

## A STATEMENT BY DANIEL HARPER

Since launching my website ([elijahthomaschacko.info](http://elijahthomaschacko.info)), I have become a target of hate by most members of The Westminster Tradition. My intention in publishing the website was not to hurt anyone personally, but to limit the ability of Elijah Thomas Chacko and those who represent him to recruit new members to his cult. Initially I thought it sufficient to target Elijah Chacko directly, but when his representatives added new layers of deceit (in the case of Zephaniah Soh by [denying affiliation with him](#)), I felt it was necessary to expose certain missionaries by name. Other brethren's names are to be found on the website because to remove them from source documents may discredit the evidence. I can only apologise to any who have been caught in the crossfire. If you feel the presence of your name on this website is inappropriate or defamatory, I request you contact me directly and I will consider removing or abbreviating it.

In July 2019, missionary Phinehas David Yeoh's eldest daughter launched a website on behalf of Elijah Thomas Chacko called [wt discovering the truth](#), publishing rebuttals to my articles. Some of the contents were deliberately malicious, glorying in my trials and sufferings and hoping to bury me under a mountain of slander. But those who had long witnessed my manner of life and conversation will not be so easily persuaded. *[I forgive those that have not had the courage to openly defend me. Within a culture of 'condemn or be condemned', it can be a costly business to speak out.]* Other submissions attempted to daub up the vast cracks in Elijah Chacko's teachings with untempered mortar. I posted a [general response](#) and let matters rest.

In addition to the above, rumours have for some time been maliciously circulated seeking to discredit my character. Two of the more significant of these are: (1) that I have been suspended by the medical authorities for falsifying my medical qualifications and (2) that I have stolen money from The Westminster Tradition. These rumours are fallacious and are answered [on my website](#).

In August 2020, this further website was released ([debunkingdanielharper](#)). The owner of the website, confessing to have little interest in anything of a doctrinal (i.e. scriptural) nature, seeks testimonials about my character to publish to 'the wider community'. I readily confess to finding this new website more shocking than anything that came before because the authors are my own near-relatives (namely my sister-in-law and mother-in-law). I believe the website has been set up with the consent and assistance of my wife. Some will no doubt eat up their words as they would tasty morsels. Here is gossip of the juiciest sort. Such are bloody men. To see a neighbour mauled (Prov 25:18) is sport to them. They may even climb into the arena and write a testimonial themselves. But in time they will discover the truth of the proverb: *'The words of a talebearer are as wounds, and they go down into the innermost parts of the belly'* (Prov 18:8; 26:22). God is my witness that I have not published anything of a defamatory nature about my relatives. Neither, God help me, shall I. For *'a talebearer revealeth secrets: but he that is of a faithful spirit concealeth the matter'* (Prov 11:13). One may say, "Daniel Harper is a hypocrite! Though he may not have published anything about his family members, he has published plenty about Elijah Chacko! Anyhow, he is ashamed to do so, lest his family give the lie to him." I would answer that there is a vast difference between private family matters and the public ministry of a man who claimed to be the last prophet. Since The Westminster Tradition ploughs vast resources into recruiting new members, it is clearly in the public interest to know this organisation's history, its teaching and its practices. Readers should note that I never wrote any articles about Elijah Chacko's private family life. Therefore, before assimilating the contents of this new website, I encourage readers to pause and consider. Do my wife and in-laws do well to publish such a website? Do those secretive individuals within The Westminster Tradition who have stirred them up to this deed do honourably? It is said of the virtuous woman that *'the heart of her husband doth safely trust in her...'* and that *'she will do him good and not evil all the days of her life'* (Prov 31:11a,12). Weigh these things for yourselves and *'judge righteous judgment'* (John 7:24b).

**'Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.' Matt 7:12.**

## *Questions To Ask About 'Debunking Daniel Harper'...*

### **1. Is it JUST?**

*He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him. Proverbs 18:17*

It is usually the case in a court of law that the plaintiff's cause seems just. It is only after he is searched in the light of the defendant's account that a clearer picture starts to emerge. The accounts published by my in-laws may seem just. After reading them, one might conclude I'm more devil than man. But the wise will wait and reserve judgment until '*his neighbour cometh and searcheth*' the matter. They will recognise that there are always two sides to a story. They will not accept a statement 'hook, line and sinker', and condemn a man before he is heard.

In this case, I am at a great disadvantage. The matters are private, as any discrete and sober person will recognise. Therefore, beyond posting these general comments, I will not defend myself publicly. My antagonists know this and are emboldened in their actions. But there is a righteous Judge. False witnesses rose up against Him (Psalm 27:12) and since no servant is greater than his master, I am content to follow in His steps.

