167

Printable Version of Topic

Click here to view this topic in its original format

BlackSDA _ 3ABN _ New Info From Walter Thompson -via Msdaol

Posted by: icedragon Sep 12 2006, 03:59 PM

From: "Walt Thompson" <walttmd@wi.rr.com>
To: [Removed by GM.]
Subject: Re: 3abn
Date: [Removed by GM.]

Dear [Removed by GM.],

Thank you for your e mail sharing your frustrations with 3ABN. It is understandable that you may feel frustrated regarding the breakup of Danny and Linda. You are not alone. Had the devil sought a more effective place to point his fatal arrow, he could not have found one. He aimed at its heart, and made a direct hit. However, like the promise in Genesis 3:15, though 3ABN has been wounded, it has risen again, and stronger than ever. Praise the Lord.

Let me summarize some of the events as viewed from my perspective during the past couple years. Perhaps it will allow you to view things a bit differently.

Though we have attempted to keep the leaders of the church attuned to what has been transpiring at 3ABN, we have not said much publicly for Linda's sake. We all still care about Linda, and know she must be hurting terribly.

A little more than two years ago a live television program aired on 3abn from Green Bay, Wisconsin. During that program Linda told of meeting a special person that had changed her life. She did not give the name or the sex of that person, but we later learned that he was listening in Norway. A few months earlier, a doctor visited 3ABN from Norway. He found out about Linda's son being hooked on drugs and told Linda that if he would come to his place in Norway for a month, he would be cured. Arrangements were made and Nathan went there in Feb. 04. While there Linda and one of her closest friends went to visit and spent 3 days with them. During this time Linda and the doctor struck up a relationship that her friend became very concerned about, and eventually came to the place where she decided she needed to speak out. I have heard that testimony. I will not describe it in detail, but it was described as much more than the usual doctor - client relationship. One of the things was that Linda had made arrangements to meet the doctor in Norway to spend 10 days with him touring the pretty places in the country during the following June.

In early March Danny called me. He was very distraught as he told me what Linda was doing. I immediately traveled to 3abn to find out for myself, and for the next two to three months was there for a few days almost every week. During this time I and a small committee of the board had a number of sessions with Linda, encouraging her to break off the relationship that was ruining her home and putting a serious strain on the ministry. Pastor John L. was one of the first to counsel Linda. From the start, before meeting with Danny and Linda together he warned Linda that what she was doing was wrong, and must stop. He then spent hours counseling the two of them together. I am not sure how many other sessions were had. When I arrived, I arranged for Pastor John, Linda and Danny and I to meet together. We met, talked and prayed. Both Danny

and Linda were anointed, and committed to God to do what was right. Linda promised us to cut off the relationship. Not long (I don't remember the length of time, but probably less than an hour) she was secretly on the phone to Norway with the doctor again. We had other sessions with her where she reluctantly made similar agreements, but usually said she was not going to give him up until she was sure Danny would stop interfering in her affairs - as if it was Danny's fault they were having trouble. On one occasion I was able to get the doctor on the phone. I begged him to break of the relationship. He told me he would not. We arranged for Danny and Linda to visit a marriage counselor couple out of state. They were not Adventist, but devout Christians of another faith. They were chosen so that Linda could not claim that they were biased, if Adventist. Danny and Linda spent eight hours with the counselors. They were the one's who told Linda she was committing "spiritual adultery" and that it was wrong and must be stopped at once. She made excuses, said she was doing nothing wrong. They warned her that the way she was going it would soon become physical.

Our committee of the board invited a lady friend of Linda's to sit with us, thinking that, being a woman, she would be able to make Linda comfortable. As soon as she heard Linda's story, she confided to Linda that she was wrong, and needed to correct the problem. Linda requested her to query some of the 3ABN leadership to hear their views. she did this, only to find that Linda used the negative feedback she received as evidence she was not a friend to her cause. Linda would not talk to her again - the same as she had done to the friend that went with her to Norway.

