
A Review of the Louis Naegle Women's Councils

Hear me now: Let every person take care in how they use my name, as if I had part in their every dispute, for many things provoking arguments among the people are born from pride, stubbornness, aspiring for control, and reckless indifference toward me and one another. I bear with the people still, and patiently await the return of natural fruit in my vineyard. Do not be misled by my patience, for the time is quickly approaching for the harvest of my vineyard. Amen.

- June 20, 2024

Table of Contents

Cover Sheet	1
Table of Contents	2
Copyright Disclosure	3
Condensed Summary	4
From the Viewpoint and Records of Jennifer Willis	
❖ Background	5 - 10
❖ A Women's Council is Organized	10 - 27
➤ Email Thread of Women's Council One	14 - 24
❖ A Second Women's Council is Organized	27 - 37
➤ Predetermined Outcome	28 - 31
➤ Home Fellowship	31 - 34
➤ Witness & Testimony	34 - 36
➤ To the Movement	36 - 37
❖ Still Requesting Evidence & Transcripts	37 - 39
A Statement From Louis	39 - 40
Thank You For Helping to Resolve This Dispute	41

Acronyms

WCL	= women's council
WCL1	= January 2024 women's council
WCL2	= April 2024 women's council
WCF	= women's conference
PC	= priesthood certificate

Copyright Disclosure

As per the request of WCL2

Portions of this document may include copyrighted material.* This document is produced for a very specific judicial purpose and distributed to a very specific audience (Spring 2025 Women Conference Members). This document may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form without prior written permission.

The **primary purpose of copyright** is to incentivize and reward creators by granting them exclusive rights to their original works, encouraging the creation and dissemination of creative expression for the benefit of the public.

Using copyrighted material as evidence in court proceedings is permissible, especially when directly relevant to the case. Fair Use allows limited use of copyrighted material without permission for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, and research.

*Copyright Notice of Women's Council #2

Friday, March 21, 2025, 5:40 p.m. WCL2: We, as 14 council members, do not consent to the release or publication of any of our written documents or recordings in any form that contain our names or have been written under our combined or individual hands. This includes any private communication from council members to other individuals that Jennifer and Kalisa have included in their documents. We do not give permission for any of those named in this notice or otherwise to publicly release any documents or recordings previously sent to Jennifer Willis or Stephanie Snuffer via private correspondence. This notice serves as our express written copyright on all communications in writing or otherwise without our written consent.

Tue, Mar 25, 2025, 4:33 p.m. Jennifer Willis: I have attached further evidence that I will be pulling from to submit to the women of the conference. I will be using a combination of direct quotes and summary to explain what is contained in your documents. If you would like me to include contextual elements exactly as written, I will need you to identify what information you are requesting I include and permission to publish. Thank you, Jennifer

Wed, March 26, 2025, 4:24 p.m. WCL2: We, the 14 women of WCL2 do not grant permission for any Women's Conference organizers to use or include any of our written communications (such as our emails) in any documents you publish or distribute online or by other means. That is private information that is proprietary to us as individuals, and we strongly request that you do not share it in any form with anyone.

Condensed Summary of The Louis Naegle Women's Councils

Introduction and Purpose

This document, compiled by Jennifer Willis as of April 7, 2025, chronicles two Women's Councils (WCL1 in January 2024 and WCL2 in April 2024) convened to assess Louis Naegle's worthiness to hold a priesthood certificate. It includes a revelation from June 20, 2024, urging caution in disputes and patience for divine timing. Jennifer W. aims to examine the councils' processes, not to exonerate Louis, emphasizing procedural fairness over his specific outcome.

Background (Pages 5-10)

Jennifer and John Willis have known Louis for over a decade, forming a close bond through fellowship, financial support, and shared experiences like road trips and a \$10,000 gift from Louis for a retreat project. Louis lives simply, relying on others' generosity, a lifestyle suited to itinerant preaching but unsettling to some. In 2022-2023, he lived in Israel, enduring harsh conditions during the Gaza war, journaling his experiences at Willis' encouragement. His marriage dissolved in November 2023 during a UK trip, adding emotional strain.

WCL1: January 2024 (Pages 10-27)

WCL1 began with a call from #26 in November 2023, but Jennifer W. was excluded due to objections from members of WCL1. Louis, in Türkiye spreading T&C 165, received a January 12 email with 36 hours to respond to vague marital charges. Limited by technology and time, he requested an in-person council, offering to pause ordinances. The council proceeded without him, citing T&C 157:57, which doesn't mandate his presence. Internal emails reveal tension: some members (#21, #22, #25) sought fairness and Louis' inclusion, while organizers (#7, #26) dismissed concerns, temporarily removed #22 for sharing Willis' critique with the council, and brought in alternates despite incomplete context. WCL1 ended with retention of his PC, albeit with an unvoted condition attached to remove his wife's name, which #22 later opposed as unscriptural.

WCL2: April 2024 (Pages 27-37)

After WCL1, Louis faced new charges (priestcraft, deception, abuse) in WCL2, scheduled for April 28. Invited to attend with character witnesses only, he declined, citing T&C 157:57's requirement for home fellowship involvement, claiming Willis' group as his fellowship. WCL2 included ten WCL1 affiliates, excluded WCL1 dissenters, thereby raising concerns about their bias. Jennifer Willis challenged WCL2's legitimacy, offering to address financial deception claims. On April 29, WCL2 announced a unanimous revocation of Louis' PC after seven hours of testimony, claiming confidentiality and dismissing external criticism. The promised transcript was later destroyed.

Ongoing Concerns (Pages 37-41)

Louis and Willis repeatedly requested WCL2 testimonies, denied due to confidentiality and the destroyed transcript. Willis critiques the councils' secrecy, overlapping membership, and lack of fairness, arguing they defy the Lord's guidance for justice. She seeks reconciliation, not just for Louis, but for systemic improvement, thanking conference participants for addressing these issues.

Louis' Statement (Pages 40-41)

Louis reflects on 17 months of pain, denying intent to harm and lamenting lost friendships. He avoids retaliation, focusing on personal repentance and his mission to reach remnant sheep, accepting isolation with peace and gratitude for remaining friends.

The Louis Naegle Women's Councils

From the viewpoint and records of Jennifer Willis, April 7, 2025

Jennifer's Commentary:

It might surprise some to learn that my actions regarding the recent Women's Councils held for Louis Naegle were not intended to absolve him of any potential wrongdoing that could impact his worthiness to perform public ordinances. In my view, Louis has largely been peripheral to the events unfolding around him. Instead, my efforts—through months of writing and communication—have focused on examining, thoughtfully analyzing, and seeking to enhance the processes used, especially after I noticed early signs that something was off. Though challenging for everyone involved, I believe these experiences, both positive and difficult, serve to refine us as women as we embrace this sacred and significant responsibility.

John and I met Louis over a decade ago. As everyone was forming fellowships for the first time, our first conversation with Louis was about how to do tithing in a fellowship. He's felt like our brother from the first day we met. After that initial conversation, our family created our first fellowship with Louis and others. The structure of our home fellowship has changed over the years, but with all the shifts in our life, according to Louis, the fellowships involving our family are the only fellowships he has claimed as his home fellowship. To this day, Louis claims us and we claim him.

John and I have traveled the country with Louis. Louis performed the wedding ceremony of his son in our backyard. Louis was the inspiration behind the vacation retreat we created at our home in Paradise. We didn't have the money to build the dream, so Louis gave us \$10,000 to start the project. It wasn't a loan, it was a gift. Money doesn't mean much to Louis, and his way of life is a little unsettling to those who need safety and security in the material things of this world.

Louis is always there to help a friend in need whether it is to offer therapy, help with a work project, or discuss the gospel. He also feels very comfortable receiving the hospitality of others. The rich and poor both enjoy his company. Louis has a great capacity to give freely and receive freely. For those who are not used to this generous exchange between friends, it could be a little startling if Louis helps himself to a bowl of cereal from your pantry. His way of life would be uncomfortable for most.

If anyone were to feel comfortable living in a community where all things are in common, it would be Louis. If anyone was capable of going without a purse or script relying on the generosity of others, it would be Louis. Some are going to actually be required to go out as God's itinerant preachers. God does not send out ministers who are secure in their wealth and prosperity.

Jesus sent forth itinerant preachers and commanded them, saying, "Go . . . to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. . . Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses . . . for the workman is worthy of his food. And into whatever town or city you shall enter, inquire who in it is worthy, and there abide until you go from there . . . the laborer is worthy of his hire . . . And he shall not go hungry, neither athirst. Therefore, take no

thought for the morrow, for what you shall eat, or what you shall drink, or wherewith you shall be clothed . . . this commandment is unto all the faithful who are called of God in the church unto the ministry, therefore, let no man from this hour take purse or scrip that goes forth to proclaim this gospel of the kingdom . . . Whoever receives you receives me, and the same will feed you, and clothe you, and give you money. And he who feeds you, or clothes you, or gives you money shall in no wise lose his reward. And he that does not these things is not my disciple; by this you may know my disciple . . .” [T&C 82:24-27](#)

Louis went to Israel in the fall of 2022 and came back for his father's funeral in July of 2023. We reconnected at the beginning of September 2023 while John helped Louis on the Downey Idaho project.

The war in Gaza broke out after Louis returned to Israel, and I felt the record of current events in Israel needed to be written, so I encouraged Louis to keep a journal.

October 11, 2023 Jennifer Willis: Are you in Israel?

Louis Naegle: Yes. Been here for weeks. It's kinda noisy over here

Jennifer: I can see that! Do you want to work on your journal? (Louis loved comment). If you want to make it simple, just send me a simple voice recording and some pictures each day. (Louis loved comment). We [John & Jennifer] would love to hear what's going on in your life

Louis: I was literally working on catching up the journal this morning. I don't know why I'm so allergic to it. Great ideas. I'll do it. . .

Jennifer: . . . Are you allergic to the journaling because you feel it's not the right thing to do or because it's just not your habit?

Louis: Journaling is emotional for me

I learned a principle from [Atomic Habits](#) that would help Louis stay consistent in keeping a journal. I explained to him that we are going to make this simple and easy. John and I just need him to text us one sentence every day. He could write more, but we were only asking for one sentence about what he did that day. [His Wife] was also very helpful in sending information and pictures for the journal.

