



Printable Version of Topic

[Click here to view this topic in its original format](#)

BlackSDA _ 3ABN _ Letter From Mike Bisson

Posted by: Lee Mar 2 2007, 10:04 PM

Below is a letter that has been put on the save3abn link. What Bob doesn't say is that Mr. Bisson lives in the same area as Gailon Joy and they probably attend the same church. I think it might be safe to say that possibly Gailon asked Mr. Bisson to write something to help him out. Can't you do any better than this Pickle?

Mike Bisson Says, "This Is a Very Reasonable Request"
< Prev.

Mike Bisson is a retired Commercial Property Casualty Agent. He has been a Seventh-day Adventist for 32 years, and is a member of the Sterling, Massachusetts, Church. He is one of the adult Sabbath School teachers and leads out in the Wednesday night prayer meeting. He has a number of Bible studies going at the Sterling church, and assists the pastor where needed.

Around mid-January 2007 Mike had the special privilege of watching his pastor, Nahor Muchiutti, baptize seven people that the two of them had had Bible studies with. They are studying with about that many more as of the time of the writing of his letter below.

From: [Mike Bisson]
To: [G. Arthur Joy]
Subject:
Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2007 13:14:56 +0000

Dear Gailon,

I am in receipt of your letter from Linda Shelton requesting that proof regarding her unfaithfulness to Danny Shelton be forthcoming. After reviewing her letter and discussing it with a number of friends and supporters of 3ABN we all came to the same conclusion. When Danny Shelton divorced Linda he took away her marriage, her occupation and her reputation, (most people have a very hard time handling any one of these being taken from them). She is only asking that the so-called proof of her adultery be shown. We think that this is a very reasonable request. I cannot imagine any honest Christian supporting Danny or 3ABN until this is done in the way she has requested. It is my opinion that this basic fairness of her request will resonant with the Adventist community. If I can be of any help in this matter, please let me know.

God Bless,

Mike

Posted by: wwjd Mar 2 2007, 10:08 PM

[quote name='Lee' date='Mar 2 2007, 10:04 PM' post='181834']

Below is a letter that has been put on the save3abn link. What Bob doesn't say is that Mr. Bisson lives in the same area as Gailon Joy and they probably attend the same church. I think it might be safe to say that possibly Gailon asked Mr. Bisson to write something to help him out. Can't you do

any better than this Pickle?

The pickle/joy team strikes out, yet again. Once again, no validity, doesn't hold water, and trickery.
same ole same ole

Posted by: Brenda Mar 2 2007, 10:15 PM

I am only an observer here - but I fail to see how an expressed opinion that Linda's desire to have the evidence against her out in the open, is reasonable, qualifies as "trickery". Whether or not the author knows/is an associate of Arthur Gailon Joy does not seem to matter in this instance. He has the right to express an opinion and support Linda's request. He is not claiming to be bringing in new information.

WWJD, I do not think your comments on this letter do a single thing to further your cause or add to your credibility - but of course that is just my opinion.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 2 2007, 10:18 PM

wwjd,
You are great at making calls. Perhaps you should give Brother Bisson a call and verify if Lee's and your conclusion is accurate.

Mike Bisson sounds like a devout Christian SDA, actively involved in bringing souls to Jesus. Why would you cast such aspersions on a man you only surmise as being party to trickery.

Sorry folks, this seems rather mean-spirited on your part.

Posted by: Lee Mar 2 2007, 10:24 PM

PB I was not "casting aspersions" on Mr. Bisson at all. Perhaps you might want to read what I wrote again. I was writing to Pickle who published this letter. I don't know Mr. Bisson so I cannot say whether he is a good man or not.

Posted by: wwjd Mar 2 2007, 10:25 PM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 2 2007, 10:18 PM)

wwjd,
You are great at making calls. Perhaps you should give Brother Bisson a call and verify if Lee's and your conclusion is accurate.

Mike Bisson sounds like a devout Christian SDA, actively involved in bringing souls to Jesus. Why would you cast such aspersions on a man you only surmise as being party to trickery.

Sorry folks, this seems rather mean-spirited on your part.

Sorry PB, you came to the wrong conclusion. We are not claiming anything against Mike, we don't know him. We are talking about the pickle/joy team and their trickery, because we do know them.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 2 2007, 10:42 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 2 2007, 09:24 PM) □

PB I was not "casting aspersions" on Mr. Bisson at all. Perhaps you might want to read what I wrote again. I was writing to Pickle who published this letter. I don't know Mr. Bisson so I cannot say whether he is a good man or not.

Well, Lee, read your post again because you certainly inferred a slap at the character of Mr. Bisson.

Lee said:

QUOTE

Below is a letter that has been put on the save3abn link. What Bob doesn't say is that Mr. Bisson lives in the same area as Gailon Joy and they probably attend the same church. **I think it might be safe to say that possibly Gailon asked Mr. Bisson to write something to help him out.** Can't you do any better than this Pickle?

Here we have a letter from Mike Bisson who has been described as a wonderful, active Christian man. You then suggest that Mr. Bisson wrote the letter to "help out" a possible fellow local church member (Gailon) which in my mind casts aspersions on the character of Mr. Bisson. Could he not have meant exactly what he said in the letter?

wwjd said:

QUOTE

The pickle/joy team strikes out, yet again. **Once again, no validity, doesn't hold water, and trickery.**
same ole same ole

You are charging that Brother Bisson's letter has no validity, doesn't hold water and is nothing more than trickery by the pickle/joy team. That, my brother, is casting aspersions on Mr. Bisson IMHO!

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 2 2007, 10:48 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 2 2007, 11:24 PM) □

PB I was not "casting aspersions" on Mr. Bisson at all. Perhaps you might want to read what I wrote again. I was writing to Pickle who published this letter. I don't know Mr. Bisson so I cannot say whether he is a good man or not.

You called his letter 'trickery' on the part of Gailon Joy; if you believe that then you have to believe that he was part of the conspiracy to trick and deceive and writing the letter was his part in it.

You cant call Gailon a liar without calling Mr. Bisson one too... and if you intend to do that, you need to be able to prove the letter a lie.

Do you have any evidence that refutes what is claimed in that post?

Speak now or forever hold your peace... but you are standing on the threshold of bearing false witness here... and the watchers and holy ones of God are taking notes...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Noahswife Mar 2 2007, 10:50 PM

I am not sure what the point here is. I have read several places that G. Joy lives in Sterling, MA and the letter says Bisson is from Sterling, MA. No big deal. I see no attempt at deception. Logic says they probably go to the same church. And if not, another church is not that far away.

Here is the link to the Save3abn site and the letter from the law firm to G.Joy.....his address is noted there.....for all to see if you just look.

<http://www.save3abn.com/danny-shelton-corruption-litigation-gerald-duffy-01.htm>

NW
C"i"

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 2 2007, 10:52 PM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Mar 2 2007, 11:25 PM) □

Sorry PB, you came to the wrong conclusion. We are not claiming anything against Mike, we don't know him. We are talking about the pickle/joy team and their trickery, because we do know them.

not only do you not comprehend what others say; you now don't even comprehend what you are saying out of your own mouth...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 2 2007, 10:57 PM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Mar 2 2007, 08:25 PM) □

Sorry PB, you came to the wrong conclusion. We are not claiming anything against Mike, we don't know him. We are talking about the pickle/joy team and their trickery, **because we do know them.**

No, you do not know them.
Neither do you know what you are talking about.

Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 3 2007, 09:48 AM

You think two people going to the same church is of some significance and yet two of the Dannyscribes (wwjd and bystander) use the same computer? I'm not sure if I should or Maybe laugh until I cry.

Richard

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 2 2007, 11:04 PM)

Below is a letter that has been put on the save3abn link. What Bob doesn't say is that Mr. Bisson lives in the same area as Gailon Joy and they probably attend the same church. I think it might be safe to say that possibly Gailon asked Mr. Bisson to write something to help him out. Can't you do any better than this Pickle?

Mike Bisson Says, "This Is a Very Reasonable Request"
< Prev.

Mike Bisson is a retired Commercial Property Casualty Agent. He has been a Seventh-day Adventist for 32 years, and is a member of the Sterling, Massachusetts, Church. He is one of the adult Sabbath School teachers and leads out in the Wednesday night prayer meeting. He has a number of Bible studies going at the Sterling church, and assists the pastor where needed.

Around mid-January 2007 Mike had the special privilege of watching his pastor, Nahor Muchiutti, baptize seven people that the two of them had had Bible studies with. They are studying with about that many more as of the time of the writing of his letter below.

From: [Mike Bisson]
To: [G. Arthur Joy]
Subject:
Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2007 13:14:56 +0000
Dear Gailon,

I am in receipt of your letter from Linda Shelton requesting that proof regarding her unfaithfulness to Danny Shelton be forthcoming. After reviewing her letter and discussing it with a number of friends and supporters of 3ABN we all came to the same conclusion. When Danny Shelton divorced Linda he took away her marriage, her occupation and her reputation, (most people have a very hard time handling any one of these being taken from them). She is only asking that the so-called proof of her adultery be shown. We think that this is a very reasonable request. I cannot imagine any honest Christian supporting Danny or 3ABN until this is done in the way she has requested. It is my opinion that this basic fairness of her request will resonant with the Adventist community. If I can be of any help in this matter, please let me know.


God Bless,

Mike

Posted by: Lee Mar 3 2007, 10:26 AM

Wow--I'm amazed and shocked here! I didn't know members here could read my mind--what is that called? Clairvoyance or something close to that!!

I find that very funny indeed!




Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 3 2007, 10:40 AM

And this is in regard to what?

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 3 2007, 11:26 AM)

Wow--I'm amazed and shocked here! I didn't know members here could read my mind--what is that called? Clairvoyance or something close to that!!

I find that very funny indeed!



Posted by: Lee Mar 3 2007, 10:44 AM

Well, if you don't know Richard, I'm not going to tell you.

Perhaps reading over the posts again might help you.

Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 3 2007, 11:08 AM

Mature answer. Thanks.

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 3 2007, 11:44 AM)

Well, if you don't know Richard, I'm not going to tell you.

Perhaps reading over the posts again might help you.

Posted by: Pickle Mar 3 2007, 09:34 PM

Hmm.

Lee and WWJD, would you say that user name Joe Smith was being deceptive when he posted under the user name Task Force?

In that particular case we're not talking about living in the same city or using the same computer. We're talking about being the very same person.

Posted by: Fran Mar 4 2007, 12:37 AM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 3 2007, 09:34 PM)

Hmm.

Lee and WWJD, would you say that user name Joe Smith was being deceptive when he posted under the user name Task Force?

In that particular case we're not talking about living in the same city or using the same computer. We're talking about being the very same person.

They are not the only ones that do that! It happens all the time, unfortunately. They even carry on conversations with themselves.

Posted by: wwjd Mar 4 2007, 02:12 AM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 3 2007, 09:34 PM)

Hmm.

Lee and WWJD, would you say that user name Joe Smith was being deceptive when he posted under the user name Task Force?

In that particular case we're not talking about living in the same city or using the same computer. We're talking about being the very same person.

Obviously you are on a completely different train of thought. Your post has nothing to do with what Lee and I were saying.

Posted by: Pickle Mar 4 2007, 09:09 AM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Mar 4 2007, 02:12 AM)

Obviously you are on a completely different train of thought. Your post has nothing to do with what Lee and I were saying.

No, I think it is a related topic. You two want to quibble over where Gailon and Mike live, and are

putting a lot of significance into the fact that they happen to be from the same locality.

In the case of Joe Smith and Task Force, we have two user names that belong to the same individual. Now if Gailon and Mike being from the same locality means anything, Joe Smith and Task Force being the same individual means even more.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 4 2007, 09:11 AM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 4 2007, 09:09 AM)

No, I think it is a related topic. You two want to quibble over where Gailon and Mike live, and are putting a lot of significance into the fact that they happen to be from the same locality.

In the case of Joe Smith and Task Force, we have two user names that belong to the same individual. Now if Gailon and Mike being from the same locality means anything, Joe Smith and Task Force being the same individual means even more.

No it still doesn't make sense. That is apples and oranges. BTW How do you know that Joe and Task were the same?

Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 4 2007, 09:19 AM

I just don't understand the issue, after all wwjd and bystander post from the same computer, even in the middle of the night, which indicates to me they are living together. (Or yes they could be sharing a work computer and work 3rd shift) Are we to accuse them of collaborating?

Richard

Posted by: Pickle Mar 4 2007, 01:42 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 4 2007, 09:11 AM)

No it still doesn't make sense. That is apples and oranges. BTW How do you know that Joe and Task were the same?

Good question. But let me ask you, did you already know they were before I said anything?

Posted by: Bystander Mar 4 2007, 02:27 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 4 2007, 01:42 PM)

Good question. But let me ask you, did you already know they were before I said anything?

Why would I. They didn't sound alike and I don't have any means of tracing IP's so the question would be, do you? And is that how you came to your conclusion? If not. Are you just planting innuendo again?

Posted by: Pickle Mar 4 2007, 02:40 PM

Why would you? Well, if you are Danny, you should know.

Or if you are so well connected and such an integral part of his damage causing damage control system, then you should also know.

Even without being able to trace IP's.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 4 2007, 03:25 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 4 2007, 02:40 PM)

Why would you? Well, if you are Danny, you should know.

Or if you are so well connected and such an integral part of his damage causing damage control system, then you should also know.

Even without being able to trace IP's.

I'm not DS and not a part of his 'damage" control. I am standing up for what I believe is Truth and I am standing against what I believe to be, a shameful misrepresentation of 3abn and the parties involved.

I will not be distracted. You did not answer my questions and have brought up another one. You say If I am Danny control I should know that joe and task are the same. This says that you know who they are, does it not? So you are saying they are the same person and you know who that person is. All I want to know is how do you know this? Is it a fact or are you just guessing. If you know it as a fact, then there has to be a way that you "know" it. What is it?

Posted by: Johann Mar 4 2007, 03:36 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 4 2007, 11:25 PM)

I'm not DS and not a part of his 'damage" control. I am standing up for what I believe is Truth and I am standing against what I believe to be, a shameful misrepresentation of 3abn and the parties involved.

I will not be distracted. You did not answer my questions and have brought up another one. You say If I am Danny control I should know that joe and task are the same. This says that you know who they are, does it not? So you are saying they are the same person and you know who that person is. All I want to know is how do you know this? Is it a fact or are you just guessing. If you know it as a fact, then there has to be a way that you "know" it. What is it?

About time you start telling the truth, then, isn't it?

Posted by: Pickle Mar 4 2007, 05:20 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 4 2007, 03:25 PM)

If you know it as a fact, then there has to be a way that you "know" it. What is it?

That's a question I'm not going to answer. You've chosen to not answer some, and I've chosen not to answer some.

Of course, we could possibly negotiate a trade.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 4 2007, 08:44 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 4 2007, 05:20 PM)

That's a question I'm not going to answer. You've chosen to not answer some, and I've chosen not to answer some.

Of course, we could possibly negotiate a trade.

?

Negotiate? You have to be kidding.... What is the old saying about "not making deals with the devil"? There is only one way that I know of that you would know if Joe and Task were the same person. Is that what you have resorted to now? tracing down people's IP's. Well, if so, just another example of underhanded, deceitful behavior. At least you're consistent.

Posted by: Pickle Mar 4 2007, 09:08 PM

Underhanded, deceitful behavior? Nope, I haven't engaged in that at all.

