# **Printable Version of Topic**



Click here to view this topic in its original format

BlackSDA \_ 3ABN \_ Danny's Vision Of Nov. 14/15, 1984

# Posted by: sister Nov 13 2006, 08:06 PM

Danny's Vision of Nov. 14/15, 1984:fact or fiction

The following discussion was presented on Daryl's Fawcett's forum and Bob, who started the thread, was hoping some of the members here might be able to help with some information. I will post the discussion in two parts.

Part One:

# Bob:

I could use some help on this one, and so could Danny.

Some of the accusations being leveled against Danny today don't jive with something that I heard said about him in New Orleans in 1984, and that fact has seemed like a discordant note amidst all if this. (I won't say what was said at this point.) What is the explanation for it?

That discordant note has made me ponder the events of 1984 a bit more than I would otherwise have, concentrating on the date of Danny's impression to build a TV station. He has said on numerous occasions that this occurred on the night of November 14/15, 1984, and that he wrestled with God over the matter.

Now we essentially have two choices:

- 1. He and Melody came to my home church to do a concert between November 14/15 and Thanksgiving that year, a time requirement mandated by reasons mentioned below, and we were among the very first to hear about the idea; or
- 2. If the allegations about conjuring up miracles of donated TV equipment and such be true, and if the need of such miracles was first suggested by Hal, then perhaps Danny was talking about building a TV station prior to Nov. 14/15, and after needing to come up with miracles he fixed on Nov. 14/15 as being the date for the miracle of the impression.

As you can imagine, I would prefer that the first possibility be correct, but I am in a quandry over this one and need some assistance, which I will describe below.

#### Email from Bob:

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Question on Nov. 14/15, 1984 date Date: Thu, 09 Nov 2006 12:45:33 -0600

To: Danny Shelton

Hi Danny. Here's a question that I would think even those who have recommended that you not answer questions wouldn't mind you answering.

You've stated that the impression to build 3ABN came on the night of Nov. 14/15, and that you wrestled all night about that. My sister just called me, having found some items from 1984. It looks like the evangelistic meetings in New Orleans where Oscar Lane either gave you money or took up an offering on your behalf to launch your TV work actually began on September 9, 1984,

and that he preached on the mark of the beast during the fourth week of meetings. The meeting where he got you the money was the night he preached on Babylon and jewelry, or a night very shortly thereafter. His publication that came out soon after the meetings closed called for offerings for three television cameras.

Could you clarify this a little for me? If you were not impressed to build the station until mid-November, why would you have been raising funds a month or so before that?

I trust there is an easy explanation.

Bob

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: Question on Nov. 14/15, 1984 date

Date: Thu, 9 Nov 2006 18:02:03 -0600

From: Danny Shelton

Please send me copies of any information you may have concerning Oscar Lane helping get 3ABN started by raising funds for cameras for 3ABN. Plus, I would like to see the date of the publications and the article in which this is all explained. You should want to see them yourself as I'm sure they will answer any questions about when the "idea" came to start 3ABN.

Danny

# Email from Bob:

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: Question on Nov. 14/15, 1984 date

Date: Thu, 09 Nov 2006 18:26:31 -0600

To: Danny Shelton

Hi Danny.

I could send a copy of the publication to you, but I don't think it would be all that helpful, since a number of the details I sent didn't come from it. The biggest help the publication was that my sister found was pinning down the dates of Oscar Lane's meetings.

Given the fact that evangelists usually like to have their meetings wrapped up by Thanksgiving, and that there wouldn't be much time between between Nov. 14/15 and Thanksgiving that year, I was just a little puzzled. My sister was helping me out by trying to find the poem she wrote for Lane so that we could get a date from it, since she dates her poems. She finally came across it and found that publication too which said his meetings started September 9, the mark of the beast was presented in the fourth week, and that the new church in New Orleans was organized in October.

I only got to go to three nights of Lane's meetings. The first two were in his big red tent, and on the third they were all in the new church. The first of the two nights I heard him in the tent he preached on Babylon and jewelry, and the second he shook everyone's hand rather than preach. It was in one of those two meetings in the tent that you and Melody were there, and Oscar Lane gave you at least \$1000 toward your TV venture, because in the next meeting I was there he told everyone how you had come to see him in the morning before you left town.

My sister read me the plea Oscar Lane made for funds for the TV cameras in his publication. He was on your board at one time, wasn't he?

At any rate, I think we can probably find quite a few people that will remember your promotion of your TV venture during that concert trip. Just at Lane's meetings there were 400 baptized, with

many more attending, and that wasn't your only stop on that trip.

So do you have any thoughts on where the mix up might be?

-----BOD

Bob:

I recall at least three families from our church and the church in Covington/Mandeville making the drive into New Orleans to Lane's meetings: the G's, the P's, and the Q's. I think Lane referred to us at some point as a little salt amidst all the pepper. As such we should have been quite noticeable to Danny the night he was there.

Young Matthew Q. actually went forward and asked for the mike and gave his own altar call and/or sang a song at one of Lane's meetings. The effect upon the crowd was quite dramatic and helped bring the people forward to make decisions. I wasn't there that night.

My grandparents were visiting from Ohio and they went at least one night too. We weren't sure what Grandpa would think of being in a black meeting, but he enjoyed it from what we could tell.

End of Part 1.

Posted by: sister Nov 13 2006, 08:19 PM

Part 2:

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: Question on Nov. 14/15, 1984 date

Date: Thu, 9 Nov 2006 21:33:25 -0600

From: Danny Shelton

Bob, I have no earthly reasons to give wrong beginning dates of 3ABN. If the idea would have come in Oct. of that Year I/we, Linda and me would have always said that it came in Oct. But it didn't.

We were married approx. 10 days after the idea to build a tv station came to me. I think this is even one thing she would agree with me on.

Please show me otherwise.

Email from Bob:

---- Original Message -----

To: Danny Shelton

Sent: 11/9/2006 6:43:18 PM

Subject: RE: Question on Nov. 14/15, 1984 date

P.S. My apologies, Danny, I didn't word my original question in the best way possible.

When I asked, "... why would you have been raising funds a month or so before that?" I should have said instead, "... why would you have been promoting the idea a month or so before that?" While I remember Oscar Lane giving you money in the meeting toward your venture, I do not remember you asking for it.

Hal Steenson several months ago told me that he married you and Linda 23 years ago. That being so, is it at all possible that you got the impression in 1983 instead of 1984? Or did Hal just get his dates wrong?

dates wrong?
Bob
Original Message Subject: RE: Question on Nov. 14/15, 1984 date Date: Thu, 9 Nov 2006 21:24:13 -0600 From: Danny Shelton
We were married on Nov. 25, 1984.
If you check your notes you will find nothing about 3ABN before Nov. 14, 15 1984.
Bob:
The problem is that my mental notes most certainly have Danny promoting a TV venture at Oscar Lane's meetings and probably at my home church too.  And Lane's/Last Days Revival's publication, Word of Truth, vol. 1, no. 1, 4th quarter 1984, dates his crusade in new Orleans from Sept. 9 through October.
<del></del>
Original Message  To: Danny Shelton  Sent: 11/9/2006 9:58:24 PM  Subject: RE: Question on Nov. 14/15, 1984 date
Thanks so much for your replies, Danny.
What then do you think happened? Why would Oscar Lane have gotten that much money for you in October for a TV venture if you weren't working on any sort of TV venture whatsoever until the last half of November?
Wasn't Lane on your board at some point, or involved in some way?
I'll be honest with you about something: It was what Oscar Lane said that you told him in the morning before you left town that has really stuck in my mind all these years. What he said you said just doesn't jive with some of the things your critics have said about you, and I've told a number of them that.
Bob
Bob:
I wish Danny would comment just a little on the question of Oscar Lane being on the board. We all wondered why, once 3ABN got rolling, Oscar Lane was never mentioned. I think we enquired

http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?act=Print&client=printer&f=48&t=11474

just disappeared.

-----

more than once, and the reply I remember was that they didn't know where he was, that he had

Subject: RE: Question on Nov. 14/15, 1984 date
Date: Thu, 9 Nov 2006 22:23:10 -0600

From: Danny Shelton

Bob, honestly, this is very taxing for me to continue to talk about something that didn't happen in Oct. Please do your homework and it will all make sense to you. You cannot put a puzzle together unless you have all the parts. What you need to show me is proof that something happened in Oct. instead of Nov. in a statement from some one written back then. Maybe Oscar's newsletter or something. But I can't see me wasting anymore time on something that never happened.

Tell you what you show me some solid proof that 3ABN started in Oct. and I'll talk some more about it.

Thanks,

Danny

# Email from Bob:

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: Question on Nov. 14/15, 1984 date

Date: Fri, 10 Nov 2006 07:14:28 -0600

To: Danny Shelton

Hi Danny.

Well, what do you remember about your visit to his tent that night? Do you remember him giving you any money whatsoever? Do you think you were at his tent in late November instead?

Was he on your board at some point?

What is the earliest written or recorded account that you have of the 3ABN story?

I'll see if I can collect some signed statements from folks who were at some of the places you stopped at on that trip.

God bless.

Bob

\_\_\_\_\_\_

# Bob's plea for assistance:

So here is the help that Danny and I need: We need statements coming from people with real names who were at Oscar Lane's meetings when Danny was there, or who were at other churches where Danny stopped on that concert trip.

These statements need to affirm or deny:

- 1. Lane's claimed dates for his meetings, or dates for any other stops Danny made on that trip. Danny's promotion of a TV venture on that trip.
- 2. The offering of at least \$1000 given to Danny for his TV venture by Oscar Lane.
- 3. That Lane was to have some sort of major involvement with 3ABN.

4. And I continue to be interested, after all these years, in knowing why Lane disappeared and was never associated with 3ABN after it got rolling.

Given the fact that we are talking about an event tied to an African-American evangelistic campaign, someone may want to copy this over to BSDA.

If you know anyone who was in the greater New Orleans area in 1984, or who had a Danny and Melody concert that year, feel free to ask them about it, and get them to contact me.

Please make any comments in this thread. Daryl Fawcett is a member here and I am sure that he will pass on any information to Bob. Can anyone help? Does anyone have contact with Oscar Lane? Thanks... Sister

# Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Nov 13 2006, 10:18 PM

A search of Google only brings up this information as far as I can find. I copied the following paragraph from "The Bible Sabbath Association" web site (link below). It appears that his Last Days Revival Ministries is based in Atlanta, Georgia so one of you folks near there can break out your phone books and get the contact info if still around. If he is still there he should, as the source, have records of his crusades on file.

