

Your Sermon on Sunday

Contents

1 My First Response to the Sermon	1
2 Mikes Reply	3
3 My Reply to Mike first Reply	13
4 Copy letter to Richard	17
5 Mikes Reply to my Response	18
6 Mike Objection and Complaint	19
7 My Reply to Mikes Objection	19
8 Analasis of the Correspondence	24

Message 1 of 7.

To: HPBC, and 1 other, Cc: John-plumber, and 1 other · Mon
25 May at 10:08

1 My First Response to the Sermon

Hi Mike,

Further to your sermon on Sunday, and your reference to
“Making a Country Great” together with your comments re-

garding Tommy Robinson, I would like to draw your attention to some recent comments made by Katie Hopkins concerning Tommy Robinson:

https://youtu.be/5oWz1Tx5jmM?si=rHqVD0E_KsYA78gM

You may recall that I previously asked you to respond to my publication *The West and The Quran*. Although you declined to do so, I did make amendments to the work after our conversation.

I believe the book presents an honest, truthful, and faithful account of the errors of Islam, written both for the benefit of those learning the Christian faith and as a warning to those who may apostatize.

From 1978 to 1988, long before Tommy Robinson was known publicly, I taught many Muslim students at Luton College of Higher Education. During that time, I visited the mosque that existed there then, as well as the homes of Muslim students. These experiences led me to study and seek to understand Islam more carefully.

Having done so, I have not found the warnings Tommy Robinson raises concerning Islam to be untrue.

When people speak about “Making America Great Again” or “Making Britain Great,” what exactly do they mean by this? That is an important question.

The message of *The West and The Quran* is clear. Perhaps you would be willing to tell me where you believe I am wrong or where I may have misunderstood matters.

<https://www.biertonparticularbaptists.co.uk/resources/The%20West%20And%20The%20%20Quran.pdf>

Kind regards,
David Clarke

David Clarke (Click for further information)
11 Hayling Close, Fareham, Hampshire, PO14 3AE, UK
+447411990007

2 Mikes Reply

Mike Reply

Message 2 of 2. For JAWS, turn virtual PC Cursor on if needed.

To: me · Tue 2 Jun at 01:02

Message Body

Dear David,

My hesitation in replying to you in writing has been driven in part by my reluctance to see my words in print in your next publication! For the record, as with any of my previous communications, this email is neither for publication in any form, nor for forwarding in whole or in part to any other correspondent.

I'm replying from my personal email address. Please do not divulge my personal email address to any third party without my express permission.

THE WEST AND THE QUR'AN

Firstly, concerning *The West and the Qur'an*, I did give you my opinion of the book, verbally, some time ago. You then invited me to write a preface or introduction to the book, which I declined.

I said at the time that your book failed to advance any reasoned argument against Islam. It did little more than simply pick out a series of verses from the Qur'an which do not align with the Bible. As an academic exercise, that's of limited value, and does not

in any sense amount to a proper presentation of the Islamic faith to your readers. You wanted to single out Islam, but a similarly pointless exercise might be done listing the ways in which the beliefs of other faiths differ from those of Christianity.

My position on religions other than Christianity has always been that, while perhaps interesting to study from a historical and philosophical perspective, they have no impact on my faith in the Lord Jesus. I assert my right to worship God and preach the gospel from my heart to anyone who will listen, and I will defend the freedom of anyone from any other religion to do the same, within the law. These two are not incompatible. Indeed they are an integral part of a true democracy. I have many friends who follow other religions and none, and never have my personal beliefs or theirs posed any barrier to our friendship. It's about fundamental human respect and love for all, which is a central Christian virtue.

In the Publisher's Note of your book, you call Islam an "enemy" and a "threat", and make bald assertions such as, "Multiculturalism is a failure," without providing any supporting evidence. You also quote William Gladstone (the great believer that non-Europeans possessed "lower capacities", whose slave-owning family received compensation of £10 million (at today's prices) when the slave trade was abolished), and Winston Churchill, who, for all his wartime achievements, was as virulently racist about all non-white people as Hitler was about the Jews.

You also sadly make mention of FGM in a shallow attempt to demonise Muslims. I'm sure that you did this out of ignorance of the fact that FGM has no basis whatsoever in the Islamic faith, rather than your knowing the truth and choosing to perpetuate a lie. But it's indicative that you began with an unreasoning hatred of Islam, from which starting point you've simply collected a variety of opinion pieces from similarly bigoted people and not bothered to substantiate them before publishing them as fact.

