

Open Letter to C4SO and Its Bishop Regarding the Rev. Jay L. Greener

On December 7, 2021, based on “reports” of alleged misconduct, the ACNA Diocese, Churches for the Sake of Others (C4SO) led by Bishop Todd Hunter, placed the Reverend Canon Jay L. Greener on a journey that has robbed him of his reputation, ministry, rights, and human dignity. C4SO has made Reverend Greener a scapegoat to demonstrate its toughness on accused clergy to differentiate C4SO from the recent scandals of other dioceses and denominations.

Six months later, on June 2, 2022 - just one day after the C4SO Diocese delivered a confidential report to the congregants of the Church of the Redeemer in Highwood, Illinois - an Anglican publication claiming to reach four (4) million readers worldwide annually carried a story concerning Reverend Greener’s forced resignation. The storyline of C4SO’s finding of alleged misconduct by Reverend Greener was based on purported “credible” allegations of inappropriate conduct as determined by a legally untrained investigator, Wade Mullen of “Pellucid Consulting.” See virtueonline.org, June 2, 2022.

C4SO’s and its Bishop’s career-ending decision has caused Reverend Greener great emotional distress and personal anguish. Bishop Hunter effectively put Reverend Greener to the choice of resigning or (at age 62) of going through the trauma of a church trial to prove himself innocent. C4SO’s uncritical acceptance of the Mullen report, while ignoring its patently flawed fact-finding and conclusions, is not only a disservice to Reverend Greener but should sound alarm bells for other clergy in the C4SO Diocese. Among its other process failings, C4SO is ratifying the Mullen report’s acceptance of accusations without providing the accused an opportunity to refute or explain them - an unfettered peril to all C4SO clergy.

The comments and critique below are made to refute C4SO’s conclusions and publicity as to Reverend Greener in the expectation that internet searches concerning his forced resignation will also connect to this rebuttal. There is another side of the story that C4SO and some local Redeemer congregants and leaders refused to hear.

The purpose of this open letter is to demonstrate that the policy, process, implementation, investigation, report, and decision to distribute allegations publicly were fatally flawed and ethically suspect, disrespecting Anglican Canon Law, due process, and basic fairness.

C4SO and the ACNA need to do better. A healthy Church is one that models reconciliation and restoration and forgiveness. It does not abandon its clergy. If the Church cannot care equitably for all persons, how will any believe in the power of God to redeem what and who is broken? No clergyperson deserves to have due process and basic fairness undercut by a church’s poor process for evaluating claims that strike at the heart of his worthiness to serve congregants. In the spirit of protecting other clergy from ministry ruination, a critique of how Rev. Greener has been mistreated over the past 6 months is offered in the hope that no other clergy person ever again has to walk through such a life-destroying ordeal.

We assert that the process utilized here is not the way **anyone** should handle disagreement and hurt in the church and provides a poor example from a church that is supposed to embody reconciliation and restoration. The need for righting historical wrongs against women in the church is critical and sensitivity to persons who have been harmed is imperative. Reports of clergy misconduct must be taken seriously and victims supported.

However, pursuing these worthy objectives does not negate what should be done to also protect the humanity, dignity, and rights of the accused. Leaders are to be presumed innocent until PROVEN guilty. Putting aside any political capital C4SO hoped to gain, public distribution of a report of unsubstantiated allegations while disallowing the accused any response as part of that report (as here) mocks due process and justice.

C4SO's Skeletal Whistleblower "Policy" and Make-It-Up-As-You-Go Process Set the Stage For an Adverse Determination for Reverend Greener

C4SO's Bare Bones Whistleblower "Policy" Lacks Numerous Features of Policies of Other ACNA Dioceses For Evaluating Conduct Unbecoming Clergy

C4SO's 'whistleblower' policy is less a policy than a mechanism for receiving anonymous complaints about church personnel. (<https://c4so.org/safe-church-training/whistleblower-policy/>). C4SO's "policy" does not contain guardrails found in other church policies regarding complaints against clergy. Such mechanisms preserve protections for complainants making the difficult choice to bring potential misconduct to light while at the same time affording protections to the accused to assure due process in evaluating sensitive clergy-involved matters.