OSCAR LANE, JR -- "Proclaiming The Sabbath More Fully" (1 Tape)
Sabbath Conference keynote speaker -- Founder and lead evangelist of Last Days
Revival Ministries based in Atlanta, Georgia. Dr. Lane has been preaching for 41 years
and is considered by many as one of the most powerful and dynamic speakers among
SDA evangelists. Since accepting the Sabbath truth he has been preaching as a
Seventh-day Adventist evangelist for 18 years. The Lord has used him through his
international evangelistic crusades to raise 15 churches and to lead over 50,000 souls
to the truths of the Three Angels message. He is author of 13 books and over 100 audio
and video sermons. The Sabbath Conference was blessed to have Dr. Lane as one who
gave "power and force" to the his proclamation of "The Sabbath More Fully."

http://www.biblesabbath.org/sabbathmorefully.html

# Posted by: husbandoftheyear Nov 13 2006, 11:34 PM

If anyone watched the 3ABN Anniversary special - Dan made a couple of statements VERY slowly about it being a misunderstanding that Hal and Mollie donated the first equipment to 3ABN. He thanked them for their WILLINGNESS to give, but it was in fact, Joe Crews from Amazing Facts who donated the said equipment.

# Also -

If I remember correctly, and please correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that Dan and Linda were married quickly (10 days after the idead came to him to build the station) to escape the scandal of their adultery and to make their newfound ministry more appealing and wholesome.

I'm not bashing - just trying to remember that far back. Any help?

# Posted by: Lee Nov 14 2006, 08:56 AM

Wow! This is a new bit of juicy gossip! HOTY-why would you want to work at such a place? I'd be

looking for another job elsewhere!!
Posted by: Clay Nov 14 2006, 09:04 AM
Dan and Linda adultery? How so?
Posted by: watchbird Nov 14 2006, 10:23 AM
QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Nov 14 2006, 12:34 AM)
If anyone watched the 3ABN Anniversary special - Dan made a couple of statements VERY slowly about it being a misunderstanding that Hal and Mollie donated the first equipment to 3ABN. He thanked them for their WILLINGNESS to give, but it was in fact, Joe Crews from Amazing Facts who donated the said equipment.  Also -
If I remember correctly, and please correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that Dan and Linda were married quickly (10 days after the idead came to him to build the station) to escape the scandal of their adultery and to make their newfound ministry more appealing and wholesome.
I'm not bashing - just trying to remember that far back. Any help?
On your first point I did notice that in their most recent book, Dan had backed away from the original "miracle story" as it has generally been told, and spoken of it in terms of just the offer of it as being a "sign from the Lord". That is, he still tells of Hal's offer, and of his confirming that Hal really was planning to give it to him, but then he ends up that section by saying, "But, interestingly, by the time the studio was built, God provided newer and better television equipment from another source, and Pastor Hal's equipment wasn't needed. God merely used this gift as the sign Danny needed to move forward."  As to the second point this is a pretty serious allegation so I hope you are going to give us some indication as to how you know this and how sure you are it is correct information. But if true, it does help to explain some other things that have at times bewildered some of us.
Posted by: Clay Nov 14 2006, 11:43 AM
QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Nov 13 2006, 11:34 PM)
If I remember correctly, and please correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that Dan and Linda were married quickly (10 days after the idead came to him to build the station) to escape the scandal of their adultery and to make their newfound ministry more appealing and wholesome.
I'm not bashing - just trying to remember that far back. Any help?
If Danny's wife was deceased and Linda was divorced then that would make it fornication would it not? Unless you are suggesting that Linda didn't have grounds biblically for a divorce

# Posted by: fallible humanbeing Nov 14 2006, 12:35 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Nov 14 2006, 01:43 PM) 🗌	
If Danny's wife was deceased and Linda was divorced then that would make it fornication would it	
not? Unless you are suggesting that Linda didn't have grounds biblically for a divorce	
I would like to ask, additionally, what were the circumstances of Danny and Linda's meeting? What	
prought them together, how did they meet? I have wondered this for some time. I have heard stories or rather bits and pieces, but never the whole story of their meeting.	
5, 12, 12, 13, 13, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14	
- fhb	
Posted by: husbandoftheyear Nov 15 2006, 12:07 AM	
QUOTE(Clay @ Nov 14 2006, 12:43 PM) 🗆	
If Danny's wife was deceased and Linda was divorced then that would make it fornication would it	
not? Unless you are suggesting that Linda didn't have grounds biblically for a divorce	

Apparently I caused blood pressures to raise when I brought up an adulterous relationship between Dan and Linda. At Watchbird's "request" I am going to talk to some of the people who were around before 3ABN to verify everything. If you read my statement carefully, it was meant to be addressed as more of a question than a statement. However, let me rephrase - I had been told by people who knew Dan and Linda long before they got together and those people knew that they had an affair. I belive that it was Linda who was married at the time that she and Dan began a relationship.

Many of you may have heard the story about how they met as Dan has mentioned it on air. Linda needed a car and somehow Dan met her through a family member or friend when they took pity on her having just come out of a bad relationship. Come to think of it, I believe it was Tommy Shelton. (Please don't ask about the car business, I will have to find out the details. It's been too long ago.) Like most of Dan's stories, they have a measure of truth and a measure of falsehood and as I remember, Linda did need a car and met Dan that way, but it was before her divorce.

I should not have thrown out that information without more specifics. I was hoping that someone else would fill in the details.

To cool everyone off, I will do some digging and find more details.

QUOTE(watchbird @ Nov 14 2006, 11:23 AM)	
As to the second point this is a pretty serious allegation so some indication as to how you know this and how sure you are it	
it does help to explain some other things that have at times bewi	ildered some of us.

I believe, Watchbird, that there have been many serious allegations on this board.

This, however, was not meant as an allegation, but as a request for more information as the details have gotten somewhat blurred over the past 20 years.	
By the way - what other things does it explain?	
Posted by: Fran Nov 15 2006, 02:29 AM	
QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Nov 15 2006, 12:07 AM)	
By the way - what other things does it explain?	
That Danny was not called by God to start 3ABN. No matter if it was October or November of 1984, or any other date.	
God would have used a non-adulter, a non-fornicator, a non-molestor, or a non-rapist. That boat just don't float. Excuse me while I get sick!	
This morning I got up a member of the World Seventh-day Adventist, but this mess has me ashamed of my world church and ASI. I think I will have to re-think just what I am again! I have to re-think what I stand for.	
I do not believe I have any more faith in our church leadership, and I don't trust ASI or 3ABN. How can I listen to preachers in my church any longer?	
Today began as the worst day of my life. It has ended that way too. May God help me!	
Posted by: Johann Nov 15 2006, 03:33 AM	
QUOTE(Fran @ Nov 15 2006, 10:29 AM) 🗆	
Today began as the worst day of my life. It has ended that way too. May God help me! 🦳	
Dear Fran,	
I understand how you feel. Remember that we are in this together, and the Lord is right by your side.	

Elijah felt that he was alone in doing what was right when God told him there were many others who had never bowed their knees to Baal. This process of cleansing the church reveals victims and villains, and all may seem bleak for the moment, but God is still there. At the moment there are indications the work you have initiated could be one of the strongest tools in finding justice.

I am rediscovering more and more comfort in the Psalms of David. Let such words of Scripture be your source of comfort in days like these. Johann Posted by: Brenda Nov 15 2006, 03:54 AM QUOTE(Johann @ Nov 15 2006, 08:33 PM) Dear Fran, I understand how you feel. Remember that we are in this together, and the Lord is right by your Elijah felt that he was alone in doing what was right when God told him there were many others who had never bowed their knees to Baal. This process of cleansing the church reveals victims and villains, and all may seem bleak for the moment, but God is still there. At the moment there are indications the work you have initiated could be one of the strongest tools in finding justice. I am rediscovering more and more comfort in the Psalms of David. Let such words of Scripture be your source of comfort in days like these. Johann The leaders are no less sinners than the people they lead. We expect more from them but we often get disappointed. (This is a generic statement). I can cope most of the time, but failures of leaders do give my children more cause to be cynical of the SDA church. Posted by: sister Nov 15 2006, 05:07 AM x plea While what is being discussed can be of interest to a number of people, it was not the intent of this thread. I ask again: can anyone help Brother Bob? Is there anyone here that was at the evangelistic meetings held by Oscar Lane in 1984 who recalls the incident he refers to here? Brother Bob has contacted Oscar Lane, but he does not personally recall the situation that took place over 20 years ago, he does not deny it, he just does not recall it specifically. Posted by: Clay Nov 15 2006, 07:06 AM QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Nov 15 2006, 12:07 AM) Apparently I caused blood pressures to raise when I brought up an adulterous relationship between Dan and Linda. At Watchbird's "request" I am going to talk to some of the people who were around before 3ABN to verify everything. If you read my statement carefully, it was meant to be addressed as more of a question than a statement. However, let me rephrase - I had been told by people who knew Dan and Linda long before they got together and those people knew that they had an affair. I belive that it was Linda who was married at the time that she and Dan began a relationship.

Many of you may have heard the story about how they met as Dan has mentioned it on air. Linda needed a car and somehow Dan met her through a family member or friend when they took pity on her having just come out of a bad relationship. Come to think of it, I believe it was Tommy Shelton. (Please don't ask about the car business, I will have to find out the details. It's been too long ago.) Like most of Dan's stories, they have a measure of truth and a measure of falsehood and as I remember, Linda did need a car and met Dan that way, but it was before her divorce.

I should not have thrown out that information without more specifics. I was hoping that someone else would fill in the details.

To cool everyone off, I will do some digging and find more details.

I believe, Watchbird, that there have been many serious allegations on this board.

This, however, was not meant as an allegation, but as a request for more information as the details have gotten somewhat blurred over the past 20 years.

By the way - what other things does it explain?

Thanks HOTY for the clarification.... I await the results of your research into how Danny and Linda met, and when... it does shed light on a number of things....