As I said at the time, the clear intention of your book – despite its almost total lack of any polemic – is to engender in the reader a fear of Islam and a wholesale demonisation of Muslims, which in my view is both grotesque and completely groundless.

Another technique you've used is to carefully select verses from the Qur'an (let's leave aside those which simply don't align with the Biblical record) which you seem to be presenting as evidence of Islam's malign intent, particularly against People of the Book. You have nothing positive to say about Muslims or Islamic culture, and that fact alone is enough to consign your book to the category of simple unsubstantiated hateful propaganda. You could have written at length, for instance, about the enormous contribution of Islam to natural science, physics, medicine, mathematics, language, philosophy and literature during the Middle Ages which provided the intellectual foundation for the European Renaissance, or the massive contribution which Muslims make to all aspects of public life in the UK, but this would clearly not have served your purpose.

But you also make the profound errors of taking those Qur'anic verses out of their true context and using misleading and self-serving paraphrases from the Arabic. I have spoken many times about the central importance of context in Biblical exegesis, and it's no less important if you wish to convey an honest understanding of passages of the Qur'an.

I'm not going to do your research for you, but I'll give you a couple of examples among many:

- 1 You cite Surah 5.5 as reading, "A Muslim not to take a Jew or Christian as a friend," but this is only part of the verse, and is not at all what the verse says.

A better translation of Surah 5.5 in full would be, "O believers! Take neither Jews nor Christians as guardians – they are guardians of each other. Whoever does so will be counted as one of

them. Surely Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people,”

The specific context to which the verse relates is the early Muslim community in Medina, embattled by various tribes and facing external threats such as the allied Roman and Christian forces. The verse stands as a political directive of its time, a warning against making allegiances which could compromise their security. It is not considered to be any kind of general prohibition against everyday kindness and friendship toward those of other faiths, as your mistranslation is clearly meant to suggest.

2 You similarly paraphrase only part of Surah 9:29 (in bold type):

“A command to fight and subdue Jews and Christians (People of The Book);”

presumably because you wish to create for your reader the spectre of a general murderous barbarism amongst today’s Muslims towards Jews and Christians.

The full verse is as follows:

Surah 9:29 “Fight the unbelievers who do not believe in God and the Last Day nor do they uphold the system of truth; from among the people of the Book; until they pay the reparation,

Again, context is everything. This passage dates from AD 631, during the Tabuk expedition, as Muslims faced an imminent threat from the Roman Empire and its allied Christian Arab tribes. Surah 9:29 was a directive to secure civic submission and collect the jizya (a protective tax) from adversaries, rather than any mandate for forced conversion. The jizya functioned as war compensation and exempted the non-Muslim citizens from military conscription, while granting them protection and the right to practise their own faith under the Islamic state.

The whole of Surah 9 encourages the ending of peace treaties with those who had previously betrayed or attacked the Muslim community. The instruction to fight is historically linked to these specific groups that broke alliances rather than a universal command to wage war on all peaceful non-Muslims.

It would be equally deceitful, for example, for a Muslim to try to denigrate all Jews and Christians today as murderous barbarians by referring to 1 Samuel 15 (the total destruction of the Amalekites) or the Book of Esther (genocide of the Persians) as evidence.

For over a thousand years, there have been numerous mass murders and persecutions of Muslims by Christian nations, and vice versa, mostly led by corrupt rulers motivated by territory, power and wealth using religion as a convenient mask. As a Christian, I despise all atrocities done in the name of the Lord Jesus, as indeed the vast majority of Muslims today distance themselves from the terrorism conducted in the name of Allah.

Don't get me wrong, terrorism in all its forms must be confronted, but Islamist terrorism should make us no more fearful of ordinary Muslims than US neo-Nazi movements make us fearful of white American males.

KATIE HOPKINS

Katie Hopkins is a reality-TV personality turned journalist, a self-confessed racist, conspiracy theorist and Islamophobe who was been successfully sued for libel several times by people (mainly Muslims, unsurprisingly) whom she falsely accused in a variety of right-wing newspapers. This speaks to the poor quality of her journalism.