For example, when comparing the C4SO policy to one from the Anglican Diocese of the Rocky Mountains: (<http://rockymountainanglican.org/founding-documents-policies/>, start at p.8ff), the differences in clarity, process, detail, rights of the accused and potential outcomes are striking. The accused is presumed innocent until otherwise determined, the accused sees the specific allegations in writing and knows its source, confidentiality of the report is assured, conflicts of interests are prevented, and 5 possible outcomes, escalating in severity, are listed. This is all to occur in an expeditious manner. None of these characteristics or guardrails are present in C4SO's Whistleblower Policy.

C4SO's Whistleblower Policy Also Does Not Account For Anglican Canon Law

- C4SO's policy does not direct the parties to Canon Law for instruction and structure for the rights, obligations, and methods for settling conflict by the parties.¹

¹ "Canon 8: Disruption of Pastor Responsibility: When a Rector has been regularly settled in a Parish he shall not be dismissed without the consent of the Bishop of the Diocese. In case of a controversy between a Rector and Parish, which cannot be settled by the parties themselves, the parties or either of them may appeal to the Bishop, whose duty it shall be to seek to bring the parties to an

- C4SO's policy does not account for ACNA Canon 8 as the Bishop failed to work toward an amicable resolution within 6 months, recused himself from the process, and handed responsibility over to an 'ombudsperson' and 'investigator'.
- C4SO's Whistleblower policy is the only policy C4SO has in place for any level of allegation – from a minor complaint up to criminal activity (the Bishop stated in December 2021 that Rev. Greener was not accused of any illegality).
- The C4SO policy as written is skeletal and open to misuse, allowing an anonymous and protected person to make a "report" that removes the Rector from leadership for months while an investigation into the credibility of the "report" is undertaken. Because the reporter remains anonymous to the Bishop, the reporter may be named to or allowed to maintain a leadership role, potentially creating a serious conflict of interest whereby the reporter gains undue influence, including possible takeover of the church as the leader going forward.

In This Case, C4SO's Investigative Process Under Its Skeletal Whistleblower Policy Prejudiced the Rights of the Accused

Because C4SO's Whistleblower Policy has no guardrails or other criteria to guide investigations, it was susceptible from the outset to abuse which unfortunately prejudiced Reverend Greener in this case:

- The up-front promises of anonymity for complaining parties in this case were extended by C4SO through the entire investigation and the accused kept in the dark (including by investigator Mullen - see below) as to who was alleging what and when, foreclosing a meaningful defense. Indeed, under the C4SO policy's terms, the confidentiality requirement can be relaxed to facilitate the fact-finding process. That was not done here.²
- The Bishop's initial letter to the community (dated December 9, 2021) stated that there were "credible allegations" against Rev. Greener when only "reports" had been made. Supposedly, the investigation was to determine whether they were credible. The escalation of language was sent to every person on the Redeemer mailing list (far beyond persons currently attending Redeemer). A "correction" of that language was made by the church Wardens during a verbal announcement in a Sunday morning worship service and eventually placed on the church website. However, when Reverend. Greener and legal counsel asked that the correction be sent to all who received the original email, the church leadership declined to resend the message. For those who did not view the

amicable conclusion. If this matter cannot be amicably settled within a reasonable time, not to exceed six months, the Bishop shall consider the advice from the Executive Leadership Team. Any conclusion rendered by the Bishop after such consultation shall be binding."

² Legal counsel requested "at this juncture in the spirit of due process there should be in writing a writ of complaint for Fr. Greener that demonstrates why the Title IV is underway" (letter to Bishop Hunter dated January 14, 2022). A written complaint was not provided.

worship service recording or intentionally view the website, C4SO's communication was negatively biased against Rev. Greener from the beginning.

