

Redemptive Charges, Captives, and Justice (AHM Blog 0003)

The appeal to the Assemblies of God continued, even under severe mistreatment and great cost. This letter was a genuine attempt, at God's direction, to bring a person I still considered a friend to repentance, before judgment fell. Christ's rules from Matthew 18 were very ingrained in me, and I had chosen to forgive and forget great harm and offense done to me and leave the situation in God's hands. God had to tell me that the purpose of the letter was to wake him up to spare him judgment, to even get me to start writing it. He is unnamed in this letter, as my attempt to follow the scripture in allowing him to be present when accused, when no one would go with me to him to resolve the matter, which Christ says to do. But perhaps, by that means, the story could be more broadly told in God's plan. (I did however give him a copy of the letter.)

More importantly, God wanted to expose sin – and the cost of the wrong doctrine the denomination was still refusing to address. I hoped perhaps exposing the great cost of the mistreatment and rejection of those oppressed by the demonic, and potential great legal liability, would move the leaders to see that it was actually less costly to revise the position paper to what they knew was the truth. This was hoped for rather than to continue what had been produced to quickly address messes in churches a generation ago, using the “hired guns” of scholars used like lawyers to bolster a position they wanted to take, rather than to find the truth from God (an approach many denominations have taken over time). God was concerned about “sheep” he wanted to bring into his flock and heal – the leaders were concerned about themselves. A revival was destroyed by the sins of the leaders, a revival that God had promised would have had great fruit and have drawn people from afar. It also would have restored doing deliverance to the Church. Many revivals have been destroyed by the Church and denominations over time the same way, for the same reasons, and prevented Christ from restoring truths and right practices to his Church. This story is not about just one denomination, it is Christ's plea to his Church, and the denominations that divide it and keep people from the truth, truth much needed in the end times – which we are now in.

And Christ was concerned about justice in his House, the Church. And God warned that those that preside over injustice will themselves be judged – a truth that applies to government as well as the Church. Due process was first taught by God in scripture. American justice, as first conceived, did not come from the founding fathers – it came from God in scripture. I have seen many ministers judged and die in my journey – for specifically disobeying God's rules for justice found in scripture. There is a body count behind me, because I represent Christ judging his Church. But all they saw was a man slandered and gossiped about and judged, unrepresented in the back-room gossip chambers common in the Church. This is because it was easier and less costly for pastors and leaders in the Church to agree with gossip and slander than stand with Christ in scriptural justice. Easier that is, until they face the True Judge on his judgment day, perhaps in this life, or, most certainly, beyond this life.

Rev. Andrew G. Hadden
(Old address deleted)
Springfield, Missouri 65803

May 10, 2010

To: General Superintendent George O. Wood
Southern Missouri District Superintendent Bill R. Baker

RE: Charges against District Official & Setting the Captives Free

Dear Brothers in Christ,

It is with considerable reluctance but in what I believe is obedience to the Lord that I write to you. I write to bring to your attention a situation in which a minister and district official has violated ministerial ethics commonly upheld in secular courts for considerable damages. He has also violated the promulgated practices of the denomination as to how it handles discipline, which is, again, a case that exposes the discipline of the denomination to the review of secular courts and can lead to very significant court-ordered damages. However, my goal is not to seek damages – though I, and another, have experienced severe damage to our reputation, ministry, and finances. I love this dear brother and believe he is indeed called to leadership. I feel the goal of the Lord is that he receive correction and set his conduct aright and continue on in the call on his life.

I feel it is appropriate that I write both the General Superintendent and the District Superintendent because this brother has also had his discipline in this matter appealed to the General Superintendent and overruled by the General Superintendent's designated representative. He then again inserted himself in rebellion against that ruling and forced the same discipline upon me. I believe that his rebellion against authority was based on fear and pride to save face with his congregation. Out of fear and insecurity – intimidation – he acted in a manner that preserved his reputation but destroyed mine. I have born that for over a year and left it in the hands of the Lord until the Lord recently told me to file charges, "For his sake" and "To get his attention." Having faced slander for many years, and being conditioned by the Lord to endure and trust Him, it was not my first inclination to involve myself in this matter and certainly not to bring him harm. I do love this man and prayed many hours for him and his family and church.