But I can't make the same claim about you. Remember when you posted as if you were one person, and then had to go back and edit it, but folks caught screen shots of both versions?

And I think you were the one who tried to justify not telling employees that a convicted sex offender worked at 3ABN. And tried to say that a girl under 18 is not a child. Right?

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 4 2007, 09:16 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 4 2007, 11:08 PM)

Underhanded, deceitful behavior? Nope, I haven't engaged in that at all.

This is said tongue in cheek right . . . you can't possible be expecting those of us who have experienced your methods to believe this right? Now, for those who are unaware of how you gather information this might work . . . but those of us who know you Bob, don't buy this for a minute!

- FHB

Posted by: Pickle Mar 4 2007, 09:25 PM

Naw, those who know me will vouch for the accuracy of my statement.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 4 2007, 09:29 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 4 2007, 09:08 PM)

Underhanded, deceitful behavior? Nope, I haven't engaged in that at all.

But I can't make the same claim about you. Remember when you posted as if you were one person, and then had to go back and edit it, but folks caught screen shots of both versions?

And I think you were the one who tried to justify not telling employees that a convicted sex offender worked at 3ABN. And tried to say that a girl under 18 is not a child. Right?

Wrong, another Pickle spin that actually leaves me "cold as a cucumber." (sorry I couldn't resist) You are a day late and a dollar short on the posts. Calvin explained it all a few days ago verifying the facts and telling those that were saying otherwise, that they were wrong. So, catch up. As far as the 18 year old girl, my post went into much detail about a particular situation. You picked out a couple of words and left out all the rest. That paints a different picture. I think that would fall under underhanded and deceitful.....

Posted by: Lee Mar 4 2007, 09:32 PM

Pickle--Calvin explained in a post to everyone that wwjd and Bystander are using the same computer. Umm, really, my husband and son use my computer....it really is okay Pickle and not deceptive at all.

But don't take my word for it. Go ask Calvin!

Those that know you will vouch for the accuracy of what you say? Why? because you told them to???

Posted by: Bystander Mar 4 2007, 09:38 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 4 2007, 09:32 PM)

Pickle--Calvin explained in a post to everyone that wwjd and Bystander are using the same computer. Umm, really, my husband and son use my computer....it really is okay Pickle and not deceptive at all.

But don't take my word for it. Go ask Calvin!

Those that know you will vouch for the accuracy of what you say? Why? because you told them to???

Probably not because he "told them to" but because those that know him are, shall we say, cut from the same cloth.

Posted by: Pickle Mar 4 2007, 10:06 PM

Lee and Bystander,

I do not recall Calvin explaining anything about why Bystander wrote as if they he was WWJD (or vice versa), and then editing it to correct that. Please provide a link to where Calvin explained why Bystander/WWJD wrote as if they were the other person.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Mar 4 2007, 10:23 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 4 2007, 09:29 PM)

another Pickle spin that actually leaves me "cold as a cucumber."

That's no longer possible.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 4 2007, 10:27 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 5 2007, 12:06 AM)

Lee and Bystander,

I do not recall Calvin explaining anything about why Bystander wrote as if they he was WWJD (or vice versa), and then editing it to correct that. Please provide a link to where Calvin explained why Bystander/WWJD wrote as if they were the other person.

3ob,

Here is a search function which will help you in this endeavor. Why don't you use it, or ask for help as here are a plethora (that ones for you Franny) of individuals who can help you through this. Do your own leg work - or do you need that time to be writing content for Gailon's web site?

Calvin cleared the issue when he reissued WWJD and Bystander's posting privileges.

FHB

Posted by: Panama_Pete Mar 4 2007, 10:30 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 4 2007, 09:32 PM)

Calvin explained in a post to everyone that wwjd and Bystander are using the same computer.

And if so, they're playing musical chairs at that computer -- all night long from dusk to dawn.

Between the two of them, they're blowing enough hot air to operate one of Garwin's windmills: WWJD and Bystander could power an entire city all night long.

 rofl

Posted by: Pickle Mar 4 2007, 10:30 PM

I guess I'm saying I think you guys are mistaken.

I think Calvin gave them/him back their/his posting privileges before he posted as if he was the other, and then went back and fixed it.

Posted by: Johann Mar 4 2007, 10:31 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 5 2007, 06:06 AM)

Lee and Bystander,

I do not recall Calvin explaining anything about why Bystander wrote as if they he was WWJD (or vice versa), and then editing it to correct that. Please provide a link to where Calvin explained why Bystander/WWJD wrote as if they were the other person.

Some time back either Bystander or wwjd explained that the computer had been logged into the wrong name by mistake. It seemed to them quite natural to make such mistakes. Being them I am not surprised.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 4 2007, 10:33 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 5 2007, 12:30 AM)

I guess I'm saying I think you guys are mistaken.

I think Calvin gave them/him back their/his posting privileges before he posted as if he was the other, and then went back and fixed it.

Bob,

Search function! Try it.

- FHB

Posted by: Pickle Mar 4 2007, 10:34 PM

So you're saying that rather than fix the matter, they pretended that they were the other person instead? If WWJD posted while Bystander was logged in, then why did he proceed to edit it so that he would appear to be Bystander when he was not?

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 4 2007, 10:33 PM)

Bob,

Search function! Try it.

- FHB

Nope. I'm fairly certain I am correct on this one. If you think otherwise, you do the search and report back. I don't mind admitting I'm wrong if I am mistaken.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 4 2007, 10:35 PM

QUOTE(Johann @ Mar 5 2007, 12:31 AM)

Some time back either Bystander or wwjd explained that the computer had been logged into the wrong name by mistake. It seemed to them quite natural to make such mistakes. **Being them I am not surprised.**

Johann,

Are you WWJD and Bystander? If so maybe you are Franny's precious Voltaire!

- FHB

Posted by: Panama_Pete Mar 4 2007, 10:36 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 4 2007, 10:27 PM)

Calvin cleared the issue when he reissued WWJD and Bystander's posting privileges.

- FHB

n a minute, Fran, Fallible is going to point out where Hamlet mentions "privilages."

t will probably be in ACT II where we see Prince Hamlet continue his descent into complete insanity.

Posted by: Pickle Mar 4 2007, 10:39 PM

FHB, I checked other records, not the search function here. Bystander posted as WWJD on February 5, and the two of them were banned on January 30. So I was not mistaken on this one.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 4 2007, 10:40 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 4 2007, 08:29 PM)

Wrong, another Pickle spin that actually leaves me "cold as a cucumber." (sorry I couldn't resist) You are a day late and a dollar short on the posts. Calvin explained it all a few days ago verifying the facts and telling those that were saying otherwise, that they were wrong. So, catch up. **As far as the 18 year old girl, my post went into much detail about a particular situation. You picked out a couple of words and left out all the rest.** That paints a different picture. I think that would fall under underhanded and deceitful.....

Bystander,

Yes, your post about the underaged girl went into a lot of detail:

You took pains to minimize her age by saying the man was a teacher of older high school or college age kids, even though, with Aletheia's help, we established that she must have been under 17 at the time in order for her parents to become involved and report the abuse (since 17 is the age of consent in Illinois).

You took pains to minimize the severity of the abuse by reporting the glowing evaluation of the man by the sheriff who brought him to the courts.

You took pains to minimize the need for parents who bring their children to 3abn to be made aware of his man's past sins.

And then you later admitted that the young girl, while feeling the sexual "affair" was consensual at the time (immature judgement) now feels as though she was abused and taken advantage of by this man.

What picture does that paint?

WB

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 4 2007, 10:44 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 5 2007, 12:34 AM)

. . . you do the search and report back. I don't mind admitting I'm wrong if I am mistaken.

Bob,

Why don't you take the time and then come back and admit you were wrong. Until then, those that have read or are actually involved will know if you are correct or not.

Sorry, I am not going to do your work for you . . . if you want to cover your behind then use the search function.

FHB

Posted by: Bystander Mar 4 2007, 10:53 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 4 2007, 09:39 PM)

FHB, I checked other records, not the search function here. Bystander posted as WWJD on February 5, and the two of them were banned on January 30. So I was not mistaken on this one.

Yes you are, If you don't believe us ask Calvin, he will clear it up for you.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 4 2007, 11:09 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 5 2007, 12:39 AM)

FHB, I checked other records, not the search function here. Bystander posted as WWJD on February 5, and the two of them were banned on January 30. So I was not mistaken on this one.

Bob,

Okay let's see where your sick little game leads. The original issue, as you raised it, was the Joe Smith = Task Force issue. You then subtly tried to link the Bystander/WWJD question to the same basic concern. These are two significantly different issues and you know this (I have to hand it to you Bob, your ability to manipulate language is almost exquisite - in a sick and manipulative way).

Joe Smith/Task force was an issue of one person, two screen names.

Bystander/WWJD was an issue of two people with one computer access.

You have tried to weave them together because you will then, if successful, will begin to raise the question again about Bystander and WWJD being the same person - even though Calvin has made it clear they are two people sharing a computer. Why would this be important? Simple, because these two individuals have information that will prove you have been duped and that you have placed yourself on a tenuous perch where you feel uncomfortable.

You know how you have come by information and the questionable methods you have used. So, you

need to discredit those that disagree with you to maintain you position. If they present information that calls into question your "facts" you are left reeling and backtracking and you don't have the time to do that as the G.A. Joy site needs your immediate attention. So, you manipulate words and create false perceptions and then pass them off as truth.

I do recall the situation you are refereing to . . . but . . . so what! . . . WWJD and Bystander share the same position on the issues and they share information sources, as is evident by their postings, these sources are proving to be rather substantial and reliable and you, my friend, are getting worried (but of course you will say you aren't, so should I just erase that . . . naw).

- FHB

Posted by: Fran Mar 4 2007, 11:10 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 4 2007, 09:16 PM)


This is said tongue in cheek right . . . you can't possible be expecting those of us who have experienced your methods to believe this right? Now, for those who are unaware of how you gather information this might work . . . but those of us who know you Bob, don't buy this for a minute!

- FHB

Do I sense a touch of jealousy that Bob has been a better detective than you? You, yourself, said you had made phone calls and emails ... and came up empty handed. Yep, Jealousy is popping its little ugly head.

Posted by: Lee Mar 4 2007, 11:55 PM

FHB jealous of Pickle?



Posted by: Panama_Pete Mar 4 2007, 11:59 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 4 2007, 11:55 PM)

FHB jealous of Pickle?

You asked the question and you answered it.

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 5 2007, 12:00 AM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Mar 4 2007, 09:59 PM)

You asked the question and you answered it.

'ou beat me! You took the words right out of my mouth!

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 5 2007, 06:24 AM

QUOTE(Fran @ Mar 5 2007, 12:10 AM)

Do I sense a touch of jealousy that Bob has been a better detective than you? You, yourself, said you had made phone calls and emails ... and came up empty handed. Yep, Jealousy is popping its little ugly head.

Does the word of God warn us it is a dangerous thing to trust personal feelings, and surmisings, and to lean unto thine own understanding?

What does it say about using those things to judge another's motive and intent and character?

Just the facts, ma'am"

Posted by: Pickle Mar 5 2007, 07:39 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 4 2007, 10:53 PM)

Yes you are, If you don't believe us ask Calvin, he will clear it up for you.

The dates on the screen shots are Feb. 5, and my records indicate you were banned on January 30. I don't see how Calvin can come up with anything different.

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 5 2007, 08:57 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 5 2007, 07:24 AM)

Does the word of God warn us it is a dangerous thing to trust personal feelings, and surmisings, and to lean unto thine own understanding?

What does it say about using those things to judge another's motive and intent and character?
"Just the facts, ma'am"

What does it say of you to ask this question of another when you have been doing the same thing to in even greater extent?

In His service,
Mr. J

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 5 2007, 12:09 AM)

. . . WWJD and Bystander share the same position and they share information sources, as is evident by their postings...

Which begs the question of what were they trying to accomplish, given all they share, including the same computer, by coming in here and putting forth the deception of pretending to not know each other?

This question has been asked repeatedly... and none of you has answered it.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 5 2007, 10:15 AM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 5 2007, 09:57 AM)

Which begs the question of what were they trying to accomplish, given all they share, including the same computer, by coming in here and putting forth the deception of pretending to not know each other?

This question has been asked repeatedly... and none of you has answered it.

Because it's stupid! You are the ones claiming that they were pretending they didn't know each other, not them.

Get real, any member here can refer to, or quote what another poster writes without having to proclaim whether they know that other poster or not, and how and why.... That is not being dishonest nor deceptive!

Posted by: Clay Mar 5 2007, 10:25 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 5 2007, 10:15 AM)

Because it's stupid! You are the ones claiming that they were pretending they didn't know each other, not them.

Get real, any member here can refer to, or quote what another poster writes without having to proclaim whether they know that other poster or not, and how and why.... That is not being dishonest nor deceptive!

keep on spinnin..... wait, whats that I hear? I think the white house is calling, they need another

spinmeister....

Posted by: calvin Mar 5 2007, 11:03 AM

Bystander and WWJD are probably two people in the same household sharing a computer. Other members do that as well. It is very easy to one to unintentional not log off and the other person to start posting thinking they where logged in. This software uses "cookie" to store you id and password. Most you don't have to login so it is also easy to bring up your browser and think you where automatically logged in, when it was the other person that was last on So what Pickle and others where referring to was probably a mistake, others have done it.

Task Force and Joe Smith are probably not the same person. I have the evidence. Pickle I don't appreciate the insinuation that they are. I don't need this drama here.

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 5 2007, 10:15 AM)

Because it's stupid! You are the ones claiming that they were pretending they didn't know each other, not them.

Get real, any member here can refer to, or quote what another poster writes without having to proclaim whether they know that other poster or not, and how and why.... That is not being dishonest nor deceptive!

This is what I saw. One of them referring to the other in a post. So where is the evidence that they were pretending not to know each other?

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 5 2007, 11:11 AM

QUOTE(calvin @ Mar 5 2007, 12:03 PM)

Bystander and WWJD are probably two people in the same household sharing a computer. Other members do that as well. It is very easy to one to unintentional not log off and the other person to start posting thinking they where logged in. This software uses "cookie" to store you id and password. Most you don't have to login so it is also easy to bring up your browser and think you where automatically logged in, when it was the other person that was last on So what Pickle and others where referring to was probably a mistake, others have done it.

Task Force and Joe Smith are probably not the same person. I have the evidence. Pickle I don't appreciate the insinuation that they are. I don't need this drama here.

This is what I saw. One of them referring to the other in a post. So where is the evidence that they were pretending not to know each other?

Read their early posts, Calvin... both came in here playing the "concerned 3ABN viewer" who was otherwise not affiliated with 3ABN and pretending that they only became aware of each other's existence here.... both of which were shown to be untrue over time...

There have been several other pairs of danny apologists who have followed the same script... and who have busted themselves in like fashion.

In His service,

Mr. J

Posted by: Pickle Mar 5 2007, 11:14 AM

So Calvin, in a situation like that, would it be better to pretend that one is the person who was still logged in and edit one's post accordingly, or would it be better to delete one's wording, log out, log in under the correct user name, and then repost what one had wanted to say?

I believe I shared with you the evidence I have regarding Joe Smith and Task Force being the same person, but it's your board, not mine. You're in charge.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 5 2007, 03:05 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 5 2007, 10:14 AM)

So Calvin, in a situation like that, would it be better to pretend that one is the person who was still logged in and edit one's post accordingly, or would it be better to delete one's wording, log out, log in under the correct user name, and then repost what one had wanted to say?