She has in the past depicted herself as the Virgin Mary and called herself the “Jesus of the outspoken”. In a clear reference to the Nazi extermination of Jews, she called for a “final solution”

in the wake of the Manchester Arena bombing of 2017. She referred to migrants as “cockroaches,” echoing the language used by the Nazis to describe the Jews, and by the Rwandan Hutus to describe the Tutsi population prior to the genocide of 1991.

When asked in 2015 to identify the “swathes” of no-go areas for non-Muslims in the UK, she could not name any, saying only, “I know they exist”.

With such an unapologetic record of hate-filled rhetoric and journalistic error, I have little confidence in anything she has to say.

TOMMY ROBINSON

As for Stephen Yaxley-Lennon (aka Tommy Robinson), he is a violent fascist criminal (convicted of offences ranging from assault, mortgage fraud and drug possession to stalking, harassment, immigration offences and contempt of court) who has long harboured a hatred of anyone he doesn’t regard as ethnically English (by which he means white) and a hatred of Muslims in particular. His campaign of hate against Muslims is generously funded by billionaires Elon Musk and Robert Shillman, and he concocts hateful propaganda on social media, ingeniously using blatant lies to incite violence against innocent Muslim communities.

To give one example, he masterminded the 2024 violent attacks on innocent Muslims in Southport knowing that Muslims had had nothing at all to do with the killings of the three girls. His followers blindly believe whatever he says, and never bother to discover the truth, especially because his lies chime with their own racist views and their propensity for violence. Incited by Robinson’s tweets, they dutifully descended upon the Muslim community of Southport with murderous zeal.

In 2025, Robinson stole a TikTok video of a Nigerian man (Ola-

juwon Ayeni) playing with his (white) granddaughters and his brother in a park in Redcar. He shared the video with his followers expressing his horror, suggesting that Ayeni was a paedophile and a stranger to the children. Ayeni and his family received violent death threats which forced them into hiding and his career was seriously impacted. Robinson persisted with the lie even after it became obvious that the allegations were totally false.

My guess is that when he initially saw the video, he was deeply, viscerally disgusted at the very thought of a black man playing with white children. Such a scene transgressed all of the boundaries which are at the heart of his race war theories, so he decided to use his influence to destroy this man's life by an evil deception. He succeeded.

Robinson promotes the notion of a "rape epidemic" in Britain supposedly perpetrated by Pakistani Muslim men, when he knows that in England and Wales 85% of sexual offences against children are committed by white men.

His supporters will often declare their passionate commitment to protecting women and children (always, of course, from the perceived threat of abuse by Muslim men), but evidence shows that 40% of the men arrested for participating in the 2024 summer riots were the subject of a domestic abuse report before their involvement in that public disorder, and 21% of the rioters have since been reported to the police for domestic abuse against their intimate partner in the intervening 2 years.

As a supporter of Tommy Robinson, have you ever checked the veracity of the vile statements on which he bases his campaign of hate? Were you aware of all the lies he has told and continues to tell? If you were aware, David, I cannot imagine that as a Christian you could defend his behaviour, and if you were not aware, how do you feel about him now?

THE FASCIST THREAT

The fascist threat is one which our democracy must confront in every generation.

In the 1930s, the fascists in Germany chose the Jews as their scapegoat.

In order to succeed, fascism requires the ruling elite to invent an “enemy within” to take the focus of the mass of the population away from the real causes of their poverty and lack of agency. It also requires the invention of the myth of a golden age – an era when the “true patriots” were in charge, and whose destiny is to rule again. The German National Socialist Party created the myth of an Aryan race, and for years masterfully spewed its grotesque and evil caricatures of the Jewish people and supported the increasing violence against Jews and their businesses, then used this violence to justify massive discrimination against them. The German people and their children were swept up in this hysterical righteous hatred, and they elected Hitler as Chancellor to rid the Fatherland of the “rats” whom they believed had ruined Germany and who were plotting to take over the whole economic system.

In this country, newspapers such as the Daily Mail, the Daily Express and The Times propagated Jewish conspiracy theories during the 1930s and applauded Hitler’s rise.

In the 1970s, the BNP and National Front used similar techniques to the Nazis to make the British public hate the Commonwealth migrants who had come from Uganda and Jamaica. These fascist parties were only defeated by mass public action in support of those migrant communities and their rich contribution to British life.