Meanwhile, all during this time, Linda was spending long hours on the phone with the doctor on international calls using phone cards, credit cards, etc. We have records of those cards and can verify the amount of time spent. Some calls were overheard by Danny when she did not know he was around. Whereas she says that she was discussing her son, the calls were, in fact not about her son, but were very personal. Arrangements were made, and tickets purchased to meet him in Florida. (We have evidence such a meeting did indeed take place) When that was discovered, they planned to meet in Las Vegas, and New York. And as you might expect, Danny was by this time checking things out pretty carefully. One night she came home all cheery. While she and Danny were getting ready for bed, she left to do something else (I have forgotten what). While out, Danny found a sack of things in the closet. Upon opening it, he found a pregnancy test kit. (He is "fixed" so he cannot have more children.) When she found out that he had discovered it, she was at first angry because he had "snooped" in her things, and then told him she had just purchased it to see his reaction. We also have evidence that the doctor had given her an expensive wristwatch.

While this was going on, Linda refusing to give up the doctor, and Danny not willing to live with a third party disrupting things, they began talking divorce. Linda's mother lived in Las Vegas (I think) and Linda began making plans to move there long enough to gain residency status and then was going to get a divorce. Discovering the possibility of getting a divorce through Guan, they jointly agreed. Danny was driven by several factors. One, she was not about to be faithful to him. She was running up huge credit card debts on joint accounts making him responsible for paying them off, and he was concerned about 3ABN and the effect the situation was causing on the ministry. It simply could not continue the way things were going. Though I and the board did not get involved in the marriage, we were very much concerned about the ministry.

All the while, this was taking a real toll on the ministry. Work was not getting done. The employees were pulled in both directions. Finally, I sent Linda a registered letter (she was not answering my e mails or phone calls). In it I told her that we were offering to send her away for counseling to a place and with people mutually acceptable. I told her that if she would not accept our offer and find help to get rid of the doctor, we would have to consider removing her from her positions. She did not respond to my letter.

At camp meeting time (the end of May), we also had a board meeting. On Friday night of camp meeting, the doctor and Johann (our European representative before this all developed) came and sat in the back row. Danny was very uncomfortable with them there, fearful they would make a scene on international television. He asked us to ask them to leave. They refused. They walked out just as the meeting was ending. I and some other people went out after them. When we got outside, Johann grabbed me by the shirt and started to shake me in anger. When other bigger people came to my support, he calmed down, and we all talked together for a half hour or so - I

am not sure of the total time. In the meantime, Mark Finley spoke with the doctor. I joined them for a few minutes. While I was with Mark and the doctor, something was said that upset Johann, and he and the doctor left, angry and fast, spinning dirt as they left. Because they had begun to hand out papers of a proposed article they were planning to submit to the local newspaper discrediting 3ABN, we warned them not to come back.

The next day, Sabbath, we got hold of Johann by phone and he agreed to meet with us at a park and talk things out. The doctor was also invited, but he said he had said all he had to say the night before, and refused to come. We spent an hour or two with Johann, going over all of the events until then. Finally, I took him to the hotel where they were staying. We sat in the car and talked for some time. At that time he confessed to me that maybe he was wrong in supporting Linda. We had prayer and parted. The three of them left and returned to Springfield shortly after that.

Linda did not come to the board meeting on Sunday morning. She sent a letter instead. The board considered her letter carefully in light of all that had gone on, and unanimously agreed that she could no longer serve the ministry under these conditions, nor continue to serve on the board. (We have since been accused of refusing to let the doctor and Johann represent her at the board. No such request was ever made, either by voice or by pen.)

Linda did go to Norway for her ten-day vacation with the doctor in June. We know that. There have been many other trips back and forth by both of them since.

Linda said on her web site recently that I had told Johann a year before that I had never accused her of adultery. She was correctly quoting a portion of my statement to Johann, but what she did not bother to say is that I was defending 3ABN against an accusation that we had fired her for adultery. I was merely telling him that it was for defiance of her board that she was let go, not because of adultery, an accusation, it is true, I never stated. As you can see from the few things I have included here, we have had ample evidence to suggest adultery, but it is true, we have not seen the two of them in bed together.