Now, so as to not violate the clear commands of scripture (in Deut. 19:15-19, Matt. 18:15-18, II Cor. 13:1, and I Tim 5:19) by allowing accusations out of the mouth of only one witness or not allowing the accused to be present to hear and give answer to the accusations, I would ask a meeting be set up in which we can both be present. Indeed this was violated against me in this matter so I would not expect justice from the Lord if I were to in turn violate it. (And I had intended that he see this letter before you if I could get another to go with me to him to give him a chance to repent. However, I tried previously and could not get someone to go with me and again that effort failed. I initially handed him a letter about these offenses over a year ago but he did not respond appropriately. In fact he responded in a threatening manner such that when I

prayed God told me to "Go" from the church and from the Assemblies of God – and, to his credit, he let me. But God said I could come back to the A/G and has placed the burden of this message upon me again.)

Let me point out that the denomination states that scripture is divinely inspired and is their "authoritative rule for faith and practice." Accordingly, one has every right to expect them to follow their own rules in the matters of accusation and discipline. Additionally, this district official made me a vow that, if accusations came against me there, he would follow the scripture and allow me to face my accusers. He broke that vow. He later tried to say he say his vow was restricted to particular accusations, but no such restriction was stated when the vow was given and I had every right to expect he would keep the scripture and he did not.

However, there is more at stake in this matter, much more. This misconduct was used by the enemy to prevent a revival of setting the captives free that God still purposes to bring. I came to this church for 18 months and God repeatedly spoke of a coming revival of great impact and the leadership accepted it and it began to come. When God spoke of how He wanted to use them to set the captives free, the pastor was excited and accepted that vision before the congregation. This was even when it was presented in a vision described before the congregation as freeing people from the fiery holding area for those waiting to be consigned to hell. Indeed the pastor vowed to the congregation that they were going to follow the Lord and do what He asked in this move of God. And God did move among them. There were open visions after God prophetically declared an open heaven. There were souls brought to salvation at the altars. There was healing. The pastor called me aside and told me I had his ear – because he saw being fulfilled in the service the revival God had prophesied among them. But, when God showed them a "captive" that needed deliverance, he ran scared, intimidated by the fear of man – and your position paper.

Also, I gave you, in my last communication related to these matters (dated March 14 of 2009) what I felt constrained to call a watchman's warning. It was that the enemy would use the unhealed wounds of people, especially wounded women, to bring accusation against good ministers and have them removed – by presenting situations where there was great pressure to violate scripture to "protect" someone. I noted that, unless you put in place bylaws requiring that scripture be followed in receiving accusations, you would lose many good ministers. At this point, my warning would seem to be phony and self-serving, because that is exactly what happened to me in this case.

However, the portion of the letter containing the warning was written before I had any knowledge of any accusations against me or even the potential for them. This situation involves women wounded and abused by men, including a minister, then seeing a situation that was presented (by demonic accusation) as what wounded them – and seeing a person before them that they thought needed protecting at any cost. Their "protection" though, violated the clear commands of scripture as taught in the A/G and violated the free will of an adult woman they sought to protect, but who instead sees herself as greatly damaged by their intrusion into her affairs without even consulting her to see if any wrongdoing was taking place. Indeed, she shortly testified to the district official that nothing improper had taken place. However, even with that testimony and the doctrinal question on deliverance answered in my favor by the

General Superintendent's representative, the district official did not remove all of his discipline or censure, and, to my knowledge, he did not exonerate me by confessing his error to those in his congregation that also attended and supported my ministry. And he had, based on false accusation, maligned my ministry and conduct to them – at least as it has been represented to me.