And now in the 2020s, a new generation of fascists have chosen Muslims instead of Jews as the prime target of their confected lies, but their goal is the same: To build a violent mass move-

ment well-funded by rich and powerful people who want to consolidate their power by turning the powerless against each other rather than allow then the opportunity to address the real systemic reasons for their poverty.

The tactic is always the same: Turn up the hateful rhetoric to such a volume that reasoned debate becomes impossible, so that truth is the first victim. Anyone who counsels caution or support for democratic values (the rule of law, fundamental freedoms, respect for institutions) is immediately vilified and emasculated as “woke” or unpatriotic. Hateful speech becomes normalised. Minority groups become isolated, helpless and fearful as violence is increasingly seen as justified and inevitable. Descent into tyranny follows swiftly.

CHRISTIAN NATIONALISM

Fascism recognises no religion other than unquestioning loyalty to the State. The Nazi Party constitutionally incorporated the Christian Church as an organ of the State – the Reich Church – something which I’m sure you find obscene – and used the Reich Church to preach Nazi propaganda about Aryan supremacy and the necessity of Jewish extermination.

Tommy Robinson has recently realised that appropriating a Christian label for his fascist agenda is a powerful addition to his armoury. His incitement to violence has resulted in numerous attacks against innocent men, women and children, based on false stories which he deliberately posts on social media. He never admits to the lies. He just moves on to the next. He has not renounced his violent, fraudulent, mendacious past. His current behaviour suggests he has not knelt at the Cross, nor been spiritually transformed by the Lord Jesus.

If by his lies Tommy Robinson can convince new, gullible Christians that every Muslim is part of a secret international death cult bent on the destruction of Western civilisation and Christi-

anity in particular (in much the same way that the Nazis invented conspiracy theories about the Jews), he can incite those Christians to commit acts of unspeakable hatred, while conveniently avoiding any mention of the Risen Jesus and His commandment to love our neighbour unconditionally.

Your book stands as a weapon in Tommy Robinson's arsenal.

There are a few weak church leaders who have spotted an opportunity to increase their own worldly power and influence over their flocks by falling in behind the Tommy Robinson bandwagon, to their eternal shame.

Teachers will be held to a higher standard on Judgement Day.

They use fascist hate demonstrations, such as the recent so-called Unite the Kingdom march, to preach the submission of Christians to a divisive, hateful, racist and fascist political and cultural narrative, wrapping the sacred Cross in a cheap plastic flag of white supremacy and violent domination. Anyone "converted" by this Reich Church on one of these marches has certainly not had an encounter with the Risen Jesus, and is therefore in danger of losing their immortal soul.

I could write at length about how the MAGA movement, with its emphasis on unquestioning loyalty to the Great Leader and the hatred of the 'other', is both fascist and profoundly demonic, even though, like Unite the Kingdom here, it has wrapped itself in the Cross of Christ. I'll just leave you with a few relevant scripture references – Psalm 146:3; Zechariah 7:8-10; Matthew 5:44; Matthew 7:12; 1 John 4:20 – which I encourage you to read in their full context.

I really do pray, David, that, given all the above, you would renounce this profoundly anti-Christian movement and withdraw your book from publication, rather than continue to propagate such a grave deception.

Your brother in Christ,

Mike

Message 3 of 7

To: brovnik@ · Tue 2 Jun at 16:18

Message Body

3 My Reply to Mike first Reply

Dear Mike,

Thank you for your reply to my questions regarding Making a Country Great.

I am especially thankful for your reply because it has helped me to understand more clearly the theological and political convictions that inform your position. It has therefore enabled me to respond more thoughtfully and, I trust, in a helpful theological manner, focusing on the principles involved rather than on personalities.

I was pleased to receive your response, as it provided greater insight into a number of the theological and political views that I have observed during the years I have known you.

It was for this reason that I asked both you and Richard some time ago whether you subscribed to the principles of the First London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1646. You directed me instead to the General Baptist Confession upon which Hill Park Baptist Church is governed.

My concern throughout has been to distinguish between Christianity as revealed in Scripture and the various political, cultural, and religious movements which often claim some association with it.

My original enquiry was not merely political but theological. As Christians, our understanding of society, government, morality, and national life ought to arise from the teachings of Scripture and the doctrines we profess. It was for this reason that I raised the question of confessional standards. Before discussing how a nation may become great, it is first necessary to establish by what authority and according to what principles such greatness is to be defined.