Our position on the board all through this process was to take the high road and not to tell things like this to the public, attempting to protect Linda from even more hurt that she was doing to herself. In all of our public statements, we have tried to be discrete. To protect the ministry from a public confrontation, we also gave Linda a good settlement with the agreement that she would not bad mouth 3ABN. And while she has partially fulfilled her obligation, her "friends" have kept the pot boiling - contrary to her agreement.

She wrote on her web site in March that they were not divorced, that the Guam divorce was being contested. It is interesting to know that this was posted on the web site after (or about the time that) the judge's decision had been made in favor of Danny. It is also interesting that the only reason she filed suit against Danny was to get more money from him than they had agreed upon originally. One might wonder why she would file for a new divorce if it had been Danny that had insisted on it in the first place as she alleges!

Sometime fairly early on during this experience, Linda began to accuse Danny of abusing her. She told people she was afraid to stay home with him for fear he would take his gun and hurt her. On a number of occasions during their discussions she would go off in a huff to stay with her daughter in Springfield (two hours away). On at least one of those occasions, I was on the phone with Danny when she was preparing to leave, and I heard nothing suggesting abuse of any kind. I will admit that at first, Danny was "in her face" an awfully lot trying to get her to stop talking with the doctor. This stopped after their visit with the counselors. We believe that the Dr. advised Linda to use the "abuse" language to justify their relationship - and have good evidence upon which this is based. I believe it was during the GC session in Toronto when abuse was included among the justifications for divorce. If you know Danny at all, one thing he is not, is an abuser. Talk! Perhaps! But certainly not dangerous or physical.

Just to make this letter a bit more complete, let me tell you what I know about Danny's attempt to save Linda for himself - even after the divorce papers were signed. He paid off the remaining

debt on her new car, her daughter's car, all of the credit cards, and other joint bills. He bought her interest in the house, helped her move to Southern Illinois, build a porch on her home there, gave her all of the things in their home including things that were really his. (He did these things with money obtained in a loan from a friend.) Over and over again he took her out to eat and did many other things to show how much he really cared for her. In fact, many of the employees and some of us on the board were concerned because of how she was leading him on and keeping him in turmoil. Over and over, she threatened him, saying, that if she was going down, she would bring him and the ministry down with him.

One more thing. Linda has said that she was not censured by her church. The fact is, her church did meet and confidentially went over all of the evidence they had, and wrote an 8 page letter outlining the reason they had to conclude that she was wrong. Rather than drop her from membership, out of concern for her, they agreed do a letter of censure.

As for Danny getting married, let me make a few more comments. Our board has been well informed on all of these things. We were the ones that unanimously let Linda go, as much as we all hated to take that step. We all love her, care about her, and continue to keep her in our prayers. We have also been fully informed about Danny and his new-found friend. I was at 3ABN the day she and her two girls arrived from Florida with all they possessed. I shared some peanut butter and grapes that I had left over as I was about to return home. My heart went out to them. Danny's eventually did too. They are really nice people who have a heart for Jesus and for hurting people. She has had a hard life. (Her twin sister is dead.) There relationship has grown since that day more than a year ago. (Contrary to rumor, there was no relationship going before that!) A number of the staff and some of us on the board advised Danny to "cool it." He tried. But Danny is a people person. He needs people around him. I have concluded that Brandy came to 3abn at the direction of either the devil or the Holy Spirit. I have had no trouble deciding which. I believe God has given Danny just what he has needed to continue to serve that ministry with the power and enthusiasm that is characteristic to him. He loves the Lord supremely, and seeks His guidance in all things. What you see of Danny on television is who he is. He is not a fake. Yes, he is human. He has human tendencies, just like you and I. Just because he is on television does not automatically take away those personal drives.

Before Danny married Brandy, our board met by conference call and went over the evidence again. It was our conclusion based upon the information we have, only some of which I have shared here, that Danny was morally free to re-marry if he wished. We were all concerned about the timing, but did not feel that was a just reason for condemning the action. Those of Church leadership with whom we have shared these things agree with our decision.