### **2. Is it PROPER?**

The Lord Jesus Christ laid down very clearly in His Word how faults are to be addressed between brethren:

*Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Matthew 18:15-17.*

At no point does Jesus say, "Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell it unto the world."

Indeed, though the chief contributor to the website under discussion lives under my very roof, it was an overseas friend who alerted me to its existence! What happened to '*go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone*'? By the time I had read the contents, the articles had over 200 hits each - having already been perused by a large readership within The Westminster Tradition (doubtless the target audience).

*Whoso privily slandereth his neighbour, him will I cut off: him that hath an high look and a proud heart will not I suffer. Psalm 101:5*

The content of these 'testimonials' is slanderous and also private insofar that (1) I was deliberately kept ignorant of the website's existence, and (2) the content can reach people without my knowledge. The words of Psalm 101 are not only the words of David but also the words of Christ, the Head of the Church, Who

gives very plain instructions in Matt 18 concerning the manner in which grievances are to be voiced. Grievances which can't be resolved directly are to be brought unto the church.

I am in fellowship with two congregations in London: (1) the [Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland](#) (2) [An Assembly of Christians meeting in Westminster](#). Both of these churches have a mature eldership who are competent to hear any accusations made against me and discipline me appropriately (if I be found guilty). Let these grievances be submitted to them! They should not be handled by a non-Christian who readily admits that they are 'not affiliated to any particular church, religious, or spiritual tradition' and who appeals not to the Bible, but to an ephemeral set of 'universally accepted values, ethics, codes of law and human rights'. Are these not the same values, ethics, codes and rights that support butchering the unborn, the right to self-murder and that have desecrated the marriage institution? Matters between Christians are matters for the church.

### **3. Is it DISCREET?**

*But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine... the aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things; that they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.*  
Titus 2:1,3-5

Far from being false accusers, aged women are to teach the young women holy living by word and example. Do wild and unverifiable accusations set a good example, or do they lead to the word of God being blasphemed? These testimonials are prepared by an aged woman who professes to be a disciple of Jesus Christ. Are her actions sober, loving, discreet, chaste, private, good? Do they encourage love and obedience to husbands?

### **4. Is it OBJECTIVE?**

In her introductory article *Why am I denouncing 'Doctor' Daniel?*, the creator of 'debunkingdanielharper' positively advertises her lack of objectivity. I am sure that she never met, spoke to or corresponded with 'the late pastor of the Westminster Tradition'. She was never a member of this group and is not acquainted with the people, their doctrines or their practices. And yet she speaks derisively of articles on my website, portraying them as 'flimsy witness accounts from highly-prejudiced sources.' Is this objective?

She also feels unqualified to comment on doctrinal issues and recommends that anything of a doctrinal nature would be more appropriately dealt with elsewhere. Despite being unqualified to comment, she ridicules my 'pompous assertions', "learned" references and 'doctrinal nit-picking'. Is this objective?

Having 'recently discovered' the [wtdiscoveringthetruth](#) website, she declares that it competently and clearly deals with a number of my assertions and 'should absolutely be consulted'. And yet it is impossible that she could understand the nature of the issues being discussed. Is this objective?

Let the reader not be naive! The aim of her website is perfectly obvious: it is to provide a platform for those closest to me to do maximal damage to my reputation. Objectivity and the ability to recognise and set aside prejudice would be a hindrance to such a goal.

### **5. Is it EVIDENCED?**

Some may feel that I am getting a taste of my own medicine: I published a website condemning Elijah Thomas Chacko. Now it is fitting that my in-laws publish a website condemning me. But there are some very substantial differences between the types of material presented:

1. Every article on my own website is evidenced. Westminster Tradition publications are extensively cited and links are almost always provided to the relevant pdf copy to ensure the reader can be satisfied as to the context. There are also audio recordings, WhatsApp transcripts, financial statements, photographs and court-level affidavits. [Rules of posting](#) were drawn up at the outset and adhered to. All these individual pieces of evidence fit together to provide a clear picture of (elements of) the person and teachings of Elijah Thomas Chacko. For example, a [first-hand account](#) from a child who was caned so severely that his hands and back were left bloodied might be questionable if it stood alone. But when accompanied by the statement in Elijah Chacko's own newsletter that, "There must be the consistent, rigid application of the law on children. [Pastor: "Ruthless application."], it sounds more feasible. When furthermore a statement by one of the young men ('I remember the time when pastor caned me and [Elijah's son] till our backs were bleeding') is published by Elijah Chacko in support of this 'ruthless application' of the law, there remains little reason to question the truthfulness of that first child. [See article '[Child Abuse](#)']

2. My website is almost entirely free of personal accusations against Elijah Chacko. I wrote no 'testimonial'. I determined that I would build up an accurate picture of the abuses and heresies prevailing within The Westminster Tradition. But in doing so, I would not succumb to the temptation to publish unverified or libellous material.