I believe I shared with you the evidence I have regarding Joe Smith and Task Force being the same person, but it's your board, not mine. You're in charge.

I am confused as to why all of this has any importance? It doesn't to anyone but you, Pickle, and Maybe Mr. J who has harped forever on it even after Calvin was kind enough to explain. Next question. Calvin just said joe and task were 2 different people according to his data. Now how can his information be different than yours?

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 5 2007, 10:11 AM)

Read their early posts, Calvin... both came in here playing the "concerned 3ABN viewer" who was otherwise not affiliated with 3ABN and pretending that they only became aware of each other's existence here.... both of which were shown to be untrue over time...

There have been several other pairs of danny apologists who have followed the same script... and who have busted themselves in like fashion.

In His service,
Mr. J

Mr. J don't stoop to putting the Pickle spin on this. I believe it was wwjd referred to a poster called Bystander. Thats it, the end. Never claimed to not know the person, never denied knowing the person, just made a reference to. So what. There are several on here that actually denied getting their information from Linda, that now have said they did. I haven't seen you harp and harp on that and neither has Pickle. That would be a lie. I nor wwjd lied about knowing each other. Get over it.

Posted by: princessdi Mar 5 2007, 03:08 PM

More to the point, why did Lee think that posting this letter and the fact that MB and GJ might go to the same church is of any consequence? it is all upfront, and MB is free to make whatever determination he wants from the evidence presented him, even if he is related to GJ. In fact, I am trying to see yotu problem you all are having with Linda calling for facts referred to being made publi. It is about her, and she has the most to lose if it is true, right? What is the problem, besides the fact that there may not be any evidence?

I think everyone realizes that everyone is free to post what ever evidence to support the allegations made here, that goes for those who support Danny, also.

Posted by: Ralph Mar 5 2007, 04:11 PM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 5 2007, 02:08 PM)

What is the problem, besides the fact that there may not be any evidence?

Di, there's gotta be some evidence. You can't have three PI's tracking you day in and day out and living in a bugged house without some "evidence" showing up.

My wife took a trip to Israel a few months ago. Now if I were rich enough, and paranoid enough, I am sure that I could find some "evidence" -- whatever that means. All it would prove is that I who had serious mental health issues.

Posted by: princessdi Mar 5 2007, 04:17 PM

This is true, but ok, present that...anything, but this incessant claims of guilt or innocence (depending on which party is being discussed) They really need to do something. Because they started here with the most basic lies about their identities and Danny stating how much he jes luvud his wife and they were working it out, with the quickie Guam divorce paper already in the making, they have little to no credibility with some of us.

QUOTE(Ralph @ Mar 5 2007, 02:11 PM)

Di, there's gotta be some evidence. You can't have three PI's tracking you day in and day out and living in a bugged house without some "evidence" showing up.

My wife took a trip to Israel a few months ago. Now if I were rich enough, and paranoid enough, I am sure that I could find some "evidence" -- whatever that means. All it would prove is that I who had serious mental health issues.

Posted by: Johann Mar 5 2007, 04:20 PM

QUOTE(Ralph @ Mar 6 2007, 12:11 AM)

Di, there's gotta be some evidence. You can't have three PI's tracking you day in and day out and living in a bugged house without some "evidence" showing up.

My wife took a trip to Israel a few months ago. Now if I were rich enough, and paranoid enough, I am sure that I could find some "evidence" -- whatever that means. All it would prove is that I who had serious mental health issues.

Trouble is that you wouldn't know it yourself if you did. But what you say here is absolutely true. You would never have PI's trailing your wife unless you had some serious mental problems. Does it take a genius to understand that?

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 5 2007, 04:37 PM

QUOTE(Johann @ Mar 5 2007, 02:20 PM)

Trouble is that you wouldn't know it yourself if you did. But what you say here is absolutely true. You would never have PI's trailing your wife unless you had some serious mental problems. Does it take a genius to understand that?

EXACTLY. Stop and think about this. The devil is in the details.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 5 2007, 05:36 PM

QUOTE(Ralph @ Mar 5 2007, 04:11 PM)

Di, there's gotta be some evidence. You can't have three PI's tracking you day in and day out and living in a bugged house without some "evidence" showing up.

My wife took a trip to Israel a few months ago. Now if I were rich enough, and paranoid enough, I am sure that I could find some "evidence" -- whatever that means. All it would prove is that I who had serious mental health issues.

Was your wife talking for hours on the phone with a single man, prior to going? And if so, was she claiming a strictly professional relationship but you found some gifts and other evidence to say otherwise? Did you ask your wife to stop with all this and she refused? If she would have left you at that point and you found out the "other party" was in the US and had went and looked at the mobile phone she had just purchased, you would be ok with that? If your wife was in a hotel room with said person claiming she was getting diagnosed and treated for a Yeast infection, that wouldn't bother you? Face it Ralph. There isn't a man alive that wouldn't either start following the wife themselves or hire a PI because of the continual lies about the situation.

Posted by: Pickle Mar 5 2007, 05:43 PM

Was Linda talking for hours on the phone? I don't think so.

Posted by: Observer Mar 5 2007, 06:25 PM

QUOTE

Face it Ralph. There isn't a man alive that wouldn't either start following the wife themselves or hire a PI because of the continual lies about the situation.

Nope.

I would not.

Posted by: wwjd Mar 5 2007, 06:36 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 5 2007, 05:43 PM)

Was Linda talking for hours on the phone? I don't think so.

Johann said she flew to Norway after the divorce because she needed her Best Friend. He said she had to confide in someone since DS was being so "mean" to her. So, If they weren't having a phone relationship how did they become best friends? Bob are you insinuating they saw each other in person to become best friends?

Posted by: princessdi Mar 5 2007, 06:58 PM

But you see herein lies the problem.....a "real" man would not have let his wife go through this alone. There would be reason for her to even be looking for someone to talk to about this. Where was Danny's tired behind while she was going through this with "her" son? which after 20 years of marriage, if he was a "real" man would have been "their" son. Why didn't he go to the hospital with Linda and Nathan? Why didn't he pick up the phone as the boy's father to talk to the Dr. about "their" son's progress? Why was Linda alone in this?

See, by maintaining that Linda was leaning on the good Dr. during this time you indict Danny of not being the man, the father and husband he should have been during this most difficult time. You might want to let that go. And then he got nerve to carry a gun! Give me a break!

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 03:36 PM)

Was your wife talking for hours on the phone with a single man, prior to going? And if so, was she

claiming a strictly professional relationship but you found some gifts and other evidence to say otherwise? Did you ask your wife to stop with all this and she refused? If she would have left you at that point and you found out the "other party" was in the US and had went and looked at the mobile home she had just purchased, you would be ok with that? If your wife was in a hotel room with said person claiming she was getting diagnosed and treated for a Yeast infection, that wouldn't bother you?

Face it Ralph. There isn't a man alive that wouldn't either start following the wife themselves or hire a PI because of the continual lies about the situation.

Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 5 2007, 08:14 PM

QUOTE(princessdi)

But you see herein lies the problem.....a "real" man would not have let his wife go through this alone. There would be reason for her to even be looking for someone to talk to about this. Where was Danny's tired behind while she was going through this with "her" son? which after 20 years of marriage, if he was a "real" man would have been "their" son. Why didn't he go to the hospital with Linda and Nathan? Why didn't he pick up the phone as the boy's father to talk to the Dr. about "their" son's progress? Why was Linda alone in this?

See, by maintaining that Linda was leaning on the good Dr. during this time you indict Danny of not being the man, the father and husband he should have been during this most difficult time. You might want to let that go. And then he got nerve to carry a gun! Give me a break!

Very percptive, princessdi. And there's whole lot more beneath stories like this. The cause. Mean men can drive a good woman to become an emotional mess, and then deny her what she needs most.

Who does he think he's foolin'?

Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 5 2007, 08:29 PM

QUOTE(Bystander)

Was your wife talking for hours on the phone with a single man, prior to going? And if so, was she claiming a strictly professional relationship but you found some gifts and other evidence to say otherwise? Did you ask your wife to stop with all this and she refused? If she would have left you at that point and you found out the "other party" was in the US and had went and looked at the mobile home she had just purchased, you would be ok with that? If your wife was in a hotel room with said person claiming she was getting diagnosed and treated for a Yeast infection, that wouldn't bother you?

Face it Ralph. There isn't a man alive that wouldn't either start following the wife themselves or hire a PI because of the continual lies about the situation.

And there man not be a single man who would admit he was the cause of all the problems.

Our next step, Bystander, is understanding what constitutes infidelity. Nothing you've described so far does. The scribes and pharisees didn't drag a woman to Jesus who had been caught in the act of medical treatments, or friendship. You sound very immature and full of jealousy...like the very kind of man who would cause a good woman to give up in a marriage.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 5 2007, 09:31 PM

QUOTE(LaurenceD @ Mar 5 2007, 08:29 PM)

And there man not be a single man who would admit he was the cause of all the problems.

Your next step, Bystander, is understanding what constitutes infidelity. Nothing you've described so far does. The scibes and pharisees didn't drag a woman to Jesus who had been caught in the act of medical treatments, or friendship. You sound very immature and full of jealousy...like the very kind of man who would cause a good woman to give up in a marriage.

Laurence, read the other post I just wrote for you in another thread. This just confirms what I was saying. You obviously have no idea what anyone has as far as evidence goes. For every thing there is a season....the season is close at hand. So you, my friend, would be better off to leave this subject as is before you end up with egg on your face. You strike me as someone who doesn't like to be wrong, so I am just trying to help you out here.

QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 5 2007, 06:58 PM)

But you see herein lies the problem.....a "real" man would not have let his wife go through this alone. There would be reason for her to even be looking for someone to talk to about this. Where was Danny's tired behind while she was going through this with "her" son? which after 20 years of marriage, if he was a "real" man would have been "their" son. Why didn't he go to the hospital with Linda and Nathan? Why didn't he pick up the phone as the boy's father to talk to the Dr. about "their" son's progress? Why was Linda alone in this?

Di, I don't think you are that slow on the uptake unless you want to be. All the hours of conversation, meetings, gifts, etc went way beyond strictly conversations about Nathan. Johann has established that, emails have established that. We are way beyond the "strictly professional" relationship and the more that pickle/joy prints and the more Johann talks, the more we realize how "far beyond" professional it goes.

Posted by: SoulEspresso Mar 5 2007, 09:43 PM



QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 09:31 PM)

All the hours of conversation, meetings, gifts, etc went way beyond strictly conversations about Nathan. Johann has established that, emails have established that. We are way beyond the "strictly professional" relationship and the more that pickle/joy prints and the more Johann talks, the more we realize how "far beyond" professional it goes.

None of this is evidence for adultery. And if you've been paying attention, like the rest of us, you already know that the "hours on the phone" is a sham. It was billed units. To a phone card. Either 7 minutes or 20, to Scandinavia. Any amount of minutes has to be divided by 7 or 20 for the real amount of time--and then, unless the phone records were illegally obtained, you don't know what numbers they called.


It isn't about "pickle/joy" either. It's about the rest of us paying attention, who've read the evidence over the months and have decided for ourselves. Something is rotten, and it ain't in Denmark either.

By the way, you need to quit projecting all your techniques on people **who are only calling for free and open inquiry** into the goings-on at 3ABN. I would remind you that most of these people, even if they're not fans, don't want 3ABN to go away. *They just want to see the honesty and transparency that ought to be second nature to spiritual leaders like Danny Shelton.*

You're here, we all know, not to establish truth, but so that if someone googles "3ABN scandal" and comes here, they'll think it's a balanced conversation between people who support 3ABN and people who hate it--when the truth is, it's between people who care about the cause of God no matter who's on the TV, and people *who are probably either Shelton family members or young people hired by someone connected to 3ABN to come here and post to make the discussion look balanced.*

Technique used in this post by Bystander:

Repeat the idea that evidence convicts Linda of adultery--even though no such evidence has been presented.



You can repeat a lie a thousand times, but that won't magically turn it into truth.

Where's the beef, dude? Let's see the evidence. The real stuff, not what you mentioned here--it doesn't exist.

For the lurkers here , read the whole threads, starting with the pinned stuff at the top. Even if it's all factually incorrect (which I highly doubt, there's too much documentation here and at save3abn.com), Danny & Co's behavior, including that of Aletheia, wwjd, Bystander, Lee, and Joe Smith, indicates that they're hiding something. If it's worse than all that's been alleged, it must be ... ahem ...stank ... indeed.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 5 2007, 09:56 PM

QUOTE(SoulEspresso @ Mar 5 2007, 09:43 PM)

Please read my other post to you in another thread about what you don't know and can therefore not come to any intelligent conclusions.

Oh, and Pay young people to come here? You certainly underestimate the love and support that 3abn has all over the world. That is part of the problem here. Only people that have never been there, don't know the people involved, and who don't know the scope of the ministry could make a statement like that.

QUOTE(SoulEspresso @ Mar 5 2007, 09:43 PM)

[
 [

For the lurkers here [[[, read the whole threads, starting with the pinned stuff at the top. Even if it's all factually incorrect (which I highly doubt, there's too much documentation here and at save3abn.com), Danny & Co's behavior, including that of Aletheia, wwjd, Bystander, Lee, and Joe Smith, indicates that they're hiding something. If it's worse than all that's been alleged, it must be ... ahem ...stank ... indeed. [

No, we are not hiding what we know to be facts in this situation, we are just not at liberty to expose it. There is a time for every season.....

Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 5 2007, 10:03 PM

QUOTE(Bystander)

You obviously have no idea what anyone has as far as evidence goes. For every thing there is a season...the season is close at hand. So you, my friend, would be better off to leave this subject as is before you end up with egg on your face. You strike me as someone who doesn't like to be wrong, so I am just trying to help you out here.

You've willingly put yourself if this position: to listen to fair-minded people who don't know the detailed facts, don't know the so-called lies from the liars, nor the parties involved. For one just looking in from the outside, and reading both sides of the issue (esp those like yours), one needn't use any other method than Occam's Razor to reach a reasonable conclusion. Perhaps you've never taken the first step in knowledge or philosophy. Perhaps it's better this way if you don't understand.

If you had something, you'd blurt it out instead of hiding behind the same old same old, like a child afraid of the dark, and insist on trying to protect the victim with your sarcastic tones. Everyone knows you've not trying to protect, but expose. To hold hostage with accusation. Think of all the wasted time and words you're using. Adults understand these little petty games.

Unless you're able to demonstrate what you're saying, you're not saying anything at all. Unless you can cough up something better than empty words, you'd best fix the leaky facet instead of stirring the bucket with empty, meaningless, repetitive explanations. They really don't wash. What's a revelation to you is nothing--nothing except a partisan story to anyone else. For every step you think you've gained here, you've slipped back two in nearly everyone's mind.

You say you're are not hiding what you know to be facts in this situation, but are just not at liberty to expose it. No one is buying that hackney excuse. We're calling your bluff. If you can't produce anything, you may as well shut the facet off, you're just wasting your breath, and your writer's bump is sure to develop a nasty cut.

Posted by: SoulEspresso Mar 5 2007, 10:07 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 09:56 PM) [

No, we are not hiding what we know to be facts in this situation, we are just not at liberty to expose it. There is a time for every season.....