When the war broke out of Gaza on October 7, 2023, Louis had been living in the second of two small West Bank settlements for six months. His only brief respite was to attend his father's funeral. He was renting a 3 room shed on the side of a welder's shop. This cozy place only cost \$1200 shekels per month (about \$400) because it was teeming with mice and scorpions. He paid his rent by laboring as an undocumented farm worker. The summer sun in the Middle East is not gentle, and he spent days in bed vomiting during 3 different bouts of heat stroke. After that he got a job as an auto mechanic's assistant. He subsisted mostly on charitable donations of leftover food from the local grade school cafeteria. That was a TOUGH summer.

Here's a sampling of his journal entries October 2023:

October 11, 2023 Louis: . . . I literally packed up my bags and put my boots on. If the locals here get brave, we'll be in hand to hand fighting. . .

October 12, 2023 Louis: . . . Where I live we're outnumbered 6:1 by Palestinians, so if they get brave (because Hezbollah starts blanketing our utilities with some of their 100,000 rockets), we will have a very nasty hand to hand brawl on our hands. People are very concerned.

October 13, 2023 Louis: . . . Shoot. Crazy loud booms getting closer as I text you right now . . .

October 14, 2023 Louis: Just the night before last I was sitting in my kitchen with two backpacks packed and my boots on, waiting to evacuate because Hezbollah had increased their attacks from the north. . .

October 15, 2023 Louis: Yossi came by. He's distressed that BB is taking so long to get into Gaza. I expressed my concerns about the local population here getting brave and what a catastrophe that could be. The world little understands the millenia of PTSD that has governed the Arab culture. Basically whoever is the scariest is, "the Butcher of Baghdad;" runs the show. . .

Having been in Israel for more than a year; Louis was MORE than excited to visit with his friends at the UK Covenant Conference in November. He looked forward to having a break from the war. What happened over the next couple weeks was very emotional for Louis.

Nov 9, 2023, Louis: The train/airport was the quietest I've ever seen. . . [A. friend] was there at baggage claim. Wonderful to see him. . .

Jennifer: Must be so good to see [A. friend]

Louis: Wonderful

Jennifer: Maybe you can convince him to stay in Israel with you 

Nov 10, Louis: I still feel terrible about almost killing [A. friend] last night just because he woke me up in the middle of the night trying to get to the bathroom. How was I supposed to know he wasn't Hamas ambushing me in the middle of the night?

Louis gives context for this last statement: The first night I spent outside of Israel after the war started October 7, 2023, was mid November in Edinburgh Scotland with [A. friend]. The night before that, I was in Israel, and I did what I always did before I went to bed. I set the mouse traps. I duct taped the bottom of the outside doors (scorpion protection) after I "booby trapped" the yard surrounding the entrance of my place with empty cans that would drag/topple over if someone came towards the door during the night and kicked the trip wire.

I also checked my several pieces of 18" steel rebar that were placed in various locations around the property, including the one on the chair next to my single bed. These were for self defense in case of an attack during the night. As a foreigner I wasn't allowed to have a gun. "Hamas copycat raids" were too common at that time and happened regularly across Samaria and Judea (West Bank). The settlement was on perpetual high alert, and security had literally locked heavy barricades across one of the two entrances. The other was heavily guarded 24/7. But even with those precautions in place, there are/were no other security walls; just chain link fencing that could easily be cut and penetrated. Even stupidly suicidal attempts were encouraged and praised as martyrs.

We were heavily outnumbered, and the few friends I had nurtured were in other villages several miles away and had families of their own to worry about. The weather was getting cold, so I kept supplies and clothing hidden in various places. My bedroom there was tiny, just wide enough to accommodate a single bed and a chair. The only door was at the foot of my bed. There were no windows in the room, so it was very dark. The place was usually quite quiet at night with normally no other sounds other than the mice in the ceiling, scorpions clacking across the floor from time to time, and the ubiquitous Muslim "call to prayer" that happens 5 times a day including an hour before sunrise and an hour after sunset. I was living in an industrial area where human activity was basically unheard of at night. I'd been living there for 6 months at the time (a year total in Israel).

Well...

I hadn't slept well the night before as I had had to walk to the bus stop very early. It had been a very long day, and I'd dropped off to sleep exhausted. Next thing I knew, I was startled awake in the middle of the night by the sounds of human footsteps inside of my room and a door opening at the foot of my bed! My terror was indescribable. My thoughts were racing. How did they not trip the wire? How did they get all the way into my bedroom without me hearing? As I reached for my piece of rebar on my chair next to my bed, the nightmare became worse. No chair. No rebar!, and I was wrapped in blankets! I started kicking frantically at the blankets and the terrorists in my room. I grasped for anything with which to strike, but NOTHING.

As I got to my feet and off the end of the bed, I could hear the footsteps in my kitchen as well as a human voice but it was pitch black, I was groggy, clumsy, bare handed, but I wasn't going to be killed in bed without a fight. It was a nightmare.

Then the light turned on and there was the blessed face of [A. friend]! He was wide eyed and whispered loudly to me to "Be quiet!! You're going to wake up our Airbnb host!!" Obviously, my most terrifying nightmare turned into a "wonderful reality," in a split second. Well...for me anyway. It's pretty clear [A. friend] wasn't pleased that I'd followed him into the bathroom thinking he was the enemy. I apologized profusely more than once.

[Context: Although this summary history does not delve into the specifics of Louis' marital relationship, it's worth noting that the challenges he and his wife faced had reached a critical point just before the events in England, as evidenced by his text messages and emails from that time period.]

Nov 15, Louis: . . . The tempest is raging . . .

Nov 17, Louis: . . . She told me the second night we were here; "God told me we were divorced 3 years ago."

Nov 19, Jennifer: I'm missing November 18th and 19th entries

Louis: November 18th and 19th were some of the worst days of my life. I literally left a war zone looking for some kindness from friends. 100% wish I would have stayed in the West Bank. . .

Nov 21, Jennifer: How are you doing? Do you want to talk sometime? No pressure, just want to make sure you're doing okay.

Louis: I'm probably not ready to talk. I won't be very good at it. Pretty much a stomach ache. But thank you! 

Jennifer: You take your time. Sounds like it has been a rough week. I'm available if you need a friend to talk to  my prayers are with you. . .

Are you planning on coming back to Utah or are you going to stay in England for a while? Probably feels good to be off the battlefield for a while . . .

Louis: I'm planning to stay in England as long as the Palestinian protests continue. It's a ripe field all ready to harvest; scattered Israelites who think they're Muslims.

Jennifer: The battles in the heart are harder to deal with than a war that can kill the body.

Louis: Amen

Louis gives context: For the second time within a year and a half, the woman I considered myself sealed to, had proclaimed to my face, "God told me I'm no longer married to you!" It made no sense to me. But...She meant it. I haven't seen her nor heard a word from her since that week in Leeds. I had worked extremely hard on the relationship and had been absolutely loyal. I was upset about losing the relationship.

I'm sure you all would have kept your composure, but I did not. Rather than show empathy, or at least restraint, I received instead a public scolding because of a private text I sent to a small group of friends. So, I'm guilty. I was days (hours!) out of an active war zone. I had less than 2 hours of sleep. I woke up without her. I was watching my very most intimate relationship disintegrate before my eyes. And I cared. On top of this, a couple of my dearest covenant "friends," leapt to conclusions and determined that they knew what had occurred without so much as private conversation.

So, yes.... I indeed yelled at one of these "friends" in a parking lot. I did apologize, in writing, to him and his wife.

Nov 18, Text from wife to Louis: I forgive you.

Text from Louis to wife: I forgive you too. Be happy.

Nov 24, Louis to #7 WCL2 and her husband: *Watching the end of my relationship with [wife] is, and was, very difficult for me; and it's still causing me considerable anguish. I sincerely apologize for my loss of control; she mattered to me, and I wanted it to work.*

When she informed me on our first night in Leeds that "God told [wife] I was divorced from you 3 years ago" it obviously put me into a tailspin. I'm still very emotional.

I apologize that left me yelling at you in the gas station parking lot. I honestly had only slept for barely an hour, and was watching my marriage evaporate. But that's just context and explanation. There's no excuse. I was wrong and I apologize.

Nov 26, Louis to small group thread: *I've already apologized to [#7 WCL2 and her husband]. If I owe anyone else on this thread an apology, please contact me on my US number and I'll make it right. . .*

A Women's Council is Organized

* At the request of the WCL members, I will be using numbers instead of their names throughout this document. WCL1 was held in January of 2024. WCL2 was held in April of 2024. Several members from WCL1 were brought in to serve on WCL2. Ten of the members of WCL2 were directly or indirectly involved in WCL1.

Women who served only on WCL1 will be referred to with a number in the 20's and identified as "of WCL1".
Example: (#26 of WCL1)

Women who served on both WCL1 and WCL2 will retain the same number for WCL1 and WCL2 and will be identified as "of WCL2". Example: (#7 of WCL1&2) - this person served as "#7 of WCL1&2" on both WCL1 and WCL2.

Women who only served on WCL2 will be identified with a number alongside "of WCL2". Example: (#12 of WCL2)*

Jennifer's Commentary:

Nov 21, 2023 (#26 of WCL1) called me (Jennifer Willis) to ask if I would be on a WCL for Louis. I said I would help them hold a successful WCL for Louis.

Dec 3, 2023 (#26 of WCL1) called to let me know there are women on the council who do not want me to be on the council. I was okay with their decision. I directed her to read Sara L's document "Priesthood in Our Day" so she could follow the instructions the Lord has given.

I knew there was a WCL being planned for Louis but knew it would not be right for me to say anything to Louis about it. **If they were going to hold a WCL, they would need to tell him.**

At the beginning of Jan 2024, Louis learned from friends in Israel that "Turkish soldiers in uniform were fighting against Israel in Gaza." At that time it occurred to him that if T&C 165 was ever going to get into the Muslim nations surrounding Israel, it would most likely need to happen immediately. On Jan 7, 2024, he left for Türkiye and was there for three weeks. On Feb 12,

2024, he went to Cairo to take T&C 165 to Egypt and Lebanon as well. That is the best he could think of to do.

Friday, January 12 #7 of WCL1&2:

Lou,

Attached is a letter that #26 of WCL1 and I co-wrote regarding the upcoming Women's Council that has been convened. Please read and respond at your earliest convenience.

Thank you ...

This letter represents an opportunity for you to answer several questions as they relate to the three charges. In attempting to answer these questions, you are at liberty to make us aware of any additional circumstances and perspectives informing your choices that we, as witnesses, may or may not be aware of...

