

131

Printable Version of Topic

Click here to view this topic in its original format

BlackSDA _ 3ABN _ 3abn Produce The Evidence

Posted by: calvin Aug 4 2006, 08:56 AM

Below are just a few places In Dr Thompson's letter where "evidence" is noted that 3ABN has that confirms the relationship with Dr. A in Norway was less than professional. So what is the evidence? I have heard it is taped conversations. Why not end this craziness that has been going on for two years? Produce the evidence that you are so reluctant to expose. You have given the evidence to a select few but still questions and rumors abound.

Send the evidence to me at: calvin@blacksda.com I will post it here. I will keep your identity anonymous.

QUOTE

The relationship Linda had with the Norwegian Dr. was not a normal doctor-patient relationship as she claims. It is true. Linda was very concerned about her son Nathan. He was the vehicle through which the Dr. reached Linda. Our evidence leaves no question that this became much more than a doctor-patient relationship. We know that the long hours on the phone together were not about Nathan and have hard evidence to support this knowledge - nor were times spent together on both sides of the Atlantic. Furthermore, she refused to break it off, even after weeks of pleading with her to do so. We, the board believe the evidence we have clearly justifies the divorce and gives Danny the moral and legal right to remarry. Those in church leadership with whom we have shared some of this evidence agree with us. Out of concern for Linda we have been reluctant to make details public.

Posted by: Rand856 Aug 4 2006, 10:50 AM

Calvin, Good Post.....but don't hold your breath. 3ABN can't produce something that don't exist.

Posted by: calvin Aug 4 2006, 11:10 AM

Well, somebody has seen something that is convincing enough for the 3ABN BOD and church leaders to continue to support 3ABN. So what is it?

Posted by: Observer Aug 4 2006, 11:52 AM

QUOTE(Rand856 @ Aug 4 2006, 09:50 AM)

Calvin, Good Post.....but don't hold your breath. 3ABN can't produce something that don't exist.

A major piece of evidence, I believe, is supposed to be a taped telephone conversation in which only one participant in the conversation was taped.

One side is supposed to be evidence? Astounding!

Posted by: lurker Aug 4 2006, 11:59 AM

Someone said and I believe it was Johann who said it - that emails were sent claiming to be from Linda but they didn't fool her friends. Why were they sent when it would be so obvious to her friends that they were faked and not from Linda? Don't you think they were to leave "evidence". Who else had access to Linda's computer, especially during the time she was kept from visiting 3ABN. Now they have the hard drive etc.

Posted by: watchbird Aug 4 2006, 01:54 PM

QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 4 2006, 11:10 AM)

Well, somebody has seen something that is convincing enough for the 3ABN BOD and church leaders to continue to support 3ABN. So what is it?

Oh that's an easy one..... "Danny says.....Danny wants....."
What is more convincing that hearing the voice of "God"?

Strike up the band 

"Dan said it, I believe it, and that good enough for me."

Posted by: Panama_Pete Aug 4 2006, 02:49 PM

QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 4 2006, 12:10 PM)

Well, somebody has seen something that is convincing enough for the 3ABN BOD and church leaders to continue to support 3ABN. So what is it?

It was apparently the Illinois Conference **President** who moved the 3ABN pastor to Springfield to subjugate Linda Shelton and bring her to heel as the wicked adulterer in the minds of the other Springfield church members.

And the Illinois Conference President sits on the 3ABN Board.

The biggest problem is the one Watchbird mentioned. 3ABN has the Adventist Church's **Seal of Approval**.

Metaphorically speaking, because the Adventist Church is involved, I think the fast-moving iceberg will be found to have deliberately struck the **SS Vasectomy** . In other words, the captain of the **SS Vasectomy** -- with the seal of approval -- can do no wrong.

They're already planning 3ABN satellite seminars in September featuring Dwight Nelson and Doug Batchelor. 3ABN is mentioned as a partner. The spots are running on 3ABN. I think this photo represents the official Adventist Church's "ONE WAY" position:

 IPB Image

I think the verdict is already in, it's just that the trial hasn't happened.

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 4 2006, 04:37 PM

QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 4 2006, 10:10 AM)

Well, somebody has seen something that is convincing enough for the 3ABN BOD and church leaders to continue to support 3ABN. So what is it?