Well, I'm thinking it's high time we see the evidence. Is it coming out in court? Who's going to get sued? These are all rhetorical questions that I don't expect you to answer, but if that evidence is going to come out in any other forum it had better be quick, because God's work and God's message is getting a black eye. **If you're withholding evidence that would exonerate Danny and make of him an honest man, you're hurting the church.** □

QUOTE

Oh, and Pay young people to come here? You certainly underestimate the love and support that 3abn has all over the world. That is part of the problem here. Only people that have never been there, don't know the people involved, and who don't know the scope of the ministry could make a statement like that.

□ I notice you didn't deny it. That's appreciated.

live in a part of the world where everybody but the head elder and I think that 3ABN is an open, transparent ministry of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. In other words, a lot of them have no idea it's not actually part of the church.

QUOTE

Please read my other post to you in another thread about what you don't know and can therefore not come to any intelligent conclusions.

Proverbs 19:11. (I know too much to consider myself wise, but I want to learn all I can.)

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 5 2007, 10:09 PM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Mar 5 2007, 05:36 PM) □

Johann said she flew to Norway after the divorce because she needed her Best Friend. He said she had to confide in someone since DS was being so "mean" to her. So, If they weren't having a phone relationship how did they become best friends? Bob are you insinuating they saw each other in person to become best friends? □

Johann said she flew to Norway to be with her **three best friends** . To say any less would be telling in untruth.

Posted by: Ralph Mar 5 2007, 10:14 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 04:36 PM)

Was your wife talking for hours on the phone with a single man, prior to going?

Dunno . . . I don't ask who my wife is talking to.

QUOTE

And if so, was she claiming a strictly professional relationship but you found some gifts and other evidence to say otherwise?

I wouldn't know. I don't snoop in my wife's things. I would never invade my wife's privacy for any reason, be it drawers, purse, letters, or whatever.

QUOTE

Did you ask your wife to stop with all this and she refused?

Who she talks to is her business. She is not my slave.

QUOTE

If she would have left you at that point and you found out the "other party" was in the US and had went

had went??

QUOTE

and looked at the mobile home she had just purchased, you would be ok with that? If your wife was in a hotel room with said person claiming she was getting diagnosed and treated for a Yeast infection, that wouldn't bother you?

Ah come on. Feed me something that isn't quite so wild.

QUOTE

Face it Ralph. There isn't a man alive that wouldn't either start following the wife themselves or hire a PI because of the continual lies about the situation.

It is one thing to play the devil's advocate, but it appears that you **actually believe** that sane guys would pull a trick like this. This is asinine. Although I know that Danny went this route, I am dumfounded that his clones are of like mind. There's something going on here that is paranormal. -- At least four of you thinking the same. That really scares me. Maybe the following quote is more correct than I at first believed.

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Mar 5 2007, 03:37 PM)

. . . . Stop and think about this. The devil is in the details.

Posted by: Chez Mar 5 2007, 10:14 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 09:31 PM) □

Laurence, read the other post I just wrote for you in another thread. This just confirms what I was saying. You obviously have no idea what anyone has as far as evidence goes. For every thing there is a season....the season is close at hand. So you, my friend, would be better off to leave this subject as is before you end up with egg on your face. You strike me as someone who doesn't like to be wrong, so I am just trying to help you out here.

Di, I don't think you are that slow on the uptake unless you want to be. All the hours of conversation, meetings, gifts, etc went way beyond strictly conversations about Nathan. Johann has established that, emails have established that. We are way beyond the "strictly professional" relationship and the more that pickle/joy prints and the more Johann talks, the more we realize how "far beyond" professional it goes.

This is so interesting. What troubles me is Danny's and Nathan's relationship or the lack thereof. I think about the years of opportunity that Danny had to be a real father to this young man, but there seems to lack evidence that he was a father or father figure to Nathan. I know of a couple (non-SDA) who married and had a blended family such as Danny and Linda. However, the stepfather (who had one biological daughter) took it upon himself to be a father to his stepson (wife's son) and vice versa. The stepfather stated that he was not the boy's biological father, but wanted to be as much of a father/daddy as possible and the same with the wife. What is interesting is that the boy calls this man "Dad". Their relationship wasn't easy during the early days/years; however, this couple persevered and have a beautiful family. I have often thought that if this was the case in Danny's and Linda's home, I don't believe that we would be having this conversation.

I just don't understand why Danny never seemed to be involved and/or cared about Nathan's treatment. It is my understanding that when treating any kind of drug addiction, family should be involved. Therefore, Danny and Linda needed to be involved in his treatment, even though Nathan was an adult. Think of Betty Ford. Her husband and her children (who were adults) were also intimately involved in her treatment and recovery. This idea that Linda shouldn't talk to the doctor about Nathan is ludicrous. I must admit that my doctor and I have a professional and somewhat of a personal relationship. We have encouraged each other on many levels and my spouse finds it refreshing and with my encouragement is going to the same doctor.

Posted by: SoulEspresso Mar 5 2007, 10:22 PM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 5 2007, 10:09 PM) □

Johann said she flew to Norway to be with her **three best friends** . To say any less would be telling an untruth.

These people deal in untruths, PB. You know that.

How does it feel to twist other people's words, Bystander?

I guess what I'm asking is, how can you live with yourself? I wouldn't be able to sleep.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 5 2007, 10:22 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 08:31 PM) □

Laurence, read the other post I just wrote for you in another thread. This just confirms what I was saying. You obviously have no idea what anyone has as far as evidence goes. For every thing there is a season...the season is close at hand. So you, my friend, would be better off to leave this subject as is before you end up with egg on your face. You strike me as someone who doesn't like to be wrong, so I am just trying to help you out here.

Bystander,

Just because you say it doesn't make it so. You can agree with yourself till the cows come home and it doesn't sway the jury one jot or one tittle.

Some months ago FHB brought forward a quote he enjoyed:

"Once you decide to titillate instead of illuminate . . . you create a climate of expectation that requires a higher and higher level of intensity" **Bill Moyers.**

Your teasers about the coming season are just that, designed to titillate rather than illuminate, IMO.

Posted by: Johann Mar 5 2007, 10:22 PM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 6 2007, 06:09 AM) □

Johann said she flew to Norway to be with her **three best friends** . To say any less would be telling an untruth.

And notice the letter from Danny written four months earlier where he says Linda needs new friends because he would never accept her back. They were still married then, on April 27, 2004. The divorce was in June.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 5 2007, 10:34 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 08:56 PM) □

Please read my other post to you in another thread about what you don't know and can therefore not come to any intelligent conclusions.

Once again, just because you said it doesn't mean it's verifiable truth. You may continue to hold your own opinions and agree with yourself but where is the substance?

QUOTE

No, we are not hiding what we know to be facts in this situation, we are just not at liberty to expose it. There is a time for every season.....

There you go again. Titillation without illumination. Oooooooooo!

QUOTE(SoulEspresso @ Mar 5 2007, 09:22 PM)

These people deal in untruths, PB. You know that.

How does it feel to twist other people's words, Bystander?

I guess what I'm asking is, how can you live with yourself? I wouldn't be able to sleep.

Sadly, I am seeing that more and more.

PB

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 5 2007, 10:43 PM

QUOTE(Ralph @ Mar 5 2007, 08:14 PM)

Ah come on. Feed me something that isn't quite so wild.

It is one thing to play the devil's advocate, but it appears that you **actually believe** that sane guys would pull a trick like this. This is asinine. Although I know that Danny went this route, I am dumfounded that his clones are of like mind. There's something going on here that is paranormal. -
- At least four of you thinking the same. That really scares me. Maybe the following quote is more correct than I at first believed.

Ralph, you got it. There are not 4. There is ONE. People should be more then terrified at what is going on here.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 5 2007, 11:11 PM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 5 2007, 10:34 PM)

Once again, just because you said it doesn't mean it's verifiable truth. You may continue to hold your own opinions and agree with yourself but where is the substance?

 There you go again. Titillation without illumination. Ooooooooooo!
 Sadly, I am seeing that more and more.

PB

guess I should repeat for the hundreth time....When the truth is brough to light it won't be on here. t will be the right time, the right place and the right people. I would think that you are too intelligent o go for the, "if it ain't here, they aint' got it" line.

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 5 2007, 11:15 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 09:11 PM)

I guess I should repeat for the hundreth time....When the truth is brough to light it won't be on here. It will be the right time, the right place and the right people. I would think that you are too intelligent to go for the, "if it ain't here, they aint' got it" line.

say it all the times you want. I hope I can be in that court room the day "the truth" comes out. Ya, right. If it doesn't need to be here, then why are you here anyway? What does it matter to you what is said here? What's the big deal? Just go away then and wait for that court date. I'm looking forward to it too.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 5 2007, 11:30 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Mar 5 2007, 11:15 PM)

Say it all the times you want. I hope I can be in that court room the day "the truth" comes out. Ya, right. If it doesn't need to be here, then why are you here anyway? What does it matter to you what is said here? What's the big deal? Just go away then and wait for that court date. I'm looking forward to it too.

'm here because I hate false allegations against a wonderful ministry. Why are you here? To defend Linda. That's my choice and yours
 I'm here too. I hope I can wrangle an invite....

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 5 2007, 11:34 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 09:30 PM)

I'm here because I hate false allegations against a wonderful ministry. Why are you here? To defend Linda. That's my choice and yours
Me too. I hope I can wrangle an invite....

I am here because truth matters most - even and especially over "a wonderful ministry" that frankly is a front for other things not so wonderful. Pleeeezzzz. This is NOT about a ministry - at least it didn't have to be, but since you are destined to drag it down too, so be it.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 5 2007, 11:35 PM

QUOTE(Chez @ Mar 5 2007, 10:14 PM)

This is so interesting. What troubles me is Danny's and Nathan's relationship or the lack thereof. I think about the years of opportunity that Danny had to be a real father to this young man, but there seems to lack evidence that he was a father or father figure to Nathan.

And you would know this how? By what Lindanites have said on these forums? You say there is a "lack of evidence" that he was a real father. You have no idea what he did or did not do for 20 years. You have no idea of the performance of his mother during his growing up years.

Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 5 2007, 11:42 PM

QUOTE(Bystander)

I'm here because I hate false allegations against a wonderful ministry.

Nah, no one's buying that. Too self-contradictory. It's quite obvious you're here because of the big announcements on 3abn-Live a few weeks ago. "Enoughs enough," remember? Looks like the board decided to send out its biggest attack-Chihuahuas to fight back.

Posted by: SoulEspresso Mar 5 2007, 11:56 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 11:30 PM)

I'm here because I hate false allegations against a wonderful ministry. Why are you here? To defend Linda.

Linda's situation is merely one of several that merit a free and open inquiry. It is NOT just about the divorce. It's also about Tommy and his accusers (by the way, did you know that less than 3% of

abused children ever come forward? It's a really low rate for adult victims of abuse too). It's also about misuse of funds donated for ministry.

It ought to be about sloppy theology and teaching too, but that's less immediate than open sin.

I've said it at least three times but I'll say it again. The problem is not with the ministry. We began Bible studies the other day with a lady who showed up at our church because of 3ABN.

The problem is the complete lack of transparency on Danny's part, and on that of his board of lackeys.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 6 2007, 12:14 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 10:11 PM) □

I guess I should repeat for the hundreth time...When the truth is brought to light it won't be on here. It will be the right time, the right place and the right people. I would think that you are too intelligent to go for the, "if it ain't here, they aint' got it" line.

It doesn't matter how many times you repeat it, it doesn't make it true. There has been plenty of truth brought to light right here already. You have helped in that endeavor more than you can ever know.

And, BTW, I "ain't" falling for any line.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 6 2007, 12:15 AM

QUOTE(SoulEspresso @ Mar 5 2007, 11:56 PM) □

The problem is the complete lack of transparency on Danny's part, and on that of his board of lackeys.

And when will you realize soul that it is ludicrous that you refer to upstanding leaders, business men and women of our denomination as Lackeys. Do you really think that about Ellsworth McKee, Kenneth Denslow, Merlin F, Carmalita Troy etc are not smart enough to think for themselves or "brave" enough to disagree with something if they don't like it? You know thats not realistic. As I have mentioned before, if you are going to refer to the board that way, then you would also have to refer to ASI, as well as numerous other organizations that support 3abn and the leadership there. It goes against reason that everybody that loves and supports 3abn is a fool or a lackey. There are too many highly intelligent, business minded individuals on that list. Garwin McNeilus is a perfect example. If ever a man knew how things should be run, it would be him. He has all kinds of knowledge of how 3abn is run and the decisions that have been made by leadership. His actions speak for his opinion. These are people that know the intricate workings of the ministry and support it. But, you think, you have more facts and knowledge than they do? No matter how hard you or others try, you cannot dispute the facts of these people and the "inside" information that they know or have dealt with personally. It actually takes a lot of audacity to act like that the little group here knows the facts and these pastors, leaders, business people, conference people, don't. They have privy to things the

general public will never know. Their conclusions? They continue to support 3abn and its leadership.

Posted by: princessdi Mar 6 2007, 12:18 AM

You are missing my point, BS. A woman, doesn't spend long hours on the phone with her girlfriends when she is [happily]married. What was Danny doing that she had this kind of time? Most importantly when did she have this kind of time, If at that time she was still working at 3ABN? I mean you are over int he other post talking about Danny not having anytime because of his schedule. Same thing applies. Where was Danny that Linda might even feel she needed someone else besides her husband of 20 years to give her emotional support through this trial? There is not way around it, BS, Danny was not on his job as a husband or a father, and you emphasize that with every new allegation of Linda's long phone conversations and trips, etc. Does Danny want everyone to believe, he was just standing around watching.....the man who carries a gun..... yeah right!

I tell you what, I could even respect you and your gang a bit more if you said they were both tippin'. That would at least explain where Danny was. It would also explain why he was so angry. Men who are tippin' don't often believe their wife is also. Oh but when they find out..... Now Danny's actions are more consistent with the last scenario.....Cuz all this running in and out the house, and phone calls is disrepectful, I don't see Danny as the the one would would tolerate this conversation:

Danny: Where are you going, Dear?

Linda(dressed for a date): Out? Don't wait up!

-OR-

Danny: Where are you going with your luuage, Dear?

Linda: Out! Be back Monday(Friday, next week)!

Can you see why your story is full of holes?

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 07:31 PM) □

Di, I don't think you are that slow on the uptake unless you want to be. All the hours of conversation, meetings, gifts, etc went way beyond strictly conversations about Nathan. Johann has established that, emails have established that. We are way beyond the "strictly professional" relationship and the more that pickle/joy prints and the more Johann talks, the more we realize how "far beyond" professional it goes.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 6 2007, 12:31 AM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 6 2007, 12:18 AM) □

Can you see why your story is full of holes?[/color]

No Di it isn't. Why, because it isn't just idle speculation or gossip like most here. You as well as most of the others don't have a clue of what transpired, when it transpired and how it transpired. Stop and think of this. If 3abn and DS would have trashed LS the way you all say they did, You too, would know exactly what went down. The fact that you and so many others don't know what truly happened just proves there was no big trashing of Linda.