[Jennifer's note: Louis is then asked a list of questions regarding a marital dispute, yet Louis is informed that neither he nor his wife are invited to attend a council discussing their marriage]

As mentioned above, we are using the Lord's counsel recorded in T&C 157:57 as our guide. As you may or may not know, it does not have a provision for the accused to speak at or during a Women's Council. The Lord left that up to the Women to decide whether to allow that or not. Because we decided against inviting you to speak during the upcoming meeting/proceedings, this letter is our attempt to hear your side/version of the events . . . We ask that you reply by email on or before Saturday night, Jan 13th, at midnight US time, which is 7 am UK time on Sunday the 14th [Jennifer's note: this was less than 36 hours]. . .

Louis: *Are you saying you're going to hold a women's council via email?! . . . I'm in Turkiyë right now. I do not have a laptop (nor anything but my cellphone with which to communicate) and although I bought Airalo a few days ago, my internet coverage is literally a nightmare and getting worse (actually dangerous at times, not to mention my eyes now sting from looking at screen).*

I'm not trying to be disrespectful. I just don't have the financial ability to make it back to where we could have a real "council" right now. Please know; such a council will be my top priority if/when I am again stateside (maybe in New York in April??).

Since I feel "time is of the essence," in the effort I've currently undertaken; not to mention that others have gone through the trouble of doing so much work (and made sacrifices themselves); I'm going to continue to get section 165 out as fast, and far as possible, as expediently as I can. (See www.BloodOfAbraham.net)

In the meantime; respecting your current effort: If you two (three? more?) have decided I shouldn't perform priesthood ordinances while I'm over here; (though I regret to opine, the odds of me needing to immerse anyone here seem small to none, a guy must hope); I

will respect your power and authority, and not do so; without being compelled by a woman's council of any sort. [emphasis added]

If I can make it back in April, I'll text you and let you know so you can hold a more fair sort of "council" then. (Or maybe we few just talk privately first and see if it's something you really want to pursue more publicly once you have all the facts and context??) Best of luck to you guys.

#7 of WCL1&2 to Louis: Please feel free to make a video response. . . or even just an audio file . . . the easiest thing might be to simply send a series of texts, one per each question. There are multiple ways to solve the problem of not having a laptop. . .

And lastly, please review T&C 157:57. It states that the only thing required for a man's priesthood certificate to get revoked is that a council of 12 women are unanimous in their decision to revoke it. Nothing in the guidelines (also found in T&C 175) stipulates that the accused has to be physically present in a women's council.

As I mentioned in the letter, we are abiding by the guidelines as cited in T&C and are therefore proceeding without your attendance, as is our right. However, we are willing to consider your direct responses to the questions we sent last night so long as they comply with the guidelines laid out in the letter.

January 15, Louis: You have given me a timetable I cannot meet.
Do you have a reason to hasten this process?
Is anyone in immediate danger because of me?
Is there a reason you do not want me present at the women's council held on my behalf?
I would like to be there in person, but I am not going to force the issue.
I am not very good at writing. My written words often get misunderstood.
If you decide to proceed without me, please send me a recording.
With Love, Louis

January 17, 9:16 am #26 of WCL1 to Louis: We met on Sunday as a Women's Council. We did not come to a decision. We called a recess and will meet again next Sunday, January 22. . . . You have asked why we are asking you for a written statement (or audio) and not inviting you to participate in person. . . . your attendance is not required. Please review those scriptures. In addition to the absence of that requirement in our scriptures, receiving your written report is optimal for the following three reasons:

1. Your physical location (in Turkey) makes things difficult because of the time difference and access to reliable technology.
2. You have a reputation . . . Some people who love you dearly have set some personal boundaries with you, as is their right.
3. You also have a reputation for . . . Some of the women on the council have asked for anonymity so they may feel at liberty to vote their conscience.

. . . To answer your final question about why we are still holding a Women's Council if you are not currently baptizing, blessing the sacrament, or ordaining others. As a man who holds the priesthood, you are aware that it is a real and important responsibility. Specifically in your case, you are teaching, preaching, exhorting, and expounding the gospel to people abroad every day, and should you be successful in converting some few who will listen, they may desire baptism immediately. Without a valid priesthood certificate, you would be unable to service them in this vital next step, and the subsequent steps of partaking of the sacrament and accepting of the covenant now offered to mankind. You should most definitely "afford to care" about such an important role and responsibility. Simply abstaining from performing public ordinances may serve to avoid accountability. . . . we have set the deadline for us to receive your written/audio response as Thursday, January 18th at 12 Noon [Jennifer's note: this was just over 24 hours].

January 17, 10:56 pm Louis to Jennifer W.: Haven't even read this yet [referring to the previous email]. Almost didn't have a place to sleep last night as my internet went completely out.

January 18, 10:05 pm Louis to #7 of WCL1&2, #22 & #26 of WCL1: I am willing to respond to a council of twelve women, not a council of three . . . I cannot meet over the internet and request we meet in person at the upcoming general conference. I also need to know all of the charges, so I can call relevant witnesses. Thank you

January 19, 8:43am, #7 of WCL1&2 to Louis: . . . Regarding your request to meet us in person at the upcoming general conference. As you know, that is being held in the state of New York. Only a handful of the women on this council are planning to attend, and therefore, that is not a reasonable request. We are disappointed that you refused to answer our questions. Clearly, you have access to email since you have been able to decline our invitations to hear your side by email. . . .

Jennifer's Commentary:

Louis was notified of WCL1 on Friday, January 12th. He was given less than 36 hours to process and respond to a series of questions. This is while he was living alone, in a foreign country, in a time zone opposite to that of the states. He did not have simple access to the internet, nor a computer to write his responses. He did not even have a permanent place to sleep and often had to track down new lodgings every night.

After struggling for hours to write a response on his phone with spotty service, he wrote to the council on January 13th . . . "I've got to quit for now and find a place to sleep. I'll try again later."

In spite of his efforts, his life circumstances made it impossible for Louis to meet the WCL's demands. The deadline for his responses passed and was quickly followed by the scheduled council hearing. For all Louis knew, his opportunity to tell his side of the story had come and gone with barely enough time to process what was happening.

On Wednesday, January 17th, Louis received a new message from WCL1. The organizers notified Louis they had not come to a decision and they intended to meet again on Sunday,

January 21 [*note - there is a typo in some of the WCL correspondences marking the date as the 22nd. They did in fact meet on Sunday the 21st].

WCL1 then let him know he was being given another opportunity to submit his answers by Thursday, January 18th at noon. By the time Louis had received this message he had less than 12 hours to respond. Another email from the council then followed with an additional 2 questions and a further extension of 24 hours.

Notwithstanding the difficulty of his life circumstances, Louis managed to get his answers together by Saturday evening. Although he had missed their Friday timeframe, he assumed the council would rather have a late submission than no answers from him at all. He finalized and sent his document to a woman on WCL1 who is acquainted with his daily walk.

Instead of expressing relief at having received a response, the council organizers attempted to kick Louis' daily walk member off of the council. Her fire-able offense was simply forwarding Louis' answers to the group after their deadline had passed.

Email Thread of Women's Council One

Since January 2024, I, Jennifer Willis, have been compiling the record available to me and asking for any and all information to understand the processes and procedures of the WCLs against Louis. A few weeks ago, on March 18, 2025, I received the 133 page email chain of WCL1. I have only used a small portion of this document. I have done my best to distill hundreds of pages of documentation from sources available to me in a brief and simple way.

January 10, 12:01 am, #7 of WCL1&2: *The first question is, will Lou speak at the Council or participate in any way? No. . .*

Are we required to allow the accused to speak to the Council and call witnesses on their behalf? No. . . And as stated, we had determined that Lou would not participate. . .

January 16, 1:35 pm, #23 of WCL1:

. . . I do feel it important to allow Loui the opportunity to be present and deliver words on his behalf. . .

January 16, 2:00 pm, #7 of WCL1&2: *Allowing Louis to be present via ZOOM would mean that he could see all of the participants on the council and know their identities. . . the scriptures do not state that he has that right or privilege, as this is not a secular court of law. A women's council is simply 12 women who have gathered to discuss a man's eligibility to keep his certificate when valid . . .*

Simply demanding to be there does not grant the accused the right to be there, else the Lord would have spelled that out in the scriptures that govern women's councils . . . Additionally we have offered Louis the option of recording a video with him speaking to the issues and questions we have raised. So far his response . . . goes a long way, in my opinion, in demonstrating an

utter lack of remorse and humility when we attempt to hold him accountable, as all of us are expected to be held accountable. . . [emphasis added]

January 16, 1:19pm, #25 of WCL1: *I'd like to propose some edits as well. One of which is that we should sign our names at the end of the email. I believe we are and should act as women of faith. If we are doing the right thing, we have no reason to fear what man can do. "For God has not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." . . . if we feel confident with what we write and what we're doing, I believe we should sign our names to it and be brave. Another note is that I am not in favor of telling people [Louis] what they can say or how they say it. . .*

Tuesday, January 16, 2:17 pm, # 7 of WCL2: *Here's an option to consider, because you submitted your vote to "revoke" last Sunday, (if I remember correctly) you can choose to stand by that vote if you are unable to attend this Sunday, and we proceed without you, or you can choose to switch it to "abstain" if you cannot be there and feel more comfortable with that. . .*

January 16, 3:21 pm, #23 of WCL1: *. . . In sharing my vote or thoughts it was merely to share my vote since I was not there and a vote was taken. I needed to let my vote be known for my own conscience. . .*

January 16, 4:55 pm, #25 of WCL1: *. . . Maybe it would be wise and possibly prudent to slow things down, take some time, ensure that ALL the women of this council can be there and give Louis ample time to respond. Speaking of decisions, how is this council making decisions? I understand that a council usually starts with one or two women, but once the council is formed the decisions should be made by the group. . . From the emails I've just read, it sounds like unless I choose [to not go to a previous engagement] then I will not be allowed to be a part of the council going forward. Did we put that to a vote? Is everyone in agreement? Does that seem fair? . . .*

January 16, 5:23 pm, # 7 of WCL2: *. . . You are welcome to register your vote in the first 15 minutes of the meeting on Sunday before leaving to your party, if that is what you wish to do.*

January 18, 10:46 pm, #21 of WCL1: *. . . I think this takes careful consideration and discussion. It felt to me that some came into the call with thoughts of this being a slam dunk or black and white and therefore no discussion was needed. . . At the beginning of the call, a "preliminary" vote was taken before any discussion. So, I voted no. . . I think we need to have the discussions. . . I struggle to pass judgement on others when I have not heard their side of it. . . we should hear both sides if we are going to judge appropriately. . .*

January 19, 3:56 am, #8 of WCL1&2: *I must take responsibility for the vote being taken at the beginning of the proceedings [she explains her reasoning] . . . in order to gauge if there were any opposed, [#7 of WCL1&2] called for a full vote. This also allowed those who needed to leave early the opportunity to cast their vote . . .*

January 19, 8:11 am, #7 of WCL1&2: . . . I know it's important that we discuss . . . Our meeting from 8:00am to 11:45 am - almost 4 hours of discussion, with no outside witnesses for either side. It was just us 13 women talking with each other for nearly 4 hours straight. . . I acknowledge your frustration at not hearing his side of things, I too am frustrated and disappointed with his choice to stonewall us. . . He has refused all of our pleadings. So is it our fault we don't know his side? No, that's squarely on his shoulders.