Well Calvin, you're forgetting the real problem. NO ONE saw ANYTHING. THEY only HEARD Danny. They HEARD what John and others were to SAY to them - all of it 2nd hand, and NO ONE WAS WILLING to HEAR LINDA or anyone else BEFORE they made their judgement. And if you keep in mind, the board there at 3abn is not like a "normal" board. They are for appearances only. They play a literal roll, a figurement. They are not like the board in your church, or other independant ministries such as Amazing facts. They are structured for a total different purpose. If you only visited your mother once or twice a year, and she talked to you for 1 hour, had you sign papers you had to sign, and you left, really how much would you know after that about what was going on in her neighborhood? Nothing. You would only be interested in what she had to say and what she needed you to sign, and you are on your way, you did your good deed as a figurehead. That was your only task. Nothing more. You are only a necessary party for "legal" reasons where your face and sig are needed. And besides, he's God's chosen, who are we to question??? Good'ole SDA thinking???

It was VERY clear to MANY that the only reason it was happening the way it was with Linda and Danny, was because "the president doesn't want his vice-president any more, period". I am quoting. Church leaders didn't want to get involved - their tendency is not to till they HAVE to. Well, they are having to now, like it or not, and now we shall see just how they hold their responsibility to the rest of the church. Keep your eyes open...it's happening.

Posted by: Freedom Aug 4 2006, 06:11 PM

Isn't it ILLEGAL to tape a phone conversation without the consent of both parties?
My understanding is that it is illegal.

Freedom

QUOTE(Observer @ Aug 4 2006, 10:52 AM)

A major piece of evidence, I believe, is supposed to be a taped telephone conversation in which only one participant in the conversation was taped.

One side is supposed to be evidence? Astounding!

Posted by: Panama_Pete Aug 4 2006, 06:44 PM

QUOTE(Freedom @ Aug 4 2006, 07:11 PM)

Isn't it ILLEGAL to tape a phone conversation without the consent of both parties?
My understanding is that it is illegal.

Freedom

You could tape my phone calls until the cows come home and never hear anything of interest. However, you could make a transcript and include explanations of every comment that sound very damning.

Pete: "Hey Fred, I'm leaving for Wal-Mart now."

(That late-nite trip to Wal-Mart, that's where Pete meets the drug dealer, everybody.)

Pete: I've got to pick up some Claritin-D.

(This is an important ingredient for people with meth labs.)

Pete: I'm feeling a little under the weather, Fred.

(Fred is one of the other dealers downline.)

Pete: I've got a big day tomorrow and I need some sleep.

(A "big day" is code for when drugs are being smuggled into the country.)

This is sort of what I understand happened to Linda. "Explanatory comments" were apparently added to her phone call, prepared as a transcript, and then sent out.

Posted by: watchbird Aug 4 2006, 06:54 PM

QUOTE(Freedom @ Aug 4 2006, 06:11 PM)

Isn't it ILLEGAL to tape a phone conversation without the consent of both parties?
My understanding is that it is illegal.

Freedom

Don't really understand the applications of your question. I mean look at it this way why would someone who itotally focused on finding something that will give him the "legal right" to marry his sweet little cutie pie, care about whether taping a phone conversation is "illegal" or not? Pu-lease! Don't confuse us with such "legal" technicalities.

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 4 2006, 07:04 PM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Aug 4 2006, 05:44 PM)

You could tape my phone calls until the cows come home and never hear anything of interest. However, you could make a transcript and include explanations of every comment that sound very damning.

Pete: "Hey Fred, I'm leaving for Wal-Mart now."

(That late-nite trip to Wal-Mart, that's where Pete meets the drug dealer, everybody.)

Pete: I've got to pick up some Claritin-D.

(This is an important ingredient for people with meth labs.)

Pete: I'm feeling a little under the weather, Fred.

(Fred is one of the other dealers downline.)

Pete: I've got a big day tomorrow and I need some sleep.

(A "big day" is code for when drugs are being smuggled into the country.)

This is sort of what I understand happened to Linda. "Explanatory comments" were apparently added to her phone call, prepared as a transcript, and then sent out.

PEERRRRRRECT analogy. I love analogies...they just seem to cut to the chase, don't they? 