In my opinion, 3abn made 1 mistake. They waited too long to say anything and too long to show why they came to the decisions they came to. If the truth had been shown sooner, I'm sure you and I wouldn't be here right now.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 6 2007, 12:33 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 11:15 PM) □

And when will you realize soul that it is ludicrous that you refer to upstanding leaders, business men and women of our denomination as Lackeys. Do you really think that about Ellsworth McKee, Kenneth Denslow, Merlin F, Carmalita Troy etc are not smart enough to think for themselves or "brave" enough to disagree with something if they don't like it? You know thats not realistic. As I have mentioned before, if you are going to refer to the board that way, then you would also have to refer to ASI, as well as numerous other organizations that support 3abn and the leadership there. It goes against reason that everybody that loves and supports 3abn is a fool or a lackey. There are too many highly intelligent, business minded individuals on that list. Garwin McNeilus is a perfect example. If ever a man knew how things should be run, it would be him. He has all kinds of knowledge of how 3abn is run and the decisions that have been made by leadership. His actions speak for his opinion. These are people that know the intricate workings of the ministry and support it. But, you think, you have more facts and knowledge than they do? No matter how hard you or others try, you cannot dispute the facts of these people and the "inside" information that they know or have dealt with personally. It actually takes a lot of audacity to act like that the little group here knows the facts and these pastors, leaders, business people, conference people, don't. They have privy to things the general public will never know. Their conclusions? They continue to support 3abn and its leadership.

Bystander,

Audacity? That is an interesting choice of words. I would think it shows audacity for a board filled with the high-powered business people you have mentioned to seemingly ignore the allegations against Tommy Shelton.

Do you know if the board was made aware of the allegations against Tommy? If not, why not? If they were, what was their position on the matter? Why was Pastor Dryden's letter passed off in 2003 with less than a cursory investigation by Walt Thompson? Taking a stand against pastoral abuse of power would go a long ways towards rebuilding credibility for this board filled with wealthy, important people. It might make them seem much more intelligent and more caring about their fellow human beings. It might make them appear to view others just as Jesus does - as so precious He willingly shed His blood for them!

Posted by: Panama_Pete Mar 6 2007, 12:36 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 09:56 PM) □

No, we are not hiding what we know to be facts in this situation, we are just not at liberty to

expose it. There is a time for every season.....

'We are not hiding what we know to be the facts in this situation, we are just not at liberty to expose it.'

nonsense

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 6 2007, 12:41 AM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Mar 5 2007, 10:36 PM) □

"We are not hiding what we know to be the facts in this situation, we are just not at liberty to expose it.'

Nonsense

is's specialty.nonsense. and then thinking anyone accepts the nonsense. that's nonsense.

Posted by: princessdi Mar 6 2007, 12:43 AM

BS, now I am going to say that I know you are not that slow on the uptake. Danny doesn't need to tell "the details" in order to trash Linda. He trashes her each and every time he mentions a woman being seduced by a professional, or by the internet or over the phone. Man, I don't watch 3abn that much, maybe ten times in my lifetime, and I have heard him do it. Even folks who don't know what happened, by Danny's own mouth know something happened. Since he is remarried and supposed to be "over it" he can not mention it at all. But that is not the question I posed to you.

Point is, where was he? You give Linda great amounts of time where she was free to talk on the phone for hours, etc. Where was Danny? Why wasn't he with her when taking her son? Why wasn't he supporting her emotionally? Where was he? By saying that Linda had these great amounts of time to do these things, one has to ask, where was Danny? That is why I made up the scenario. I admit that enactment was straight Book of Princess, but I just don't see it going down like that. Where was he? If you have no answer to this question, then just don't answer, because the rest doesn't make sense.

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 10:31 PM) □

No Di it isn't. Why, because it isn't just idle speculation or gossip like most here. You as well as most of the others don't have a clue of what transpired, when it transpired and how it transpired. Stop and think of this. If 3abn and DS would have trashed LS the way you all say they did, You too, would know exactly what went down. The fact that you and so many others don't know what truly happened just proves there was no big trashing of Linda.

In my opinion, 3abn made 1 mistake. They waited too long to say anything and too long to show

why they came to the decisions they came to. If the truth had been shown sooner, I'm sure you and I wouldn't be here right now.

Posted by: Ralph Mar 6 2007, 01:00 AM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Mar 5 2007, 09:43 PM) □

Ralph, you got it. There are not 4. There is ONE. People should be more then terrified at what is going on here.

'eh, we are dealing with a Hydra. How many of the nine heads have appeared to date? I lost count.

Posted by: Chez Mar 6 2007, 07:08 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 11:35 PM) □

And you would know this how? By what Lindanites have said on these forums? You say there is a "lack of evidence" that he was a real father. You have no idea what he did or did not do for 20 years. You have no idea of the performance of his mother during his growing up years.

His fruits or the lack thereof speak volumes. It is interesting to note that when the word went out about Linda and the Dr. A, I felt sorry for Danny. Danny was pleading on the 3ABN for Linda to turn around. Many of us were heartbroken. My spouse and I asked why was she traveling to Norway and spending so much time with this doctor. We heard about the specialty in treatment and began to ask "Why wasn't Danny also involved in the treatment process with Nathan?" Nathan had lived in his house for many years. I presented a generic scenario to several psychologists colleagues and all agreed that the stepfather should have been involved in Nathan treatment recovery. The unanimous conclusion (without having diagnosed and treated Nathan) was that Nathan and Danny did not have a positive relationship. In addition, the fact that the mother and the stepfather were still married and Nathan was going through treatment. This would have been an opportune time for the stepfather to reach out to Nathan and show his love and concern for him, thus taking on a more humane and paternal role.

Let's get real. Danny was tired of Linda and wanted a divorce. He got a quick divorce. This has trouble quite a few people in my area. These people were staunch 3ABN supporters and contributors. It is interesting to sit and listen to them. Not all of these people were fans of Linda, however, they did not like and still don't approve of how Danny got rid of her. The problem was not only the divorce, but the apidity of such an act and his remarriage. Some believe that if Linda and the doctor were so involved as claimed by Danny, then she would have been the first to get married. However, this is not the case.

Bystander, you sound as though you are a confidant of Danny. There are many people who are troubled by his divorce from Linda, remarriage to Brandy, and the trashing of Linda on 3ABN. Not all of these people are Adventists. Please suggest to him to return to his mission, keep his mouth shut (including his staff) about Linda and others (even through inuendos), and get on with the work that he says that the Lord called him to do. The very people who he is trying to reach are noticing that something is wrong. The very people who he is trying to reach are turned off by it. Danny should

cease and decist with his continued rhetoric and get on with the mission of 3ABN! He is hurting himself.

Posted by: Clay Mar 6 2007, 07:49 AM

Di,

Danny expected that Linda be available at his beck and call... she was to be submissive to her man... you know how those controlling men can be... it doesn't matter where he was, she was suppose to be waiting for him, or drop everything in a moments notice to cater to the whims of her man.... just one level above barefoot and pregnant..... likewise that's what the dannyclones feel Linda should have done..... all of them chauvinistic and controlling.... and the female dannyclones have likewise bought into that mindset.....


so don't expect any meaningful dialog to come from that issue of where was Danny when Linda allegedly was on the phone, it doesn't matter.... Danny the annointed one, the heir to all that is good and righteous was to be served.....

Posted by: caribbean sda Mar 6 2007, 08:55 AM



QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 6 2007, 02:31 AM) □

In my opinion, 3abn made 1 mistake. They waited too long to say anything and too long to show why they came to the decisions they came to. If the truth had been shown sooner, I'm sure you and I wouldn't be here right now.

...but you ARE here...and this whole saga is a joke, a sad, sad joke...I have come to the conclusion that the friends of ramblin' Dan will never convince the Linda supporters that Danny Shelton is the paragon of virtue and upright living and the Linda Defenders will never convince the Friends of Danny that she remained faithful to her husband, spiritual adultery accusation notwithstanding...so the sooner all of y'all agree to disagree and recognize that the truth, whatever it is, lies hidden deep somewhere in all this mess...yes...MESS...you all are just spinning your wheels... 

Posted by: SoulEspresso Mar 6 2007, 08:59 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 6 2007, 12:15 AM) □

And when will you realize soul that it is ludicrous that you refer to upstanding leaders, business men and women of our denomination as Lackeys. Do you really think that about Ellsworth McKee, Kenneth Denslow, Merlin F, Carmalita Troy etc are not smart enough to think for themselves or "brave" enough to disagree with something if they don't like it? You know thats not realistic. As I have mentioned before, if you are going to refer to the board that way, then you would also have to refer to ASI, as well as numerous other organizations that support 3abn and the leadership there. It goes against reason that everybody that loves and supports 3abn is a fool or a lackey. There are too many highly intelligent, business minded individuals on that list. Garwin McNeilus is a perfect example. If ever a man knew how things should be run, it would be him. He has all kinds of

knowledge of how 3abn is run and the decisions that have been made by leadership. His actions speak for his opinion. These are people that know the intricate workings of the ministry and support it. But, you think, you have more facts and knowledge than they do? No matter how hard you or others try, you cannot dispute the facts of these people and the "inside" information that they know or have dealt with personally. It actually takes a lot of audacity to act like that the little group here knows the facts and these pastors, leaders, business people, conference people, don't. They have privy to things the general public will never know. Their conclusions? They continue to support 3abn and its leadership.

Okay, I'll refer to some (not all, because I don't think they all agreed) of the ASI leadership, and the other organizations that support 3ABN, as lackeys.

Rich-and-powerful name-dropping means nothing to me. One's income level does not determine whether or not one is a sinner.

Actually, having grown up watching church work rather up close, the richer and more business-savvy a person is, the less likely I am to trust them. I would remind you of James 2:1-7.

Of course I know who these people are. One of the board members is a family friend who is stuck, and, I gathered, doesn't know what to do. That may be the case for all of them, yes, I'll say it: sheer lack of courage.

Or it may be an unwillingness to pursue something that would damage the church. After all, the Adventist church for decades has swept all allegations of sex abuse under the rug--bad publicity, ya know? Gradually, the leaders of the actual denomination are learning that it's better to be plain and open than to hide, but 3ABN isn't exactly the most progressive element of Adventism.

Or it may be corruption. Or blackmail. I mention these last because I hope they're not true. But "power corrupts," and 3ABN is one of, if not *the* most powerful organization connected with the Adventist church.

Posted by: Johann Mar 6 2007, 09:37 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 6 2007, 08:15 AM)

And when will you realize soul that it is ludicrous that you refer to upstanding leaders, business men and women of our denomination as Lackeys. Do you really think that about Ellsworth McKee, Kenneth Denslow, Merlin F, Carmalita Troy etc are not smart enough to think for themselves or "brave" enough to disagree with something if they don't like it? You know thats not realistic.

--

Since you mention Miss Troy, then you had better tell us why Danny Shelton was not honest enough to honor the agreement he made with her parents? Why did he build tall Owen Troy a pigmy-size house to fit his own minute stature so that Elder Troy had to double up underneath the ceiling? Aren't the Shelton brothers carpenters enough to follow blueprints, or are they never used in that part of southern Illinois?

Posted by: erik Mar 6 2007, 09:52 AM

bystander,

i believe this is your qoute?

and looked at the mobile home she had just purchased, you would be ok with that? If your wife was in a hotel room with said person claiming she was getting diagnosed and treated for a Yeast infection, that wouldn't bother you?

A yeast infection, in a woman of linda's age is not the first one. Most likely the "treatment" might have been as simple has hey doc what is the best natural treatment for a yeast infection, instead of going and spending 25.00 at the local drug store, you are strongly hinting that something much more was going on and that is not supported by the facts, NOW if the PI's that danny had working for him, made some recordings of the doc and linda treatments that tell a different story then by all means post transcript of what was said, along with time and date.

erik

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 6 2007, 12:32 PM

Chez,

If only Danny and his supporters would realize that what you have described is the experience of many others who have not even chosen a side to support, perhaps they would get real in working to resolve this sad situation.

I know there must be some secret shame in both of Nathan's parents for getting so involved with the business of running 3abn that the children probably didn't get the care and attention they needed. I know this is a hard statement to make, but I'm quite sure that building and maintaining 3abn took a lot of Danny and Linda's energy. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if it also took a toll on the time they needed to stay focused on their marriage.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 6 2007, 12:49 PM

QUOTE(SoulEspresso @ Mar 6 2007, 07:59 AM)

Okay, I'll refer to some (not all, because I don't think they all agreed) of the ASI leadership, and the other organizations that support 3ABN, as lackeys.

Rich-and-powerful name-dropping means nothing to me. One's income level does not determine whether or not one is a sinner.

Actually, having grown up watching church work rather up close, the richer and more business-savvy a person is, the less likely I am to trust them. I would remind you of **James 2:1-7**.

Of course I know who these people are. One of the board members is a family friend who is stuck, and, I gathered, doesn't know what to do. That may be the case for all of them, yes, I'll say it: sheer lack of courage.

Or it may be an unwillingness to pursue something that would damage the church. After all, the Adventist church for decades has swept all allegations of sex abuse under the rug--bad publicity,

ya know? Gradually, the leaders of the actual denomination are learning that it's better to be plain and open than to hide, but 3ABN isn't exactly the most progressive element of Adventism.

Or it may be corruption. Or blackmail. I mention these last because I hope they're not true. But "power corrupts," and 3ABN is one of, if not *the* most powerful organization connected with the Adventist church.

SE,

Thank you so much for bringing this up. While sometimes a person is blessed with good fortune and position when in a close walk with God it does not necessarily mean that all who are so blessed can be viewed as trustworthy in character. Name-dropping misses the mark when attempting to build a case or credibility.

I hope that those board members who are "stuck" will one day have the courage to stand up for truth and principle regardless of the fallout.

'B

Posted by: princessdi Mar 6 2007, 01:04 PM

Oh, I see so the fact that she was on the phone when he beckoned at all was "too much". Well, he wasn't beckoning too much, cuz according to him she had plenty of time to chat on the phone, etc. Poor thing! BTW, where is Brandi?

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 6 2007, 05:49 AM)

Di,
Danny expected that Linda be available at his beck and call... she was to be submissive to her man... you know how those controlling men can be... it doesn't matter where he was, she was suppose to be waiting for him, or drop everything in a moments notice to cater to the whims of her man.... just one level above barefoot and pregnant.... likewise that's what the dannyclones feel Linda should have done..... all of them chauvinistic and controlling.... and the female dannyclones have likewise bought into that mindset.....

so don't expect any meaningful dialog to come from that issue of where was Danny when Linda allegedly was on the phone, it doesn't matter.... Danny the annointed one, the heir to all that is good and righteous was to be served.....

I am sure you also realize that there are those who have been "promoted" to such positions for their backbone, and even moreso those who have been chosen for promotion for the lack

hereof..... as-if

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 10:15 PM)

And when will you realize soul that it is ludicrous that you refer to upstanding leaders, business men and women of our denomination as Lackeys. Do you really think that about Ellsworth McKee, Kenneth Denslow, Merlin F, Carmalita Troy etc are not smart enough to think for themselves or "brave" enough to disagree with something if they don't like it?

You know thats not realistic.....

Posted by: Noahswife Mar 6 2007, 01:47 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 6 2007, 08:49 AM)

Di,

Danny expected that Linda be available at his beck and call... she was to be submissive to her man... you know how those controlling men can be... it doesn't matter where he was, she was suppose to be waiting for him, or drop everything in a moments notice to cater to the whims of her man.... just one level above barefoot and pregnant..... likewise that's what the dannyclones feel Linda should have done..... all of them chauvinistic and controlling.... and the female dannyclones have likewise bought into that mindset.....

so don't expect any meaningful dialog to come from that issue of where was Danny when Linda allegedly was on the phone, it doesn't matter.... Danny the annointed one, the heir to all that is good and righteous was to be served.....