January 19, 10:24 am, #22 of WCL1: . . . Knowing Louie the way that I do, I can say with certainty he is not trying to evade the questions asked. He has said many times through responses to the council he wants to be here in person to represent himself and I believe we should grant him that opportunity.

I think a more measured solution would be to recess for now and reconvene at the upcoming conference to allow him that opportunity with as many women who will also be there in person, and zoom with those in the council who are not.

Furthermore inviting the witnesses to come in person and not him or (#1 of WCL2) doesn't ensure a level playing field and will likely put the legitimacy of the council in question, which only hurts all involved as well as the movement in general. I remember well the counsel from the Lord that how we proceed must be as noble as the cause we seek.

January 19, 11:31 am, #7 of WCL1&2: . . . The fact of the matter is we reached out to him five different times, and each time, he . . . countered our invitations by demanding his terms be met, which is that he gets to be there in person.

However, we are not obligated, nor instructed to meet his demands. This is our council, and as such, we are abiding by the scriptures that govern it. Nothing in those scriptures supports his claim that he gets to be there in person. . .

The other witnesses were not initially invited. The only reason they are coming this week is because several on the council asked that they be there to help them gain a better understanding of how Lou's actions affected the group. . .

As for Lou, in an attempt to be fair, we have veritably begged him to please stand up for himself and communicate his version of the events in any number of ways that are available to him five times. All five times he has refused. Therefore the consequences of that are on him, not us.

As for postponing until April . . . Just because he declined our five invitations to defend himself, unless we do it on his terms, does not mean that we should put everything on hold until it suits him. We even extended the deadline not once, but twice for his convenience and schedule.

All to say, [organizers of WCL1]are going forward with the council as planned on Sunday at 2 pm. If you (#22 of WCL1 and/or anyone else on the council) believe that Lou has been treated unfairly, you are welcome, of course, to vote for him to retain his certificate. Or you can choose

to abstain from voting for that reason as well. Alternatively, you can also choose to recuse yourself altogether if you feel we have not run this council according to the guidelines in the scriptures. We have several alternates that can step in.

[Jennifer's note: Should alternates be called to this council at this time, they would have missed the entirety of the council proceedings and witness testimony up to that point. They would not have the relevant information needed to cast an informed vote.]

But either way, #26 of WCL1 and I are moving forward with the council on Sunday. If you do decide to recuse yourself, please let us know no later than Saturday night at 6 pm. . .

January 20, 11:21 am, #8 of WCL1&2: *There have been some concerns raised in our current council, in my opinion they are procedural concerns more than concerns over the actual behavior we have been asked to council on . . . Many of the women have been concerned (and many who are not on the council but feel it is their right to call around and share their opinion) that Lou is not present and given the opportunity to "face his accusers" and "defend himself." . . .*

My final thought on the concern some have about Lou not being in attendance and waiting until April so he can be. Why is he not here? He has the money and the opportunity to travel back to Utah and to ask if he could be present. He chose instead to run to Turkey where he is laboring among the Arabs, not the Jews, and now claims he cannot answer the questions or give us a repentant statement. Lou has been extended grace on so many levels. He could have repented . . . He could have asked for forgiveness . . . Lou has agency and could have at any time asked for forgiveness . . .

January 20, 2:05 pm, #22 of WCL1: *Just sharing as asked.....*

[#22 of WCL1 forwards the following message from Jennifer Willis to WCL1]

Jennifer Willis: (# 7 of WCL2), 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 (#26 of WCL1). I will also text (#22 of WCL1) 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 [names of the 3 known women]. You have to have 12 women. There is no legitimacy to Phantom women. And if you decide to revoke Louis' 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 Louis. 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 Louis, I would not respond until a council of 12 women with real names comes forth with questions. Thank you, Jennifer Willis

January 20, 2:13 pm, #8 of WCL1&2: You can let Jennifer Willis know we are aware that we will need to sign our names if a unanimous decision is reached. And only then. . We are not hiding. And there are 13. However there is no reason to let Lou know before the decision who was on the council . . .

January 20, 3:56 pm, #7 of WCL1&2: Jennifer Willis, You could have and should have sent this directly to me via email but you did not. Why? The fact that you chose to intentionally filter your unwanted, disparaging, and entirely uncalled-for message through the entire group via (#22 of WCL1) is troubling and inexplicable. . .

January 20, 10:21 pm, #7 of WCL1&2 & #26 of WCL1: . . . **Third**, after much discussion, (#26 of WCL1) and I made the joint decision to release (#22 of WCL1) from participating in the Women's Council. [emphasis added]

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 Jennifer Willis (an unwanted, uninvited outsider) on our Council Group thread was a massive breach of trust and harmful lapse in judgment . . . Furthermore, it revealed that (#22 of WCL1) is obviously discussing these matters with . . . Jennifer Willis. That is not okay . . .

The bigger question is, why was there any communication between (#22 of WCL1) and Jennifer Willis 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, (#22 of WCL1) told me that she was in text communication with Lou 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 Jennifer 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, (#22 of WCL1) 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 (#22 of WCL1). 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. [emphasis added]

[Jennifer's note: Should alternates be called to this council at this time, they would have missed the entirety of the council proceedings and witness testimony up to that point. They would not have the relevant information needed to cast an informed vote.]

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.

January 21, 7:37 am, #25 of WCL1: *I am feeling a bit broken hearted this morning after pondering the email from (#7 of WCL1&2) and (#26 of WCL1) last night. . . Maybe you don't see it this way, but we are operating under a hierarchy in this women's council. . . once the council is formed . . . we should operate as equals. . . . It is not equality to have two women make decisions for the group without the consent of the group. . . We do not remove women from the council who may disagree with us or do something we disagree with [emphasis added] . . . We want to feel confident that our process has been kind, charitable, noble even. Let's come together in unity. Let's operate in equality. . .*

January 21, 8:07 am, #24 of WCL1: . . . *I too have struggled this week and you have put to words my thoughts as well. The thought that has repeatedly been coming back to my mind is from the Lords Answer to Prayer for Covenant as found in T&C 157:10 "How you proceed must be as noble as the cause you seek."*

January 21, 8:30 am, #21 of WCL1: [#21 of WCL1 forwards the following message from Louis to WCL1]

Sunday January 21, 2024, 11 am., Harran, Turkiy , To whom it may concern, I am sending this message to the entire women's council, as I'm told, there has been one convened on my account (although I don't actually know, because I haven't been allowed to attend, listen to a recording of the procedures, or even hear who, or what, is being witnessed against me). . . [Louis answers the questions WCL organizers had sent to him.]

January 21 9:36 am, #22 of WCL1: *Late last night I received an email from (#7 of WCL1&2) and (#26 of WCL1) 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.*

[#22 of WCL1 includes the following message from herself to #7 of WCL1&2 and #26 of WCL1]

Attached response: (#7 of WCL1&2 and #26 of WCL1), I apologize for any aggravation you are feeling over Jenn W. and her communication with you and the current council, in particular my involvement in that. . . . I received a call from Jenn. W. yesterday asking if a text she had sent out to the three of us had been passed along to the council as she requested. . . . 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. . . . 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. . . . 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 Louis Naegle. 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.

January 20, 9:19 pm, #7 of WCL1&2 & #26 of WCL1: We are shocked and dismayed at what transpired this afternoon as a result of your decision to "share as asked" Jennifer Willis' scathing message on our group thread outlining her unwarranted and uninvited disapproval of how we are running a council that she is NOT INVOLVED in. . . . you used our very private, confidential group email thread in order to give Jennifer Willis access to all 12 of us so that she could harm all of us. . . .

Your decision to allow this harmful, subversive act to be perpetrated by Jennifer 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 both 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 that you "will not say any more about our process."

So, instead of saying any more about the process of our group, you invited Jennifer Willis up on stage and then handed her a bullhorn 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. . . .

Last Monday, in our phone conversation, you admitted to me that you had texted Lou the day or two before the council to tell him that in preparation for the upcoming council, you wanted to know. . . .

Thus, by your own admission, you have ongoing and recent contact with Lou. 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? . . .

As such, we have tried to train all of our focus on the despicable behavior of Louis Naegle 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 Lou are.

Let it be known, for the record, that we answer to God alone as to how we run our council . . . For all the reasons stated in this letter, you are hereby excused from this council.

January 21, 10:10 am, #9 of WCL1&2: . . . *This is a serious matter before us. So I am honestly stupefied that rather than discuss the reason behind the council being formed in the first place, we have spent the week caught up in the minutia of “how to proceed”, instead . . . Why are Lou’s rights seemingly more important than the harm he has caused to so many? . . .*

Instead, the focus has been solely on being fair to Lou, who in my opinion, forfeited any say he had in the matter . . . He has no defense. Bringing his own witnesses doesn’t negate the actions witnessed by so many others. We have already been more than merciful by extending multiple invitations to hear from him, anyway.

As (#25 of WCL1) said, there is much leeway in how councils proceed. (#7 of WCL1&2 and #26 of WCL1) called the council. They set the parameters. There were clear boundaries and rules they put in place. When one member of the council crossed those boundaries, breached our trust, dissolved anonymity, and created harm to others, they had the right to let her go. This is all within the “much leeway” of how they see fit to guide this council. If we didn’t have anyone “in charge”, this would drag out indefinitely with endless rabbit holes of discussion, demands, and ultimate dissolution. And it would place the focus on the council, rather than on the man in question.

And this is exactly what the adversary wants. If he can stir up our hearts into conflict, hijack the conversation and derail the purpose of this council, then we take the focus off of the sin and onto ourselves. And then he has won.

I believe we women are the ones on trial here. If we can’t recognize the need to rise up and protect one of our own in this very clear case, then perhaps we don’t warrant the Lord’s trust in us.

I pray that we can come together today in love and one purpose, with the eye on Louis’ actions and not on ourselves.