Posted by: LadyTenor Aug 6 2006, 11:34 AM

QUOTE(Freedom @ Aug 4 2006, 07:11 PM)

Isn't it ILLEGAL to tape a phone conversation without the consent of both parties?
My understanding is that it is illegal.

Freedom

Only in certain states is that illegal...and it is ALWAYS illegal if the gov't is doing it ABSENT A LEGALLY SUFFICIENT WARRANT...

Posted by: watchbird Aug 8 2006, 04:45 PM

QUOTE(LadyTenor @ Aug 6 2006, 11:34 AM)

Only in certain states is that illegal...and it is ALWAYS illegal if the gov't is doing it ABSENT A LEGALLY SUFFICIENT WARRANT...

An interesting comment, LadyT. Maybe you could push this a little further so as to answer a nagging little question that's been sitting on a stool in the corner of my mind for a long long time

OK ... you have made a distinction between legal and illegal in two different ways..... what state one is in, and whether it is the "gov't" vs (I suppose) an ordinary citizen.

Now here's another "distinction" I'd like you to address. I had always thought that taping a phone conversation was, by definition, a recording of both sides of the conversation, that which is coming over the phone line as well as what can be heard in the room. It has also been my understanding that to place such a recording device on your own phone, was not illegal.

But if there is no recording device picking up the incoming voice, then I really don't see how it has anything to do with legal vs illegal. It is not illegal to record what is being said in your own home, is it?

Posted by: Freedom Aug 8 2006, 07:36 PM

But after Linda moved and was in her OWN trailer, didn't Danny plant listening devices and still record phone conversations?

The trailer wasn't his so.....

Freedom

QUOTE(watchbird @ Aug 8 2006, 02:45 PM)

An interesting comment, LadyT. Maybe you could push this a little further so as to answer a nagging little question that's been sitting on a stool in the corner of my mind for a long long time

OK ... you have made a distinction between legal and illegal in two different ways..... what state one is in, and whether it is the "gov't" vs (I suppose) an ordinary citizen.

Now here's another "distinction" I'd like you to address. I had always thought that taping a phone conversation was, by definition, a recording of both sides of the conversation, that which is coming over the phone line as well as what can be heard in the room. It has also been my understanding that to place such a recording device on your own phone, was not illegal.

But if there is no recording device picking up the incoming voice, then I really don't see how it has anything to do with legal vs illegal. It is not illegal to record what is being said in your own home, is it?

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Aug 11 2006, 09:19 PM

Calvin,

I hope you will forgive the reference to the first post in this thread. I started reading this discussion board months ago and just recently decided to dig in here and see if there is any truth here.

Let's presuppose for a minute that there is hard evidence (and you can't say just because it hasn't been provided to you that it doesn't exist - faulty logic) what if it would leave Linda in a heap, revealing more than has been projected to this point. Do you want to be part of that? Do you want to be part of an even more devastating experience for Linda?

Is it possible (and I only ask the question, this is not a statement) that what you have been told by Linda and her closest allies is not completely accurate, not completely the truth, but was spun and couched before it was presented to you? Is this possible - or have you unequivocally removed any possibility for inaccuracies? Have you sat across the table from both Danny and Linda in order to arrive at this conclusion? I think this would be important. I haven't so I can't say one way or the other. But I sure would like the chance - which of course I don't think I will ever be privy to.

- fallible

QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 4 2006, 09:56 AM)

Below are just a few places In Dr Thompson's letter where "evidence" is noted that 3ABN has that confirms the relationship with Dr. A in Norway was less than professional. So what is the evidence? I have heard it is taped conversations. Why not end this craziness that has been going on for two years? Produce the evidence that you are so reluctant to expose. You have given the evidence to a select few but still questions and rumors abound.

Send the evidence to me at: calvin@blacksda.com I will post it here. I will keep your identity anonymous.

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Aug 11 2006, 09:36 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Aug 4 2006, 08:04 PM) □

PEERRRRRRFECT analogy. I love analogies...they just seem to cut to the chase, don't they? □

Analogies are de bomb!



QUOTE(Freedom @ Aug 4 2006, 07:11 PM) □

Isn't it ILLEGAL to tape a phone conversation without the consent of both parties?
My understanding is that it is illegal.