#### Posted by: husbandoftheyear Nov 15 2006, 07:50 AM

QUOTE(Fran @ Nov 15 2006, 03:29 AM)
That Danny was not called by God to start 3ABN. No matter if it was October or November of 1984, or any other date.
God would have used a non-adulter, a non-fornicator, a non-molestor, or a non-rapist. That boat just don't float. Excuse me while I get sick!
This morning I got up a member of the World Seventh-day Adventist, but this mess has me ashamed of my world church and ASI. I think I will have to re-think just what I am again! I have to re-think what I stand for.
I do not believe I have any more faith in our church leadership, and I don't trust ASI or 3ABN. How
can I listen to preachers in my church any longer?
Today began as the worst day of my life. It has ended that way too. May God help me! 🗂

Fran - first - you know that God uses us all, murderers, adulterers, etc. Does it make us sick - yes, but that is our human side thinking.

You CANNOT allow for the mess with 3ABN to interfere in your walk with Christ! Please, please consider the fact that you are allowing this to affect your life and quite possibly your health. Take a few moments to step back and evaluate just how threaded Dan Shelton is in your life...and realize that none of us should give any one person that power over us.

I'm worried and praying for you, Fran.	
Posted by: watchbird Nov 15 2006, 11:13 AM	
QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Nov 13 2006, 11:18 PM)	
A search of Google only brings up this information as far as I can find. I copied the following paragraph from "The Bible Sabbath Association" web site (link below). It appears that his Last Days Revival Ministries is based in Atlanta, Georgia so one of you folks near there can break out your phone books and get the contact info if still around. If he is still there he should, as the source, have records of his crusades on file.  OSCAR LANE, JR "Proclaiming The Sabbath More Fully" (1 Tape)  Sabbath Conference keynote speaker Founder and lead evangelist of Last Days Revival Ministries based in Atlanta, Georgia. Dr. Lane has been preaching for 41 years and is	
considered by many as one of the most powerful and dynamic speakers among SDA evangelists. Since accepting the Sabbath truth he has been preaching as a Seventh-day Adventist evangelist for 18 years. The Lord has used him through his international evangelistic crusades to raise 15 churches and to lead over 50,000 souls to the truths of the Three Angels message. He is author of 13 books and over 100 audio and video sermons. The Sabbath Conference was blessed to have Dr. Lane as one who gave "power and force" to the his proclamation of "The Sabbath More Fully."	
http://www.biblesabbath.org/sabbathmorefully.html	
Thanks PB and it is interesting that this is the ONLY google hit that comes up for "Last Days Revival Ministries." One might be tempted to ask where the writer of this advertising note got his information.	
At any rate, it is a simple thing to compare the time line between this and the date about which Bob is questioning. Some questions arise like	
What kind of church was he associated with at the time mentioned by Bob?	
Was he ever recognized as a Seventh-day Adventist minister by the Adventist church?	
Does his "Last Days Revival Ministries" still exist?	
Since he was/is? a black "evangelist", perhaps we are in the best place in the world to ask these questions and any other that might be appropriate.	
For starters, it would be a good idea to read what this group has already had to say about this person assuming, of course, that there are not two men by the same name Check out the thread entitled "Who Is This Oscar Lane Character?" for starters, at http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?s=&showtopic=9395&view=findpost&p=132613, though this is a spin off from another thread. You can find more on Oscar Lane by using the search engine.	
Posted by: fallible humanbeing Nov 15 2006, 01:02 PM	
QUOTE(watchbird @ Nov 15 2006, 01:13 PM)	

Thanks PB.... and it is interesting that this is the ONLY google hit that comes up for "Last Danys Revival Ministries." One might be tempted to ask where the writer of this advertising note got his information. Yesterday I came a cross a Google hit that awesumtenor also provided in the thread you linked to. Here is the http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php? s=&showtopic=9395&view=findpost&p=132642. And the external link to the story, http://www.aliciapatterson.org/APF001976/Masterson/Masterson05/Masterson05.html (the article is circa 1976). - fhb Posted by: Lee Nov 15 2006, 01:43 PM I am wondering something. If HOTY is correct in what he said about Linda and Danny committing "adultery" as he called it before they were married and while Linda was yet married--if Linda would do this with Danny, then why not with the doctor or anyone else? Some may say that she was separated from her husband and in the process of getting a divorce but did she have Biblical grounds then to marry Danny? Posted by: Johann Nov 15 2006, 04:27 PM QUOTE(Lee @ Nov 15 2006, 09:43 PM) Some may say that she was separated from her husband and in the process of getting a divorce but did she have Biblical grounds then to marry Danny? Some time ago I met Linda's first husband's sister. She told me that her brother attended church with Linda for a short while. When their mother discovered this she demanded her son throw Linda out and he moved in with another woman. The mother would not have her son entangled with such a herecy as what her neighbors, the Shelton's, were promotiing. She did not evaluate Adventist by their doctrines, but by their behavior. Nobody should, should they? Posted by: Nuggie Nov 15 2006, 04:29 PM x sna There's no end to the twists and turns in this saga... Posted by: princessdi Nov 15 2006, 04:44 PM

4/2/2007

OK?!!! So now if Danny and Linda was kickin' it(slang for "having an affair") before they got married, and she or he ws still maurried, it doesnt' excuse how he handled things, but it sure makes sense. For me, it now places Linda, also in the "What goes around, comes around"

category
QUOTE(Nuggie @ Nov 15 2006, 02:29 PM) 🗆
There's no end to the twists and turns in this saga 💌 sng
Posted by: Nuggie Nov 15 2006, 04:46 PM
QUOTE(princessdi @ Nov 15 2006, 04:44 PM)
OK?!!! So now if Danny and Linda was kickin' it(slang for "having an affair") before they got married, and she or he ws still maurried, it doesnt' excuse how he handled things, but it sure makes sense. For me, it now places Linda, also in the "What goes around, comes around" category
Yep, yep, yepmy pastor used to say if you sow the wind, you'll reap the whirlwind
QUOTE(Nuggie @ Nov 16 2006, 12:29 AM)
There's no end to the twists and turns in this saga 💌 sna
Danny Shelton has maintained through this ordeal that we cannot judge him for what he did many years ago. Is he right?
Posted by: husbandoftheyear Nov 15 2006, 06:43 PM
QUOTE(Johann @ Nov 15 2006, 07:14 PM) 🗌
Danny Shelton has maintained through this ordeal that we cannot judge him for what he did many years ago. Is he right?
Has he said this publicly? I'm curious

Posted by: Johann Nov 15 2006, 07:13 PM
QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Nov 16 2006, 02:43 AM)
Has he said this publicly? I'm curious
He has written this to me and said it to others. How many makes it public?
Posted by: husbandoftheyear Nov 15 2006, 07:39 PM
QUOTE(Johann @ Nov 15 2006, 08:13 PM)
He has written this to me and said it to others. How many makes it public?
Posted by: princessdi Nov 15 2006, 11:38 PM  QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Nov 15 2006, 05:39 PM)
QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Nov 15 2006, 05:39 PM)   I guess I should have asked if you heard this on the air. I have never heard this - but it sounds lik
something he would say - and then deny of course.
People who offend NEVER want you to remember what they did, and the past is an hour ago according to them. They convince themselves of "how" things happened, and they stick to it. When they get finished there is something wrong with you for ever bringing it up. According to them, they did do it as you say, or they got away that long time ago, why are you still talking about it. Danny will never admit to anything that happened outside of an hour ago, and you didn't see him do.
Posted by: Ralph Nov 16 2006, 12:50 AM
QUOTE(Lee @ Nov 15 2006, 01:43 PM)
if Linda would do this with Danny, then why not with the doctor or anyone else?

Compare the track record of Danny Shelton and that of Dr. Arild Abrahamsen. If a woman gets into

trouble it is usually because of pressure put on by the man and yet the blame is often unfairly put or the woman.	
Posted by: Ralph Nov 16 2006, 04:17 AM	
QUOTE(Johann @ Nov 15 2006, 06:14 PM)	***************************************
Danny Shelton has maintained through this ordeal that we cannot judge him for what he did years ago. Is he right?	many
Yes, he is right. Not very many of us have a past so squeaky clean that we do not wish to dra curtain over some past incident(s). And people who have lived a "perfect" life can be hard to laround.	
I have no problem of leaving the past in the past providing it stays there. Some people learn a past mistakes; others don't. If allegations that have been made by more than one person are we are looking at some pretty serious stuff that isn't that far in the past. Let's not lose our for	correct,
Posted by: Observer Nov 16 2006, 06:22 AM	***************************************
QUOTE(Johann @ Nov 15 2006, 05:14 PM)	
Danny Shelton has maintained through this ordeal that we cannot judge him for what he did years ago. Is he right?	many
I am dumbfounded at the turn this has taken. The marital issues are the least of my concern. are much more important issues at stake here.	There
Danny and Linda married 20 years ago, or so. How in the world can either Danny or Linda res an alligation that they were sexually involved prior to their marriage? Thay can't. Such alligati not fair to either of them. Twenty years of water, so to speak has passed under the bridge (Yemixing metaphores.). What is the value to us today of this focus?	ions are
Posted by: västergötland Nov 16 2006, 07:42 AM	
QUOTE(Johann @ Nov 15 2006, 11:27 PM)	
Some time ago I met Linda's first husband's sister. She told me that her brother attended ch with Linda for a short while. When their mother discovered this she demanded her son throw	

out and he moved in with another woman. The mother would not have her son entangled with such a herecy as what her neighbors, the Shelton's, were promoting. She did not evaluate Adventist by their doctrines, but by their behavior. Nobody should, should they?

Seems to be a classic case of "Do as I say, not as I do". And equally classically what ends up being remembered is the actions rather than the words.

#### Posted by: Clay Nov 16 2006, 08:33 AM

# QUOTE(Observer @ Nov 16 2006, 06:22 AM)

I am dumbfounded at the turn this has taken. The marital issues are the least of my concern. There are much more important issues at stake here.

Danny and Linda married 20 years ago, or so. How in the world can either Danny or Linda respond to an alligation that they were sexually involved prior to their marriage? Thay can't. Such alligations are not fair to either of them. Twenty years of water, so to speak has passed under the bridge (Yes, I am mixing metaphores.). What is the value to us today of this focus?

yes they could.... its simple... either Linda and Danny had sex before they were married to each other, or they didn't... they may be older, but most people remember when they first had sex with their spouse before the official "I do" or after it...

It is not a matter of fairness, it is a matter of context.... If the allegation is that Danny may have known his current wife before he was divorced from Linda, perhaps this is not the first time he entered into a relationship that was complicated by a marriage (either his or his intended)......

# Posted by: Observer Nov 16 2006, 12:31 PM

Re: "  $\dots$  perhaps this is not the first time he entered into a relationship that was complicated by a marriage (either his or his intended)....."