January 21 11:24 am, #25 of WCL1: . . . *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. . . There is no reason to kick her off. . .*

January 21, 11:30 am, #24 of WCL1: I agree. (with #25 of WCL1)

January 21, 11:28 am, #7 of WCL1&2: . . . (#22 of WCL1) will be rejoining us in the council today. On behalf of all of us, we thank her for her apology . . .

I hope you saw (#21 of WCL1)'s email, with Lou's response. That will obviously be a big point of our discussion today. I am very frustrated that he sent it [answers to their questions] last minute . . . and throw it at us 4 hours before we are meeting. Some women won't even have time to read it . . . That is why we gave him a deadline of 12 noon on Friday . . .

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 . . . 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 [we] have spent putting this together; 95% of the time has been focused on concern for Lou and fending off criticism and strife from within the council. . .

January 21, 12:51 pm, #7 of WCL1&2: We will begin with the three men making statements about what they witnessed . . . and how it affected them . . .

January 22, 7:20 pm, #7 of WCL1&2: It has come to our attention that Jennifer Willis is reaching out to (#1 of WCL2) and members of this council, trying to get them to send her information about the proceedings of the Women's Council we just concluded.

Apparently, she has appointed herself an official record keeper of some sort? This is the text that (#1 of WCL2) received from Jennifer Willis at 11:44 am today:

"I am making a record of Louis' women's council. Please send me your testimony and anything else you want included in that record. Thank you"

This is entirely unacceptable. She totally overstepped all boundaries and crossed the line in this request. . . Therefore, we want to remind all who participated over these past few weeks that every single statement, email, and testimony that was in any way connected to this council is considered extremely confidential. Please keep everything you saw/heard/read as participants confidential, including and especially the identities of the other council members. . .

January 22, 8:47 am, #9 of WCL1&2: . . . Jennifer Willis has nothing to do with this council. She has no business requesting, gathering, compiling, or saving any information about it. Her continued harassment of council members and witnesses for their information, reflections, and statements is entirely inappropriate and completely unacceptable. This council was strictly between those of us involved and no one else. She shouldn't even know about. . .

If any of us want to preserve our own reflections and experience, that is our personal prerogative. The Restoration Archives site has a private archive where people can submit their confidential reflections, recordings, documents . . . If any want to safely preserve their record through that official site, you are welcome to reach out to the archive administrators.

January 23, 10:24 am, #7 of WCL1&2: *Thanks, (#9 of WCL1&2) Well said. I have been inundated over the past few days with messages from Jennifer Willis that are so out of line, and so frankly bizarre that I am perplexed as to how to even deal with it.*

I am not sure why or how she is the self-proclaimed "recordkeeper". No one has assigned her that "calling" (because there are no "callings" in this movement), nor has she been asked or "sustained" by anyone to do anything that she is doing.

Furthermore, it is a massive and overt conflict of interest for her to take a deep personal interest in the proceedings of our Women's Council . . . I know for a fact that she is taking all of our communications (texts, emails), transcribing them into a chronological "record," and then sending it to Lou . . .

Is this woman stalking me? Threatening me? Do I need a restraining order? What is happening here? Has she had a psychotic break? All to say, please do not send her anything at all. I am very concerned for my safety . . .

January 24, 1:46 pm, #7 of WCL1&2: *(#21 of WCL1), Since we have had a few days to process the events of Sunday and sort things out I am reaching out to let you know that both (#26 of WCL1) and I, along with several other women on the council, are extremely frustrated and disappointed with your unilateral decision to post Louis' statement on Sunday morning.*

In our estimation, it was a very underhanded move that put each and every one of us in a precarious and disadvantaged position, and it very much tainted the proceedings of the Women's Council . . . But in the spirit of fairness, I extended the deadline to Friday, with the strict condition that we would not accept anything past Friday at 12 noon as that would jeopardize the cause of truth by robbing us of a much-needed, prayerful process to seek the Lord for discernment and would, thereby, derail the proceedings.

And then, much to shock and dismay, on Sunday morning at 9:45 am you posted his multi-paged text on the group thread. Not two days before the council, not even one. But just 4 hours before. That was a horrible decision . . . he gave us almost no time to absorb and process it . . . Why didn't you direct him to send it to us, and not put you in that difficult position?

. . . Another complicating factor was that I got an email at 4:30 am that morning from (#22 of WCL1) apologizing for doing exactly what you did—she had posted something on the group thread without letting me or (#26 of WCL1) know ahead of time.

So, because of what (#22 of WCL1) had done, (#26 of WCL1) and I were in conversations all morning with each other and with her as to whether or not to let her rejoin the council after that egregious breach of trust. That is where my focus had been all morning, and therefore, much to

my dismay, I had not read Lou's statement before calling you, or the call with you would have been much different than it was. . . That is why, in my phone call with you, I didn't raise any of my concerns too loudly. . .

What resulted from that decision is everything, EVERYTHING, we were trying to avoid — everyone was caught off guard and reeling, which is why we set a strict deadline of Friday at 12 noon. We deserved the needed time to read and scrutinize his statement.

That you and Lou dropped it on us just 4 hours before the council is unconscionable . . . How was that fair to throw this at all of us at the last minute? . . . we only had 5-6 minutes to absorb Lou's long and rambling statement and then only a few additional minutes to discuss it - and even then, with no real depth or analysis. That put 14 women at a grave disadvantage. Again, the only word that comes to my mind is, tragic . . .

Furthermore, in the course of our phone conversation, you admitted to being in contact with Lou throughout the week leading up to Sunday and exchanged texts with him, pleading with him to respond.

That is totally inexcusable and, frankly, worse than what (#22 of WCL1) had done to get dismissed. We had asked for strict confidentiality from all the women from the very first email onward, and you agreed to abide by that from the very beginning.

For you to be in contact with Lou all week (and longer?), and then collude with him to post his statement at the very last minute was a massive breach of trust.

Several women, including (#26 of WCL1) and I feel that constituted grounds for you to be dismissed as it has cast a huge pall over the entire proceedings and the outcome that resulted.

Had I read Lou's statement before I called you on Sunday morning and could see the fallout that would ensue when I and most of the other women didn't get to read it and give it the scrutiny it deserves, I would have responded much differently than I did. But because it caught me by such surprise, I extended way more grace to the situation than it deserved, and I regret that.

What's done is done, but what you and Lou did to undermine and then derail this women's council is beyond disappointing. . . [emphasis added throughout]

Jennifer's Commentary:

At the time, I had no insight into the council's inner workings but observed that their processes seemed misaligned with the Lord's guidance and unfair to Louis. Looking through their emails, it appears some members were reluctantly swept along by the proceedings.

With the added information, the council's dynamics suggest that a few individuals exerted significant influence, often dismissing concerns raised on Louis' behalf. Communication with Louis or me risked expulsion for daily walk members, and requests for fairness were met with resistance. The Lord's instructions were overlooked or loosely applied, with the implication that votes could occur without full attendance.

Some members faced pressure to step aside for questioning the process or requesting to be present for discussions. Scheduling conflicts were resolved by catering to the organizers preferences with no regard for other member's obligations. Alternates were ready to vote despite missing substantial portions of the proceedings, a detail that appeared unimportant to those steering the council.

Louis, meanwhile, communicated courteously. He asked to attend his council and be given adequate time to respond. He offered to pause his PC-related actions until a fair hearing could be arranged. Those familiar with him emphasized that his questions came from a genuine wish to participate, rather than prideful defiance. In spite of their support, his concerns were simply viewed as opposition.

In his final message before the first council date passed, Louis expressed confusion, accepted the council's decision to proceed without him, requested a recording, and signed off affectionately.

I, too, urged the council to adopt a fairer approach.

These efforts were each disregarded, not for lack of concern among some members, but likely due to the dominance of a few assertive voices. Misunderstandings of Louis' intentions, my intentions, and even those of fellow council members were common. If such misinterpretations are typical, it raises questions about the council's ability to fairly assess anyone's intent. A tendency to assume the worst may well have contributed to the decision to convene Louis' council in the first place.

If such misinterpretations are typical, it raises questions about the council's ability to fairly assess anyone's intent. A tendency to assume the worst may well have contributed to the decision to convene Louis' council in the first place.

January 22, #26 of WCL1 to Louis: *Last night a woman's Council met and discussed the status of your priesthood certificate. Thank you for writing and sending your testimony. After reviewing all the testimonies and having a discussion. We voted. The outcome is that you retain your priesthood certificate on the condition that your wife . . . name is removed.*

[Jennifer's note: The condition that his wife's name is removed from his PC was not voted upon by WCL1]

May 14, 2024 #22 of WCL1 Testimony of WCL1: *Lastly, the final correspondence to let Louie know the decision of the council (retain certificate) was relayed to him with a condition that his wife's name would need to be removed from the certificate if he wanted to retain it. This condition was not discussed or a part of the decision whatsoever. In fact,*

I believe this is in direct opposition to the instruction of the Lord for a man's certificate to be signed where He states "If the man is married, his wife must be among the seven women." I did not know until several weeks after that "condition" was given to Louie and I would have opposed that to be included to retain his certificate.

January 25, 9:05 p.m Jennifer Willis to WCL1: . . . As I said before, I do not have an issue with you calling a council for Louis. This is not about defending Louis or forcing an outcome. But we do not have secret councils and hide our identities from the man we are questioning. You have an obligation to tell him who is on the council. He also has the right to hear the accusations being made against him.

We do not make secret agreements or rules to keep this information from the man. I'm saddened to hear that women have been intimidated, threatened, and cast out; so they feel as though they have no other option than to keep this secret.

Let's not be like the LDS church and hide what we are doing. The Lord has a wonderful way of bringing everything into the light.

. . . And woe unto them that seek deep to hide their counsel from the Lord, and their works are in the dark, and they say, Who seeth us? And who knoweth us? And they also say, Surely your turning of things upside down shall be esteemed as the potter's clay. But behold, I will shew unto them, saith the Lord of Hosts, that I know all their works. . . . 2 Nephi 11:21

Have a good evening, Jennifer

Thursday, Jan 25, 2024 #7 of WCL1&2 to Jennifer Willis: . . . Lastly, you got the result that you fought for like it was you and Lou in the ALAMO, so why all this drama? As you know, Lou retained his certificate because 2 of 13 women didn't believe . . . constituted enough of a reason to determine that Lou's "daily walk" is a mockery . . .