Freedom

QUOTE(LadyTenor @ Aug 6 2006, 12:34 PM) □

Only in certain states is that illegal...and it is ALWAYS illegal if the gov't is doing it ABSENT A LEGALLY SUFFICIENT WARRANT...

She be de ler-yer!



QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Aug 11 2006, 10:19 PM) □

...I hope you will forgive the reference to the first post in this thread. I started reading this discussion board months ago and just recently decided to dig in here and see if there is any truth here.

Let's presuppose for a minute that there is hard evidence (and you can't say just because it hasn't been provided to you that it doesn't exist - faulty logic) what if it would leave Linda in a heap, revealing more than has been projected to this point. Do you want to be part of that? Do you want to be part of an even more devastating experience for Linda?

Is it possible (and I only ask the question, this is not a statement) that what you have been told by

Linda and her closest allies is not completely accurate, not completely the truth, but was spun and couched before it was presented to you? Is this possible - or have you unequivocally removed any possibility for inaccuracies? Have you sat across the table from both Danny and Linda in order to arrive at this conclusion? I think this would be important. I haven't so I can't say one way or the other. But I sure would like the chance - which of course I don't think I will ever be privy to.

- fallible

Fallible - (interesting name choice)

I want the **truth**. At the rate it is going thus far - there is nothing....**NOTHING** that can be said that will hurt Linda worse. Now....let's flip your script....

What if it comes out that everything that Danny has said "is not completely accurate, not completely the truth, but was spun and couched before it was presented to"....um...the world?

You say that you haven't sat across from the table from Danny and Linda - neither have I...but I wasn't born (born) yesterday...and one thing I know.....

Boo-Boo stinks. I don't have to take a "big inhale" to see if it "still stinks"....

If something doesn't sound quite right, or looks a bit *cock-eyed* chances are there is some hot mess on toast ("inaccuracies")....



Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 11 2006, 10:03 PM

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Aug 11 2006, 08:36 PM)

Analogies are de bomb!



She be de ler-yer!



Fallible - (interesting name choice)


I want the **truth**. At the rate it is going thus far - there is nothing....**NOTHING** that can be said that will hurt Linda worse. Now....let's flip your script....

What if it comes out that everything that Danny has said "is not completely accurate, not completely the truth, but was spun and couched before it was presented to"....um...the world?

You say that you haven't sat across from the table from Danny and Linda - neither have I...but I wasn't born (born) yesterday...and one thing I know.....

Boo-Boo stinks. I don't have to take a "big inhale" to see if it "still stinks"....

If something doesn't sound quite right, or looks a bit *cock-eyed* chances are there is some hot mess on toast ("inaccuracies")....



Well put 'PrincessDrRe! and thanks for the laugh too (boo-boo stanks!! - I smell plenty of it round these parts lately).

Posted by: calvin Aug 11 2006, 10:06 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Aug 11 2006, 09:19 PM)

Calvin,

I hope you will forgive the reference to the first post in this thread. I started reading this discussion board months ago and just recently decided to dig in here and see if there is any truth here.

Let's presuppose for a minute that there is hard evidence (and you can't say just because it hasn't been provided to you that it doesn't exist - faulty logic) what if it would leave Linda in a heap, revealing more than has been projected to this point. Do you want to be part of that? Do you want to be part of an even more devastating experience for Linda?

Is it possible (and I only ask the question, this is not a statement) that what you have been told by Linda and her closest allies is not completely accurate, not completely the truth, but was spun and couched before it was presented to you? Is this possible - or have you unequivocally removed any possibility for inaccuracies? Have you sat across the table from both Danny and Linda in order to arrive at this conclusion? I think this would be important. I haven't so I can't say one way or the other. But I sure would like the chance - which of course I don't think I will ever be privy to.

- fallible

Look, I am willing to follow truth wherever it may lead, it that leaves Linda in a heap of trouble, then so be it. I have been told this too by those close to 3abn (not anyone here) they want to spare Linda from embarrassment, as you have alluded to. That is a pretty weak argument. Considering that 3abn is in full damage control mode, salvaging what is can from the ministry, blatantly begging for money and calling out Danny's accusers as liars. They could end much of this craziness now by coming forward with the evidence of Linda cheating. Instead we heard that Danny is taking a leave of absent, uh vacation for three months that only leaves to more speculation.