'Where love rules, there is no will to power; and where power predominates, here love is lacking. The one is the shadow of the other.'

Carl Gustav Jung

Posted by: Lee Mar 6 2007, 01:54 PM

It is obvious that all of you are making "shots in the dark" because you don't know what you are talking about. You feel so free to make judgments based on heresay.

Danny is not chauvanistic and neither is Bystander or Greg. You don't know them Clay, so how can you judge? You are just spouting to the wind.

To use the term "lackeys" is disrespectful and unChristlike.

PB: how do you know Nathan didn't get the attention he needed from his parents? I'm a grandmother like you are--surely you are smarter than that!

Now you say some board members are "stuck" in their position. That is not truthful PERIOD!

It would be better to keep quiet than to spout off and show foolishness as I am reading in this thread.

Posted by: caribbean sda Mar 6 2007, 02:00 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 6 2007, 03:54 PM)

It is obvious that all of you are making "shots in the dark" because you don't know what you are talking about. You feel so free to make judgments based on heresay.

Danny is not chauvanistic and neither is Bystander or Greg. You don't know them Clay, so how can you judge? You are just spouting to the wind.


To use the term "lackeys" is disrespectful and unChristlike.

PB: how do you know Nathan didn't get the attention he needed from his parents? I'm a grandmother like you are--surely you are smarter than that!

Now you say some board members are "stuck" in their position. That is not truthful PERIOD!

It would be better to keep quiet than to spout off and show foolishness as I am reading in this thread.

his one rates 4 violins



Posted by: Clay Mar 6 2007, 02:18 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 6 2007, 01:54 PM)

It is obvious that all of you are making "shots in the dark" because you don't know what you are talking about. You feel so free to make judgments based on heresay.

Danny is not chauvanistic and neither is Bystander or Greg. You don't know them Clay, so how can you judge? You are just spouting to the wind.

To use the term "lackeys" is disrespectful and unChristlike.

PB: how do you know Nathan didn't get the attention he needed from his parents? I'm a grandmother like you are--surely you are smarter than that!

Now you say some board members are "stuck" in their position. That is not truthful PERIOD!

It would be better to keep quiet than to spout off and show foolishness as I am reading in this thread.

not judging just making an observation..... and why not take your own advice..... i.e. keep quiet rather than spouting off?

Posted by: from-the-pew Mar 6 2007, 02:21 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 6 2007, 02:54 PM)

Danny is not chauvanistic and neither is Bystander or Greg. You don't know them Clay, so how can you judge? You are just spouting to the wind.

Whoa... rewind... who is Greg?

(Context would not be consistent with Gregory Matthews aka Observer)

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 6 2007, 02:21 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 6 2007, 12:54 PM)

PB: how do you know Nathan didn't get the attention he needed from his parents? I'm a grandmother like you are--surely you are smarter than that!

I read Mending Broken People. I don't know for sure that the children didn't get all the attention they needed as they grew, but by the descriptions in the book both co-founders put a lot of their time into raising 3abn so it stands to reason that there may have not been enough of Danny and Linda to sufficiently go around.

My husband and I built and briefly ran a business and found there was precious little time for our own small children. I know about the shame I mentioned from personal experience.

QUOTE

Now you say some board members are "stuck" in their position. That is not truthful PERIOD!

And you know this, how? Soul Espresso knows at least some of them and knows about at least one who is "stuck". Read his post. First-hand testimony from him.

QUOTE

It would be better to keep quiet than to spout off and show foolishness as I am reading in this thread.

I agree, Lee. Good advice and I hope you take it.

PB

Posted by: princessdi Mar 6 2007, 02:40 PM

You got that right! Greg=wwjd?

BTW, Welcome to BSDA! I see you understand our motto quite well....."This is not Sabbath School, we pay attention"

QUOTE(from-the-pew @ Mar 6 2007, 12:21 PM)

Whoa... rewind... who is Greg?

(Context would not be consistent with Gregory Matthews aka Observer)

Posted by: princessdi Mar 6 2007, 06:41 PM

Then fine, Lee. Have it your way? Go back to my questions. Where was Danny while his wife and step son of twenty years were going through this time? Why was he not emotionally available to Linda? Where was he when he had ALL this time for long phone calls and trips? Why was Danny not steppin' up like a real man and addressing the Dr. with his wife about "their" son?

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 6 2007, 11:54 AM)

It is obvious that all of you are making "shots in the dark" because you don't know what you are talking about. You feel so free to make judgments based on heresay.

Danny is not chauvanistic and neither is Bystander or Greg. You don't know them Clay, so how can you judge? You are just spouting to the wind.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 6 2007, 06:54 PM

QUOTE(Johann @ Mar 6 2007, 08:37 AM)

Since you mention Miss Troy, then you had better tell us why Danny Shelton was not honest enough to honor the agreement he made with her parents? Why did he build tall Owen Troy a pigmy-size house to fit his own minute stature so that Elder Troy had to double up underneath the ceiling? Aren't the Shelton brothers carpenters enough to follow blueprints, or are they never used in that part of Southern Illinois?

I am so glad you stated this as you did. That way everyone can see the similarities between you and Pickle

1. Honor an agreement? Danny did not build the house. Kenny S was the contractor, so Danny was not under any agreement.

2. What you refer to as a "pigmy" size house is unbelievable. The house is enormous. What you refer to is a 6ft sloping attic. When Mrs. Troy ask for the attic to be walled in, the contractor told her it would be 6ft or less at the tallest point with a sloping ceiling. He was clear that (due to Owen's height) they would only want to use the area for storage. Owen didn't realize his wifes plan for storage and decided later he would like an office there, obviously that wouldn't work. The End.

You are really getting desperate to bring up something so minute and try to turn it into something major.

The above statement in red is deceitful enough to be a lie.

Also in an earlier post several months back you told me that Ann T told you this story in the way that you had written it. She was asked if she did.

Her answer was no, that is not what she said to you.

So far, you have been consistent in telling all your stories this way. You tell a small part but then

leave out the rest, or totally blow it out of proportion until it becomes a falsehood.
If anyone wants to see if Johann is telling the truth about the "pigmy house" I will have someone get some pictures for me and we will see if it is as Johann describes.

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 6 2007, 01:18 PM) □

not judging just making an observation..... and why not take your own advice..... i.e. keep quiet rather than spouting off?

How can you make an observation when you have never met them or been around them?

Danny wanted her 1 step above barefoot and pregnant??? You cannot imagine how wrong you are. She never cooked for her family, she had people to do her cleaning, she didn't even wash DS's clothes!!! He did that himself. He cooked for himself and usually made her breakfast. She went where she wanted, she bought whatever she wanted and she did whatever she wanted until she brought a 3rd party into the picture. Her own children could tell you that all the above is true. Now does that make her a horrible wife and mother? No, it doesn't. What it does do, is show you and others like you how far off track you are about the role you accuse DS of playing. You judge and accuse on nothing but what you have read here.

Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 6 2007, 07:16 PM

Quote Bystander - 1....Danny did not build the house. Kenny S was the contractor, so Danny was not under any agreement.

This doesn't preclude a second person from working on a project and offering verbal solutions to future owner/occupier.

Quote Bystander - 2. What you refer to is a 6ft sloping attic. When Mrs. Troy ask for the attic to be walled in, the contractor told her it would be 6ft or less at the tallest point with a sloping ceiling. He was clear that (due to Owen's height) they would only want to use the area for storage. Owen didn't realize his wifes plan for storage and decided later he would like an office there, obviously that wouldn't work.

I'm not sure you're qualified to be talking about things related to legal building codes. Building inspectors don't allow these kind of changes without owner resubmitting plans for approval first. Ceiling height, insulation, truss load/floor joist spacing, etc., etc., must be changed if a living quarter in the attic is added. Insurance companies and county assessors are also legally concerned with changes.

Posted by: Pickle Mar 6 2007, 07:20 PM

If you know all that, Bystander who adamantly refuses to stand by, certainly you can tell us 3ABN's side of the story as to why Nick Miller was forced to resign.

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Mar 6 2007, 07:26 PM

If Dan was not directly involved with the building, he sure spent enough time their during the process to do so. His truck was parked there quite often.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 6 2007, 08:14 PM

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Mar 6 2007, 06:26 PM)

If Dan was not directly involved with the building, he sure spent enough time their during the process to do so. His truck was parked there quite often.

That would make sense, since his brother was doing the work. Again, what is your point. That is neither here nor there with Johans untrue story about the house. Why don't you comment on that. Obviously you have seen the house and know he painted a totally untrue picture. But no, of course you won't comment on that. Because that wouldn't make DS look bad.

QUOTE(LaurenceD @ Mar 6 2007, 06:16 PM)

I'm not sure you're qualified to be talking about things related to legal building codes. Building inspectors don't allow these kind of changes without owner resubmitting plans for approval first. Ceiling height, insulation, truss load/floor joist spacing, etc., etc., must be changed if a living quarter in the attic is added. Insurance companies and county assessors are also legally concerned with changes.

You obviously are not from a rural area. Other than faulty wiring that could burn down a building, you don't go through those channels in rural areas. You can change what you want when you want without notifying anyone. When the insurance co. comes after the house is finished, they could care less whether you built an attic or storage area they assess "as is" And the tax assessor does the same.

All of that was said for nothing because it is all a moot point. Let me help you understand that the point was, Johann did not tell the story truthfully in any kind of way, and the owners, say that he did not.

Posted by: seraph|m Mar 6 2007, 08:15 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Mar 6 2007, 01:41 AM)

bs's specialty.nonsense. and then thinking anyone accepts the nonsense. that's nonsense.

Sonshine, is this like a "play on words"? BS in some circles means nonsense or "bull". Just curious.

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Mar 6 2007, 08:20 PM


QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 6 2007, 09:14 PM)

That would make sense, since his brother was doing the work. Again, what is your point. That is neither here nor there with Johans untrue story about the house. Why don't you comment on

that. Obviously you have seen the house and know he painted a totally untrue picture. But no, of course you won't comment on that. Because that wouldn't make DS look bad. snip...

No, I didn't comment, because unlike you, I am not all-knowing.

Why, exactly would it be normal that a brother spends hours and hours on the job. My brother doesn't come to work with me? Does yours?


I really could care less about whether or not the house is too small or too large. I was commenting on Dan being involved or not. Thank God we always have you to keep us on track. 

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 6 2007, 08:21 PM

QUOTE(seraph|m @ Mar 6 2007, 06:15 PM) 


Sonshine, is this like a "play on words"? BS in some circles means nonsense or "bull". Just curious.




 yes, I am multitasking.

Posted by: seraph|m Mar 6 2007, 08:27 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Mar 6 2007, 09:21 PM) 

 yes, I am multitasking.

Thank you for clarifying. 

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 6 2007, 08:37 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 6 2007, 07:14 PM) 

You obviously are not from a rural area. Other than faulty wiring that could burn down a building, you don't go through those channels in rural areas. You can change what you want when you want without notifying anyone. When the insurance co. comes after the house is finished, they could care less whether you built an attic or storage area they assess "as is" And the tax assessor does the same.

Bystander,

Are you saying that there are no building codes being enforced in Franklin County other than for wiring? Did the buildings at 3abn get built without any type of building codes being followed? Is this really standard practice in rural Illinois?

I am updating my post to advise you that I have just written an email to the Illinois Capital Development Board (formerly the Illinois Building Commission) to find out if you really can bypass "those channels" in rural areas. I will let you know what I am advised.

Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 6 2007, 08:49 PM

PeacefullyBewildered, in 2005, the governor became concerned for building codes in rural areas of Illinois. The state commissioned a task force for an evaluation. The task force recommend adoption of the IBB by May of this year (2007). The governor will ask the state legislature for adoption of the code at that time.

There are federal codes that already apply, like the American Disabilities Act. Enforcement is another kind of problem, but violations are easy to spot.

Bystander may not realize self-regulation is about to come to an end.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 6 2007, 08:59 PM

QUOTE(LaurenceD @ Mar 6 2007, 07:49 PM)

PeacefullyBewildered, in 2005, the governor became concerned for building codes in rural areas of Illinois. The state commissioned a task force for an evaluation. The task force recommend adoption of the IBB by May of this year (2007). The governor will ask the state legislature for adoption of the code at that time.

There are federal codes that already apply, like the American Disabilities Act. Enforcement is another kind of problem, but violations are easy to spot.

Bystander may not realize self-regulation is about to come to an end.

LD,

you are leaps and bounds ahead of me (I'm not at all surprised). I guess that my questions of Bystander can most likely be answered in the affirmative. I wonder if the buildings at 3abn are safe? I hope so. Nobody needs any more problems.

Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 6 2007, 09:11 PM

PeacefullyBewildered, I'll take a look at the outside of the buildings with the zoom on google earth and see if anything looks fishy, like modifying the trusses of manufactured/mobile home--which are regulated by the Feds (FHA), not local building officials.

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 6 2007, 09:41 PM

QUOTE(LaurenceD @ Mar 6 2007, 09:49 PM)

PeacefullyBewildered, in 2005, the governor became concerned for building codes in rural areas of Illinois. The state commissioned a task force for an evaluation. The task force recommend adoption of the IBB by May of this year (2007). The governor will ask the state legislature for adoption of the code at that time.

There are federal codes that already apply, like the American Disabilities Act. Enforcement is another kind of problem, but violations are easy to spot.

Bystander may not realize self-regulation is about to come to an end.

I also want to know, what is your point?

You are not talking about a house which will be built , you are talking about a house built when???

What is the deal with the Governor being concerned in 2005, how does that relate to this discussion, of the Troy's house and johann's claims it was built in pygmy proportions, and D.S.wasn't honest enough to keep his agreement?

What agreement Laurence?

And what evidence backs up johanns claims??? DO YOU PERSONALLY KNOW, or have some kind of verification aside from Johann?

The point has been made that the owners disagree with what Johann says...

Can YOU prove different? If not, again, what is YOUR point?

Posted by: Bystander Mar 6 2007, 09:45 PM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 6 2007, 08:41 PM)

I also want to know, what is your point?

You are not talking about a house which will be built , you are talking about a house built when???

What is the deal with Governor being concerned in 2005, how does that relate to this discussion?

And what evidence backs up johanns claims???

The point has been made that the owners disagree with what he says...

Can you prove different? If not, again, what is your point?

Aletheia, I think that Laurence, Like observer likes everyone to know that he is familiar with certain laws and codes and obviously has time to look up the answers that he wants to give. Trouble is, usually what he brings up is just useless information that has nothing to do with the actual point of the post.


Posted by: Rosyroi Mar 6 2007, 09:56 PM

QUOTE(Chez @ Mar 6 2007, 05:08 AM)

His fruits or the lack thereof speak volumes. It is interesting to note that when the word went out about Linda and the Dr. A, I felt sorry for Danny. Danny was pleading on the 3ABN for Linda to turn around. Many of us were heartbroken. My spouse and I asked why was she traveling to Norway and spending so much time with this doctor. We heard about the specialty in treatment and began to ask "Why wasn't Danny also involved in the treatment process with Nathan?" Nathan had lived in his house for many years. I presented a generic scenario to several psychologists colleagues and all agreed that the stepfather should have been involved in Nathan treatment recovery. The unanimous conclusion (without having diagnosed and treated Nathan) was that Nathan and Danny did not have a positive relationship. In addition, the fact that the mother and the stepfather were still married and Nathan was going through treatment. This would have been an opportune time for the stepfather to reach out to Nathan and show his love and concern for him, thus taking on a more humane and paternal role.