Jennifer's Commentary:

WCL1 concluded just ten days after Louis was first notified. The following is a list of their processes that violate common sense and the Lord's instructions

- Louis was repeatedly given less than 36 hours to respond to council demands.
- His life circumstances were not taken into consideration even when he explained his challenges
- Louis was never given details of what he was being charged with
- He was never given details of the witnesses against him
- He was not notified of who was on the council
- He was never told which home fellowship had been assigned to him
- He was not allowed to call a single witness
- He was limited in his ability to "speak on his behalf" to answering only specific questions
- He was never given details of his hearings even after the conclusion of the council

- Council members were expected to vote even if they could not be present for the entire meeting
- Council members, including those acquainted with his daily walk, were not allowed to speak with Louis
- Members were repeatedly threatened with expulsion or asked to recuse themselves for acting or speaking on Louis' behalf
- WCL1 members testify that certain men gave input throughout the witness hearings
- Fairness and process concerns were at the core of the majority of the council's inner disputing

WCL1 encountered many problems. In the end the women acquainted with Louis' daily walk voted that Louis should keep his certificate.

Louis was not without damage for having endured the process. His reputation was disparaged in front of men and women who had attended WCL1 and he had been given no way to defend himself. Every word spoken in that hearing is permanently affixed in the minds of those who were present though they have little understanding of Louis' side of the story.

Louis had no ability to seek recourse for what had happened to him.

A Second Women's Council is Organized

Jennifer's Commentary:

It appears some members of WCL1 did not get the outcome they had hoped for. According to Louis' daughter Addie, #7 of WCL1&2 went looking for new evidence. She went so far as to probe into a relationship with his ex-wife that ended 15 years ago.

January 28, 2025, Addie Naegle Tempest to Jennifer W: Several months ago [after WCL1 & prior to WCL2] my siblings and I were enjoying family brunch at my mom's house when she [My Mom] received several phone calls from a number she did not recognize. When she finally picked up the phone she initially thought the stranger had called about her sister . . . but quickly left the room when she realized someone had called to talk about my dad. She then spoke privately on this call for an extended period of time before returning to the brunch gathering and explaining how a lady named (#7 of WCL1&2) had called because she was on a "mission" to "bring down" and "expose" our dad. This whole situation has completely turned me off from ever wanting anything to do with this religion or so many of these people. It's hard for me to fathom how these women could expend so much time and energy trying to ruin someone else. They all need to get a life. We all have enough beam in our own eyes to keep ourselves occupied.

April 21, 2024 9:05 pm: #7 of WCL1&2 to Louis: This email is to inform you that a Women's Council will convene at 11 am on Sunday, April 28, 2024, to determine your ability to retain your priesthood certificate.

You are invited to come speak on your behalf in person. The council will be held in Davis County, Utah. This is not a continuation of the previous Women's Council which ended in January of 2024. This Council is being convened to consider new charges which are as follows:

[Jennifer's Note: WCL1 complaints have been added next to WCL2 complaints for a side by side comparison]

[WCL2 Complaints]	[WCL1 Complaints]
-Priestcraft	[unrighteous dominion]
-Deception	[bearing false witness, disparaging character]
-Abuse	[abuse]

You may invite up to 3 witnesses to speak to your character. Anyone you bring to speak on your behalf will be asked to address the Council first. After addressing the Council, they will be dismissed and expected to leave the premises.

Strict Deadline: Please respect our time and the amount of preparation this entails by responding to this email no later than Thursday, April 25, 2024, midnight to confirm whether you will be in attendance and the number and names of your character witnesses who plan to attend.

If you choose to appear, the address will be provided. If you do not RSVP by the deadline as stated above, the address will not be provided. You are responsible for providing your character witnesses the details, such as date, time, and address. Furthermore, your witnesses can only attend if you are present; they cannot come in your place. Be aware that only those people on your witness list or those who have been invited to participate in the council will be allowed entry.

Also, please note that the council will proceed as planned whether you attend or not. Lastly, the meeting will be recorded, and a complete transcript will be made of the proceedings.

Jennifer's Commentary:

Although there will be further details given below, I'm including a brief overview of what Louis and I saw the moment we read WCL2's summons. It is important to remember that the email was sent by #7 of WCL1&2 who had headed the troubled WCL1 just 3 months earlier. The following is a list of WCL2's processes identifiable in the email that immediately violate common sense and the Lord's instructions:

- The council was being headed by the same woman who had headed WCL1
- Louis was given less than 1 week to prepare to defend himself and only 4 days to find witnesses available at the selected time
- Louis's life circumstances were not taken into consideration

- Louis was heavily limited in his ability to “speak on his behalf” as he was only informed of three single word charges. He was never given the information (such as what, when, where and witness claims) that would allow him to defend himself
- Similarly, he was given no information about the witnesses against him
- He had no knowledge of who was on the council
- He was not told which home fellowship had been assigned to him
- He did not know who on the council qualified as “those acquainted with his daily walk”
- He was not allowed to “call on such witnesses as he chooses” and instead was only allowed “3 character witnesses”
- His witnesses could not stay to support him, nor would they be allowed to hear what they were supposed to be witnessing against

John and I had walked with Louis as he lost beloved friends and had his reputation destroyed by WCL1. We were witness to the process and behaviors of several of the same women who were now calling Louis to a second WCL. The brief timeframe he was given to prepare, the restrictions on witnesses he was allowed to call, the shrouded identities of the council members involved, and the vague charges being brought against him illustrated to me that WCL2 also was riddled with many of the same problems as WCL1.

Because he was still managing the consequences and ramifications of WCL1, I could see it would not turn out well for Louis if he attended. He did not know who was on WCL2 and (#7 of WCL1&2) was demanding that he stand alone. What defense could three character witnesses bring to vague charges? Louis had no knowledge of what he would be walking into and no defense against what was waiting for him.

Despite the understanding that Women’s Councils are to be run by women, during this time, influential men insisted Louis attend WCL2. Louis made a choice and listened to the counsel of a woman from his home fellowship who was also acquainted with his daily walk and had witnessed the processes of WCL1. I still believe this was his best option.

Knowing that Louis' actions to resist this WCL2 would only be seen in the worst light, I then planted myself firmly between these unfair proceedings and my friend and fellowship member. He was being called to an unjust council for a second time within 3 months by at least one of the same women.

Although difficult, I do not regret the hits to my reputation this action has caused. I can see no other way that these unjust councils can be called to account. As we see from WCL1, a man’s complaints will always be interpreted as defiance, pride, and trying to get out of being called to a council. A woman who has authority to call a council has the equal authority to challenge unjust practices.

Nobody is required to subject themselves to a WCL who do not follow the Lord’s instructions and attempt to judge without hearing a proper defense. We are granted the authority the Lord has given WCL’s *only* when we follow His revelations and honor the spirit found therein.

A PREDETERMINED OUTCOME

Jennifer's Commentary:

At the time WCL2 was called, I only knew the identity of the council member who had sent the summons to Louis on April 21st. Given the problems with fairness in WCL1, I was immediately alarmed.

I would ask this question of anyone reading this account: Is it fair to the accused in any high or low court of this country to have ANY member of the jury in a first case be included as jurors in a second case with separate charges? This is never allowed for the very obvious reason that a juror can not remain unbiased under these conditions.

Over time as the council members identities were revealed, I noticed several things:

- Of the 14 members of WCL2, 10 of them had been involved in WCL1 in some fashion: 6 were original members of WCL1, 2 had been alternates, Louis' estranged wife/witness from WCL1, the wife of the man who took it upon himself to give an opening statement in WCL1, then his witness testimony, and even commented later through what little discussion there was afterwards.
- The council members from WCL1 who showed the most bias against fair practices were again leading the charge against Louis
- Not all members from WCL1 were included on WCL2
- Notably absent were the 2 daily walk members that had voted that Louis should retain his certificate
- No member from WCL1 who had spoken out on behalf of fairness for Louis was included

Eventually, I discovered that most of those who were excluded had not just excused themselves. They had in fact never been given an invite at all.

Why had WCL2 only invited members that had raised no issues on Louis's behalf in WCL1? When asked this question in mediation, the response was that it was very difficult to find council members to serve on a WCL at all. They needed to find members where they could.

This does not align with the claim that there were alternate council members waiting in the wings for WCL1. Furthermore, this still does not answer the question of why only certain council members were given an invitation to council 2.

How is it possible to take half of the members of WCL1 and place them in WCL2 and claim the council was legitimate? How is WCL2 not tainted by WCL1 when they are employing the same or similar unfair processes against Louis?

As a reminder of the biases of the first council, I'll share the following excerpt from the testimony of #21 of WCL1. She states that she felt rules were made up and enforced at random throughout the process. She also testifies that she believes many women were biased against Louis from the start with 3 members of WCL1 outright stating they hated Louis during introductions for WCL1. She also verified that those members served on WCL2.

"This council did not have equality among the women on the council. There were, in my opinion, 4 women who trumped all other members. This was shown in communications through zoom calls and emails. Ideas and questions were presented which were shut down and dismissed without discussion or voting. It felt like rules were being made-up along the way that were not discussed or voted on but enforced throughout as issues arose.

I felt like there were several women on the council that were biased against Louis. In fact, three women stated why they hated Louis at the beginning as they introduced themselves. Why are women that hate a man sitting in judgement of him? If those women were not even willing to discuss the circumstances and have an open mind to possibly vote no, then why were they there? Shouldn't women on a council be willing to vote either way?

I felt this council was very much about punishment. This was actually stated and agreed upon by many of the more silent members of the council. "This is bad behavior and needs to be punished."

Where there had been concern and push back against the processes of WCL1, no push back appears to have existed in WCL2.

The most forceful members of WCL1 remained at the forefront of WCL2. All of the council members who had spoken for fairness on Louis' behalf - including his daily walk advocates - were not invited to participate again.

Perhaps this is why the council of twelve is directly connected to home fellowship, daily walk and the instruction "*to ensure no injustice results*". It seems evident that this council of 12 was selected for the express purpose of obtaining a predetermined outcome.

HOME FELLOWSHIP

Jennifer's Commentary:

WCL2 assigned a "home fellowship" to Louis that both he (as the expert witness on the matter) and Jennifer Willis (as a mutual claimant) directly refuted.

- Louis emailed #7 of WCL1&2 to let her know he cannot participate because she does not meet the requirements set by the Lord.
- #7 of WCL1&2 claimed Louis' online fellowship is calling for this conference, yet she doesn't name any online fellowship members until after WCL2 is over. She alone is

identified as calling for this conference. Additionally, she never self identifies as a member of this online fellowship.