Too your second paragraph: All this is possible and I continue to ask questions of everyone involved.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Aug 11 2006, 10:07 PM

PDR,

So true, the question runs both ways - however, this venue has made it's choice clear so not having been able to find what I feel is the "whole truth and nothing but the truth" I show up here to glean what I can and add to what I have here-to-fore.

I sure hope that my moniker isn't an impedement to my engaging you in discussion - it just seems an obvious choice for any human being on the face of this earth.

I have heard some tough stuff about Linda - reiterated here (in a defensive posture), but I can imagine worse. I have heard the cloak room rumors and there is still worse that could be leveled. Not that there is something - but one can imagine worse.

But, I would have to flip your coin and say that over the past two years the same could be said of some of the things I have heard coming from the Linda camp. Doesn't sit right - the gut reacts with a bit of queasiness. Sorry if that doesn't put me "on the team" - but this is the truth as I know it, I have heard things that do not sit right.

So let me know when I am "in the club" and can actually begin to ask questions regardless of whether I side with you or not. I want to know just as much as anyone else.

- fallible

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Aug 11 2006, 10:36 PM)

Fallible - (interesting name choice)


I want the **truth**. At the rate it is going thus far - there is nothing....**NOTHING** that can be said that will hurt Linda worse. Now....let's flip your script....

What if it comes out that everything that Danny has said "is not completely accurate, not completely the truth, but was spun and couched before it was presented to"....um...the world?

You say that you haven't sat across from the table from Danny and Linda - neither have I...but I wasn't born (born) yesterday...and one thing I know.....

Boo-Boo stanks. I don't have to take a "big inhale" to see if it "still stanks"....

If something doesn't sound quite right, or looks a bit *cock-eyed* chances are there is some hot mess on toast ("inaccuracies")....



Posted by: fallible humanbeing Aug 11 2006, 10:20 PM

Calvin,

Thank you again. Is it possible that those at 3ABN who have shared this with you may truly want to spare Linda any more grief and stress? How is that a weak argument? It may very well leave them open for speculation, but what if they truly do want to spare her?

As far as 3ABN being in damage control - I can't imagine that there aren't those who are in fear for the ministry of God being brought down. Is there any way to deny the truth that this ministry has truly lead many to the feet of the cross and introduced them to the truth of the love of our Saviour?

It is human nature to be defensive - isn't this section of this discussion board an exercise of defensive in Linda's behalf? Is there a balance - even an admission that nothing ever happens in a relationship in a one sided manner. Is there always one person who has been perfect and one who

has not when divorce becomes the course of the relationship?

Why is it so unimaginable that Danny is taking a vacation? What if you (suspend for a moment whether he is guilty or not) had had to deal with this perpetual attack on your character and your lifes ministry for two years, do you think you would want to take a breather, a rest, to meet with your God in the solitude that can only be found out of the limelight? He could have stayed and avoided the potential speculation and innuendo that would follow making that decision, but he decided to take a break - does that convict, certainly not in any court of common sense. Why make a statement (bolded/underlined below) like this, wait, hold the judgement and lets see if he comes back and if he does what his spirit is - let's let the Holy Spirit comfort and lead him (just as we hope the same for Linda).

- fallible

QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 11 2006, 11:06 PM) □

Look, I am willing to follow truth wherever it may lead, it that leaves Linda in a heap of trouble, then so be it. I have been told this too by those close to 3abn (not anyone here) they want to spare Linda from embarrassment, as you have alluded to. That is a pretty weak argument. Considering that 3abn is in full damage control mode, salvaging what is can from the ministry, blatantly begging for money and calling out Danny's accusers as liars. They could end much of this craziness now by coming forward with the evidence of Linda cheating. **Instead we heard that Danny is taking a leave of absent, uh vacation for three months that only leaves to more speculation.**

Too your second paragraph: All this is possible and I continue to ask questions of everyone involved.

Posted by: awesumtenor Aug 11 2006, 10:20 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Aug 11 2006, 11:07 PM) □

So let me know when I am "in the club" and can actually begin to ask questions regardless of whether I side with you or not. I want to know just as much as anyone else.

- fallible

If you arent seeing anyone about this persecution complex you continue to manifest, there are several mental health professionals on the forum who could help you with that...