Let's get real. Danny was tired of Linda and wanted a divorce. He got a quick divorce. This has trouble quite a few people in my area. These people were staunch 3ABN supporters and contributors. It is interesting to sit and listen to them. Not all of these people were fans of Linda, however, they did not like and still don't approve of how Danny got rid of her. The problem was not only the divorce, but the rapidity of such an act and his remarriage. Some believe that if Linda and the doctor were so involved as claimed by Danny, then she would have been the first to get married. However, this is not the case.

Bystander, you sound as though you are a confidant of Danny. There are many people who are troubled by his divorce from Linda, remarriage to Brandy, and the trashing of Linda on 3ABN. Not all of these people are Adventists. Please suggest to him to return to his mission, keep his mouth shut (including his staff) about Linda and others (even through inuendos), and get on with the work that he says that the Lord called him to do. The very people who he is trying to reach are noticing that something is wrong. The very people who he is trying to reach are turned off by it. Danny should cease and decist with his continued rhetoric and get on with the mission of 3ABN! He is hurting himself.



There are people in my neighborhood LOVE 3ABN but are saying they are upset and don't like what Danny spews on world wide television.
Others are saying they quit watching 3ABN because they don't like what Danny says.
I also wish Danny would get back to the mission of 3ABN.

Posted by: Rosyroi Mar 6 2007, 10:13 PM

QUOTE(seraph|m @ Mar 6 2007, 06:27 PM)

Thank you for clarifying.

was watching that one also. 

Posted by: Fran Mar 6 2007, 11:24 PM


QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 6 2007, 01:04 PM)

Oh, I see so the fact that she was on the phone when he beckoned at all was "too much". Well, he wasn't beckoning too much, cuz according to him she had plenty of time to chat on the phone, etc. Poor thing! BTW, where is Brandi?

Fran: Very GOOD point! I think we need to check HIS phone records and see who was calling him and who he was calling!

I am sure you also realize that there are those who have been "promoted" to such positions for their backbone, and even moreso those who have been chosen for promotion for the lack

thereof.....



Well these people that continue to stay are in the process of loosing their credibility and their position.

Think about this:

What did Linda vote when Danny was no longer allowed to be a 3ABN employee years ago?

Did she go against Danny's wishes?

Did he just let that pass?

Or did he decide way back then that it would never happen again?

Then BOOM, fast forward to 2003! Linda was on the board at the time. The letter came; what was Linda's reaction?

Did she ever voice her opinion that Melody should not be allowed to sing on 3ABN?

Was this when Danny privately went to others to pray for him because he needed Linda off the board?

Was this actually the preparation of the foundation of doubt to get rid of Linda as far back as then?

What if Danny could no longer allow Linda to go against him where his family was involved?

He felt he not only needed her out of 3ABN, but out of his life too?

The Dr was a total unexpected rabbit caught in Danny's trap. Yep, just in time to fill that need to get rid of Linda.

Could this be true? Is it possible this could have happened.

Now I must sign off, stating the above is only my opinion. The above statements are mine and mine alone. This is my Q-CY/MA-L. Thank you.

Posted by: Fran Mar 7 2007, 12:05 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 6 2007, 09:41 PM)

I also want to know, what is your point?

You are not talking about a house which will be built , you are talking about a house built when???


What is the deal with the Governor being concerned in 2005, how does that relate to this discussion, of the Troy's house and johann's claims it was built in pygmy proportions, and D.S.wasn't honest enough to keep his agreement?

What agreement Laurence?

And what evidence backs up johanns claims??? DO YOU PERSONALLY KNOW, or have some kind of verification aside from Johann?

The point has been made that the owners disagree with what Johann says...

Can YOU prove different? If not, again, what is YOUR point?



Posted by: princessdi Mar 7 2007, 12:19 AM

Now, Fran, that is not such a far fetched Idea. I once had a very good customer. She was married to a man quite a bit older and that married her from an extremely sheltered home environment, right out of high school(this being her first and only relationship. Apparently as the years passed, he began "seeing" someone else, but was at a loss as to "exit" his marriage, by now they had three boys. Well, feeling the lack of attention and alienation, the young woman turned to a friend, who ws "there" at that point to talk, listen, etc. Now this young lady was very young, and made the mistake of having her friend call her house. Man that husband took that and ran with it. He had to police come when he ws gettign his things out of the house, because he said that she abused him(the woman was tall, but not big as a minute, In fact my Father over heard her telling me that and said later to me that the man should be ahsamed to tell anybody that woman beat him) and eventually also said she abused the boys. He said ALL kinds of things, made her life a living hell.....she was completely clueless until one day she spanked one of her boys and he got mad and told her they were getting a new "mommy" who was nice and didnt' spank them...this was only about a month after he had left. This man called child protectove services I can't tell you how many times. It soon became apparent to them that "he" was crazy and they gave her

custody of the boys. So the good Dr. appearance at the right time, is not such a stretch...it's been done....ain't nothin' new under the sun! LOL!!

*****I would also like to clarify that the above story is true, but the premise as it pertains to the Shelton case is purely from the Book of Princess*****

QUOTE(Fran @ Mar 6 2007, 09:24 PM) □

The Dr was a total unexpected rabbit caught in Danny's trap. Yep, just in time to fill that need to get rid of Linda.

Now I must sign off, stating the above is only my opinion. The above statements are mine and mine alone. This is my Q-CY/MA-L. Thank you. [/b]

Posted by: Fran Mar 7 2007, 12:33 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 6 2007, 09:45 PM) □

Aletheia, I think that Laurence, Like observer likes everyone to know that he is familiar with certain laws and codes and obviously has time to look up the answers that he wants to give. Trouble is, usually what he brings up is just useless information that has nothing to do with the actual point of the post.

Give Observer and LaurenceD a break OK?

Observer does his best. Most of the time he is right on the mark. What can you expect from someone who is always sitting on the politically correct side of the fence at any given moment. It has been difficult now that he has decided to take a stand. It is hard to get off those spiked fences you know!

He can't be all that bad; he reads Voltaire, who by the way was a brilliant man! He caused people not to just take things as stated to them, but to check it out first. That is why we are here right? To check things out?

Another reason I respect him is because he has helped Linda when Danny fired AND divorced her in one BIG breath!

Now I must close out by saying that the above is my opinion and only my opinion. This is my Q-CY/M-A/P-L Statement. (Quick, Cover Your/My A--/Posterior Legally.)

By the way, I still have questions; are you ready?

Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 7 2007, 08:58 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia)

I also want to know, what is your point?

You are not talking about a house which will be built , you are talking about a house built when???

What is the deal with the Governor being concerned in 2005, how does that relate to this discussion, of the Troy's house and johann's claims it was built in pygmy proportions, and D.S.wasn't honest enough to keep his agreement?

What agreement Laurence?

And what evidence backs up johanns claims??? DO YOU PERSONALLY KNOW, or have some kind of verification aside from Johann?

The point has been made that the owners disagree with what Johann says...

Can YOU prove different? If not, again, what is YOUR point?

ust observing this series of incoherent questions above, the answers would not likely mean much to you.

QUOTE(Bystander)

]Aletheia, I think that Laurence, Like observer likes everyone to know that he is familiar with certain laws and codes and obviously has time to look up the answers that he wants to give. Trouble is, usually what he brings up is just useless information that has nothing to do with the actual point of the post.

That's probably the best way for you to look at it.

Posted by: seraph|m Mar 7 2007, 09:15 AM



Posted by: Lee Mar 7 2007, 10:52 AM

QUOTE(Fran @ Mar 7 2007, 01:33 AM)

Give Observer and LaurenceD a break OK?

Observer does his best. Most of the time he is right on the mark. What can you expect from someone who is always sitting on the politically correct side of the fence at any given moment. It has been difficult now that he has decided to take a stand. It is hard to get off those spiked fences you know!

He can't be all that bad; he reads Voltaire, who by the way was a brilliant man! He caused people not to just take things as stated to them, but to check it out first. That is why we are here right? To check things out?

Another reason I respect him is because he has helped Linda when Danny fired AND divorced her in one BIG breath!

Now I must close out by saying that the above is my opinion and only my opinion. This is my Q-CY/M-A/P-L Statement. (Quick, Cover Your/My A--/Posterior Legally.)

By the way, I still have questions; are you ready?

Voltaire brilliant? I don't think so Fran.

Here is what God said about Voltaire through the pen of Ellen G. White:

"When Voltaire was five years old, he committed to memory an infidel poem, and the pernicious influence was never effaced from his mind. He became one of Satan's most successful agents to lead men away from God. Thousands will rise up in the judgment and charge the ruin of their souls upon the infidel Voltaire." Child Guidance, p. 196.

You can also read Great Controversy, p. 281 and 288 if you want more information. There you can read where she said Voltaire spread his poison of infidelity everywhere.

Brilliant? Absolutely not in the eyes of God. He will answer for the loss of souls someday because of his spreading of lies, THOUSANDS (plural) of souls will be lost because of him. I wouldn't read this mans writings for anything. I'd stay far away from them.

Posted by: lurker Mar 7 2007, 11:05 AM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 6 2007, 01:04 PM)
BTW, where is Brandi?

It would seem that the problem the old wife tried to help her son solve, the new wife may have with her brother's problems.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 7 2007, 11:12 AM

QUOTE(lurker @ Mar 7 2007, 10:05 AM)

QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 6 2007, 01:04 PM)
BTW, where is Brandi?

It would seem that the problem the old wife tried to help her son solve, the new wife may have with her brother's problems.

Now what are you trying to insinuate and spread. Is there no end? In fact, Calvin can correct me if I am wrong, but I thought Brandi was off limits. She hasn't done anything to anybody and should not even be brought up here.
 Calvin is that right or wrong?

Posted by: Bystander Mar 7 2007, 11:24 AM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 7 2007, 09:52 AM)

Voltaire brilliant? I don't think so Fran.

Here is what God said about Voltaire through the pen of Ellen G. White:

"When Voltaire was five years old, he committed to memory an infidel poem, and the pernicious influence was never effaced from his mind. He became one of Satan's most successful agents to lead men away from God. Thousands will rise up in the judgment and charge the ruin of their souls upon the infidel Voltaire." Child Guidance, p. 196.

You can also read Great Controversy, p. 281 and 288 if you want more information. There you can read where she said Voltaire spread his poison of infidelity everywhere.

Brilliant? Absolutely not in the eyes of God. He will answer for the loss of souls someday because of his spreading of lies, THOUSANDS (plural) of souls will be lost because of him. I wouldn't read this mans writings for anything. I'd stay far away from them.

Now, this sheds some light on a subject that keeps being mentioned here. EGW couldn't be any plainer on the subject. That helps me understand the "personalities" of those that are a big fan of Voltaire.

Posted by: princessdi Mar 7 2007, 11:43 AM

I am not insinuating anything. I just asked where she was. To my knowledge she has not been on the show, or very visible lately. That is all I meant. Now, from your response one would think something was wrong. I don't think we can get around Brandi being brought up either. Now what is off limits is anything pertaining to her life before marrying Danny. However, she will be mentioned as she inherited this mess through marriage.

@ Bystander trying to tell Calvin on me! Stop!

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 7 2007, 09:12 AM)

Now what are you trying to insinuate and spread. Is there no end? In fact, Calvin can correct me if I am wrong, but I thought Brandi was off limits. She hasn't done anything to anybody and should not even be brought up here.
Calvin is that right or wrong?

Posted by: lurker Mar 7 2007, 11:45 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 7 2007, 11:12 AM)

Now what are you trying to insinuate and spread. Is there no end? In fact, Calvin can correct me if I am wrong, but I thought Brandi was off limits. She hasn't done anything to anybody and should not even be brought up here.
Calvin is that right or wrong?

J.K. Even if we say she is off limits, is her brother? It is a matter of public record in the courts. Does

not necessarily reflect badly on her. Just that she may feel that he needs moral support and sympathy.

Posted by: seraph|m Mar 7 2007, 11:49 AM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 7 2007, 12:43 PM)

I am not insinuating anything. I just asked where she was. To my knowledge she has not been on the show, or very visible lately. That is all I meant. Now, from your response one would think something was wrong. I don't think we can get around Brandi being brought up either. Now what is off limits is anything pertaining to her life before marrying Danny. However, she will be mentioned as she inherited this mess through marriage.

@ Bystander trying to tell Calvin on me! Stop!

Remember, my g-mom use to say that a lie don't care who tells it.

Posted by: princessdi Mar 7 2007, 11:59 AM

I didn't know Brandi had a brother. But I am sure that he is pretty much off limits. Unless it has something to do with the owrkings of 3ABN, I think we should just let this die right here. Brandi married Danny and is only mentioned in relationship to that. No need to drag in her whole family. Not very nice, either.

QUOTE(lurker @ Mar 7 2007, 09:45 AM)

O.K. Even if we say she is off limits, is her brother? It is a matter of public record in the courts. Does not necessarily reflect badly on her. Just that she may feel that he needs moral support and sympathy.

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 7 2007, 12:08 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 7 2007, 12:24 PM)

Wow, this sheds some light on a subject that keeps being mentioned here. EGW couldn't be any plainer on the subject. That helps me understand the "personalities" of those that are a big fan of Voltaire.

Have you ever read anything written by Voltaire? Have you ever even tried to do so?

Any of you is welcome to answer...

In His service,

Mr. J

Posted by: Clay Mar 7 2007, 12:10 PM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 7 2007, 12:08 PM)

Have you ever read anything written by Voltaire? Have you ever even tried to do so?



Any of you is welcome to answer...

In His service,
Mr. J

it may have been read but if their comprehension of Voltaire is like it is here..... then ummmm it went right over their heads.....

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 7 2007, 12:12 PM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 7 2007, 12:43 PM)

 @ Bystander trying to tell Calvin on me! Stop! 

His mommy wasn't available...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Bystander Mar 7 2007, 12:21 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 7 2007, 11:10 AM)

it may have been read but if their comprehension of Voltaire is like it is here..... then ummmm it went right over their heads.....

Obviously, then, it went right over EGW's head too, if you read her conclusions. But, of course, you guys no more that she did. I forgot

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 7 2007, 11:12 AM)

His mommy wasn't available...

In His service,
Mr. J

So actually she's not. She died a few years ago. But, you certainly are right, a mom would be nice to talk to concerning this mess.

Posted by: Clay Mar 7 2007, 12:22 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 7 2007, 12:20 PM)

Obviously, then, it went right over EGW's head too, if you read her conclusions. But, of course, you guys no more that she did. I forgot

It's not "no" it's "know" and it's clear we know more than you.... and of course it went over her head.... she only went to the 3rd grade... if indeed she wrote the quote that was posted.... it could have been one of her scribes.....

Posted by: Lee Mar 7 2007, 12:37 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 7 2007, 01:10 PM)

It may have been read but if their comprehension of Voltaire is like it is here..... then ummmm it went right over their heads.....