My reason for referring to Tommy Robinson and Katie Hopkins was not because I regard them as authorities in matters of religion, but because their public statements help explain the beliefs and motivations behind movements that seek to “Make Britain Great Again” or “Unite the Kingdom.” The question I was seeking to address was: what do they mean by making the United Kingdom great?

I cannot speak for their personal religious convictions. What I do know is that a political or social movement of this nature cannot convert a nation to Christianity, nor can it properly be described as the Christian religion. A distinction must be made between political activism and the Christian faith. The greatness of a nation, whether measured by prosperity, influence, military strength, social order, or cultural identity, is not the same thing as the advancement of the Kingdom of God. Christianity advances through the preaching of the Gospel, not through political movements. As our Lord Jesus Christ declared:

“My kingdom is not of this world” (John 18:36).

Neither do I advocate the Kingdom of Heaven as a political state. Christ’s Kingdom is not advanced by the sword, by legislation, or by political power, but by the preaching of the Gospel and the effectual work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men and women. For this reason I believe it is important to distinguish between political movements seeking national reform and

the Kingdom of God revealed in the New Testament.

With reference to the Qur'an and Islam, my concern is primarily theological rather than political. It is my conviction that the Qur'an presents a religion which stands opposed to the Christian faith and does not lead sinners into peace with God through the forgiveness of sins received by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Qur'an denies the Sonship of Christ, rejects His atoning death upon the cross, and opposes the central truths upon which the Gospel rests. For that reason I regard Islam not merely as another religion, but as a denial of the Gospel itself.

The Apostle Paul wrote:

“But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed” (Galatians 1:8).

The issue, therefore, is not merely one of religious difference, but of two competing and irreconcilable messages concerning the person and work of Jesus Christ.

I do not claim to be a scholar of Islam, nor have I attempted to write an exhaustive academic treatise on the subject. My purpose was far more modest. I sought to provide sufficient information for ordinary readers to understand the principal claims of Islam and to compare those claims with the teaching of Holy Scripture. In my judgement, the first part of the book contains ample evidence for a Christian reader to reject the claims of Islam and to remain steadfast in the faith once delivered unto the saints.

When one compares the doctrines set forth in the First London Baptist Confession of Faith with the teachings of Islam, it becomes evident that the two are fundamentally at variance.

With regard to quotations and alleged misquotations of the Qur'an, I do not feel compelled to defend the Qur'an as though it were an authoritative source of divine truth. As a Christian, I do not recognise the Qur'an as the Word of God, nor do I regard it as possessing authority over faith and practice.

My concern is not whether every Muslim scholar agrees with a particular interpretation of a verse, but whether the teachings of the Qur'an, taken as a whole, are consistent with the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It is precisely because I do not believe the Qur'an to be inspired Scripture that I examine its claims in the light of the Bible, rather than interpreting the Bible in the light of the Qur'an.

Whilst there may be debate amongst Muslim commentators regarding the meaning of particular passages, such debates do not alter my fundamental conclusion that the Qur'an presents a message contrary to the Gospel and therefore cannot be regarded as divine revelation.

The question for me is not whether a particular verse has been translated or interpreted differently by various Islamic scholars, but whether Muhammad's message accords with the faith once delivered unto the saints. On that point, I remain unconvinced.

On a lighter note, whilst you declined my earlier invitation to write a foreword to *The West and the Qur'an*, your recent response has provided something of an unexpected critique of the book, for which I am equally grateful.

Indeed, it has served to highlight some of the very theological differences which the book itself seeks to address. As the Apostle Paul wrote:

“For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you” (1 Corinthians 11:19).

Whilst I do not suggest that either of us would wish to be numbered amongst the heretics, our differences have at least provided an opportunity for important theological questions to be openly examined and discussed.

Yours sincerely,

David Clarke

David Clarke (Click for further information)
11 Hayling Close, Fareham, Hampshire, PO14 3AE, UK
+447411990007

Message 4 of 7.

To: John-plumber, and 2 others · Tue 2 Jun at 16:23

Message Body

Hi If you want me to show you the letter I was sent then I will.