In all of the Bible, I have not been able to find a single instance where God had a prophet condemn any one for anything that was not either illegal or immoral. As our board, and leaders of the church, have carefully examined the evidence, we find nothing for which to condemn Danny either. As regarding age difference, I find nothing in the Bible or the SOP that speaks to this issue. You may remember Elder Archo Dart, a General Conference officer doing family counseling during the fifties. He married a patient of mine who was at least 20 years younger when he was in his late 70's. They had an excellent marriage. Teddy, his new wife, loved every minute of their time together - as she told me. They are both dead now.

Linda, in spite of what I have noted above, refuses to acknowledge that what she was doing was wrong - nor is she telling the facts as they happened. It is one thing to forgive and forget, but is altogether something else when one is unable to acknowledge wrong doing. Yes, and I truly would like to know what Jesus would have done differently. As I see it, we gave Linda every imaginable opportunity to remain and work with 3ABN - except for one condition. When she refused, what more is one to do? Jesus was patient with Judas too, but He did not prevent Judas from doing what he did.

For my part, I have asked God for wisdom to guide in all that we have done. I have insisted at every step that we do everything in a way that could never be honestly faulted. I believe God has

honored our desire, and blessed the ministry beyond measure because we have tried so hard to be faithful. You may remember that even God lost some of his best friends (Lucifer, Ananias and Saphira and others). It hurts. But sometimes one must act to stop bad things - even when it hurts!

I hope this helps to clear the confusion. NO ONE at 3ABN wanted to get rid of Linda, least of all, Danny. I don't think there are very many people that would condemn Danny for not waiting longer to agree to divorce if they had been there and witnessed the situation. Even God has limits to His tolerance. If you have further questions or need further evidence, please let me know.

Sincerely in Jesus' precious name,

Walter Thompson MD

Chairman, 3ABN Board

****

==========

Topic and introductory part of post corrected from Dr. Ralph Thompson to Dr. Walter Thompson. - Daryl

---

Gregory
May God's will be done.

i believe this to be credible and shows motivation for divorce. while all the detalis are to there it certiantly is helpful.

Posted by: Uncle Sam Sep 12 2006, 04:26 PM

It is so hard to know who to believe. I have one question, If Danny was so in love with Linda where was he when her son was in trouble. Why was she put in the position to be alone and vulnerable with the "Dr"? I have stepchildren and when there was a problem it pulled us together, and we have had some pretty bad situations come up with my stepson. But I have never asked my spouse to deal with it alone.

Also, why will Danny and the others not let it go? Most viewers would have no idea what is being said if Danny would just keep quiet. I know I for one had no idea until Danny kept talking to I went online and found this site. I wrote to Danny and explained this to him. He wrote back a nice response. He has written me on more than one occasion and has always been nice.

I don't know when or where Danny is interfering in Linda's life but I wish all of this would come to an end one way or another.....

Posted by: princessdi Sep 12 2006, 05:17 PM

Ok, so I called myself reading this, but I really didn't see any "new" information. So somebody explain it to me like i am 6 years old. What was "new" about this information?

Mind you this still doesn't change my mind, I am with Clay, no matter what Linda did, it is Danny's and the 3ABN boards reaction that is unchristlike. I am talking about what I know they did, not what happened behind the scenes, 3ABN's public response was deplorable! Plus there are still holes. tjomspon still claims to have proof, the same proof from two years ago, all that talking they have been doing, their proof should have been out there. Why didn't they take it to court? Now, to my little suspicious mind it just looks like they have been reading this(and other) sites, and are now incorporating that information from here into their story.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Sep 12 2006, 06:37 PM

QUOTE(Uncle Sam @ Sep 12 2006, 05:26 PM)

It is so hard to know who to believe. I have one question, If Danny was so in love with Linda where was he when her son was in trouble. Why was she put in the position to be alone and vulnerable with the "Dr"? I have stepchildren and when there was a problem it pulled us together, and we have had some pretty bad situations come up with my stepson. But I have never asked my spouse to deal with it alone.