As to the matter of breach of ethics, which are commonly enforced by the courts, I need to explain. In my last letter I also presented my scriptural basis for remarriage. I followed the process I believed to be proper for a divorced minister in the Assemblies of God to petition leadership for a ruling on the matter. I had given this district official that document and much more, showing that the scripture clearly considers me to have the right to remarry because it clearly classifies the conduct of my former wife as defining her as an unbeliever (per I Cor. 6:9-10) who had departed and divorced a believer – even though she attends church in her unrepentant state. He also knew I had the required witnesses. I received a reply from the General Superintendent that did not dispute my scriptural argument but stated that he did not have enough knowledge of my marriage circumstances to make a ruling. I had already supplied those details to the district official. He had a letter attested to by three witnesses. Therefore, I had done everything that could be expected of me to enter into quiet non-public relationship – even though I would have to wait for official approval before actually getting married. Indeed, God was sending me to that district official to "open my heart" about the relationship when all the accusations I knew nothing about, and was not given an opportunity to hear or answer, resulted in, in my opinion, unscriptural and harsh and abusive discipline.

As I stated previously, the discipline of this district official was overruled by the designated representative of the General Superintendent. When the matter was referred to Dr. Gary Allen, I invited the district official to attend any meeting I set up on the matter. Apparently confident his position would win, he declined and Gary chose to have the meeting via phone since just he and I were involved. However, I took careful notes and had a witness present hearing my side of the conversation. Three times I was told to continue as I was in the deliverance in question. I was also told that the "guardrails of our theology" had to be set wide enough to handle cases like this (when someone we know is a Christian is manifesting demonically). I was also told one could not expect just one incident of deliverance to be necessary (as some tried to force upon me). In short, on any doctrinal questions on which I had been supposedly disciplined, I was totally vindicated.

In the phone conversation, I spoke my understanding of what I was being told and the witness heard me stating it. I then reported the decision on the matter back to the district official and proceeded helping Amber because the District official's order to stop all deliverance had been overruled and the doctrinal question on deliverance settled. I also later gave the district official an account of the conversation with Dr. Allen -- which I provided to him in a letter for him to, in turn, give to one of his parishioners who had accused me. (The parishioner refused to meet with me as the scripture requires and the official did not orchestrate a meeting). While I later gave him a revised letter with less said of the phone call with Gary Allen, I did provide the official with a summary based on my contemporaneous record of the phone call.

The district official then proceeded to breach ministerial ethics by resorting to breach of confidence. Having lost the doctrinal dispute by me being told to continue the deliverance as I

was, he proceeded to try to "protect" the subject of the deliverance by resorting to unethical, unscriptural, and illegal conduct. I went to him as my pastor and opened my heart as the Lord had commanded me. In that setting I had every right, and every legal right to expect confidentiality. I told him the secrets of my heart – that I had fallen in love quite against my plans or will and found that the Lord had arranged it contrary to any expectation on my part. In fact I had expected the Lord to rebuke me when I found that I had feelings for someone. Instead God told the woman involved that He had set it up – contrary to the expectation or intent of either of us. And the woman was the subject of the deliverance.

Now, at this point, he seemed to think I had breached ministerial ethics – but I strongly object. His basis was that this person was, in his view, weak and vulnerable. However, that involves no scripture being broken. The person was not a minor or legally incompetent. Then later, it was argued by some that she was a "counselee." However, this district official had been on my board of my ministry and had previously had my ministry mode of operations thoroughly explained and had accepted that I do not do counseling. Indeed I had previously presented arguments to specifically show that what I do is not counseling and those arguments were accepted by him. What I do is mostly prayer ministry and ministry in the gifts of the Holy Spirit, mostly in a group setting or in front of a shopping center building with a glass front and the blinds open for accountability. Private conversations do occur and private moments of prayer ministry – but they had never been cast by either party as "counseling." When asked for counseling I have always stated that I do not do counseling. Furthermore, I am not a pastor and have little experience as a pastor and do not do "pastoral counseling." In fact, I had had no classes in counseling or even psychology, having tested out of the only class ever required of me as a seminary prerequisite. And, if scripture really is our authoritative basis for faith and practice (and thereby for accusation), no scripture was violated.