Yes, as the word "perhaps" has suggested, this is all speculation. There is no evidene to suggest that sex, even a single event, prior to marriage, will 20 years later make it more likely that those two will have sexual intercourse outside of their marriage.

If Danny and Linda were sexually active prior to thier marriage, even once, it is not revelent to the issues that we face today. It is not fair to either. How can you defend aganist a 20 year-old alleged event? You cannot.

Here is what is revelant today:

# Linda:

- 1) Did she, or did she not with Dr. A?
- 2) Did she have any inappropriate relationships with others while married to Danny?

# Danny:

- 1) What relationships did Danny have, if any, while married to Linda, with other women?
- 2) What relationship did Danny have with Brandi while married to Linda, and prior to his marriage to Brandi?

The above questions are even-handed on both sides. They are appropriate to the issues we face today. Questions from 20 years ago are not.

	Posted by: nick Nov 16 2006, 01:45 PM
	conversation between Nick and Nick.
	Nick: Why does this entire 3abn thing seem like justifiable gossip among christians who claim that they want to see wongs made right?
	Nick: dunno Nick. But the way I see it going jus nawt sure Jesus is too happy about it i jus
	Ps oh don't mind me guys, I'm just having a lil talk with myself 「.
	Posted by: watchbird Nov 16 2006, 01:59 PM
	QUOTE(Observer @ Nov 16 2006, 01:31 PM)
	Re: " perhaps this is not the first time he entered into a relationship that was complicated by a marriage (either his or his intended)"
	Yes, as the word "perhaps" has suggested, this is all speculation. There is no evidene to suggest that sex, even a single event, prior to marriage, will 20 years later make it more likely that those two will have sexual intercourse outside of their marriage.
and the state of the bank of the state of th	If Danny and Linda were sexually active prior to thier marriage, even once, it is not revelent to the issues that we face today. It is not fair to either. How can you defend aganist a 20 year-old alleged event? You cannot.
The same of the same of	Here is what is revelant today:
	Linda:
Contract of the Contract of th	<ol> <li>Did she, or did she not with Dr. A?</li> <li>Did she have any inappropriate relationships with others while married to Danny?</li> </ol>
	Danny:
	1) What relationships did Danny have, if any, while married to Linda, with other women? 2) What relationship did Danny have with Brandi while married to Linda, and prior to his marriage to Brandi?
	The above questions are even-handed on both sides. They are appropriate to the issues we face

today. Questions from 20 years ago are not.

When the issues we face today have to do with questions as to what kind of people founded the ministry some 20 years ago... then anything that was done then is relevent today. But frankly, I think your prior post on this was more to the point.... let's take another look at that...

# QUOTE(Observer @ Nov 16 2006, 07:22 AM)

 ${\rm I}$  am dumbfounded at the turn this has taken. The marital issues are the least of my concern. There are much more important issues at stake here .

Danny and Linda married 20 years ago, or so. How in the world can either Danny or Linda respond to an alligation that they were sexually involved prior to their marriage? Thay can't. Such alligations are not fair to either of them. Twenty years of water, so to speak has passed under the bridge (Yes, I am mixing metaphores.). What is the value to us today of this focus?

When I was first introduced to the problems at 3abn, almost the first thing that was told to me by someone who had been at 3abn for long years was.... "This is NOT about Linda and Danny's relationship". This was the refrain that you, yourself, echoed repeatedly on the Club Adventist website throughout the years that it was open to discussion on the woes of 3abn. This was also the refrain spoken often by some of us throughout the years here on BSDA.

And with that refrain have come the other issues.... the other areas of concern. The Televangelist, for example, pulled many of these concerns together, back in May of 2005. It was circulated fairly widely, but not until Sister brought it to BSDA, first in excerpts, and then in its entirety, was it ever published on a website where all could see. But even when it was, the individual areas it covered never drew the attention that they warrented and needed. (Even yet it is not included in the pinned items at the top of the menu, so newcomers only meet it if they dig deep into either the "Unauthorized History threads" or into the back pages of the thread menus.) And always someone has found a way to turn the focus back onto Linda and how Danny had treated her.... or onto Danny and whether he had the legalistic "biblical right" to remarry.

What it has seemed to me from Day One is that Linda was used as a "red herring" to draw attention away from whatever other problems there was that the Shelton empire did not want anyone to see. As time went on, it began looking as though both Linda and Danny's private "affairs" were being used ... by all sides .... notice I said "all" not merely "both".... for the same purpose. The question is still..... WHY?

And the greater question we who trust that God is leading in all of this may need to ask is a more thoughtful (as contrasted with emotional) "Why?".... that is to say..... what purpose might there be from God's viewpoint in allowing these distractions from what many of us see as the real task of doing a complete "house-cleaning" of 3abn so that it no longer casts a dark shadow on the name of the Adventist church... and even on God Himself?

I have, for months, suggested that one answer to that question is that all has not yet been revealed that needs to be revealed. Not all of the conspirators have been identified. Not all of the corruption has been uncovered. If any of us were to be given the power right today to "clean house", do any of us really know who to depose and who to retain.... and who are the supporters in all "high places" that also need to be flushed out and down the drain? I don't think we do. And I am not at all sure that even those in the highest places in our church structure know that either.... though I'm sure there are many who know much more than I do.

I have also stated for months that for most of us, this is now a time of waiting to see what develops from things that are being done "behind the scenes".... not only by our church leaders, but also by civil authorities. But waiting is one of the most difficult things in life to do.... especially for those of us who are "activists" at heart.

I have also stated from the very beginning that the reason for these discussions is that of becoming informed, of spreading information so others could be informed... and all for the purpose of understanding.... not for the purpose of passing judgement on individuals... whether those individuals be victims, perpetrators, informers, or some of all these and more.

And it is in this area that I believe the answer to your question, "What is the value to us today of this focus?" can find an answer that gives legitimacy to this area of Danny and Linda's life being brought before us.

In order to rightly relate to all that is going on.... and to form personal opinions as to what needs to be done in order to clean out the mess at 3abn and see who should go and who should stay and who should be brought in.... we need very much to have some very comprehensive and accurate understandings of the individuals who have been invoved.

We justified looking at events in Danny's past life on the basis of how it affected his present decisions and actions and by comparing the past with the present, asking whether there was a discontinuity between them, or a continuity and even perhaps an escalation of the same traits? By this understanding we can justifiably develop expectations for the future. And when it comes to the continuation of his ownership and operation of 3abn.... those questions are not restricted to his moral behavior--though they do include it.... neither are morals and ethics restricted to sexual issues..... and we are amiss in not spending more time proportionately on other areas of misconduct than what we have. Though we can be somewhat excused for that.... considering that these are areas in which legalities prevent us from even posting all of what is known, much less discussing it in any detail.

We have not often allowed anything negative to be said about Linda.... out of compassion for the hurts she has suffered from Danny.... particularly in the last few years of her marriage and in the years since the divorce..... and the desire to not bring greater distress to her. That protectiveness has been good and right, IMO.... at least in the area where she is clearly innocent.... that of her relationship with Arild Abrahmsen. But that has also meant that we have a very one-sided picture of Linda, and we have very little basis of understanding her person, her role, her inner feeling towards her roles, her relationships..... or the reactions of others towards her .... or objective views of these roles and reactions. Maybe it is time that we enlarged our understanding by looking at some other facets of Linda's life than merely the way she has been treated by Danny for the last few years. And perhaps this little glimpse into the past ... showing the shaky ground on which they established their marriage can serve as a beginning of learning more about who Linda really is.

We would, however, be falling into the same tunnel vision trap and using the same "red herring" technique, if we focus unduly upon this single aspect of her life. There are still all of the other problems of 3abn..... what really was her role in all of those.... was she really only an ineffective bystander with no ability to turn the tide of evil as it grew larger and larger? What about her role in her various positions at 3abn? How did she handle those responsibilities?

And the reasons for asking these questions are not merely for coming to personal understandings or conclusions. There are two reasons why I feel it is vital for these things to be examined.

- 1) If, as we have reason to believe, there will be a legal examination of the "irregularities" of the money handling aspects of Danny's "regime".... then Linda WILL be a part of what is examined. There is no way that a distraction to marital matters will enter into that examination. A question that I have is.... is there any evidence that Linda is even yet either aware of or making preparations to meet the accusations that she will have to meet at that time?
- 2) In some of the informational material that I receive, it would seem as though either Linda or those who are advising her, are still seriously entertaining the hopes of her being reinstated at 3abn in her original role as half owner, including salary.... which presumably would entail her resuming some of her previous responsibilities, though that detail has not been mentioned. My question here has to do not only with the seemingly impossible psychological position that would put her and everyone else concerned in... but also the more practical one as to whether she is.... on the basis of how she ran the departments under her in the past..... capable of taking on such a position and job responsibilities?

And finally.... can she maintain both a position of innocent inability to deal with things in the past and project the capability of wisely overseeing such things in the future simultaneously?

I continue to care deeply for Linda. I fear that she is walking into a trap. One that will be much more damaging than anything she has experienced thus far.... and one that will make it even more difficult for the mess at 3abn... and where ever else it extends.... to be cleaned out.

Information and understanding are the only tools and safeguards that I know of. I suggest we keep sharing them.... ranging as far and wide as our sources of information happen to know, rather than continuing to focus so closely upon Linda and Danny alone.

# Posted by: Clay Nov 16 2006, 03:30 PM

# QUOTE(Observer @ Nov 16 2006, 12:31 PM)

Re: " . . . perhaps this is not the first time he entered into a relationship that was complicated by a marriage (either his or his intended)....."

Yes, as the word "perhaps" has suggested, this is all speculation. There is no evidene to suggest that sex, even a single event, prior to marriage, will 20 years later make it more likely that those two will have sexual intercourse outside of their marriage.

If Danny and Linda were sexually active prior to thier marriage, even once, it is not revelent to the issues that we face today. It is not fair to either. How can you defend aganist a 20 year-old alleged event? You cannot.

Here is what is revelant today:

# Linda:

- 1) Did she, or did she not with Dr. A?
- 2) Did she have any inappropriate relationships with others while married to Danny?

#### Danny:

- 1) What relationships did Danny have, if any, while married to Linda, with other women?
- 2) What relationship did Danny have with Brandi while married to Linda, and prior to his marriage to Brandi?

The above questions are even-handed on both sides. They are appropriate to the issues we face today. Questions from 20 years ago are not.

in your opinion.... sometimes... more than often past behavior may be indicative of future behavior..... so for me, I want to know...