- Bishop Hunter's original letter also asked that "congregants resist the urge to contact the Greeners," leaving many confused about whether the Greeners desired connection or not or whether the congregation was 'allowed' to reach out to care for them. Over several months, congregants kept asking if they were allowed to have any communication with the Greeners and received mixed messages.
- The Greeners were not allowed to be prayed for in Redeemer worship service by name because it was asserted that mentioning their names might trigger trauma.
- Bishop Hunter withheld pastoral care. The Bishop called once to tell Rev. Greener of the reports of misconduct and asked him to take a leave-of-absence, and one time to check in. Both calls were made in December of 2021. The accused (the Rector in this case) was removed from the church, along with his spouse, and effectively kept in the dark as to how things would proceed.
- Bishop Hunter explained to the Redeemer congregants (June 4, 2022) that his analysis of the complaints against Reverend Greener was influenced by two prior situations in which he was personally involved; the clergy in those cases were instrumental in the Bishop's personal faith journey but both fell drastically through sexual indiscretions.
- There is no stated option in the Whistleblower policy other than removal of the clergyperson and there is no option in the Whistleblower policy for reconciliation and/or restoration. That may be the spirit of our age, but it is not the Gospel.
- Rev. Greener and/or his legal counsel were regularly omitted from official communications from the Diocese. In addition, official communications sent to Rev. Greener omitted key information that was shared with the Vestry and the congregation.
- The Diocese failed to respond to inquiries from Rev. Greener's legal counsel in a timely manner or with any response at all.
- Rev. Greener had to obtain updates on the process by reading the weekly Redeemer congregational e-newsletter.

C4SO's Investigative Process Was Unconscionably and Prejudicially Lengthy

Bishop Hunter told Reverend Greener in December 2021 that he could expect a four-to-six-week process for C4SO to evaluate the complaints. The process ended up being six months under the auspices of 'independent' outside 'investigator,' Wade Mullen.

Rather than a targeted and focused investigation based on initial complaints (from two people) that were shared in writing, investigator Mullen embarked on a fishing expedition spanning decades. Investigator Mullen initiated a survey process to current and former congregants seeking 'information' on the accused and requesting persons having such information to come forward. Redeemer's own communications each week requested anyone who had 'information' on the accused to come forward. In the end these efforts turned up little of substance, especially considering Reverend Greener's tenure of 16 years and many hundreds of parishioners over that time. However, the six-month time frame effectively assured that there would be no return to Redeemer by Rev Greener, whatever the outcome of the report.

The “Investigator” Chosen By The C4SO Diocese To Assess the Complaints Against Reverend Greener Was Not Qualified to Make the Judgments He Was Asked to Make

Reverend Greener does not dispute that a Bishop may find it necessary to engage someone with experience and time to assist the Bishop in the conduct of church business. Investigating claims of conduct unbecoming clergy would seem to call for such specialized knowledge and ability. However, the circumstances surrounding Mr. Mullen’s selection, and his lack of knowledge of the rules of determining facts, raise serious questions regarding his qualifications to do the job for which he was hired.

Wade Mullen is not known to Bishop Hunter; the Bishop has never even met Mullen. Rather, based on the recommendation of the ombudsperson for the C4SO diocese and a Redeemer church leader/bible scholar, Mullen was chosen to conduct the investigation of the complaints made concerning Reverend Greener.

One look below the surface shows that Mr. Mullen claims no special training or certification in forensic interviewing skills or psychology, both vital to working with people who are in conflict and hold very divergent views of the same events. Mr. Mullen just started his investigative consulting business, “Pellucid,” months ago; he is a rookie in his chosen consulting field. And Pellucid has no other employees beside Mr. Mullen.

According to Mr. Mullen’s LinkedIn profile (<https://www.linkedin.com/in/wade-mullen-a89a94124/>):

- He lists no education/experience in law or and does not claim to have legal training.
- He does not list a certification in forensic interviewing or rules of evidence.
- He does not have academic degrees or training that make him suitable for investigating the claims raised against Reverend Greener.
- He lists experience as an Institutional Response Specialist at G.R.A.C.E, an organization that indicates that their “investigative section includes multiple former abuse **prosecutors** as well as **law enforcement** with expertise in abuse and trauma. Each investigation will get a **hand-picked team for maximum relevancy and effectiveness in finding the truth**” (<https://www.netgrace.org/independent-investigations>). This description does not align with Mr. Mullen’s qualifications to investigate Rev. Greener.