Having said that, I believe I have a basis for asserting that I do not do counseling and that the subject in question was not a counselee and having even a court uphold me in that, especially given I have the full support of the supposed counselee in that assertion. In fact, in writing she had characterized the relationship as a friendship before any assertion that it was counseling could have reasonably been made. And she still supports the assertion that nothing improper took place.

In spite of this district official having previously acknowledged that I do not do counseling at my ministry, he then resorted to breach of confidence –to accuse me with the apparent goal being to preserve his standing before those in his congregation, rather than accept correction. Upon hearing that he had lost the doctrinal dispute, and that I was to continue helping the subject, he apparently asserted to Gary Allen that the subject in question was a counselee and that I was in relationship with her. This in effect was accusing me of a breach of ministerial ethics and damaging my reputation in order to attempt to reverse a decision on what had been represented as a doctrinal question and an appeal of his resulting discipline.

This is where abuse of district authority enters the picture. Once the doctrinal question had been won, persistence in the matter to the point of unethical and illegal breach of confidence seems to reveal that the matter was really about interfering with the personal decisions of a minister and an adult woman parishioner as to whom they may marry. Now the prophetic is soundly rebuked

in this denomination for trying to indicate or control whom one may marry. (I am sure I could find official teaching of the denomination to that effect.) Here it appears that we are being asked to accept that others, some or all of them claiming to be prophetic, have the right to control whom a person may marry – and to use the cloak of district or pastoral authority to do so. And it appears we are being asked to now justify such control to the point of accepting accusations unscripturally, destroying the reputation of a minister previously highly esteemed with all concerned, and committing unethical and even illegal acts.

As to the vulnerability of the subject, let me share a few facts. She is the daughter of a Baptist minister, a counseling pastor. She is the graduate of one of their Christian universities with high grades. She has several years of work experience and ministry experience with youth. And she is not a victim but a survivor of occult abuse beyond what most would accept as possible in this country and time. In essence she has the strength of one who carried a ten thousand pound weight for ten years and now by the grace of God and the power of Christ conquered all the demonic attack the enemy could bring to bear upon her. She walks confidently in the power and love of the Lord and His gifts. She has given her testimony before a congregation and ministered in the gifts with the approval of pastors and the acceptance of the congregations. And she has, unfortunately, also graciously endured a firestorm of criticism of well-meaning but much less than loving people who have believed the slander against her and her chosen future mate. Instead of protecting her from this firestorm and protecting her from the demonic that still needed to be dealt with, her pastor and district leader protected himself from the criticism of well-meaning but wounded and misguided people on his staff and in his congregation. She also, has cause for action in the eyes of some, for abuse and defamation in the Church.

There is further potential misconduct and liability in this matter. It has been reported to me that this district official met with a woman who decided to do an "investigation" on me and report it to others. This person was a friend of Amber's family previously involved in the occult who does investigations of abuse of children – using a very unscriptural approach in which the accused never gets to face their accusers or know who accused them. She applied that approach to investigating me and reported her "findings" back to Amber's family and others. Among the information she shared were other things I had shared in strictest confidence with this district official – but which he had judged in my favor and for which he did not invoke any discipline. I did admit I spoke something many years ago that was wrong, but that was beyond the district's statute of limitations for discipline. I had made myself fully accountable in those matters, voluntarily and confidentially and received no censure. But later this official, out of fear of parishioners based on false accusations against me I never got to properly confront and give answer to, decided to go back to that matter and re-judge me and discipline me. In effect, when it became convenient, I was tried and judged twice for the same crime with no further accusations or evidence in those matters. I can willingly give account of these matters.

This person doing the investigation also shared information with others that was unquestionably false and slanderous and greatly damaging to myself and to Amber. I tried to meet with this woman politely and courteously to get her to follow the scripture and allow me to hear and give answer to the accusations and she angrily demanded I leave her home immediately. She then met with Amber to share her accusations and attempt to alienate her affections from me. This woman had gathered testimony from people she claimed were witnesses but not one of them was

actually a witness to any of what was reported to Amber and passed back to me. Rather than witnesses they were friends of my ex-wife that had little personal contact with me and neither saw nor heard anything of which I am commonly accused. They were simply reporting hearsay – the testimony of one accuser repeated through her friends. And this person, and the participation of this district official, demonstrated an agenda of manipulation and control – to control Amber's personal decisions. Amber warned this person what they were doing was digging up dirt and spreading it and that God had warned through a famous formerly A/G minister from Australia that He was going to deal severely with gossip and slander in the Church, He was going to judge it.