#### QUOTE(nick @ Nov 16 2006, 01:45 PM)

... conversation between Nick and Nick.

Nick: Why does this entire 3abn thing seem like justifiable gossip among christians who claim that they want to see wongs made right?

Nick: dunno Nick. But the way I see it going jus nawt sure Jesus is too happy about it i jus
Ps oh don't mind me guys, I'm just having a lil talk with myself [ ]
no one is forcing Nick to read a word in this forum as for what it seems like to Nick, Nick has been mistaken before if Nick has a problem with the content in this area, Nick can play in other areas of the forum then again, Nick knows this
Posted by: Jvat Nov 16 2006, 03:59 PM
Watchird, deep and thoughtprovoking musings indeed!
Posted by: nick Nov 16 2006, 04:01 PM
QUOTE(Clay @ Nov 16 2006, 09:30 PM) 🗆
in your opinion sometimes more than often past behavior may be indicative of future
behavior so for me, I want to know no one is forcing Nick to read a word in this forum as for what it seems like to Nick, Nick has
been mistaken before if Nick has a problem with the content in this area, Nick can play in other
areas of the forum then again, Nick knows this
AND THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY
Nick: you know Nick, the thought that Nick is right!!! Kills!!!!
Nick: 🐷
Nick: I mean, some folks may be here genuinely, but the majority seem to be here for the saucy news.
Nick: Point taken. It really amazed me how this 'saga' grew so fast here even getting it's own forum an all that $\boxed{\Box}$ .
Nick: yea and have you noticed the amount of peeps who came running to bsda jus' fo' this story.
Nick: mmmmmmm scary Nick
Posted by: simplysaved Nov 16 2006, 04:39 PM
x roft
QUOTE(nick @ Nov 16 2006, 05:01 PM)
Nick: you know Nick, the thought that Nick is right!!! Kills!!!!

Nick: 🔽
Nick: I mean, some folks may be here genuinely, but the majority seem to be here for the saucy news.
Nick: Point taken. It really amazed me how this 'saga' grew so fast here even getting it's own forum an all that $\boxed{\Box}$ .
Nick: yea and have you noticed the amount of peeps who came running to bsda jus' fo' this story.
Nick: mmmmmmm scary Nick
QUOTE(nick @ Nov 16 2006, 02:45 PM) 🗌
conversation between Nick and Nick.  Nick: Why does this entire 3abn thing seem like justifiable gossip among christians who claim that they want to see wongs made right?
Nick: dunno Nick. But the way I see it going jus nawt sure Jesus is too happy about it i jus  Ps oh don't mind me guys, I'm just having a lil talk with myself   [ ]
Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Nov 16 2006, 05:19 PM
QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Nov 15 2006, 12:02 PM) 🗌
Yesterday I came a cross a Google hit that awesumtenor also provided in the thread you linked to. Here is the http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php? s=&showtopic=9395&view=findpost&p=132642.
And the external link to the story, http://www.aliciapatterson.org/APF001976/Masterson/Masterson05/Masterson05.html (the article is circa 1976).
- fhb

#### **FHB**

When I was Googling Oscar Lane's name, I did come up with several hits on this article. I got as far as the San Francisco portion and then, after a brief and fruitless scan of the rest, had to leave without reading further and finding the part about this fellow. I wish I had read it then! There are some interesting similarities to the financial dealings of another fundraiser who is discussed on this very forum from time to time. It is a good read and I would suggest that others follow your link to the "Los Angeles" entry in this interesting piece of last century history.

РВ	
Posted by: Clay	Nov 16 2006, 07:31 PM
	ov 16 2006, 04:01 PM) 🗌
Nick: you know N	ck, the thought that Nick is right!!! Kills!!!!
Nick:	
Nick: I mean, son news.	ne folks may be here genuinely, but the majority seem to be here for the saucy
Nick: Point taken, forum an all that	It really amazed me how this 'saga' grew so fast here even getting it's own,
Nick: yea and story.	have you noticed the amount of peeps who came running to bsda jus' fo' this
Nick: mmmmmm	m scary Nick
•	testing, it is noticed that Nick is still here reading to Nick's heart's content says
something about N	<del>-</del> -
Posted by: Peace	ick
Posted by: Peac	ick  cefullyBewildered Nov 16 2006, 08:39 PM  lov 15 2006, 01:29 AM)  ot called by God to start 3ABN. No matter if it was October or November of 1984,
Posted by: Peace QUOTE(Fran @ N That Danny was r or any other date	ick  cefullyBewildered Nov 16 2006, 08:39 PM  lov 15 2006, 01:29 AM)  ot called by God to start 3ABN. No matter if it was October or November of 1984,
Posted by: Peace QUOTE(Fran @ I That Danny was r or any other date God would have u just don't float. Ex	ick  cefullyBewildered Nov 16 2006, 08:39 PM  lov 15 2006, 01:29 AM)  ot called by God to start 3ABN. No matter if it was October or November of 1984,  c.  sed a non-adulter, a non-fornicator, a non-molestor, or a non-rapist. That boat is cuse me while I get sick!  t up a member of the World Seventh-day Adventist, but this mess has me orld church and ASI. I think I will have to re-think just what I am again! I have to
Posted by: Peace QUOTE(Fran @ I That Danny was r or any other date God would have u just don't float. Ex This morning I go ashamed of my w re-think what I st	ick  cefullyBewildered Nov 16 2006, 08:39 PM  dov 15 2006, 01:29 AM)  ot called by God to start 3ABN. No matter if it was October or November of 1984,  sed a non-adulter, a non-fornicator, a non-molestor, or a non-rapist. That boat couse me while I get sick!  t up a member of the World Seventh-day Adventist, but this mess has me orld church and ASI. I think I will have to re-think just what I am again! I have to and for.  have any more faith in our church leadership, and I don't trust ASI or 3ABN. How
Posted by: Peace QUOTE(Fran @ I That Danny was rearned of my we re-think what I st	ick  RefullyBewildered Nov 16 2006, 08:39 PM  Nov 15 2006, 01:29 AM)  ot called by God to start 3ABN. No matter if it was October or November of 1984,  sed a non-adulter, a non-fornicator, a non-molestor, or a non-rapist. That boat is cuse me while I get sick!  t up a member of the World Seventh-day Adventist, but this mess has me orld church and ASI. I think I will have to re-think just what I am again! I have to and for.

_		

While we are here on this old world there is only one Person that we can count on and safely put our faith in 100% of the time - our God. Human beings always have the potential to fail, to do wrong things. It is never safe for us to look at them as anything more than fellow pilgrims on this journey.

The SDA church we are a part of, the Body of Christ, is made up of the same fallible human beings. Sometimes this body has viruses, bacterial infections and even cancers. When we allow it, the illnesses can be healed by the Great Physician but sometimes a malignancy needs to be removed. While the Holy Spirit provides fruits and gifts to the Body of Christ so that by using them the body's members are strengthened, our ultimate focus has to be on the LORD.

members are strengthened, our ultimate focus has to be on the LORD.
"Finally, be strong in the Lord, and in His mighty power!" Eph. 6:10
Posted by: nick Nov 17 2006, 01:33 AM
QUOTE(Clay @ Nov 17 2006, 01:31 AM)
for all of Nick's protesting, it is noticed that Nick is still here reading to Nick's heart's content says something about Nick
Nick: they're just not getting it are they Nick
Nick: r
Nick: they're looking past the issue raised (wonder if they have even thought about it $\Box$ ) and go straight into justifying their actions, by trying to take you on a guilt trip $\Box$ . You rolling Nick?
Nick: Not on that trip I am!! Truth is truth and I will keep speaking about it. MOST FOLK HERE COME FOR THE ILL TALK, HAVING ITCHING EARS. They don't come so much with genuine christian concern.
Nick: As if saying 'If the laundry is dirty, we want to go through it', 'we'll just say that we long to see it clean and that'll justify our 'dirty laundry searching". You do realise that there is a subconcious admittance of 'reading to one's hearts content'?
Nick: Well put Nick, the motive is scattered throughout the posts here $\boxed{\boxed{\mathbf{x}}}$ what can I say, great minds do think alike $\boxed{\boxed{\mathbf{x}}}$
Nick: Well you know me better than anyone Nick
Nick and Nick: Let's hope they get it this time, we're not against this forum or any other - just calling for folk to clean up thier act, like they profess to be doing in Danny's case.
Posted by: Clay Nov 17 2006, 06:22 AM
Nick, there are meds for what you have you may need to avail yourself

# Posted by: awesumtenor Nov 17 2006, 08:14 AM

QUOTE(nick @ Nov 16 2006, 02:45 PM) 🗌	
conversation between Nick and Nick. Nick: Why does this entire 3abn thing seem like justifiable gossip among christians who claim they want to see wongs made right?	that
Nick: dunno Nick. But the way I see it going jus nawt sure Jesus is too happy about it i j Ps oh don't mind me guys, I'm just having a lil talk with myself	us
rs on don't finha file guys, i fil just having a ni taik with mysen [4]	***************************************
I bet that holier-than-thou gets real heavy to carry sometimes	
In His service, Mr. J	
Posted by: simplysaved Nov 17 2006, 08:33 AM	***************************************
Amen!!!! Well saidat the end of the day, that is how it is for ALL of us	
QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Nov 16 2006, 09:39 PM)	YPYPPPFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFF
Fran, While we are here on this old world there is only one Person that we can count on and safely pour faith in 100% of the time - our God. Human beings always have the potential to fail, to do wrong things. It is never safe for us to look at them as anything more than fellow pilgrims on to journey.	
The SDA church we are a part of, the Body of Christ, is made up of the same fallible human be Sometimes this body has viruses, bacterial infections and even cancers. When we allow it, the illnesses can be healed by the Great Physician but sometimes a malignancy needs to be remove While the Holy Spirit provides fruits and gifts to the Body of Christ so that by using them the bemembers are strengthened, our ultimate focus has to be on the LORD.	ved.
"Finally, be strong in the Lord, and in His mighty power!" Eph. 6:10	**************
Posted by: watchbird Nov 17 2006, 08:42 AM	energies and enterior in the contract of the c
QUOTE(nick @ Nov 16 2006, 02:45 PM)	******
conversation between Nick and Nick.  Nick: Why does this entire 3abn thing seem like justifiable gossin among christians who claim.	that