The Report Produced By Mr. Mullen to Support the Forced Resignation of Reverend Greener Is Riddled with Evidentiary Failings, and Therefore It Was Inappropriate for C4SO To Have Relied Upon It

Given Mr. Mullen’s lack of experience and relevant educational background, it was predictable that the investigative report he would generate would suffer from serious evidentiary and other failings. Though he reached a conclusion that was acceptable to the C4SO diocese, the report’s

deficiencies are so serious that the Mullen report is too unreliable to be used as a basis for decision-making, particularly in a case, as here, where termination of clergy is at issue. Among the more serious failings are the following:

- Mr. Mullen's report and narrative repeatedly uses summary quotations to illustrate what one complaining party or another may have said in interviews and to take those statements at face value. Though Mr. Mullen says he found the complaints to be "credible" (in the sense of truthful), there is no assessment in the report whether the person making them had a *reasonable* basis for doing so or whether other considerations were at play that skewed the facts.
- Based on the quotations, Mullen organizes a narrative that Reverend Greener was a calculating predator in his ministry all along and, later in the report, applies social science articles about inherent power imbalances in support. In short, in C4SO the subjective recollections and assessments of the complaining party govern whether a minister is doing his job - not objective standards of conduct and reasonableness. This unrestrained path accepted by the Diocese and Redeemer will undermine ministry and place clergy perpetually at risk of unfair assessments and discipline.
- Mr. Mullen repeatedly uses adjectives to enhance the gravity of the claimed situation: "Many, most, a number of, numerous, multiple, etc." He never mentions who made the alleged statement. He also does not fix events in time. He does not say in 2007, this happened; in 2012, that happened; or in 2021 another thing happened. His narrative compresses events over decades as if they are all from a single story that happened just last week.
- The report tells us how three witnesses "felt" that Reverend Greener allegedly made "racist" or "sexist" comments; but after slapping on discrimination labels, Mr. Mullen does not tell us the words Reverend Greener purportedly used - just witnesses' or Mr. Mullen's impressions.
- We also do not know how or whether Mr. Mullen used leading questions and harassment terminology in dialogue with interviewees to develop narratives and quotes that did not originate with the reporting parties.
- Mr. Mullen also literally relies on information from "a woman who advocated for another" without acknowledging woman A stating woman B's story is hearsay on its face - meaning that it is not admissible at law for any purpose.

All of the foregoing failings combine to make the Mullen report unreliable as a basis for deciding whether a clergyman has engaged in unbecoming conduct. But the report's further, critical failing is Mr. Mullen's statements that Reverend Greener simply denied wrongdoing, implying strongly that the denial was not credible or constituted stonewalling.

This is not only poor fact finding; it rises to the level of *deception*. The Mullen report studiously avoids telling its readers that Mr. Mullen never asked Reverend Greener about the specific accusations leveled against him. So, the record (in the report) contains the complaints made, but nothing informs the reader that Reverend Greener was refused an

opportunity to deny or explain the specific allegations raised against him as the C4SO whistleblower policy specifically authorized Mr. Mullen to provide.

The deposition transcript of Reverend Greener has the same failings. In his questions, Mr. Mullen studiously avoided specifying the allegations against Reverend Greener, so the record (in his report) contains quotes from complainants but not denials or explanations from Reverend Greener.

In fact, Reverend Greener did not see or hear any specific allegations until the Mullen report was released publicly; Reverend Greener only obtained an unredacted version of the report by searching on the internet.

And, in response to general questions posed by Mr. Mullen (“did you ever...”), Mr. Mullen discredits Reverend Greener when he did not offer recollections when it is equally credible that he simply did not recall due to the cascade of congregant personal issues he has dealt with over decades.

Mr. Mullen’s report also omits the highly positive experience of various Redeemer congregants and staff supporting Reverend Greener for his ministry over the years.

If Mr. Mullen had been objective, he could have interviewed witnesses ***who requested to be interviewed*** regarding the resolution of two of the situations – one with a counselor (15 years

ago) and one with a mediator (8 years ago). Two witnesses were interviewed by Mr. Mullen, but were never directly asked, like Reverend Greener, about the specific situations presented in the report. Thus, ***the investigator had the opportunity to verify and did not do so***. How does seeking resolution with a counselor and a mediator fit the ‘predatory narrative’ of Reverend Greener constructed by Mullen?

And is it not relevant that the two most cited complainants each had a disagreement with Reverend Greener around ministry decisions and direction during the COVID season that had yet to be fully resolved? Mr. Mullen’s report portrays the usual hard decisions of leadership as somehow an abuse of authority and retaliation, though the Rector holds the authority to make decisions as to the direction the church will take. And Reverend Greener had done so in consultation with the Vestry and other ministry leaders in Redeemer.