Also, why will Danny and the others not let it go? Most viewers would have no idea what is being said if Danny would just keep quiet. I know I for one had no idea until Danny kept talking to I went online and found this site. I wrote to Danny and explained this to him. He wrote back a nice response. He has written me on more than one occasion and has always been nice.
I don't know when or where Danny is interfering in Linda's life but I wish all of this would come to an end one way or another.....

I have a close family member who was in Green Bay the weekend that Dr. Thompson mentioned. It occurred at the Green Bay Church on Friday and Saturday, April 2, and 3, 2004. The guests who were taping a "3ABN Close-up" Friday evening were Pastor and Mrs. Corkum of the Wisconsin Conference.

Following that Friday night meeting, Danny greeted departing guests standing adjacent to the coat room, near some stairs, at one end of the Green Bay church, and Linda greeted guests inside the front doors at the opposite end of the church. Danny and Linda Shelton were actually out of eyesight of each other. Danny and Linda were avoiding each other.

Danny had previously asked for a divorce a month earlier on Sunday, March 7, 2004. By leaving that fact out, Dr. Thompson paints a different picture.

We already knew she was talking to someone about her marriage crisis by the time of the April meeting in Green Bay. Dr. Abrahamsen says so in his letter.

In part, Danny's demands for a divorce, a month earlier, was the catalyst for Linda's interaction with friends who would listen to it all.

The problem is that once you've asked for a divorce, it's far too late to start collecting information on your spouse's behavior. The horse is already out of the barn.

As for the rest of it, I don't see any new information that isn't analyzed and dealt with elsewhere.

Posted by: watchbird Sep 12 2006, 06:45 PM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Sep 12 2006, 05:17 PM)

Ok, so I called myself reading this, but I really didn't see any "new" information. So somebody explain it to me like i am 6 years old. What was "new" about this information?

Mind you this still doesn't change my mind, I am with Clay, no matter what Linda did, it is Danny's and the 3ABN boards reaction that is unchristlike. I am talking about what I know they did, not what happened behind the scenes, 3ABN's public response was deplorable! Plus there are still holes. tjomspon still claims to have proof, the same proof from two years ago, all that talking they have been doing, their proof should have been out there. Why didn't they take it to court? Now, to my little suspicious mind it just looks like they have been reading this(and other) sites, and are now incorporating that information from here into their story.

I agree. I don't know why this was posted here. It really isn't all that different from the mass mailed one that we have pinned to the top. That one, so far as I know is circa May of this year. I have one that I believe is identical to this one that seemed to have been a form letter sent out during June .... at least I had two copies of it to two different people, with nothing different except the addressees and some slight difference in wording of the introductory and closing paragraphs. It's just another "smoke and mirrors" attempt. No problem at all for a "6 year old mind" .... remember the "Emperor's New Clothes"?

This is just more of the stuff. designed to addle as many brains as possible.....

Posted by: Lucyladye Sep 12 2006, 07:07 PM

Being the expert at it, Satan and his pawns (whoever they may be) thrive on the game of confusion.

Posted by: September Sep 12 2006, 07:21 PM

Well, it's just the same old same old stuff...I don't believe a word of it. It's way too vague and contrary to what he says, they have trashed Linda. He even **again** likened her to Lucifer, Anninias and Saphira (excuse the spelling).

Like Barbara Kerr said in another post, Linda has been vindicated and we will find out shortly how...if she's been vindicated then Walt's letter is basically his last ditch effort to tell a story

Posted by: freckleface Sep 12 2006, 07:34 PM

I have just read the letter and honestly I feel like throwing up. They say they don't want to talk bad about Linda but the complete article was about trashing her.

I have also been talking to one of the Illinois conference coordinators and he tells me that Ken D. (Illinois conf. Pres.) has said that he did not vote in favor of Danny's remarriage. My question is, why? If Danny has proof to go around why is the Ill. Conf. Pres. saying he did not vote in favor of his marriage?