Ask nicely and you might even get a discount.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Aug 11 2006, 10:24 PM

AT,

Thank you so much for supporting my point so clearly for me. Maybe we can have a dialogue now.

- fallible

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Aug 11 2006, 11:20 PM)

If you arent seeing anyone about this persecution complex you continue to manifest, there are several mental health professionals on the forum who could help you with that...

Ask nicely and you might even get a discount.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: awesumtenor Aug 11 2006, 11:05 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Aug 12 2006, 12:24 AM)

AT,

Thank you so much for supporting my point so clearly for me. Maybe we can have a dialogue now.

- fallible

Only if you omit the whine; I gave up drinking that stuff a long time ago...

No, I'm not drinking the kool-aid you're trying to cook up either, Mr. Jones... no matter how hot it gets in the Guyana sun...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: awesumtenor Aug 11 2006, 11:17 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Aug 12 2006, 12:20 AM)

Is there any way to deny the truth that this ministry has truly lead many to the feet of the cross and introduced them to the truth of the love of our Saviour?

That does not in the least make 3ABN God-ordained in any wise:

Mat 7:22 Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? 23 And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

Even Judas healed the sick and cast out devils... didn't stop him from betraying Christ, however... nor did his having done it grant him any special dispensation...Paul admonishes us in 1Cor 9 to maintain discipline in the practice of our faith " lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway. "

There's a lesson in that for those who have ears to hear...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Aug 11 2006, 11:18 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Aug 11 2006, 11:07 PM)

PDR,

So true, the question runs both ways - however, this venue has made it's choice clear so not having been able to find what I feel is the "whole truth and nothing but the truth" I show up here to glean what I can and add to what I have here-to-fore.

I sure hope that my moniker isn't an impedement to my engaging you in discussion - it just seems an obvious choice for any human being on the face of this earth.

I have heard some tough stuff about Linda - reiterated here (in a defensive posture), but I can imagine worse. I have heard the cloak room rumors and there is still worse that could be leveled. Not that there is something - but one can imagine worse.

But, I would have to flip your coin and say that over the past two years the same could be said of some of the things I have heard coming from the Linda camp. Doesn't sit right - the gut reacts with a bit of queasiness. Sorry if that doesn't put me "on the team" - but this is the truth as I know it, I have heard things that do not sit right.

So let me know when I am "in the club" and can actually begin to ask questions regardless of whether I side with you or not. I want to know just as much as anyone else.

- fallible

1st point - Both sides have been presented here....those that are "for" Danny - those that are "for" Linda. This is actually one of the few places that has the extensive (free) view of both sides. However the difference is that LINDA HERSELF has never come here and said one bad thing about DANNY. Now - since I can honestly take it that you haven't read **ALL** the 3ABN threads - you would not know that....

You may have heard something coming from the "camp" - but from the actual person? Only Danny been having the "runnin' off of de mouth." Just as my Mother told me long ago - "The truth don't have to yell....." Why is Danny yelling?


2nd point - As for "the club"..... You can ask a question. Just be prepared to get an answer you may not like.

3rd point - Now - your name....

Hey - you pick what you want for a name...

<http://education.yahoo.com/reference/dictionary/entry/fallible><---Click Here!

...but this says that you could be "wrong" - yet when people tell you that you could be "wrong" you get upset..... maybe you should change your moniker to "slightly infallible" or "somewhat infallible in a sense at times".....



Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 11 2006, 11:31 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Aug 11 2006, 09:07 PM)

PDR,

So true, the question runs both ways - however, this venue has made it's choice clear so not having been able to find what I feel is the "whole truth and nothing but the truth" I show up here to glean what I can and add to what I have here-to-fore.

I sure hope that my moniker isn't an impedement to my engaging you in discussion - it just seems an obvious choice for any human being on the face of this earth.

I have heard some tough stuff about Linda - reiterated here (in a defensive posture), but I can imagine worse. I have heard the cloak room rumors and there is still worse that could be leveled. Not that there is something - but one can imagine worse.

But, I would have to flip your coin and say that over the past two years the same could be said of some of the things I have heard coming from the Linda camp. Doesn't sit right - the gut reacts with a bit of queasiness. Sorry if that doesn't put me "on the team" - but this is the truth as I know it, I have heard things that do not sit right.