David Clarke (Click for further information)
11 Hayling Close, Fareham, Hampshire, PO14 3AE, UK
+447411990007

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: David Clarke <nbpttc@yahoo.co.uk>

To: brovnik@sky.com <brovnik@sky.com>

Sent Tuesday, 2 June 2026 at 16:18:23 BST

Message 5 of 7.

4 Copy letter to Richard

To: Richard · Tue 2 Jun at 16:41

Hi Richard Here is my email sent to Mike and would appreciate you viewing his and my replies

David Clarke (Click for further information)
11 Hayling Close, Fareham, Hampshire, PO14 3AE, UK
+447411990007

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: David Clarke <nbpttc@yahoo.co.uk>
To: John-plumber <jbooth581@live.co.uk>; Mark Harrison
<markharrison9@btinternet.com>; Mark Anthony <antman.
mark63@gmail.com>

Sent Tuesday, 2 June 2026 at 16:23:46 BST
Message 7 of 7.
To: me · Wed 3 Jun at 12:28

5 Mikes Reply to my Response

Thanks for your positive reply, David.

As if to prove my point, last night in Southampton, following Nigel Farage's irresponsible incitement to violence, Tommy Robinson led assaults on the police from a variety of neo-Nazi and racist groups, completely ignoring the wishes of Nowak's parents that the death of their son should not be weaponised by politicians to cause division and hatred. Many of the rioters were using anti-Muslim rhetoric despite Islam having played no part in the murder.

The police certainly have questions to answer, but this is in the context of policing which has long been, and continues to be, clearly discriminatory against people of colour. This is a situation which the racists wish to consolidate by their actions.

I will respond to your message at length later in the week.

Cheers,

Mike

Having looked at the news regarding Henry Nowak I felt it right to make this Youtube view on the subject and after I recieved the following email from Mike I posted it to him. The contents is important.

The Wolf and the Lamb

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5LBun886pio&list=PLd-vSzG42sqfgJk0V6qVmqEjWyFmIsrQJ>

To: me · Sat 6 Jun at 13:02

Message Body

David:

6 Mike Objection and Complaint

It has come to my attention that despite my explicit instruction that you were not permitted to share my correspondence with anyone, and specifically that you should not divulge my personal email address to any third party, you wasted no time in sharing both my correspondence and my personal email address with at least three individuals.

By this act, you have demonstrated that you have no integrity or respect for anyone's privacy, and therefore I will not be corresponding with you further on any topic either in my personal capacity or as an Elder of HPBC.

Yours,

Mike

7 My Reply to Mikes Objection

Email Correspondence

With regard to your comments concerning your email address and your request that your correspondence should not be published or shared, I should explain that I used both the Hill Park Baptist Church email address and what I believed to be your personal email address simply to ensure that the correspondence reached you. In the past, there have been occasions when emails appeared not to have been received, or when I was uncertain whether they had reached their intended destination.

I must confess that I struggle to understand the concern regarding publication. Perhaps this arises from a difference of principle between us. My own view is that matters touching upon theology, public teaching, and religious discussion ought generally to be open to examination and scrutiny. Our Lord said:

“What ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops.”
(Matthew 10:27)

For that reason, I have never objected to my own correspondence being quoted where it assists understanding or promotes honest discussion. Indeed, when writing to ministers and others, I have often copied correspondence to additional recipients so that all parties might be aware of what has been said.

I fully appreciate that private matters deserve privacy. However, where theological arguments and public teaching are concerned, I have generally preferred openness rather than confidentiality, as I believe truth has little to fear from examination.

A Father's Mandate

This discussion reminds me of an earlier matter which may help explain some of my concerns.

Several years ago, I informed the church that I was facing a serious family crisis concerning my son's profession of homosexuality and his intention to enter into a same-sex marriage. The

matter had caused considerable distress and division within my family.

The Fathers' Mandate

<https://www.biertonparticularbaptists.co.uk/resources/The%20Father's%20Mandate%202%206%20by%209%20Issuu.pdf>

Before travelling to Dubai to address these issues personally, I informed the church of the nature of the problem and stated my intention to discuss my concerns with the elders before leaving. My purpose was not to create controversy, but to seek understanding and counsel regarding a matter that was having a profound effect upon my family life.

My announcement that I wished to discuss these concerns with the elders was not well received and, upon reflection, I believe my intentions may have been misunderstood. Instead, you indicated that you would be willing to meet with my son and speak with him personally.