Danny has been saying that the 3ABN board voted unanimously on this matter. In my humble opinion if he (Danny) can lie about this, what makes us think he won't lie to us about everything else? Of course, he will mix in some truth just so he sounds credible.

By the way I am new here and have been doing quite a bit of reading in this site. Let's keep praying for some sort of justice and soon.

Posted by: PaperTigers Sep 12 2006, 07:41 PM

QUOTE(freckleface @ Sep 12 2006, 08:34 PM)

I have just read the letter and honestly I feel like throwing up. They say they don't want to talk bad about Linda but the complete article was about trashing her.

I have also been talking to one of the Illinois conference coordinators and he tells me that Ken D. (Illinois conf. Pres.) has said that he did not vote in favor of Danny's remarriage. My question is, why? If Danny has proof to go around why is the Ill. Conf. Pres. saying he did not vote in favor of his marriage?

Danny has been saying that the 3ABN board voted unanimously on this matter. In my humble opinion if he (Danny) can lie about this, what makes us think he won't lie to us about everything else? Of course, he will mix in some truth just so he sounds credible.

By the way I am new here and have been doing quite a bit of reading in this site. Let's keep praying for some sort of justice and soon.

exactly, if he'll lie about such a small minute detail... what will he NOT lie about.

welc

and i love the name freckleface!!

Posted by: justme Sep 12 2006, 07:55 PM

"There are none so blind as those who refuse to see".

"Unanimous votes"? = "puppets"

"Local church.."? = the one Danny built, (and controls)"

"He could have saved his time with this letter and just typed "DITTOS" all over the page."

"They who have no fear just don't see the problem".

"Larger "potential" audience"? = of whom?

"Quality, not quantity".

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Sep 12 2006, 08:41 PM

QUOTE(icedragon @ Sep 12 2006, 04:59 PM)

From: "Walt Thompson" <walttmd@wi.rr.com>
To: [Removed by GM.]
Subject: Re: 3abn
Date: [Removed by GM.]
Dear [Removed by GM.],

What is the actual and honest date of this email?

Posted by: Clay Sep 12 2006, 08:46 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 12 2006, 09:41 PM)

What is the actual and honest date of this email?

it was made up FHB just for you, so that you could spin a conspiracy theory..... just say you don't believe and wait to see if the poop hits the fan.....afterall time will tell....

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Sep 12 2006, 08:49 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Sep 12 2006, 09:46 PM)

it was made up FHB just for you, so that you could spin a conspiracy theory..... just say you don't believe and wait to see if the poop hits the fan.....afterall time will tell....

Such a telling response.

Ask a simple question, get no honest answer.

I am curious when in the whole timeline of things this happened - only one person here can provide that information, the poster of the entry who would know the actual date of the email.

Posted by: Clay Sep 12 2006, 08:56 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 12 2006, 09:49 PM)

Such a telling response.

Ask a simple question, get no honest answer.

> I am curious when in the whole timeline of things this happened - only one person here can provide that information, the poster of the entry who would know the actual date of the email.

ıot a telling response at all..... I am skeptical of your skepticism..... and that is because I don't think ʏou are looking for answers as much as adding confusion to the mix.... consequently when I can, I am ɟonna yank on your chain....

ıs for the email, it makes no difference when it was written, it contains the same lies that were told nitially.... *reminds me of something my mom use to say.... why ask for the truth from someone you* ;now to be a liar?

Posted by: inga Sep 12 2006, 09:09 PM

While most of what is in this Walt Thompson letter has been analyzed before, some details have not been dealt with.

I wonder if we should believe what Dr. Thompson says regarding unverifiable conversations when some of the verifiable facts are not what he represents them to be?

> **QUOTE(icedragon @ Sep 12 2006, 04:59 PM)**
>
> From: "Walt Thompson" <walttmd@wi.rr.com>
> To: [Removed by GM.]
> Subject: Re: 3abn
> Date: [Removed by GM.]
> Dear [Removed by GM.],
>
> <snip>
> Arrangements were made and Nathan went there in Feb. 04. While there Linda and one of her closest friends went to visit and spent 3 days with them. During this time Linda and the doctor struck up a relationship that her friend became very concerned about, and eventually came to the place where she decided she needed to speak out. I have heard that testimony. I will not describe it in detail, but it was described as much more than the usual doctor - client relationship.