So let me know when I am "in the club" and can actually begin to ask questions regardless of whether I side with you or not. I want to know just as much as anyone else.

- fallible

It's obvious, this aint about asking questions....



Posted by: fallible humanbeing Aug 11 2006, 11:48 PM

Okay, point 1: If what we are going to claim as balance is evidenced by the pinned material what do we have?

- Dr. Abrahamsen letter
- Dr Thompson letter

- The Unauthorized 3ABN History
- The Televangelist

Now, I know there are purported emails form various individuals (including Danny and Kay Kuzma), but if what is official here are the above documents that doesn't strike me as balance. Show me the balance - direct me where I will find it and I will re-read anything you send me to.

So then Danny has come here and defamed Linda (<- seeking insight, knowledge, information, proof)? How is what is here not yelling from the Linda camp?

Point 2: My dad taught me to ask questions of anyone, God included, but be prepared for the answer. I have no problem with that - but I reserve the right to weigh it in the balance against all I have heard thus far and see what happens.

Point 3: in the spiritual sense I am fallible - according to The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition the word is defined as: "Capable of making an error" and Princeton University's Wordnet defines it this way: "having the attributes of man as opposed to e.g. divine beings; "I'm only human"; "frail humanity". Seems to fit humankind.

- fallible

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Aug 12 2006, 12:18 AM) □

1st point - Both sides have been presented here....those that are "for" Danny - those that are "for" Linda. This is actually one of the few places that has the extensive (free) view of both sides. However the difference is that LINDA HERSELF has never came here and said one bad thing about DANNY. Now - since I can honestly take it that you haven't read **ALL** the 3ABN threads - you would not know that....

You may have heard something coming from the "camp" - but from the actual person? Only Danny been having the "runnin' off of de mouth." Just as my Mother told me long ago - "The truth don't have to yell....." Why is Danny yelling? □

2nd point - As for "the club"..... You can ask a question. Just be prepared to get an answer you may not like.




3rd point - Now - your name....

Hey - you pick what you want for a name...

<http://education.yahoo.com/reference/dictionary/entry/fallible><---Click Here!

...but this says that you could be "wrong" - yet when people tell you that you could be "wrong" you get upset..... maybe you should change your moniker to "slightly infallible" or "somewhat infallible in a sense at times".....



Posted by: princessdi Aug 11 2006, 11:49 PM

No, it is not, Sonshine. It is about "getting" information, and a desperate, last resort attempt at that. We need to shut down this ride, also.

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Aug 11 2006, 10:31 PM)

It's obvious, this aint about asking questions....



Posted by: Hersheys99 Aug 11 2006, 11:55 PM

QUOTE

No, it is not, Sonshine. It is about "getting" information, and a desperate, last resort attempt at that. We need to shut down this ride, also.

Right on pernt Di!!

Posted by: inga Aug 12 2006, 12:34 AM



QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Aug 12 2006, 12:18 AM)

3rd point - Now - your name....

Hey - you pick what you want for a name...

<http://education.yahoo.com/reference/dictionary/entry/fallible><---Click Here!

...but this says that you could be "wrong" - yet when people tell you that you could be "wrong" you get upset..... maybe you should change your moniker to "slightly infallible" or "somewhat infallible in a sense at times".....



You said it, PrincessDrRe!

Or maybe "quite infallible human being." 

Posted by: Clay Aug 12 2006, 01:10 AM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Aug 11 2006, 11:48 PM)

Okay, point 1: If what we are going to claim as balance is evidenced by the pinned material what do we have?

- Dr. Abrahamsen letter
- Dr Thompson letter
- The Unauthorized 3ABN History
- The Televangelist

Now, I know there are purported emails form various individuals (including Danny and Kay Kuzma), but if what is official here are the above documents that doesn't strike me as balance. Show me the balance - direct me where I will find it and I will re-read anything you send me to.

So then Danny has come here and defamed Linda (<- seeking insight, knowledge, information, proof)? How is what is here not yelling from the Linda camp?

Point 2: My dad taught me to ask questions of anyone, God included, but be prepared for the answer. I have no problem with that - but I reserve the right to weigh it in the balance against all I have heard thus far and see what happens.