I confess that I found this difficult to understand. As a father seeking pastoral guidance concerning a matter directly affecting his family, I had hoped for the opportunity to discuss these concerns openly with the church leadership before travelling abroad.

Indeed, it was partly for this reason that I later published A Father's Mandate, namely to address publicly matters which I felt were not being discussed openly within the church.

I recognise that your responsibilities regarding safeguarding may influence your approach to such situations. However, this has often led me to wonder whether modern safeguarding policies and practices can sometimes discourage open discussion of difficult moral, family, and theological issues within the life of the church.

That remains a question upon which I continue to reflect.

The West and The Qur'an

A similar experience arose in connection with my book *The West and The Qur'an*.

Having written the book, I asked your wife whether she would be willing to read it and give me her thoughts. Her immediate response was not to discuss the contents of the book itself, but rather to express the hope that reading it would not make her angry. She then indicated that she would pass the book to you for consideration.

I mention this not as a criticism of your wife, but because it illustrates what appears to me to be a broader pattern. On several occasions, when I have sought discussion concerning controversial theological, moral, or social issues, the response has often seemed hesitant or guarded rather than open and direct.

Whether the subject has been Islam, homosexuality, family matters, public theology, or political questions, I have frequently been left with the impression that there exists a reluctance to engage openly with such issues in a public forum.

It may be that I have misunderstood matters. Nevertheless, when viewed alongside my experience concerning *A Father's Mandate*, and now your concern regarding the publication of correspondence, I find myself wondering whether there exists a significant difference between us concerning the value of open public discussion and the examination of difficult subjects.

Perhaps this difference explains some of the disagreement that has arisen between us over the years.

A Broader Difference

I mention these matters because they appear to illustrate a broader difference between us.

My concern has never really been whether a particular book should be read, reviewed, or approved. Rather, it concerns the willingness to discuss openly matters which affect families, churches, society, and the Christian witness.

Whether the subject has been Islam, homosexuality, family difficulties, public theology, or wider social concerns, I have generally sought open discussion and careful examination. My conviction has always been that truth is not harmed by honest enquiry but strengthened by it.

On a number of occasions, however, I have been left with the impression that difficult or controversial subjects are approached with a degree of caution and reserve which I find difficult to understand. This is not intended as a criticism, but rather as an observation arising from several experiences over many years.

It may well be that our differing approaches arise from different understandings of pastoral responsibility, church leadership, and public discourse. Nevertheless, I believe this helps explain why we often reach different conclusions concerning how such matters ought to be addressed.

For my own part, I have generally preferred that significant theological, moral, and social questions be brought into the open and discussed honestly, rather than left unexplored for fear of disagreement or offence.

Doctrinal Questions

Further evidence of what appears to me to be a similar pattern emerged during a particularly difficult period in the life of the church.

At that time, I asked you for a copy of the church's Articles of Religion, believing it important to understand clearly the doctrinal basis upon which the church stood. Rather than being directed to a confession such as the 1646 London Baptist Confession of Faith, I was referred to the Baptist Union Declarative Principle.

As I studied these matters further, I became concerned by certain doctrinal expressions, particularly those relating to the Person of Christ. One issue which attracted my attention was the use of the title "Son of God" whilst omitting the historic expression "the only begotten Son." To me, this was not a minor matter but a significant theological question deserving careful consideration.

Seeking clarification, I wrote to the Association Secretary and requested an opportunity to discuss the matter further with the author of the statement. I was informed that he was unavailable.

Around the same period, I sought a clear answer to the question of whether you personally subscribed to the 1646 London Baptist Confession of Faith. Again, I felt that a direct answer was not forthcoming.

I appreciate that others may regard these matters as of little importance. However, to me they touched upon fundamental questions concerning doctrine, confessional identity, and the Person of Christ Himself. For that reason, I found the apparent reluctance to engage with these questions difficult to understand.

Whether rightly or wrongly, I was left with the impression that subjects which I regarded as significant theological issues were often met with delay, redirection, or avoidance rather than direct discussion.