Let me say that the root of this is slander. Amber confronted it in a dearly beloved friend, an older woman with many unhealed wounds. Her husband was wounded by a minister and felt rejected by him. He then asked me to be his friend and I tried to offer him what I could but he apparently felt rejected by me also. Then a situation arose where a number of us were sitting at a table and I joked around with Amber in a way that had a previous context he did not know about – returning good natured jesting she had dished out previously. He, because of his prior context of experience, decided I was thinking pornographic thoughts about Amber. No one else at the table did, least of all Amber. I later had opportunity to talk to him discreetly and bring up the matter after he accused me to Amber. I assured him I was thinking no such thoughts. I indicated the religious spirit was involved – making accusations and judging unscripturally much as the Pharisees did with Christ, who did not sin but was accused none the less, based on rules beyond scripture.

But the matter did not end there. His wife lived a rough life of sin for many years and her four daughters ended up unsaved with many wounds from men. Indeed she had many wounds from men. She then took up the "defense" of Amber based on the assumption that she, not even a witness to the events, knew my thoughts to be pornographic. Then she set out to "protect" another young woman attending my ministry. (Again a woman deeply wounded by men and unhealed.) Then this young woman, to "protect" Amber, spread about her now great fears for Amber – because at this point Amber was spending more time with me because she was considering marrying me. (Apparently some of the accusation was based on how I supposedly looked at Amber, but once you decide you know someone's thoughts and they are evil, you interpret all their actions evilly. Others present, not subjected to the slander, saw no evil in my looks.)

Then, they went to an associate pastor's wife, again a woman with many unhealed wounds from a former abusive husband. The associate then apparently decided a doctrinal argument was needed to keep me from using deliverance as a means to take advantage, so a case was apparently made that deliverance should only occur once, based on a poor hermeneutic applied to one passage (and immediately thrown out by the General Superintendent's representative). Then apparently the delegation ended up communicating to the pastor and the judgment ensued with me not even being given the opportunity to hear the accusations or give a defense.

I should add that previous to this the pastor/district official had accepted the validity of the occult ritual abuse Amber had gone through, and the deliverance, and held a funeral-like remembrance service for her unborn children, conceived by brutal rape and forcibly aborted and slain by occult

practitioners. He had also been informed along the way by me of the deliverance that was going on and accepted it. He even spoke in front of others of me as being ahead of my time regarding my work in her deliverance and healing.

But the firestorm of false accusation changed all that, deeply hurting Amber. She was then treated by this official as thoroughly psychologically impaired and spiritually deceived and he stated that something had happened to her (but not the ritual abuse and deliverance). But in time the aforementioned person saved out of the occult (and doing social work and serving as an expert witness in ritual abuse cases in court) actually convinced Amber's family she had indeed gone through occult ritual abuse. She provided books, including one by a clinical psychiatrist who is a noted expert in the field. I summarized these books and sent the summaries to the district official and others proving the validity of traumatic/dissociative amnesia and memories surfacing years later, the way they surfaced (abreaction), the types of things she remembered (standard cult practices she knew nothing of), everything. But this official never humbled himself and admitted he was wrong.