they want to see wongs made right?
Nick: dunno Nick. But the way I see it going jus nawt sure Jesus is too happy about it i jus
Ps oh don't mind me guys, I'm just having a lil talk with myself 🗔 🙃
I've heard that it is nothing to worry about if one talks to himself but if one finds himself ANSWERING himself then it is time to start worrying
Seriously it might be a great deal more profitable if you were to talk with Jesus about it following his instruction to "enter into your closet" to do so rather than standing on the street corner where you can be heard by all.
As for "the entire 3abn thing" the time to speak up on that is AFTER you have read everything that has been written here take your time we can wait for you
Posted by: awesumtenor Nov 17 2006, 09:13 AM
QUOTE(nick @ Nov 17 2006, 02:33 AM)
Nick: they're just not getting it are they Nick
Nick: 「「
Nick: they're looking past the issue raised (wonder if they have even thought about it 🗔 ) and go
straight into justifying their actions, by trying to take you on a guilt trip 🗀 . You rolling Nick?
Nick: Not on that trip I am!! Truth is truth and I will keep speaking about it. MOST FOLK HERE COME FOR THE ILL TALK, HAVING ITCHING EARS. They don't come so much with genuine christian concern.
Nick: As if saying 'If the laundry is dirty, we want to go through it', 'we'll just say that we long to see it clean and that'll justify our 'dirty laundry searching". You do realise that there is a subconcious admittance of 'reading to one's hearts content'?
Nick: Well put Nick, the motive is scattered throughout the posts here 🗔 what can I say,
great minds do thìnk alíke
Nick: Well you know me better than anyone Nick 🦳
Nick and Nick: Let's hope they get it this time, we're not against this forum or any other - just calling for folk to clean up thier act, like they profess to be doing in Danny's case.

You omitted this part:

"God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as these unfortunate sinners posting in the 3ABN thread..."

In His service,  Mr. J	
Posted by: nic	« Nov 17 2006, 10:19 AM
QUOTE(awesur	ntenor @ Nov 17 2006, 03:13 PM) 🗌
You omitted this	part:
	ee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as e sinners posting in the 3ABN thread"
In His service, Mr. J	

And you seemed to have missed this part:

"we're not against this forum or any other - just calling for folk to clean up thier act, like they profess to be doing in Danny's case"

... and this part:

"some folks may be here genuinely, but the majority seem to be here for the saucy news."

Here's my bone of contention Bro. Kev;

I have read and do understand the concerns and injustices viewed about this saga. But some of us are starting to go too far... way too far. I have felt very uncomfortable with some of the posts on this issue. They have gone from simple concern and truth seeking to condemnation, wishing ill etc.

I can pull up a few posts and show you but nah. Don't want to put folks in the spot light.

Two wrongs don't make a right. Danny's guilt and secret issues should not be taken and become gossip for us.

If that makes me 'holier-than-thou, then...

# Posted by: mystery- man Nov 17 2006, 12:26 PM

Nick, I am sure that you dont understand the countless amount of human suffering and the many souls that will be lost because things kept in secret by men in position of authority never are exposed for what they are. That is why John the Baptist exposed Herod. That is why the Prophet was sent to David in open forum to expose the sin to everyone. Danny has chosen to stay in the position of authority despite the apparent misgivings. Look at what I have posted previously and you will see where I stand. Before the internet Pastors were allowed to continue in secret their lives of sin even tho countless individuals were eventually hurt. I PERSONALLY KNOW OF MANY CASES WHERE THE EFFECT OF PERSONAL SINS HAVE LEFT A LASTING DAMAGING LEGACY ON UNTOLL NUMBERS OF MY FRIENDS. BUT HOPEFULLY BY THE GRACE OF GOD THESE INDIVIDUALS WILL GET OVER THEIR PAIN. I dont know the actual reason for your supposed

indignation because of what you have read I can only guess. But by in large the things posted have been appropriate. But as in anything you can always find people who in almost anything do something wrong. BUT YOU SEEM TO FORGET THAT IF YOU WERE ACCUSED OF THE SAME THINGS DANNY WAS ACCUSED OF YOUR CHURCH WOULD INVESTIGATE THE ALLEGATIONS TO THE FULLEST. BY THE WAY AND IF YOU REFUSED TO LEAVE YOU WOULD BE FORCEFULLY REMOVED AND THESE SAME INDIVIDUALS WOULD DO WHAT EVER THEY NEEDED TO REMOVE YOU EVEN TO THE EXTREME OF POLICE ARREST IN PUBLIC.

# Posted by: princessdi Nov 17 2006, 01:08 PM

I am going to assume, MysteryMann that you do not realie that the use of all caps is a signe of shouting out here in cyberspace. We can disagree, but I ask that you use you "inside voice" please.

# QUOTE(mystery- man @ Nov 17 2006, 10:26 AM)

Nick, I am sure that you dont understand the countless amount of human suffering and the many souls that will be lost because things kept in secret by men in position of authority never are exposed for what they are. That is why John the Baptist exposed Herod. That is why the Prophet was sent to David in open forum to expose the sin to everyone. Danny has chosen to stay in the position of authority despite the apparent misgivings. Look at what I have posted previously and you will see where I stand. Before the internet Pastors were allowed to continue in secret their lives of sin even tho countless individuals were eventually hurt. I PERSONALLY KNOW OF MANY CASES WHERE THE EFFECT OF PERSONAL SINS HAVE LEFT A LASTING DAMAGING LEGACY ON UNTOLL NUMBERS OF MY FRIENDS, BUT HOPEFULLY BY THE GRACE OF GOD THESE INDIVIDUALS WILL GET OVER THEIR PAIN. I dont know the actual reason for your supposed indignation because of what you have read I can only guess. But by in large the things posted have been appropriate. But as in anything you can always find people who in almost anything do something wrong. BUT YOU SEEM TO FORGET THAT IF YOU WERE ACCUSED OF THE SAME THINGS DANNY WAS ACCUSED OF YOUR CHURCH WOULD INVESTIGATE THE ALLEGATIONS TO THE FULLEST. BY THE WAY AND IF YOU REFUSED TO LEAVE YOU WOULD BE FORCEFULLY REMOVED AND THESE SAME INDIVIDUALS WOULD DO WHAT EVER THEY NEEDED TO REMOVE YOU EVEN TO THE EXTREME OF POLICE ARREST IN PUBLIC.

# Posted by: nick Nov 17 2006, 01:37 PM

# QUOTE(mystery- man @ Nov 17 2006, 06:26 PM)

Nick, I am sure that you dont understand the countless amount of human suffering and the many souls that will be lost because things kept in secret by men in position of authority never are exposed for what they are. That is why John the Baptist exposed Herod. That is why the Prophet was sent to David in open forum to expose the sin to everyone. Danny has chosen to stay in the position of authority despite the apparent misgivings. Look at what I have posted previously and you will see where I stand. Before the internet Pastors were allowed to continue in secret their lives of sin even tho countless individuals were eventually hurt. I PERSONALLY KNOW OF MANY CASES WHERE THE EFFECT OF PERSONAL SINS HAVE LEFT A LASTING DAMAGING LEGACY ON UNTOLL NUMBERS OF MY FRIENDS. BUT HOPEFULLY BY THE GRACE OF GOD THESE INDIVIDUALS WILL GET OVER THEIR PAIN. I dont know the actual reason for your supposed indignation because of what you have read I can only guess. But by in large the things posted have been appropriate. But as in anything you can always find people who in almost anything do something wrong. BUT YOU

SEEM TO FORGET THAT IF YOU WERE ACCUSED OF THE SAME THINGS DANNY WAS ACCUSED OF YOUR CHURCH WOULD INVESTIGATE THE ALLEGATIONS TO THE FULLEST. BY THE WAY AND IF YOU REFUSED TO LEAVE YOU WOULD BE FORCEFULLY REMOVED AND THESE SAME INDIVIDUALS WOULD DO WHAT EVER THEY NEEDED TO REMOVE YOU EVEN TO THE EXTREME OF POLICE ARREST IN PUBLIC.

IN PUBLIC. I understand fully your point and do sympathise with the victims. I am not saying that the truth should not be persued and for folk to be revealed for what they really are. Jesus himself did it. The concern that I have is the extreme that some of us have gone to in this. If as a result of my previous posts anyone took offense - I apologise. I am not being insentsitive to the issue at hand. Again... × Posted by: mystery- man Nov 17 2006, 04:15 PM I AM SORRY FOR THE UPPER CASE DID NOT MEAN TO BE SCREAMING  $\mid \tau \mid$  And Nick I am sorry if I appeared to be reading motive into what you have said. I do not know you personally so I dont, as I have stated, know the reason for your apparent problems with the post. If it is that some have posted inappropriate things you would be, in my opinion, correct. But with almost everything in this world you have to take the good with the bad. For the most part, I believe, the things posted here serve a needed function, that being to alert the masses to the corruption of the individuals in charge. The blind leading the blind will fall into a ditch. While I know God is very forgiving and loving towards his people still there is a limit. I am not saying that I know what that limit is either but what I do know is that the people in responsible positions have a responsibility to act responsible, and that resposibility greatly multiplies when the individual claims to be the carpenter

Posted by: nick Nov 17 2006, 05:39 PM

representing the great carpenter Jesus Christ.

QUOTE(mystery- man @ Nov 17 2006, 10:15 PM)

I AM SORRY FOR THE UPPER CASE DID NOT MEAN TO BE SCREAMING \_\_\_ And Nick I am sorry if I appeared to be reading motive into what you have said. I do not know you personally so I dont, as I have stated, know the reason for your apparent problems with the post. If it is that some have posted inappropriate things you would be, in my opinion, correct. But with almost everything in this world you have to take the good with the bad. For the most part, I believe, the things posted here serve a needed function, that being to alert the masses to the corruption of the individuals in charge. The blind leading the blind will fall into a ditch. While I know God is very forgiving and loving towards his people still there is a limit. I am not saying that I know what that limit is either but what I do know is that the people in responsible positions have a responsibility to act responsible, and that resposibility greatly multiplies when the individual claims to be the carpenter representing the great carpenter Jesus Christ.