In addition, the two persons Reverend Greener asked to be interviewed were never contacted (his counselor and an Afro-Latino congregant who could directly address two of the areas of complaint). Furthermore, a female former staff person and a black male clergy person serving at Redeemer who contacted Mullen were never interviewed. Had Reverend Greener known the content of the report’s allegations, he could have also recommended that Mullen interview several other former female staff persons.

The exclusion of positive testimony, or testimony that may have contradicted the reports, points to a clear bias against Rev. Greener. ***People have come forward since the report was released claiming they offered information that directly refutes statements Mr. Mullen presents as settled fact. But their input was not considered or included.*** The investigator, then, was not an impartial listener, but an advocate.

C4SO's and the Bishop's refusals even to consider Mr. Mullen's investigatory tactics as a basis for rejecting the Mullen report are a travesty of due process and should be an embarrassment to ACNA. This was not an investigation; it was a trap to construct a record to support termination.

Making Matters Worse, The Bishop and C4SO Widely Distributed the Mullen Report in Anglican Circles

By June of 2022, the C4SO Bishop apparently made a decision to distribute the Mullen report, in its entirety, far and wide through the diocese's many networks. When the initial reports of misconduct came to the Bishop's attention in December 2021, recall that the Bishop asked Reverend Greener to take a leave of absence which he agreed to do so out of obedience to his Bishop (although he did not agree to its necessity). **Reverend Greener was never under discipline or inhibited from performing priestly duties by the Bishop.**

The Bishop twice provided assurances that **only a summary of the Mullen report would be distributed** (first on May 25, 2022, to the accused and legal counsel; second on May 28, 2022 to the accused and his spouse) and would be provided only to appropriately interested parties, namely the congregation. **At the last minute, and in contradiction to the wishes/desires of an apparent majority of Redeemer's Vestry, the Mullen report was released in full on June 1, without edits members of the Vestry had requested and without congregational discussion.** On Saturday, June 4, at the congregational Q&A with the Bishop, it was clear that the Vestry itself was not sure whether the Mullen report was to be reviewed by Vestry members first before it was deemed final or modified.

Thereafter, in short order the report was emailed to:

- the church mailing list, which includes not only current congregants, but anyone who has ever requested to be on the mailing list.
- all clergy of C4SO and to the C4SO mailing list around the world.
- other church leaders.

The 'story' with quotes from the Bishop's letter and a larger photo of Rev. Greener was then picked up by an Anglican news site on June 2 and distributed even further to two global Anglican news sites, one of which claims over 4 million readers annually. In addition, the story was shared publicly on a church leadership site, as well as in several newsletters, one of which claims hundreds of subscribers.

Particularly given the sensitivity of the matters discussed in the Mullen report and the apparent disagreement in the Redeemer Vestry about whether the report should be released at all and in what form, what was the purpose of this defamatory and insensitive distribution? Was it to broadcast positive optics for the diocese and Bishop, that they were not like other groups that had stumbled with complaints raised by staff or congregants?

Conclusion

The C4SO's process in this case resulted in a capital sentence against Reverend Greener, destroying his reputation and ministry career, disrespecting his church, and making it virtually impossible he could ever serve in pastoral ministry again. The Bishop, the C4SO Diocese and Church of the Redeemer leadership are guilty of authorizing and approving a deficient process leading to Reverend Greener's personal ruin. Given the predictable damage to Fr. Greener's reputation and career by the Mullen report as distributed, the consequences demanded a much better process than occurred by someone better qualified to undertake it.

What is the proper response by C4SO, the Bishop and the Church of the Redeemer to the points made in this Open Letter?

- C4SO and the Bishop should admit that C4SO's whistleblower policy needs substantial revision to conform to due process requirements and Anglican Canon Law, that the investigation process was fatally flawed and that the public humiliation of Rev. Greener was a punishment that far exceeded a just response to the allegations recounted in the Mullen report.
- The Vestry Wardens and the appointed Deacon leading the process for Redeemer should reevaluate their role in a process that embraced the unreliable fact determinations of the Mullen report and inflicted unjustified hurt and reputational damage to Reverend Greener.

Questions regarding this open letter should be addressed to:

The Right Reverend Kevin Francis Donlon, Ph.D., LL.M
Adviser for Ecclesiastical and Ecumenical Affairs
canon_donlon@pm.me