Now I will admit that, when I went to this official to "open my heart" about God leading Amber and I toward marriage, I was caught off guard by the firestorm I immediately faced and overreacted. I reacted pridefully and felt embattled and raised my voice a bit. I did not yell but I am known for a voice that projects when I am making a point – something I developed from leading many large meetings on projects as a department head at A/G Headquarters for 12 years. I meant to convey that I had studied deliverance for many years and read and talked to some of the leading experts in the field and that the associate that argued that deliverance should only occur once was a complete novice in the debate. Instead I said he would not last three minutes in a debate on deliverance. I, in fairly short order, apologized to the official and confessed the pride in me the interaction had exposed. And I submitted to his censure of my ministry and any contact with Amber. Once he had met with Amber and she had assured him there had been nothing improper on my part, I understood his censure of contact with her was removed. But he still prevented any further deliverance on Amber, even though she was manifesting demonically and quite evidently suffering, and I complied until the General Superintendent's representative overruled his discipline. Then I had a short interval where being able to take authority over the enemy brought her great relief that lasted. Indeed we apparently dealt with about the last of any demons.

Then the district official called to say that I was again under his restriction against doing any deliverance on Amber. He told me he had called the General Council official and told him about my being engaged/in a relationship with Amber. I was stunned at his breach of confidence to win what was supposedly a doctrinal question. He also tried to say that the General Council official, Gary Allen, had told me to take Amber immediately to a psychologist. I told him that is not what the official had said. Gary Allen had mentioned some psychologists I could refer her to at my option but three times in the conversation told me to continue ministering deliverance as I was as long as she was making progress, which she was. The district official then said he would set up a meeting with Gary Allen to resolve the matter but he never contacted me with any meeting arrangements.

All this followed immediately after I communicated to one of his parishioners what the General Council official had said and that I had basically won the doctrinal question and the discipline on me had been overruled on appeal by the General superintendent's representative in the matter. (This parishioner was a regular attendee at my ministry and one whom I had asked to consider being on my board so I had reason to report the matter). Indeed, Gary Allen had made statements that indicated he knew he was overruling the District official in the matter. Again, this has the appearance of a district official being intimidated by fear of his congregation and acting to save his favor before his congregation rather than following the scripture or the bylaws or the authority of his superiors in the denomination.

Forgive me for quoting your own legal expert to you, but it is helpful in this case to give quicker understanding to the seriousness of this case. Richard Hammar in *Pastor, Church, and Law, Third Edition* in section 3-08.09 on page 130, states: "Clergy can be held liable for disclosing communications shared with them in confidence to others without the permission of the counselee." On page 131 he states: "Be sure to distinguish between the concepts of privilege and confidentiality. The clergy-penitent privilege provides that clergy cannot be compelled to disclose in court the content of communications shared with them in confidence while acting as a spiritual advisor. The related concept of confidentiality imposes upon clergy a duty not to disclose to others any communications shared with them in confidence." Then on page 132 he states: **"Clergy who disclose confidential information shared with them in counseling sessions may be exposing themselves, as well as their church, to legal liability on basis of malpractice, invasion of privacy, breach of fiduciary duty, and infliction of emotional distress. This conclusion may apply even when clergy share confidential information in order to discipline a member for violating church standards."**

I make reference to these quotes because this district official made statements that seemed to indicate he felt he had no risk of liability in this matter, and that indicate, upon legal research, that he perhaps confused these two concepts, and the circumstances under which the confidences were shared. I shared the privileged communication with him alone in his office, with the door closed, during normal office hours, having made an appointment to talk to him as my pastor for spiritual counsel. I started the session by indicating that God had told me, "open your heart" to him and I was obeying. I had every expectation that the communication was privileged and confidential. He was the only person I had told. I was shocked and appalled when he, with a combative and flagrant attitude, told me over the phone that he had shared this confidential information, obviously in order to sway a headquarters official's ruling back in his favor – when the matter in question had been presented as doctrinal in nature. I saw him as resorting to unethical and illegal conduct to win back the control of a discipline appeal, having been overruled by the designated representative of the General Superintendent, Gary Allen.