ʻhat persons would be Brenda Walsh. Is her testimony credible, considering she reportedly spent a lot ɔf time with Danny alone and invited him (without Linda) to a birthday party while Dan and Linda were ;till married?

> **QUOTE**
>
> Our committee of the board invited a lady friend of Linda's to sit with us, thinking that, being a woman, she would be able to make Linda comfortable. As soon as she heard Linda's story, she confided to Linda that she was wrong, and needed to correct the problem.

don't recall this "friend" being brought in before. Who was she?

> **QUOTE**
>
> Meanwhile, all during this time, Linda was spending long hours on the phone with the doctor on international calls using phone cards, credit cards, etc. We have records of those cards and can verify the amount of time spent.

ɔeeing that overseas calls may be charged at 5x the "minutes" of local calls, this would give a very ɛxaggerated view of the amount of time spent. Thus "hundreds of hours," as charges, might boil down o 50 hours or less -- some of which were conversations with Irmgard and Johann, others with

Nathan, and others with Dr. Abrahamsen, with a good part of that time devoted to family therapy for addictions. So, perhaps over the course of a few months, Linda spent an actual 25 hours talking to Dr. Abrahamsen. Is that way out of line for family counseling for addictions?

> **QUOTE**
>
> Arrangements were made, and tickets purchased to meet him in Florida. (We have evidence such a meeting did indeed take place)

Now this is a very serious charge, and the facts should be verifiable. Did Linda, in fact, meet Dr. Abrahamsen alone in Florida?

I understood that when such a meeting was supposed to have happened Linda was, in fact, somewhere else.

It would be good to have this verified. If she was, in fact, somewhere else, then this is a complete fabrication on Dr. Thompson's part. Can we then trust his report on what Linda supposedly said and agreed to?

Posted by: Uncle Sam Sep 12 2006, 09:24 PM

> **QUOTE(inga @ Sep 12 2006, 08:09 PM)**
>
> While most of what is in this Walt Thompson letter has been analyzed before, some details have not been dealt with.
>
> I wonder if we should believe what Dr. Thompson says regarding unverifiable conversations when some of the verifiable facts are not what he represents them to be?
>
> That persons would be Brenda Walsh. Is her testimony credible, considering she reportedly spent a lot of time with Danny alone and invited him (without Linda) to a birthday party while Dan and Linda were still married?
>
> I don't recall this "friend" being brought in before. Who was she?Seeing that overseas calls may be charged at 5x the "minutes" of local calls, this would give a very exaggerated view of the amount of time spent. Thus "hundreds of hours," as charges, might boil down to 50 hours or less -- some of which were conversations with Irmgard and Johann, others with Nathan, and others with Dr. Abrahamsen, with a good part of that time devoted to family therapy for addictions. So, perhaps over the course of a few months, Linda spent an actual 25 hours talking to Dr. Abrahamsen. Is that way out of line for family counseling for addictions?Now this is a very serious charge, and the facts should be verifiable. Did Linda, in fact, meet Dr. Abrahamsen alone in Florida?
>
> I understood that when such a meeting was supposed to have happened Linda was, in fact, somewhere else.
>
> *It would be good to have this verified. If she was, in fact, somewhere else, then this is a complete* fabrication on Dr. Thompson's part. Can we then trust his report on what Linda supposedly said and agreed to?

I don't want to be verbally "stoned" but how do we know Linda is telling the truth? Danny has as many witnesses as Linda? It is all he said, she said. What can Danny do at this point to fix this problem? Does he have to step down or would just leaving Linda alone be enough? I have heard rumors that Linda is with the Dr. even now. How do we know that is not true? This just gets more complicated.....