No sweat Mystery, we cool

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Nov 17 2006, 09:05 PM
QUOTE(nick @ Nov 17 2006, 12:33 AM)
Nick: Not on that trip I am!! <b>Truth is truth</b> and I will keep speaking about it. MOST FOLK HERE COME FOR THE ILL TALK, HAVING ITCHING EARS. They don't come so much with genuine christian concern.
Note to Self: Ask Nick what the truth is from his point of view. Self: Nick, could you please fill me in on what Truth is here?
QUOTE
Nick: As if saying 'If the laundry is dirty, we want to go through it', 'we'll just say that we long to see it clean and that'll justify our 'dirty laundry searching". You do realise that there is a subconcious admittance of 'reading to one's hearts content'?
Additional note to Self: Fill Nick in on my own opinion about the spirits at work here on BSDA.
Self: Hey Nick, way back in August 2006 I became a member here in hopes to find morsels of truth about the "situation" at 3abn, a ministry that has often been a blessing to me and has enhanced my spiritual experience. Right away I became aware of some who were honest truth seekers and others who seemed to be salivating over the tasty tidbits on the dirty laundry.
Being that I prefer a plant-based diet, the laundry tidbits are not what I choose to ingest, unless they are true morsels that need to be plated and served up.
QUOTE
Nick and Nick: Let's hope they get it this time, we're not against this forum or any other - just calling for folk to clean up thier act, like they profess to be doing in Danny's case.
Thankfully, when some patrons (NOT A MAJORITY, IMO) of this establishment get to gnawing to the point of eviscerating, the Maitre' Ds adeptly step in and point out the rules of courteous dining.
Final note to Self: Pass the antacids and please choose an easier metaphor next time.
Posted by: husbandoftheyear Nov 18 2006, 01:17 PM
QUOTE(Observer @ Nov 16 2006, 07:22 AM)
Danny and Linda married 20 years ago, or so. How in the world can either Danny or Linda respond to an alligation that they were sexually involved prior to their marriage? Thay can't. Such alligations

are not fair to either of them. Twenty years of water, so to speak has passed under the bridge (Yes,

I am mixing metaphores.). What is the value to us today of this focus?	***************************************
If this is the case then everything discussed about 3ABN is off limits considering many of the li started arond the same time.	ies
I don't believe that there is a statute of limitations on sin	
Posted by: calvin Nov 18 2006, 02:34 PM	
I have drawn the line on this discussion to limit it to the ministry of 3ABN, NOT what happened these folks lives prior to its formation. Yall, got enough stuff with over 20 years of 3ABN to me through without speculating on whether Danny and Linda where having sex before they got married and before they started 3ABNthat's nobodies business.	
Posted by: PrincessDrRe Nov 18 2006, 02:42 PM	
QUOTE(watchbird @ Nov 17 2006, 10:42 AM)	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
I've heard that it is nothing to worry about if one talks to himself but if one finds himself ANSWERING himself then it is time to start worrying	
You are correct - when you start answering yourself you have some "other stuff" goin' on	
Posted by: nick Nov 18 2006, 04:19 PM	
QUOTE(calvin @ Nov 18 2006, 08:34 PM) 🗌	***************************************
I have drawn the line on this discussion to limit it to the ministry of 3ABN, NOT what happene these folks lives prior to its formation. Yall, got enough stuff with over 20 years of 3ABN to muthrough without speculating on whether Danny and Linda where having sex before they got m and before they started 3ABNthat's nobodies business.	uddle
QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Nov 18 2006, 03:05 AM)	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
Note to Self: Ask Nick what the truth is from his point of view. Self: Nick, could you please fill me in on what Truth is here? Additional note to Self: Fill Nick in on my own opinion about the spirits at work here on BSDA.	
Self: Hey Nick, way back in August 2006 I became a member here in hopes to find morsels of	truth

about the "situation" at 3abn, a ministry that has often been a blessing to me and has enhanced my spiritual experience. Right away I became aware of some who were honest truth seekers and others who seemed to be salivating over the tasty tidbits on the dirty laundry.

Being that I prefer a plant-based diet, the laundry tidbits are not what I choose to ingest, unless they are true morsels that need to be plated and served up.

Thankfully, when some patrons (NOT A MAJORITY, IMO) of this establishment get to gnawing to the point of eviscerating, the Maitre' Ds adeptly step in and point out the rules of courteous dining. Final note to Self: Pass the antacids and please choose an easier metaphor next time.

Please read my posts in detail. Some folk here have understood my concern by doing just that. Then, if you still need clearer answers to the issues that you have raised, I will gladly respond...

# Posted by: Fran Nov 18 2006, 05:35 PM

# QUOTE(calvin @ Nov 18 2006, 02:34 PM)

I have drawn the line on this discussion to limit it to the ministry of 3ABN, NOT what happened in these folks lives prior to its formation. Yall, got enough stuff with over 20 years of 3ABN to muddle through without speculating on whether Danny and Linda where having sex before they got married and before they started 3ABN...that's nobodies business.

Thank you.

That comment made me think of all the rape victims in court. The defense will stop at nothing to get the guilt shifted to the victim so the guilty can roam the streets to rape again!

The victims seem to get victomized all over again! It broke my heart. God help us all!

# Posted by: Observer Nov 18 2006, 06:47 PM

Re: "If, as we have reason to believe, there will be a legal examination of the "irregularities" of the money handling aspects of Danny's "regime".... then Linda WILL be a part of what is examined. "

The above statement is correct. It's truth is recognized by informed people who understand the issues, and advise Linda.

Linda was a coroprate officer in 3-ABN. Any examination of financial irregularities during the time that she was a corporate officer would subject her to an examination to see what part she played in those irregularities, if any.

NOTE: Such an examination would not make her a target, in itself. It is the examination that would determine who, if any, would be a target.

# Posted by: Observer Nov 18 2006, 07:02 PM

Re: " In some of the informational material that I receive, it would seem as though either Linda or those who are advising her, are still seriously entertaining the hopes of her being reinstated at

3abn in her original role as half owner, including salary.... which presumably would entail her resuming some of her previous responsibilities, though that detail has not been mentioned. My question here has to do not only with the seemingly impossible psychological position that would put her and everyone else concerned in... but also the more practical one as to whether she is.... on the basis of how she ran the departments under her in the past..... capable of taking on such a position and job responsibilities?"

I do not challenge the validity of the questions.

At the moment all such is speculation. I do not consider it appropriate to comment on such speculation.

I can only say that time will likely reveal whether the above is accurate, or if it is not. Further, it just may be that as events begin to unfold, as denominational officials contact various people to see if some hypothetical resolutions could bring resolution to issues that these attempts to build bridges with people will be reported as fact, when in fact they are far less than their report.

There are people who are attempting to discover resolution. Some of these are denominational officials. Others come from both sides. They are going to have to work in privacy, behind closed doors so to speak to see if they can come together. I have hope that some basis for an agreement to accomplish something positive, even if limited, will happen. However, the obstacles are great. Any tidbits of information that will leak out about this process will likely be a mixture of truth and error. In many cases the error will likely be much more than the truth.

# Posted by: Observer Nov 18 2006, 07:21 PM

Re: ". . . is there any evidence that Linda is even yet either aware of . . ." and it would seem as though either Linda or those who are advising her, . . ."

Yes, I know that I have ripped the above all out of context. But, allow me to comment for a minute.

Linda has collected a group of advisers, that is well known. Her directive to them is to charge them to tell her the truth, as they see it. I.e. to advise her as they believe her to be appropriate. Her advisers do not always give her the same advice. They do not always see things exactly the same.

Linda does not always accept what they tell her. She may challenge them. She may demand that they defend their advice. She has been known to make a decision.

Furthermore, contrary to what many may believe, her advisers generally do not tell her what to do. They facilitate her in making her decisions. This differs considerably from telling her to do something. Linda makes decisions at her own pace, and when she is ready.

However, she is informed, and involved.

However, it should be clearly understood that people who defend her in public act independently in what they post. They post what they think without checking in with her.

Whatever Linda does in the future will be her decision. She has collected a group of people who work with her in helping her to decide, not to tell her what to do.

Posted by: Skyhook Nov 19 2006, 01:47 AM

On another forum where 3abn has not been a topic of discussion someone posted that the pastor of thier local church informed a group in his church yesterday that a civil action may be brought against 3abn for misappropriation of millions of dollars.

It appears that some pastors are becoming informed and are not afraid to speak publicly about it.

# Posted by: Observer Nov 19 2006, 05:23 AM

# QUOTE(Skyhook @ Nov 19 2006, 12:47 AM)

On another forum where 3abn has not been a topic of discussion someone posted that the pastor of thier local church informed a group in his church yesterday that a civil action may be brought against 3abn for misappropriation of millions of dollars.

It appears that some pastors are becoming informed and are not afraid to speak publicly about it.

Many here would probably appreciate it if you would cite a reference to that forum so people could check it out.

# Posted by: Skyhook Nov 19 2006, 12:34 PM

Observer, I'll be happy to. www.revivalsermons.org Go to "forums" then scroll down to "town hall," then clik on "another questionable ministry". The posting I mentioned was made yesterday by "Colporteur." This is a fairly conservative website run by Richard O'Ffill.

#### Posted by: Observer Nov 19 2006, 01:12 PM

The othre forum is run by Richard O'Ffill. Here is the entire quotation that I think that your referenced:

"colporteur Hero Member

Posts: 3,363

View Profile Re: Another Questionable Minisitry .... « Reply #53 on: November 18, 2006, 08:11:26 PM »

Not to dredge up all the garbage about 3ABN but tonight at vespars a pastor that does not run down ministries expressed his concern that 3ABN is headed for big trouble and will probably end up in civil court. He didn't give details but said that this is what happens when boards are hand picked an when a single person is more or less allowed to control the whole ministry. The accusation agaisnt 3ABN is abuse of use of funds by the millions. This will surely come back to bite the church when the SDA name is pushed to the forefront.

I have not been outspoken on this until know but Danny should have been removed when he remarried with out being biblically divorced. If for no other reason he should have been removed from the minstry on that count. If Linda comitted "physical" adultery then he should have claimed such but never did he or anyone claim this. This is the problem when at the GC the rules were

changed and a new man made rule was made that spiritual adultery is grounds for divorce even when there is not physical adultery. Now we see the fruit and frankly it does not surprise me. Pretty hard for the church leadership to condemn something that they have approved. It is sad when people so love Danny that they were willing to ignore this and let it escalate into whatever we have at 3ABN today. I was noticing a change with Linda and her wardrobe and makeup shrtly before the scandle. I wonder if an of the key figures at 3ABN have clean hands. This blight will be irrepairable. "

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

# I will make a couple of comments:

- 1) I see an accusation that 3-ABN has abused millions of dollars of funds. There is also speculation that this will result in civil action against 3-ABN. I Beleive that such is speculative, and premature. Yes, I am aware that investigations are ongoing. But, such does not mean that anything other than an investigation will take place. Such an investigation could lead to either civil or criminal action. But, it is premature to speculation on there being results of investigation that will lead to either.
- 2) The General Conference has never authorized "spiritual adultery" as Biblical grounds for a divorce. This issue came into play in regard to discussions of Linda's conduct and guilt. I will briefly summarize. One individual brought up the issue of "spiritual adultery" based upon a book written by a non-SDA. The idea of "spiritual adultery" was so blown out of the water, so to speak, that it was soon dropped. Supporters of 3-ABN do not presently claim that spiriutal adultery is a Biblical ground for divorce. Also, they do not claim that Linda committed physical adultery. Rather, they claim that she had an inappropriate relationship with a male (Dr. A.) not her husband, while married to Danny.