- John and I challenged the claim that some other fellowship or group defines themselves as Louis Naegle's home fellowship. We asked any such group claiming to be Louis' home fellowship to support their claim.
- When I reached out to the Online Fellowship Organizer, instead of confirming the online fellowship is Louis' home fellowship, he gave reasons why it is not Louis' home fellowship. . . Louis had attended their fellowship only once in the previous 6 months and has never participated in their titling group. This is in direct refutation of organizers claims that Louis had attended this online home fellowship regularly.
- Louis's only attendance in the past 6 months was on March 17, 2024. Jennifer Willis also attended this online fellowship on the same day.
- If Louis became a member of this online fellowship by attending just once in 6 months, Jennifer W. also became a member of the online fellowship by the same standards.
- Yet, as a "new member" of this online fellowship, Jennifer W. is not invited to participate in the WCL2 called for Louis and Jennifer's "newly assigned home fellowship."

Keeping to the Lord's instructions on Home Fellowship did not seem to be of much concern for some members. #5 of WCL1&2 said home fellowship doesn't hold much weight with her. #7 of WCL1&2 removes herself from the conversation with, "*The Willis Family Fellowship* has no standing or relevance in the forthcoming council."

Whether this WCL was being held in Louis's actual home fellowship was obviously in question. There was no need to force Louis and concerned community members to accept an "assigned" home fellowship. The WCL could have resolved the dispute and ensured they were following the Lord's instructions by simply holding the hearing at a general conference. They declined to do so and as a result did not meet the Lord's requirements.

There were two convenient general conferences in April & June of 2024 where this women's council could have taken place. But this same organizer made it clear in WCL1 that holding the WCL at a general conference was not convenient for them.

April 22, 4:11 pm, Louis to #7 of WCL1&2: You are not a member of my home fellowship, neither are you someone who is acquainted with my daily walk, therefore I cannot recognize this "council" as legitimate.

“...I have told you that to remove authority to use priesthood outside a man’s family requires a unanimous decision by twelve women. A council of twelve women must be convened, either in the man’s home fellowship among those who are acquainted with his daily walk, or in private at a general conference, also including among the twelve women from the conference those who are acquainted with his daily walk, so that no injustice results.” T&C 157:57

Per directions given by the Lord, I cannot participate. If you have any further concerns about my worthiness or behavior, please contact the women in my home fellowship.

January 24, 9:46 pm #7 of WCL1&2 to Louis: Numerous people from your online home fellowship have called for this council, and will be participating as members or witnesses. That requirement of the Lord has been satisfied.

Therefore, this council will take place whether you choose to attend or not. Additionally, as stated in the invitation, the proceedings will be recorded and a complete transcript will be made.

Thus, it behooves you to show up and register on the record your responses to the charges. Should you reconsider your decision, you have until midnight Thursday to inform us. If we receive no response by then, your opportunity to speak on your behalf will be permanently forfeited.

April 25, 6:10 p.m. John & Jennifer Willis to WCL1 [the names of WCL2 were not made known so we sent this message to WCL1 assuming there would be an overlap]: We hereby challenge the claim that some other fellowship or group defines themselves as Louis Naegle's home fellowship. If any such group claims to be Loui's home fellowship, we further challenge you to support your claim.

We claim to be Loui's home fellowship. Here is our evidence:

Length of time: We been fellowshipping with Louis since 2013

Financial Support: We have received significant financial assistance from Louis when we needed it [over \$10,000]. We have likewise supported him when he has been in need.

Tithing Councils: We have counseled together as to how to support and distribute tithing funds among us.

Time and Labor: Thousands of hours have been exchanged.

Mutual Claimant: We publicly and privately claim Louis as a member of our current home fellowship. He also claims to be a member of our current home fellowship.

Meeting Frequency: We fellowship together for weekly Sunday lessons and have continual associations throughout each week.

Daily Walk: Not only have we been in fellowship association for over ten years, in a very literal sense, we have recorded where Louis has been and what he has been doing every day since October 12, 2023.

Fellowship Events: Road trips, marriage of children at our home, marriage counseling sessions with Louis and [his wife], large scale construction projects, planned and hosted retreats and conferences, etc.

Priesthood Certificate: Jennifer Willis is one of the women who has signed Louis' priesthood certificate.

As his home fellowship, we hold ourselves accountable to investigate concerns about Loui's behavior or actions as it pertains to public priestly service. Any concerns need to be brought to us. We will conduct a thorough investigation into each and every claim and report promptly. If further questions arise, we will investigate those as well. We ask you to quickly respond with details of each charge: priestcraft, deceit, abuse. Please provide as much detail as possible [Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How] and contact information of the witnesses.

April 26, Online Fellowship Organizer to WCL1 & Jennifer W : “Louis . . . has come once since October of last year(2023), which I believe was on March 17th 2024 of this year. Louis doesn't attend the tithing group in relation to our Fellowship . . . We have a list of contact people, but it doesn't mean it's their home. . .”

April 26, #5 of WCL1&2: We have ‘Volunteer’ Fellowships at the present, not home fellowships...The argument of ‘Home’ Fellowship’ yadda yadda doesn't hold that much weight with me...To me, it is more important to have women in a council who understand Christ's gospel and who are receptive to the Spirit of Truth and those who can discern wisely.

April 26, 11:01 a.m, Jennifer: (#5 of WCL1&2), The requirement of Home Fellowship might not hold much weight with you, but it does with the Lord. It is the term He uses, and we are not at liberty to change it. If you claim [online fellowship] as your home fellowship, that is your choice. I hope this means you're attending [online fellowship] on a regular basis. You do not get to choose Loui's home fellowship. (#5 of WCL1&2), I likewise challenge you to give evidence of your daily walk with Louis.

April 26, 2:03 p.m. #7 of WCL1&2 to Jennifer W: I kindly ask that you remove me from this thread.. The "Willis Family Fellowship" has no standing or relevance in the forthcoming council.

Jan 12, 2024 Louis to #7 of WCL1&2, “Please know; such a council will be my top priority if/when I am again stateside (maybe in New York in April??)”

Jan 18 Louis to #26 of WCL1, #7 of WCL1&2, #22 of WCL1, “I cannot meet over the internet and request we meet in person at the upcoming general conference.”

Jan 19 #7 of WCL1&2 to Louis, “Regarding your request to meet us in person at the upcoming general conference. As you know, that is being held in the state of New York. Only a handful of the women on this council are planning to attend, and therefore, that is not a reasonable request.”

WITNESSES & TESTIMONY

Jennifer's Commentary:

WCL2 was structured in a way that prevented Louis from speaking on his behalf to a full and just capacity.

- Louis was not allowed to “call upon such witnesses as he chooses”

April 21, #7 of WCL1&2: “You may invite up to 3 witnesses to speak to your character. Anyone you bring to speak on your behalf will be asked to address the Council first. After addressing the Council, they will be dismissed and expected to leave the premises.”

- Character witnesses are a completely inadequate defense against material witnesses. For example: Your mother's testimony of what a good person you are does not hold weight against an eyewitness account of seeing you commit a crime.
- A person would need to know the detailed charges and witnesses against them in order to call appropriate witnesses on their behalf. Louis had none of this information.
- While WCL2 had all the time they needed to prepare their accusations and gather witnesses against him, Louis was given one week to establish a blind defense. He was granted half that time to find witnesses who could meet on the chosen day and time.

Although WCL2 may claim Louis was given the opportunity to speak on his behalf by invitation, we know the letter of the law is not the spirit of the law. Louis was informed of three single word charges. He was never given the information (such as what, when, where and witness claims) that would allow him to defend himself. It is clear he was being prevented from speaking on his behalf in a meaningful way, and certainly was not being allowed to speak in the way the Lord intended.

I hoped anyway, that it would be possible to determine what the charges were prior to the council hearing. I sent a plea for reconciliation to WCL1, again knowing that there must be some overlap between the two councils, and I requested details on Louis' behalf. Nothing was supplied to either of us before the council hearing and nothing has been supplied to us since.

April 28, 10:19 a.m. Jennifer Willis “A Plea for Reconciliation” sent to WCL1: To the women involved in [WCL2]....

The complaints against Louis are deception, priestcraft, and abuse. We do not know any details about these charges, but I have heard rumors. This is the best I can discern:

1. **Deception:** *People who have given Louis “missionary money” feel Louis was deceptive. They did not know Louis was in England when they thought he was in Israel. Along with Louis, we do not want anyone to feel their generosity was abused in any way.*

Our family along with another family are willing to reimburse anyone who regrets giving money to Louis. My husband and I have a daily record of Loui’s location and activities since October 12, 2023. We are comfortable with his use of time and resources.

2. **Priestcraft:** *I have written a blog post to explain the difference between those practicing priestcraft and itinerant preachers who are required to go without purse or script. You need to understand what priestcraft is before you can judge it.*

<https://peace-in-paradise.blogspot.com/2024/04/a-peculiar-economy.html>

Jesus says this to His itinerant preachers, “Whoever receives you receives me, and the same will feed you, and clothe you, and give you money. And he who feeds you, or clothes you, or gives you money shall in no wise lose his reward. And he that does not these things is not my disciple; by this you may know my disciple.”

Like the LDS church, those practicing priestcraft are wealthy. The itinerant preachers are minimalist with basic necessities provided by others. Be careful how you judge lest you receive unpleasant consequences, "And truly I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city."

3. *Abuse: I have no idea what this could be about*

To the Movement

Jennifer's Commentary:

Bias existed in WCL1. My wariness toward WCL2 was later confirmed when WCL2 sent their letter "TO THE MOVEMENT". Ten women who participated directly or indirectly in WCL1 then became members of WCL2.

Here is the breakdown of WCL2: 6 WCL1 members, 2 WCL1 alternates, Louis' estranged wife/witness from WCL1, the wife of the man who took it upon himself to give an opening statement in WCL1, then his witness testimony, and even commented later through what little discussion there was afterwards.

On April 29, 2024 at 10:55 p.m., this email was forwarded to Louis:

TO THE MOVEMENT:

On Sunday, April 28, 2024, a council of 14 women met to consider the question of Louis Naegle's worthiness to hold a priesthood certificate. These 14 women included his wife and women from his home fellowship, as well as those who know his daily walk. All are very familiar with Louis and most have known him personally for many years.

He was charged with priestcraft, deceit, and abuse, and numerous first-hand witnesses provided overwhelming evidence to support the three charges. Louis was invited to attend, to speak on his behalf, and bring his own witnesses. He declined to do so.

After hearing nearly seven hours of compelling testimony regarding Louis Naegle's behavior, the 14 women voted unanimously to revoke his certificate.