Point 3: in the spiritual sense I am fallible - according to The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition the word is defined as: "Capable of making an error" and Princeton University's Wordnet defines it this way: "having the attributes of man as opposed to e.g. divine beings; "I'm only human"; "frail humanity". Seems to fit humankind.

- fallible

well I emailed Kay Kuzma myself and posted the response.... so either you don't believe I did that, or you do.... there is no reason for me to lie, so if you think it didnt happen you believe I am lying, then I guess there is not much more I need to say to you.... the stuff from Danny was sent to Calvin, either you believe it or you don't....

Again let's start at the beginning.... you answer this question, is there such a thing as spiritual adultery? Should spiritual adultery be used as grounds for divorce?

With all your reading you still have missed the basic fact, even IF Linda did everything she was accused of doing, she should NOT have been treated as she was.... that is the bottom line...

As for your other issues.... hope they get resolved....

Posted by: watchbird Aug 12 2006, 06:20 AM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Aug 11 2006, 11:48 PM)

Okay, point 1: If what we are going to claim as balance is evidenced by the pinned material what do we have?

- Dr. Abrahamsen letter
- Dr Thompson letter
- The Unauthorized 3ABN History

- The Televangelist

Now, I know there are purported emails form various individuals (including Danny and Kay Kuzma), but if what is official here are the above documents that doesn't strike me as balance. Show me the balance - direct me where I will find it and I will re-read anything you send me to.

- Dr. Abrahamsen letter

- Dr Thompson letter

Two letters ... written about the same time, covering approximately the same period of history, from obviously two sides. Perfect balance.

- The Unauthorized 3ABN History

A very long thread that was cut into 10 chapters, the post that is pinned is nothing more than a collection of urls to the beginning piont of each chapter. Ample opportunity for anyone to post anything on either side ... thus balanced.

- The Televangelist

A document written in a "fictionalized" style (as contrasted with its contents being fiction in the sense of untrue). But it is not pinned ... which rather points out that you are indeed "fallible".... in very obvious ways. So don't be surprised if no one here takes you very seriously.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Dec 29 2006, 09:12 AM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Aug 8 2006, 04:45 PM)

Now here's another "distinction" I'd like you to address. I had always thought that taping a phone conversation was, by definition, a recording of both sides of the conversation, that which is coming over the phone line as well as what can be heard in the room. It has also been my understanding that to place such a recording device on your own phone, was not illegal.

But if there is no recording device picking up the incoming voice, then I really don't see how it has anything to do wih legal vs illegal. It is not illegal to record what is being said in your own home, is it?

I'm not sure if this item was addressed, as requested.

I understand there is a transcript of a phone call.

Looking at a prepared transcript of one-half of a phone call, how could a third party, know how the evidence was collected? Lawyers shun suspect evidence because their malpractice insurance doesn't cover illegal wiretapping.

More at this link on one and two-party consent:

<http://www.pimall.com/nais/n.recordlaw.html>

"The question is often asked by clients if they can record the telephone conversations of their spouse in a domestic case or the conversations of their children concerning drug usage. In both of these cases, the answer is it's unlawful. **Many clients will complain that they own the telephone and pay the telephone bill so they should therefore have a right to record what they want.** However, the law doesn't address who owns the phone nor who pays the phone bill. It only addresses the use of one party and all party consent. Anything outside of that is a violation of state law and federal wiretapping law."

"The Federal Communications Commission goes further into details on recording telephone conversations and states that the party recording must give verbal notification before the recording and that **there must be a beep tone on the line to indicate that the line is being recorded** ."

Posted by: Pickle Dec 29 2006, 11:11 AM

Please note that in Illinois recordings cannot legally be made without permission of any type of conversation, not just phone conversations.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Dec 29 2006, 01:23 PM

FHB,

Dear, you have been "in the club" since August 10, 2006. This 3abn Forum on BlackSDA.com has been set aside by Calvin, a self-professed neutral party in the matter as I recall, for open discussion of 3abn by those who wish to dialogue about the varied matters of this ministry.

There are many sides represented here and each one has voice. Just listen and question and verify with that sharp mind of yours. I believe we will all eventually get to the truth of the matter.

Powered by Invision Power Board (<http://www.invisionboard.com>)
© Invision Power Services (<http://www.invisionpower.com>)