It would be foolish indeed to read Voltaire after reading what Ellen White has said. Oh, but you think you are big men and you can tell what is right or wrong in Voltaire's writings? Well, then consider this:

Just as soon as you begin to think you are big men, and that you are so large that you can comprehend and pick out all that is precious in INFIDEL authors, and leave out all that is vile, then you are wise above that which is written....The devil is right by your side, and the evil angels are here. The devil is a great deal smarter than you are, and you cannot see what he is driving at. He will so cunningly interweave his sentiments with the thoughts of these writers, that it will be IMPOSSIBLE to distinguish the error which they contain."

This was taken from This Day With God, p. 217 (emphasis mine)

Mr. J.--go ahead and look up what I wrote about Voltaire yourself. I believe Child Guidance and Great Controversy are both available online in case you don't have the book to verify what was said. Here is the link for you: <http://www.whiteestate.org/books/books.asp>

Or if they don't have this online at their site, then borrow a book from your Church.

Oh, and Clay, ignore my spelling mistakes. Thanks.

Posted by: Clay Mar 7 2007, 12:39 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 7 2007, 12:37 PM)

It would be foolish indeed to read Voltaire after reading what Ellen White has said. Oh, but you think you are big men and you can tell what is right or wrong in Voltaire's writings? Well, then consider this:

"Just as soon as you begin to think you are big men, and that you are so large that you can comprehend and pick out all that is precious in INFIDEL authors, and leave out all that is vile, then you are wise above that which is written....The devil is right by your side, and the evil angels are there. The devil is a great deal smarter than you are, and you cannot see what he is driving at. He will so cunningly interweave his sentiments with the thoughts of these writers, that it will be IMPOSSIBLE to distinguish the error which they contain."

This was taken from This Day With God, p. 217 (emphasis mine)

Mr. J.--go ahead and look up what I wrote about Voltaire yourself. I believe Child Guidance and Great Controversy are both available online in case you don't have the book to verify what was said. Here is the link for you: <http://www.whiteestate.org/books/books.asp>

Or if they don't have this online at their site, then borrow a book from your Church.

Oh, and Clay, ignore my spelling mistakes. Thanks.

comments like this reflect the fact that some have a brain that they have chosen not to use.....

Posted by: Lee Mar 7 2007, 12:46 PM

Excuse me Clay? Are you trying to accuse me of something? Are you speaking of what I said or of Ellen White? And you are a moderator on here? What kind of example are you?

Sorry, your ad hominem remarks show that you just must have the last word, even if there is nothing more than to say I am not using my brain. So tell me, what part of my post tells you I'm not using my brain?

Can't find anything? then it is better to be quiet than make useless accusations.

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 7 2007, 12:47 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 7 2007, 01:37 PM)

It would be foolish indeed to read Voltaire after reading what Ellen White has said. Oh, but you think you are big men and you can tell what is right or wrong in Voltaire's writings? Well, then consider this:

"Just as soon as you begin to think you are big men, and that you are so large that you can comprehend and pick out all that is precious in INFIDEL authors, and leave out all that is vile, then you are wise above that which is written....The devil is right by your side, and the evil angels are there. The devil is a great deal smarter than you are, and you cannot see what he is driving at. He will so cunningly interweave his sentiments with the thoughts of these writers, that it will be

IMPOSSIBLE to distinguish the error which they contain."

This was taken from This Day With God, p. 217 (emphasis mine)

Mr. J.--go ahead and look up what I wrote about Voltaire yourself. I believe Child Guidance and Great Controversy are both available online in case you don't have the book to verify what was said. Here is the link for you: <http://www.whiteestate.org/books/books.asp>

Or if they don't have this online at their site, then borrow a book from your Church.

Oh, and Clay, ignore my spelling mistakes. Thanks.

Do you realize that your thinking would have been very much at home in Berlin in 1936, don't you?

Are you going to wait until sundown for the book burning or is it so compelling that you need to start it right away?

Ray Bradbury didn't know how prescient he was being in writing Fahrenheit 451... but when people like you start endorsing censorship and the avoidance of ideas as something laudable... we are but a short step on a slippery slope from having firemen that start fires with material deemed 'objectionable' rather than putting fires out; who take the lives of those deemed dangerous thinkers rather than saving lives...

And to make it worse, you actually think your stance is righteous...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Clay Mar 7 2007, 12:48 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 7 2007, 12:46 PM)

Excuse me Clay? Are you trying to accuse me of something? Are you speaking of what I said or of Ellen White? And you are a moderator on here? What kind of example are you?

Sorry, your ad hominem remarks show that you just must have the last word, even if there is nothing more than to say I am not using my brain. So tell me, what part of my post tells you I'm not using my brain?

Can't find anything? then it is better to be quiet than make useless accusations.

did say something... did you not understand? since this is a public forum I can say something anytime I so choose.... and we need not get into what it would be better for you to do....

Posted by: Bystander Mar 7 2007, 12:55 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 7 2007, 11:22 AM)

its not "no" its "know" and its clear we know more than you.... and of course it went over her head.... she only went to the 3rd grade... if indeed she wrote the quote that was posted... it could have been one of her scribes.....

Well, those comments pretty much let us know where you stand with Ellen White. Unbelievable. Lee is correct when she says satan makes sure you can't discern between what is good and bad by infidel writers. Very few people would be arrogant enough to say they could, and wouldn't you know it, 2 of them are here, woops 3 I forgot Fran...

Posted by: Lee Mar 7 2007, 12:55 PM

Wow Clay--you are a just like pickle--sure go ahead and accuse me or Sister White. Since you refuse to answer my question, I will assume it is both of us.

Yes, this is a public forum. And you can say whatever you want. But to insult a prophet of God is serious business. Are you sure you wanted to go there?

Oh, did I say how you are like Pickle? Well, for pity sakes, can't you figure it out?

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 7 2007, 12:56 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 7 2007, 01:21 PM)

No actually she's not. She died a few years ago. But, you certainly are right, a mom would be nice to talk to concerning this mess.

it's actually better for her; if she could see you now, she'd die of shame...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Clay Mar 7 2007, 01:00 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 7 2007, 12:55 PM)

Well, those comments pretty much let us know where you stand with Ellen White. Unbelievable. Lee is correct when she says satan makes sure you can't discern between what is good and bad by infidel writers. Very few people would be arrogant enough to say they could, and wouldn't you know it, 2 of them are here, woops 3 I forgot Fran...

Bystander you are arrogant enough to have us believe you know everything about this saga... you and your twin wwjd.... and you can quit trying to hide behind egw... she is dead, and has been dead for sometime.... the only infidel writers on this forum would be you, and your dannyclone friends...

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 7 2007, 12:55 PM)

Wow Clay--you are a just like pickle--sure go ahead and accuse me or Sister White. Since you refuse to answer my question, I will assume it is both of us.

Yes, this is a public forum. And you can say whatever you want. But to insult a prophet of God is serious business. Are you sure you wanted to go there?

Oh, did I say how you are like Pickle? Well, for pity sakes, can't you figure it out?

No I am not like Pickle, but you are just like the rest of the dannyclones.... shows how much you have not been paying attention.... the prophet is dead.... been dead almost 100 yrs..... do you want to go there?

Posted by: Lee Mar 7 2007, 01:07 PM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 7 2007, 01:56 PM)

it's actually better for her; if she could see you now, she'd die of shame...

In His service,
Mr. J

Mr. J. you do NOT speak for the dead. Shame on you for stooping this low. Bystanders mother cannot come on here and defend not only herself but her son. I suggest you stop it right now. Your meanness and hatred is showing all too well.

Posted by: Clay Mar 7 2007, 01:09 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 7 2007, 01:07 PM)

Mr. J. you do NOT speak for the dead. Shame on you for stooping this low. Bystanders mother cannot come on here and defend not only herself but her son. I suggest you stop it right now. Your meanness and hatred is showing all too well.

the bible says... Resist the devil and he will flee..... we have been resisting but ya'll still here.....



Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 7 2007, 01:09 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 7 2007, 01:55 PM)

Wow Clay--you are a just like pickle--sure go ahead and accuse me or Sister White. Since you

refuse to answer my question, I will assume it is both of us.

Yes, this is a public forum. And you can say whatever you want. But to insult a prophet of God is serious business. Are you sure you wanted to go there?

Oh, did I say how you are like Pickle? Well, for pity sakes, can't you figure it out?

To paraphrase Lloyd Bentsen... I know EGW; EGW is a friend of mine... and you, Lee, are no EGW.

Don't even try this foolishness of equating disagreement with your myopic foolishness tantamount to rejecting EGW and, by extension God.

If she were still alive EGW would not be on your side... she would be speaking out against DS and TS and those of you who are making rationalizations for him like she spoke out against Kellogg and his atheism and would do so without apology.

So do yourself a favor and keep your false witness to yourself.

In His service,

Mr. J

Posted by: Lee Mar 7 2007, 01:09 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 7 2007, 02:00 PM)

Bystander you are arrogant enough to have us believe you know everything about this saga... you and your twin wwjd.... and you can quit trying to hide behind egw... she is dead, and has been dead for sometime.... the only infidel writers on this forum would be you, and your dannyclone friends... No I am not like Pickle, but you are just like the rest of the dannyclones.... shows how much you have not been paying attention.... the prophet is dead.... been dead almost 100 yrs..... do you want to go there?

Mrs. White may be dead BUT GOD ISN'T Clay. You are treading on very dangerous ground. God sent His WORD to us through Mrs. White. If you reject what she wrote, you REJECT GOD HIMSELF.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 7 2007, 01:09 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 7 2007, 01:21 PM) *

No actually she's not. She died a few years ago. But, you certainly are right, a mom would be nice to talk to concerning this mess.

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 7 2007, 11:56 AM) □

it's actually better for her; if she could see you now, she'd die of shame...

In His service,
Mr. J

Well, Mr. J, it seems you have hit an all time low with this remark. I am speechless. To say it would be better for her to be dead and then to say if she could see me she would Die with shame? I am shocked and disgusted that you would make light of anyone's parental death. I will end it there before I say too much

Posted by: Clay Mar 7 2007, 01:11 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 7 2007, 01:09 PM) □

Mrs. White may be dead BUT GOD ISN'T Clay. You are treading on very dangerous ground. God sent His WORD to us through Mrs. White. If you reject what she wrote, you REJECT GOD HIMSELF.

oh please spare me Bystander, and Lee.... you wouldnt know a word from the lord... as I said.... The bible says resist the devil and he will flee... we have been resisting, why you still here?

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 7 2007, 01:16 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 7 2007, 02:07 PM) □

Mr. J. you do NOT speak for the dead. Shame on you for stooping this low. Bystanders mother cannot come on here and defend not only herself but her son. I suggest you stop it right now. Your meanness and hatred is showing all too well.

Bystander's mother has not been insulted... nor has she been attacked... so dead or alive there is no need for her to defend herself or be defended.

I was pointing out that in spite of her giving bystander good home training, he is on here telling lies in hypocrisy in his attempt to defend the indefensible... and if she were alive to see it, it would break her heart because she'd know she taught him better than that.

And he knows it too.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Bystander Mar 7 2007, 01:17 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 7 2007, 12:11 PM)

oh please spare me Bystander, and Lee.... you wouldnt know a word from the lord... as I said....
The bible says resist the devil and he will flee... we have been resisting, why you still here?

You're confused. you posted Lee's post but responded to me.

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 7 2007, 01:19 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 7 2007, 02:09 PM)

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 7 2007, 01:21 PM) *

No actually she's not. She died a few years ago. But, you certainly are right, a mom would be nice to talk to concerning this mess.

Well, Mr. J, it seems you have hit an all time low with this remark. I am speechless. To say it would be better for her to be dead and then to say if she could see me she would Die with shame? I am shocked and disgusted that you would make light of anyone's parental death. I will end it there before I say too much

If someone he is speechless... and then proceeds to saying another 49 words immediately thereafter... was he lying when he claimed to be speechless?

I think you were trying to play the self-righteous indignation game... you should pick another game because you are not good at that one.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Bystander Mar 7 2007, 01:21 PM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 7 2007, 12:16 PM)

Bystander's mother has not been insulted... nor has she been attacked... so dead or alive there is no need for her to defend herself or be defended.

I was pointing out that in spite of her giving bystander good home training, he is on here telling lies in hypocrisy in his attempt to defend the indefensible... and if she were alive to see it, it would break her heart because she'd know she taught him better than that.

And he knows it too.

In His service,
Mr. J

Your post was plain enough, making light of a parental death. Then telling how a mother would feel


whom you have never met. My mother would be proud that I am standing up for what I know to be truth, but, regardless, this also shows that you will justify any statement you make no matter how degrading. Most christians would say they were out of line and apologize but no not you. Anything that comes out of your mouth is OK.

Posted by: Clay Mar 7 2007, 01:21 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 7 2007, 01:17 PM)

You're confused. you posted Lee's post but responded to me.

not at all.... trying to do two or three with one post... since you all are related interrelated, cloned, borged.... something... spiritually inbred... but that would be about as hard to prove as spiritual adultery...



Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 7 2007, 01:24 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 7 2007, 02:21 PM)

Your post was plain enough, making light of a parental death. Then telling how a mother would feel whom you have never met. My mother would be proud that I am standing up for what I know to be truth, but, regardless, this also shows that you will justify any statement you make no matter how degrading. Most christians would say they were out of line and apologize but no not you. Anything that comes out of your mouth is OK.

I don't apologize for telling the truth.

Never have.

Never will.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Lee Mar 7 2007, 01:26 PM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 7 2007, 02:09 PM) □

To paraphrase Lloyd Bentsen... I know EGW; EGW is a friend of mine... and you, Lee, are no EGW.

Don't even try this foolishness of equating disagreement with your myopic foolishness tantamount to rejecting EGW and, by extension God.

If she were still alive EGW would not be on your side... she would be speaking out against DS and TS and those of you who are making rationalizations for him like she spoke out against Kellogg and his pantheism and would do so without apology.

So do yourself a favor and keep your false witness to yourself.

In His service,
Mr. J

Mr. J. I never said I was Mrs. White. What a very strange thing to say. I believe in your fury that you have lost all reason Mr. Josey. Perhaps you ought to take a few moments to see if you can get it back.

Posted by: Clay Mar 7 2007, 01:30 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 7 2007, 01:26 PM) □

Mr. J. I never said I was Mrs. White. What a very strange thing to say. I believe in your fury that you have lost all reason Mr. Josey. Perhaps you ought to take a few moments to see if you can get it back.

why? that hasn't worked for you..... you've taken a few moments and haven't gotten it back yet.....



Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 7 2007, 01:32 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 7 2007, 02:26 PM) □

Mr. J. I never said I was Mrs. White. What a very strange thing to say. I believe in your fury that you have lost all reason Mr. Josey. Perhaps you ought to take a few moments to see if you can get it back.



fury? rofl

<fx= loser's tuba flourish from The Price is Right>

That would be an incorrect response...

CUE audience groan

but we have some nice parting gifts for you... </fx>

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: princessdi Mar 7 2007, 01:36 PM

*******Ok People, I am calling a time out on this one. Will be considering it's permnent fate in the next 24 hrs. Remember anyone carrying this "discussion to another thread will suffer immediate consequences*******

Posted by: calvin Mar 7 2007, 01:37 PM

We gonna take a break for awhile. Thanks Di, you beat me too it. We must have posted and I closed this at the same time.

Powered by Invision Power Board (<http://www.invisionboard.com>)
© Invision Power Services (<http://www.invisionpower.com>)