3. My website (where reasonably possible) publishes both sides of the story. After publishing the [Church of Judah's separation letter](#), I also published a series of 43 statements of defence, authored by members of The Westminster Tradition. Comments (which satisfied the criteria outlined in the 'rules of posting') have been preserved for all to see - some are now 18 months old. On the rare occasion I was sent a properly formulated reply to an article (rather than curses and abuse which make up the usual fare), I published it in full (see comment by 'pc' from Melbourne [here](#)).

4. On several occasions I specifically challenged Elijah Chacko to respond in person. Had he replied, I would have published his letter unmodified. He remained entirely silent, excepting his threat to report me to the [Information Commission's Office](#).

In contrast, most of the material on 'debunkingdanielharper' is speculative, unsubstantiated and unverifiable.

## **6. IS IT FORGIVING?**

There is truth to the allegation that as a father, a husband and a son-in-law, I have failed - and many times. It would be convenient but not upright to blame Elijah Chacko or any other individual within The Westminster Tradition. The fact is, a person cannot be forced to sin. And sins, though they may be committed in ignorance, are nevertheless sins (Lev 4). *The woman being deceived was in the transgression* (1 Tim 2:14b).

For many long months I have had to consider my own behaviour and confess my sins to both God and man. Some of these confessions will remain between myself and my God. There are swine who would be glad to trample such pearls under their feet, before turning again and rending me. As David said, *'let us fall now into the hand of the LORD; for his mercies are great: and let me not fall into the hand of man* (2 Sam 24:14b).'

But it remains that whilst a large proportion of the testimonial content of this website is false, there remains a residue of truth. Some of these things (and some not mentioned) I have already asked forgiveness for in a letter written to my wife and in-laws approximately 1yr ago. It was not written for the purpose of publication and excepting the intended recipients, I did not share it with a living soul. However, circumstances have changed and because my sins are posted publicly and online, I think it is necessary also to ask forgiveness for my sins publicly and online.

- [Letter of Apology](#) (15th Oct 2019) - Redacted

I am aware that this apology has not and is unlikely to satisfy those who write testimonials against me. I fear they are driven not by a desire for reconciliation, but revenge. Nevertheless, I offer it sincerely.

It may be asked, "Why, if you pretend to be sorry, do you continue to persecute your wife and in-laws?" To which I will reply only with a summary of my convictions:

1. I will never suffer my children to come under the spiritual and psychological bondage that I and many like me endured within The Westminster Tradition.
2. Divorce is a breach of covenant and abhorrent to God. I will never be a party to it.
3. *Each man should rule well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity* (1 Tim 3:4). *[Elijah overreached and took it upon himself to rule everyone else's houses.]* I have not always ruled my own house well, but it is my God-given responsibility to try.
4. If my in-laws will not live peaceably but will continue to undermine my relationship with my wife and children, I will not suffer them to dwell in my house. *'He that worketh deceit shall not dwell within my house: he that telleth lies shall not tarry in my sight'* (Psalm 101:7).

Conflict has come about because some members of my family have cast off these values.

***If a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand (Mark 3:25).***

## **7. Is it CHARITABLE?**

*And above all things have fervent charity among yourselves: for charity shall cover the multitude of sins.* 1 Peter 4:8

*Hatred stirreth up strifes: but love covereth all sins.* Proverbs 10:12

*Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the LORD. Ye shall keep my statutes.* Lev 19:18-19a

Is charity the motive behind the publication of this new website? What do the authors hope to achieve? Do they wish to bring honour to God? Does they wish to bring peace to family turmoil? Does they wish to heal a broken marriage? Do they wish to cover the multitude of sins or stir up strife? What is to be gained by airing personal grievances on the world wide web?

Let the reader also examine themselves by this great commandment: *thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*. I am thy neighbour. You may rejoice to see me brought low, but would you rejoice if you own wife,

mother-in-law, sister-in-law published a malicious website with the intent of destroying your reputation? Would you rejoice if all your acquaintances read it and held you in derision? Then let the reader exercise charity.

*If I ... have not charity, I am nothing (1 Cor 13:2).*

### **A TEST OF MOTIVE**

**If the authors of 'debunkingdanielharper' are genuinely endeavouring to be fair, just and objective, let them publish this article on their website in plain sight. Let them also judge every testimonial they receive by the above seven criteria and publish every testimonial which qualifies, regardless of whether it serves their end. Let them insist that each author reveal their identity and the scope of their relationship with me. Let them allow me the privilege (should I wish) to comment on each article - for the principles of justice demand that every man be able to answer their accuser.**