# Posted by: Skyhook Nov 19 2006, 02:28 PM

Observer, I appreciate your comments. My only point was not in the details, but the fact that it is apparantly starting to be discussed openly by a pastor in a local church. We can wait and see if this is a trend.

Posted by: Observer Nov 19 2006, 04:28 PM

# QUOTE(Skyhook @ Nov 19 2006, 01:28 PM)

Observer, I appreciate your comments. My only point was not in the details, but the fact that it is apparantly starting to be discussed openly by a pastor in a local church. We can wait and see if this is a trend.

I understand that. Supporters of 3-ABN regularly read these posts. when they pick up some minor, uncorrected deatail that is in error they trumpet it all over that we cannot get it right. On that basis I attempt to stop such comments as quickly as possible by correcting even minor errors. And, sometimes I have to be corrected myself.

Peace,

Posted by: Daryl Fawcett Nov 19 2006, 05:07 PM
Whether his vision was fact or fiction, it became fact.
Posted by: Skyhook Nov 19 2006, 05:14 PM
Observer, Thanks. Got it.
Posted by: Skyhook Nov 19 2006, 05:39 PM
Just so there is no misunderstanding, the problems at 3abn are a forbidden topic at Richard O'Ffill's website, and have been since the subject first came there up a few months ago.
Posted by: Daryl Fawcett Nov 19 2006, 05:42 PM
I wonder why he has forbidden them there?
Of course, after being discussed at CA for quite some time, they are also forbidden there.
Posted by: Panama_Pete Nov 20 2006, 02:41 AM
QUOTE(Daryl Fawcett @ Nov 19 2006, 05:42 PM) 🗌
I wonder why he has forbidden them there?
Ruth said, "Don't entreat me to leave you, and to return from following after you, for where you go, I will go; and where you lodge, I will lodge; your people shall be my people, and your God my God;" Ruth 1:16
Pastor O'Ffill chose to be part of 3ABN.
Review and Herald Speakers Bureau:
http://www.reviewandherald.com/speakerbureau/display.asp?id=54&speaker=yes
"He is often seen on 3ABN television and is host of a <u>weekly interview program</u> for <u>3ABN</u> radio."
Posted by: lurker Nov 20 2006, 04:20 AM
I assume that he like many others has yet to be convinced. There are still a lot of people who just do not want to believe that a problem needs to be dealt with.
Posted by: summertime Nov 20 2006, 08:58 AM

# QUOTE(lurker @ Nov 20 2006, 04:20 AM) I assume that he like many others has yet to be convinced. There are still a lot of people who just do not want to believe that a problem needs to be dealt with. I have found out within my own family that there are advantageous reasons that many pastors in our church will stand by 3ABN and who will not listen otherwise. Posted by: lurker Nov 20 2006, 09:35 AM Summertime, can you say what these advantages are? Are they material or do you mean that there is peer pressure to conform? Posted by: Skyhook Nov 20 2006, 03:27 PM Do all the people that are still seen and heard on 3abn have some selfish or ulterior motive? I don't think so. I believe that there are some who God is using not because of but in spite of the corruption that is there. We must pray that no more innocent people will be hurt in the process of resolving the mess. Posted by: Johann Nov 21 2006, 06:53 AM QUOTE(Skyhook @ Nov 20 2006, 11:27 PM) Do all the people that are still seen and heard on 3abn have some selfish or ulterior motive? I don't think so. I believe that there are some who God is using not because of but in spite of the corruption that is there. We must pray that no more innocent people will be hurt in the process of resolving the mess. What about the innocent people who are still being persecuted, or who are still sufferening from the persecution during the past 3 years? Should this be permitted to go on? Posted by: summertime Nov 21 2006, 08:47 AM QUOTE(lurker @ Nov 20 2006, 09:35 AM) Summertime, can you say what these advantages are? Are they material or do you mean that there is peer pressure to conform?

lurker, I have three members of the SDA clergy whom I have tried to talk to who belong to my own family. One is the ministerial secretary of a state not far from Missouri--Within the last three years he appeared on 3ABN to talk about a project which he was interested in and which Danny Shelton (on the air) acted to encourage people to help him with his project. To tell the truth I have forgotten what

they were talking about but there he was on 3ABN getting his story out. When I had information about all that was happening at 3ABN I e-mailed it to him and his wife, and had a quick response that I was a mudslinger. I have a brother-in-law (retired pastor) who I tried to talk to about this whole thing and he responded that a few years ago the GC had tried to manage 3ABN and that he did not blame Danny for not allowing it to happen (whatever that means) He told me that he had no good feelings about Danny Shelton personally but he thought that the airing of the problems should be dropped for the good of the church. And then a brother-in-law who is a retired SDA minister. I took the letter from Dr. A. (defending himself and Linda) for him to read. He asked me how far I was going to spread the letter. I told him that as many people as possible needed to know what is happening at 3ABN. He folded the letter and told me to pray about what we were doing. He told me that he was going to stop by 3ABN and talk to Danny. I asked him if he was also going to talk to Linda and he looked at me like he thought I was wrong in asking. I have given up trying to say anymore about it to any one because they either do not want to believe (or feel afraid that the work would be hindered by criticism of 3ABN.) Personally, I am thankful if I hear of any of our leaders understanding what is happening at 3ABN. I do not know if they have peer pressure, advice from the GC about abiding by 3ABN or if they fear that the members of their church would be aghast to learn that the pastor understands and cares what is really going on at 3ABN. Until the GC openly stands against the hurtful things that are happening at 3ABN why should our leaders bite the hand that feeds them?

# Posted by: Richard Sherwin Nov 21 2006, 05:36 PM When I questioned a pastor about Danny being at our conference campmeeting he dismissed my concerns by saying the conference leadership would not invite anyone if there were any problems. Richard Posted by: summertime Nov 22 2006, 08:41 AM QUOTE(Richard Sherwin @ Nov 21 2006, 05:36 PM) When I questioned a pastor about Danny being at our conference campmeeting he dismissed my concerns by saying the conference leadership would not invite anyone if there were any problems. Richard

See what I mean? The problems are that Danny has divorced and remarried without biblical grounds, 3ABN legal dealings are being reviewed by the state of Illinois, people have been mistreated and abused for the sake of preserving a squeaky clean image of 3ABN. No problems? It leads us back to wondering what 'no problems' means to the conference leadership. My hold on all this is that Jesus knows our problems and if 3ABN problems are not of any consequence then we have to decide where our hearts and loyalty should remain. I do not want to lose my soul over Danny Shelton's dishonesty so I simply opt out and wait for the answers to be made known by God---someday.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Nov 26 2006, 06:49 AM		
QUOTE(summertime @ Nov 22 2006, 08:41 AM)		
See what I mean? The problems are that Danny has divorced and remarried without biblical		

grounds, 3ABN legal dealings are being reviewed by the state of Illinois, people have been mistreated and abused for the sake of preserving a squeaky clean image of 3ABN. No problems? It leads us back to wondering what 'no problems' means to the conference leadership. My hold on all this is that Jesus knows our problems and if 3ABN problems are not of any consequence then we have to decide where our hearts and loyalty should remain. I do not want to lose my soul over Danny Shelton's dishonesty **so I simply opt out and wait for the answers** to be made known by God---someday.

No, we don't have to opt out. Here's what we do:

We approach pastors and relatives the same way we would approach strangers about our "Stop Smoking" clinics. We don't walk up to smokers, hand them a brochure, and then pull the cigarettes right out of their mouths, do we?

We have to be subtle and discrete.

Basically, you are an evangelist dealing with members of the public (even if they are relatives) when you bring up a painful subject that is new to them. In this instance, you are the torchbearer. You are the keeper of the flame. Your friends and relatives are unenlightened. They do not know what you know. So you have to start out very slowly.

Pete

# Posted by: summertime Nov 27 2006, 09:58 AM

# QUOTE(Panama\_Pete @ Nov 26 2006, 06:49 AM)

No, we don't have to opt out. Here's what we do:

We approach pastors and relatives the same way we would approach strangers about our "Stop Smoking" clinics. We don't walk up to smokers, hand them a brochure, and then pull the cigarettes right out of their mouths, do we?

We have to be subtle and discrete.

Basically, you are an evangelist dealing with members of the public (even if they are relatives) when you bring up a painful subject that is new to them. In this instance, you are the torchbearer. You are the keeper of the flame. Your friends and relatives are unenlightened. They do not know what you know. So you have to start out very slowly.

Pete

Hi, Pete, The problem is that this is not new to the pastors of which I speak. They know. They simply do not want to be bothered about it. Or for some reason they are afraid to talk about it. If I talk to friends about this subject, they either tell me they have no use for 3ABN and don't want to hear about it, or they are are so devoted to the message that they feel that we border on heresy if we speak against an entity which has been blessed by God with so many miracles. That is why I have taken the position to just 'wait and see' or 'surely God will not allow this to go on any longer than he chooses.' When I do talk to someone about it I am subtle and discrete. Sabbath someone asked me why the people that work at 3ABN continue to be so abused. Most people do not understand the quandry these people are in if they speak against Danny Shelton. People I talk to just do not understand how one man could be so powerful. He may be powerful but so was Hitler.

# Posted by: Johann Nov 27 2006, 11:18 AM

This is a story about four people named Everybody, Somebody, Anybody, and Nobody.

There was an important job to be done and Everybody was sure that Somebody would do it.

Anybody could have done it, but nobody did it.

Somebody got angry about that because it was Everybody's job.

Everybody thought Anybody could do it, but Nobody realized that Everybody wouldn't do it.

It ended up that Everybody blamed Somebody when Nobody did what Anybody could have done.

- I received this in a package from USA today. Is this what has happened?

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