But there is more at stake here. Amber was treated abusively, before a witness, by a staff member of this church. (And Amber lovingly confronted this staff member later, following Matthew 18.) She was judged by another staff member to not have enough faith that she belonged to Jesus because she manifested demonically when I was not allowed to minister deliverance. But they refused to minister deliverance when it was needed, because your doctrine tells them it is impossible for a Christian to need deliverance -- and they fear they will lose their credentials if they conclude that. So, what you have is people seeing evidence of a Christian

with a demon and needing it cast out and they refuse to take authority over the enemy and instead blame the wounded lamb of the flock for being in the mouth of a roaring lion seeking to devour. In essence, instead of beating the wolf attacking a sheep in the flock of God they beat the sheep. The theological equivalent would be to rail at a sick person because healing is in the atonement and if they just had faith they would be healed. Then this official added defamation to the case by saying she needed to be taken immediately to a psychologist. So then Amber gets treated as if she is insane – causing great emotional distress. This is spiritual abuse directly resulting from a denominational doctrine denominational leaders readily admit was a "reaction" or focused us on "a rabbit trail" instead of setting the captives free. So, for denominational reputation and unwillingness to correct what they know and admit privately is wrong (let's be honest before the Lord please) they are willing to let wounded sheep in the flock of God suffer. How many are going to hell for the pride of a denomination because they seek help and instead find abuse out of ignorance and self-protectiveness?

Please allow me to add some account of personal damage and sacrifice due to these matters. Because of unscriptural actions, and lack of scripturally commanded ones, many consequences have come upon me. Most of my donors have been driven away by the mishandling of these matters by this official and his superiors in the denomination (at least by their inaction). One key donor this official deliberately drove away, saying that once a ministry does deliverance that is all they do. (I don't believe the deliverance team from the Brownsville revival would agree.) A weekly prayer meeting was started at the home of the pastor's pastoral staff member specifically inviting people that had been attending my ministry and held on a night they would likely come to my ministry. My own son, who had readily stated emphatically of the slander I have faced from his mother, "She did slander you," has backed away to my great harm and emotional distress. He cited this district official's actions/discipline as a key factor in his decision. By not bringing scripturally required judgment to bear, to put my ex-wife out of the church per I Cor. 5, when the required witnesses for slander were there, this official may well have cost my former wife her soul. This may seem harsh, but First Corinthians 6 clearly states a slanderer will not inherit the kingdom of God – so even though she attends church she is not saved.

By lack of action, scripturally required, or promised, I have been damaged as well. This official promised to set up a meeting with a pastor of a non-Assemblies church where I was greatly damaged, to clear my name. He promised to be diligent to make sure it happened but he did not fulfill his promise. He promised he would read my testimony of the matters with my former wife included in the book I have written, but, to my knowledge, he never did and it affected his later judgment of me. And he had power to clear my name of the slander of my former wife and force scriptural judgement of the matter in the churches she attends or attended but never did as the scripture required. And I asked you leaders, in my last letter, for justice in the slander I have faced for many years and you have done nothing for more than a year. Indeed you seemingly ignored it. God has said He would defend me, but He seems to be the only one interested in relief for those facing injustice. Judgement in the Church may be unpopular, but relief for the oppressed is popular and it is the inseparable other side of the coin – and the agenda of God in much of scripture. Indeed failure to judge drives out the righteous oppressed and wounded and keeps the strong oppressors and wounding in control of the churches to forever drive off the weak and frail seekers and new converts. (And God says He will judge this – see Ezekiel 34).

Furthermore, I have been homeless for around a year, sleeping on the floor on a camping pad on the thirty-year-old carpet in the conference room of my ministry much of that time and driving elsewhere to take showers. I no longer have a car but share one with another by paying expenses. I have sold many valuable personal possessions at a loss to pay my bills and the ministry's bills when necessary. I have eaten countless meals of Wal-Mart's cheapest hot dogs or cheapest dried Ramen noodle soup. But I persist at the Lord's command and He has supplied enough to keep going, by one means or another. And Amber has endured similarly, sharing a cheap one-bedroom apartment and sleeping in the living room of a lady friend and eating food similar to mine. Today I am down to nothing in my wallet and twenty cents in my bank account. So it seems I must act, though reluctantly, to bring these matters to justice.

God has spoken to Amber to write a book about her testimony. It is now in progress. I would hope her account says that you saw the light the Lord was sending her and her story to you to see. I would hope you act to bring justice and to set the captives free.

In the name of Christ,

Rev. Andrew G. Hadden