we are and the way we carry out ministry?
6. Is Pastor Mark a lover of money or greedy for selfish gain (1 Tim 3:3, Titus 1:7)? In recent months allegations have become public that Pastor Mark has plagiarized.

Additionally, he allowed the ResultSource campaign, which involved hundreds of thousands of dollars of church funds and deceptive marketing practices. While he has acknowledged and corrected the plagiarism, and called the ResultSource campaign “unwise,” he has yet to publicly apologize for either. Rather, he appears to have merely offered to the internal Mars Hill audience his regret at being caught.

7. Has Pastor Mark’s public teaching, including sermons and writing, demonstrated a heart condition of his own chauvinism? Regardless of his *intent*, has his public teaching had the *impact* on people—both men and women—that chauvinism would have?
8. Is Pastor Mark guilty of plagiarism? If so, what is an appropriate consequence for him?
9. Is Pastor Mark well thought of by outsiders? Consider the myriad of media outlets that report on Pastor Mark. Can you say that the predominance of reporting on Pastor Mark and Mars Hill (which he is for all intents and purposes, a figurehead) are portrayed in a positive light? If not, is that an area of concern and how serious should those concerns be taken in light of 1 Timothy 3:7?
10. Is Pastor Mark guilty of sexual harassment in the form of sexual immorality in speech (Eph. 5:3)? We are aware of a number of credible reports of inappropriate sexually-oriented comments that Pastor Mark has made to and about other men’s wives, particularly in casual social settings.
11. Does Pastor Mark habitually fail to rightly handle the word of truth (2 Tim. 2:15)? In recent sermons especially, Pastor Mark has taught in ways that do not seem consistent with Scripture’s intent, possibly even using Scripture as a pretext for more selfish objectives. One example was last Fall, during the Ten Commandments series, when he taught that keeping the Sabbath is the only commandment that no longer applies to Christians today. Over the years, we have seen Mark advocate an organization based on meritocracy and it is clear that he is driven by results and perceived success. The sermon on Sabbath seemed to permit the worship of success as an idol, rather than leading us to find rest in Jesus. Other examples include recent sermons from Acts and James where he spent very little time actually addressing the content of God’s word and instead used Scripture and his platform to lash out against perceived “wolves”, which seemed to have reference to former elders of the church and Mark’s conflicts with them.

Our bottom line desire in all of this is that the Holy Spirit would convict Pastor Mark Driscoll of his sin and enable him to genuinely repent, giving way to healing and restoration for himself and for Mars Hill Church.