We, the women on the council, wish to stress three things to the movement:

First, the recording and transcripts of these proceedings are confidential.

Second, some are aware that Louis has been called to do a future specific work in carrying a message to certain areas of the world. The loss of his priesthood certificate in no way affects his ability to complete this assignment.

And finally, prior to this council, and likely after as well, some who are not involved and who are ignorant of the facts have nevertheless chosen to spread rumors, speculation, false information, and disparagement concerning this council and the women on it. We remind all fellow believers that only those involved in this private proceeding are informed of the complete facts. All other speculation, accusations, and complaints are made in ignorance and are best ignored.

We take seriously the responsibility the Lord has laid on us to consider the worthiness of men who publicly exercise priesthood, and to protect the community from men who are dangerous and deceptive. We have approached this fearsome and difficult task thoughtfully and prayerfully. Those who wish to accuse or criticize the women on the council are invited to reconsider their intentions, their motives, and their own ignorance of the facts. Signed, [WCL2 members]

Still Requesting Evidence & Transcripts

Jennifer's Commentary:

It wasn't until the above letter made its way to Louis that we finally knew the identities of the WCL2 members.

Although the testimonies of witnesses have been requested repeatedly by both Louis and myself (Jennifer Willis), they have not been provided. During an attempt to resolve this dispute March 9, 2025 with Stephanie Snuffer acting as mediator, I learned the transcript of WCL2 has been destroyed.

The following is an excerpt from the mediation attempted in March of 2025 between WCL2 and myself and Stephanie Snuffer:

Stephanie Snuffer: Right. So again, we're still on #9 of WCL1&2 question compromise, and what is there, or negotiation, right? . . .

Jennifer Willis: Yes, I got another thing . . . I would like them to clearly state what he did wrong and what he needs to do to remediate the situation and give him the transcripts of both councils so that he knows what he did wrong. Because I think that's the underlying key, you can be an Alma the younger, make all sorts of mistakes and turn out to be one that's translated, right? It doesn't matter what our mistakes have been. It's that, can we remediate the situation, make the necessary amends, and move forward? And that is the way the Lord always reprimands me. He tells me exactly what I did wrong and exactly what I need to do to change. And I would like that to be given to Louis clearly. That would help move this miles down the road for me.

Stephanie Snuffer: Okay. So first things first. There is no transcript. Okay. They have in the chat, they have multiple times said there is no transcript. So just for clarification for me, is there a recording, (#7 of WCL1&2)?

#7 of WCL1&2: . . . I can't speak to that because I know I don't. So that's my answer.

Stephanie: Okay, (#7 of WCL1&2), would you be in charge of finding out if there is a recording or, I'm not looking at hands. Does anybody know if there was a recording?

Jennifer W.: In the letter to the movement, it says that there'll be a full transcript made of this seven hour meeting. So what happened to that? . . . It was not recorded at all?

#7 of WCL1&2: Not that I know

Jennifer W.: So that part, I'm just a little bit confused. because you said to the movement that entire, a transcript of the seven hours was going to be made. That was after you had already had the meeting. Was that based on the idea that you had a recording that you were going to make a transcript . . .

#10 of WCL2: I have the actual answer on the recording. . . I recorded the meeting because of past problems with it getting out and Jennifer making things public. I destroyed it. It's gone.

Stephanie Snuffer: Okay, thank you for clarifying that.

January 15, 2024 Louis: If you decide to proceed without me, please send me a recording.

With Love, Louis

April 21, 9:05 pm: #7 of WCL1&2 to Louis: Lastly, the meeting will be recorded, and a complete transcript will be made of the proceedings.

Jennifer's Commentary:

During mediation I asked WCL2 to give Louis the witnesses and testimonies against him and details how he could remediate the situation. They said they had already sent Louis this information. When I asked them to give evidence of these correspondences with Louis, they came up empty handed. They explained they can't give him the information because he didn't show up to WCL2.

March 11, 2025, 5:35 p.m. #7 of WCL1&2: If Louis wanted to know "what he did" (as you put it) he should have come to the council in person so we could present the list of charges, accompanied with the witnesses testimonies and all the evidence they brought forward. That would have provided Louis with a much more complete and thorough understanding of the reasons for which the council was called and would thereby allow him to respond appropriately to each charge after seeing a comprehensive picture.

We had no inclination nor intention of putting all of that sensitive information (pages and pages) on paper and sending it to Louis to read over, after the fact, like a dossier. It would not have demonstrated integrity for the purpose and process of a women's council to simply email Louis a list of "allegations" . . .

8:44 p.m. Jennifer W.: Louis needs to know specific complaints against him so rebuttal

April 28 In WCL2's letter to Louis they said,

"And finally, prior to this council, and likely after as well, some who are not involved and who are ignorant of the facts have nevertheless chosen to spread rumors, speculation, false information and disparagement concerning this council and the women on it. We remind you that only those involved in this private proceeding are informed of the complete facts. All other speculation, accusations, and complaints are made in ignorance and are best ignored.

"We take seriously the responsibility the Lord has laid on us to consider the worthiness of men who publicly exercise priesthood, and to protect the community from men who are dangerous and deceptive. We have approached this fearsome and difficult task thoughtfully and prayerfully. Those who wish to accuse or criticize the women on the council are invited to reconsider their intentions, their motives, and their own ignorance of the facts."

Louis is still requesting to know what was witnessed against him

March 19, 2025, Louis to #7 of WCL1&2, #4, 6, 10 of WCL2: ". . . If you think you've acted justly over the past 16 months, why would you not eagerly share with me the details of the "women's councils" discussing my behavior? It's a curious thing if you've destroyed the transcripts as you've claimed. I am asking again that you send me the written details I have requested . . .

"Please provide the details of what you've judged that I've done wrong, and what testimonies you've based those judgements on. Who and what was witnessed against me? If repentance and reconciliation is truly your motivation, how can I determine what I have to repent of, and with whom I need to reconcile? Otherwise, repentance can only be between myself and God, . . . I do not desire or need a meeting with you about this matter. The written details will suffice. . . "

A Statement From Louis

A wise friend recently counseled me: "The terrible problem with spending your time and effort in trying to prove someone else is evil: If it turns out you're wrong; you are the evil."

The past 17 months have left me heartbroken and perplexed. I truly don't know how to stop the current divisive storm of gossip, scheming, and accusation. If anyone would have told me "friends" would have behaved this way; I would not have believed them. Now my reality is stranger than fiction. People I've loved have made decisions; treacherous and tragic decisions. I'm scared for them.

We obviously all make mistakes and err, but I honestly can't see there's anything I can say or do to repair this situation; like throwing a bottle of water on a forest fire. More days than not, I conduct a rigorous personal inventory to discern what to repent of, and how. I try to allow the current wrenching situation to refine me. It's quite a lonely endeavor, but I also realize I can't repent for anyone else.

Unrepentant foolishness in each of us becomes wickedness if left unchecked. While we all suffer from trauma and pain caused by others; I realize it's not OK for me to project that onward. I truly hold no animus towards any one else. That's not because I'm a saint or have worked hard to cultivate such a demeanor; I reckon it's just a byproduct of how God made me. I don't mind a good fight, but I also don't hold a grudge. My personality certainly doesn't always jive with everyone else's, but I also find even pronounced differences; interesting. I don't ruminate or hate.

I'm sorry and sad that my rough edges have evidently rubbed other people's wrong. I've been purposely and increasingly scarce among those who have openly opposed me; while still honoring the errand I'm trying to fulfill. I strive to be a good and loyal friend to offset the distasteful parts of myself. I have honestly consecrated everything I am or have, to try and please God.

As much as I've loved and enjoyed my fellowship among people who have taken the same covenant as me; I have also respected the "casting out" I've received. If folks don't want me around, I make it a practice not to impose. Outside of the two I helped organize; I have not attended but one general conference in 5 years. I attended no gatherings unless I'm personally and explicitly invited. This isolation makes me sad. The loss of this community has been much worse in my world than being excommunicated from the religion of my fathers.

I've been told, "Louie, you're a strong flavor. If someone likes that flavor, they're going to LOVE you. If NOT... well..." I've lost too many people who I loved and for whom I would have lived or died. But alas I reckon this is all part of the process. I'm just surprised from whence the offense has come.

I haven't tried to cause any pain. I haven't written a blog post against anyone. I haven't had a council against anyone. I haven't circulated a letter against anyone. I haven't published a website against anyone. I haven't passive-aggressively jabbed at anyone in my public discourse. I have not made phone calls to dig up dirt on anyone. I haven't used my influence to

foment harsh or negative feelings towards or opposition against anyone. I haven't organized a conference against anyone.

I am often solitary now; but I am at peace. I can answer with a clear conscience towards God, and look forward to that face to face reckoning. I wish the same for all of you.

I will continue to offer all I have in my pitiful attempt to seek to recover the lost sheep remnant of this land and of Israel; as well as to assist those who have made the same covenant as me. I have precious few friends any more, but they are precious indeed; to me. In this I'm blessed beyond reason and grateful to God.

-Louis, April 3, 2025

Thank You For Helping to Resolve This Dispute

I have been diligently working and advocating for fairness and justice within WCLs for over 15 months. To be clear, although Louis is a close friend and member of my home fellowship, I have been less concerned about his PC than I have been about the way in which we proceed in these very important matters. I believe the matter with Louis will resolve itself as incidental to better process in general. After disputing these councils for over five months, the Lord gave us the June 20th revelation. In the time since I have called this WCF, I have received emails, phone calls, and messages from those who have also been affected by unjust WCLs thanking me for my efforts.

I would ask you: Is it the character of a woman of God to avoid dispute because we are not the ones who are suffering from an injustice? How WCLs operate in our tiny society does indeed affect our covenant brothers and sisters. We will be held accountable for what standards we hold within our councils and conferences. Our standards do not need to be to perfection, however, they do need to uphold justice and remove injustice when it is uncovered.

I have observed WCL2 directing the focus onto Louis' behavior to justify their unfair processes and procedures in WCL1 & WCL2. Had this WCL followed the Lord's instructions and held fair councils, Louis may or may not have retained his PC. I can not say. It is certain, however, that without the standards of fairness and righteous processes, that Louis never had the chance to retain it.

Thank you for participating in the April 12, 2024 Women's Conference and helping me resolve this dispute. If you have questions about evidence or rumor, please submit your questions to upcomingconferencesubmissions@gmail.com. We are creating a FAQ folder on the google drive to answer many of your questions.

With Love,

Jennifer Willis