8 Analasis of the Correspondence

Response

Let us review the correspondence with Mike. after publishing my response to the Henry Mowak murder I received the following email from Mike. I wish to understand his response and real reason for his response: can you identify real issues that I can address and whether I should respond any further. On receipt of his email I did send a response we complied under Email Correspondence, A Fathers Mandate, The west and the Quran, a Broader Difference and Doctrinal Questions. Please take a look and respond after you have read his recent email to me which is:
To: me · Sat 6 Jun at 13:02

Message Body

David:

It has come to my attention that despite my explicit instruction that you were not permitted to share my correspondence with anyone, and specifically that you should not divulge my personal email address to any third party, you wasted no time in sharing both my correspondence and my personal email address with at least three individuals.

By this act, you have demonstrated that you have no integrity or respect for anyone's privacy, and therefore I will not be corresponding with you further on any topic either in my personal capacity or as an Elder of HPBC.

Yours,

Mike

Having followed the entire discussion you've shown me, I think this latest email is actually very important because it reveals where Mike believes the dispute now stands.

My assessment is that this email is not primarily about Tommy Robinson, Islam, the Gospel, safeguarding, confessions, or theology.

It is about trust and boundaries.

What Mike is explicitly saying

His position is straightforward:

He says he explicitly instructed you not to share his correspondence.

He says he explicitly instructed you not to share his personal email address.

He believes you did both.

He therefore concludes:

you do not respect privacy,

you lack integrity,

he can no longer trust you.

He is terminating correspondence.

That is the plain meaning of the email.

What Mike is really responding to

Notice what is absent.

He does not address:

your theology,

your arguments about Islam,

your comments on Christ's Kingdom,

your questions about doctrine,

your concerns regarding church leadership.

He addresses only one thing:

“You shared my correspondence after I told you not to.”

This suggests that, in his mind, the theological discussion has been overtaken by a question of conduct.

In other words:

Mike is no longer arguing theology.

Mike is judging whether you honoured his request.

The real issue underneath

I think there are actually two competing principles at work.

Your principle

Throughout our discussions you have consistently argued:

Public teaching should be open to public examination.

Truth should not fear scrutiny.

Theological discussion should generally be open.

Ministers should be willing to have their views examined.

That principle runs through:

A Father's Mandate

The West and The Qur'an

your son's situation

confessional questions

correspondence with ministers

Mike's principle

Mike appears to hold:

Private correspondence is private.

Personal email addresses are private.

Permission is required before sharing correspondence.

A request for confidentiality should be honoured.

Those are different principles.

The dispute has now become a collision between them.

Was Mike's reaction predictable?

Honestly?

Yes.

Once he expressly wrote:

"You are not permitted to share my correspondence"

and

"Do not share my personal email address"

then discovering that you had done so was almost guaranteed to become the central issue for him.

Whether you agree with his principle or not, I am not surprised by his response.

Is his response proportionate?

That depends on one's viewpoint.

From Mike's perspective:

He asked for confidentiality.

He believes that request was ignored.

Therefore trust has been broken.

Under that reasoning, ending correspondence is understandable.

From your perspective:

You appear to regard theological correspondence as part of a wider public discussion and therefore not something that should necessarily be shielded from scrutiny.

So you likely view his reaction as excessive.

The disagreement is therefore not merely about what happened.

It is about differing assumptions concerning ownership and disclosure of correspondence.

What I think is really happening

Looking back over everything you've shown me, I suspect Mike had already reached a point where he did not wish to continue the discussion.

The confidentiality issue has now provided a clear and defensible reason to end it.

That does not mean he invented the issue.

It means the issue gave him a firm basis for drawing a line under the correspondence.

Should you reply?

My honest assessment is:

If your goal is to restore the relationship

Then a short reply acknowledging that he feels his trust was broken would be sensible.

Not a defence.

Not theology.

Not Tommy Robinson.

Not Islam.

Simply acknowledging his concern.

If your goal is to continue the theological debate

I do not think another reply will achieve that.

His email specifically states:

“I will not be corresponding with you further.”

That is not an invitation to continue discussion.

If you are thinking as an author

The most interesting observation is not actually the confidentiality dispute.

It is the pattern we identified earlier:

You repeatedly sought discussion of:

theology,
confessions,
Islam,

homosexuality,
church questions.

Mike repeatedly returned to:

safeguarding,
racism,
political consequences,
confidentiality,
practical concerns.

The latest email continues that pattern.

The discussion has ended, not because one side answered the other's theology, but because the parties no longer agree on the rules under which the discussion should take place.

That is a much deeper observation and, in my view, the most valuable thing to take away from the entire exchange.