

Post 1 – From Harding to a forum member

2/3/2007 8:43 pm

From: **RonHarding**

To: [REDACTED]

Well, my take on kipmckean.org is that I am intimately involved with it. Yes, Kip is involved in what the site says. How could he not be? If someone put up a website falsely representing you to smear your name, wouldn't you want to put something up to counter it? Everyone talks about how aggressive he is and how he promotes himself. If he was so interested in putting up a monument, why didn't he put up Kip McKean when it became obvious that so many were looking to the internet for their research?

See no one has a problem with Jennifer Chambers putting up kipmckean.com because it's in their interest to have only one side of the story. So, we put up the other side of the story. It's not an electronic monument as you say. But, I can't look down on you for your perspective. You've had experiences which have led you to feel the way that you feel. I will say off the top of my head that you could most likely equate the City of David and Solomon's temple to all of this.

My question to you would be as follows: Do you hold the same opinions of Douglas Jacoby (<http://www.douglasjacoby.com/>) or Marty Wooten when his site was up?

I hope that answers your question.

Post 2 – From Chambers to Harding

2/4/2007 12:24 pm

From: **WildJen**

To: **RonHarding**

>>>>Yes, Kip is involved in what the site says. How could he not be? If someone put up a website falsely representing you to smear your name, wouldn't you want to put something up to counter it? <<<<<<

>>>>See no one has a problem with Jennifer Chambers putting up kipmckean.com because it's in their interest to have only one side of the story. So, we put up the other side of the story. <<<<<<

Hey Ron - just wondering 2 things from your comments.

#1 - you claim that the kipmckean.com website is falsely representing Kip and that it is smearing his name.... How so?

#2 - you said that the .com website has only one side of the story. How do you figure that?

Post 3 – Harding responds to Chambers

2/4/2007 9:47 pm

From: **RonHarding**

To: **WildJen**

Come on now Jen.

Jen, you're a smart cookie. Don't act all innocent about it. You're not an enemy that anyone would want. I credit you with that. But, trust me, you would rather have me in your corner if it were at all possible.

1. The first presentation of the site leads people to believe that this is Kip's site. You use the draw of people thinking they're going to see his site to get them there. Then the subtle smearing begins. Yes, you post his articles and sermons and mostly just put content. But, the site is riddled with little comments that are intended to smear
2. If you were trying to present an unbiased view, your resources page would look a whole lot different.

For a complete list of the letters and other articles regarding Kip and his divisiveness...

Why are so many members leaving the movement?....

You know just as well as I do that these aren't the comment that are presenting an unbiased view

Post 4 - Chambers responds to Harding

2/5/2007 6:13 am

From: **WildJen**

To: **RonHarding**

I never claimed that I'm not biased. I most certainly have opinions and viewpoints, having been in Kip's movement for 14 years.

I was just asking you why you thought the .com website wasn't presenting a legitimate point of view.

Post 5 - Chambers responds to Harding

2/5/2007 6:21 am

From: **WildJen**

To: **RonHarding**

>>>>>But, trust me, you would rather have me in your corner if it were at all possible.<<<<<

Forgot in my last response to ask you what the heck does this mean?