Posted by: Chez Sep 12 2006, 09:40 PM

QUOTE(September @ Sep 12 2006, 07:21 PM)

Well, it's just the same old same old stuff...I don't believe a word of it. It's way too vague and contrary to what he says, they have trashed Linda. He even **again** likened her to Lucifer, Anninias and Saphira (excuse the spelling).

.

Like Barbara Kerr said in another post, Linda has been vindicated and we will find out shortly how...if she's been vindicated then Walt's letter is basically his last ditch effort to tell a story

Then his letter is a big, fat lie! [Lord help him.]

Posted by: Ralph Sep 12 2006, 10:20 PM

QUOTE(Uncle Sam @ Sep 12 2006, 09:24 PM)

I have heard rumors that Linda is with the Dr. even now.

You crack me up. rofl

Posted by: Johann Sep 12 2006, 10:43 PM

QUOTE(inga @ Sep 13 2006, 05:09 AM)

While most of what is in this Walt Thompson letter has been analyzed before, some details have not been dealt with.

I wonder if we should believe what Dr. Thompson says regarding unverifiable conversations when some of the verifiable facts are not what he represents them to be?

That persons would be Brenda Walsh. Is her testimony credible, considering she reportedly spent a lot of time with Danny alone and invited him (without Linda) to a birthday party while Dan and Linda were still married?

I don't recall this "friend" being brought in before. Who was she?Seeing that overseas calls may be charged at 5x the "minutes" of local calls, this would give a very exaggerated view of the amount of time spent. Thus "hundreds of hours," as charges, might boil down to 50 hours or less -- some of which were conversations with Irmgard and Johann, others with Nathan, and others with Dr. Abrahamsen, with a good part of that time devoted to family therapy for addictions. So, perhaps over the course of a few months, Linda spent an actual 25 hours talking to Dr. Abrahamsen. Is that way out of line for family counseling for addictions?Now this is a very serious charge, and the facts should be verifiable. Did Linda, in fact, meet Dr. Abrahamsen alone in Florida?

I understood that when such a meeting was supposed to have happened Linda was, in fact, somewhere else.

It would be good to have this verified. If she was, in fact, somewhere else, then this is a complete fabrication on Dr. Thompson's part. Can we then trust his report on what Linda supposedly said and agreed to?

.et me merely state briefly here that Linda and Arild never met in Florida. In a few days I will have /erified new facts which make these statements ridiculous. There is coming an avalance of them ;hortly. Stay tuned!

Posted by: inga Sep 12 2006, 10:59 PM

QUOTE(Johann @ Sep 12 2006, 11:43 PM)

Let me merely state briefly here that Linda and Arild never met in Florida.

'hat makes it a complete fabrication by the Dan Shelton/Walt Thompson camp.

Vhat does that say for the trustworthiness of the rest of the letter? (I understand that the Las Vegas ınd New York "meetings" are speculations based on laughably skimpy evidence, none of it involving the doctor.")

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 12 2006, 09:41 PM)

What is the actual and honest date of this email?

'hat's a good question, and I'm at a loss to surmise the reason for leaving out the date.

f no one supplies it here, I'll try to find out from 'GM."

Posted by: Panama_Pete Sep 13 2006, 12:02 AM

QUOTE(icedragon @ Sep 12 2006, 04:59 PM)

From: "Walt Thompson" <walttmd@wi.rr.com>

A little more than two years ago a live television program aired on 3abn from Green Bay, Wisconsin. During that program Linda told of meeting a special person that had changed her life. She did not give the name or the sex of that person, but we later learned that he was listening in Norway.

This would be Green Bay SDA Church April 2 and 3, 2004. The guests on Friday Night were Pastor and Mrs. Corkum. Pastor Corkum is President of the Wisconsin Conference. That evening, they taped a "3ABN Up Close" program for the new TV series Linda had decided to develop. There was another program on Sabbath, the next day. That program aired live, I believe. Is this when the "special friend" was mentioned that 3ABN management, on their own, ascribed to the Norwegian doctor?

Posted by: icedragon Sep 13 2006, 11:09 AM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Sep 12 2006, 07:45 PM)

I agree. I don't know why this was posted here. It really isn't all that different from the mass mailed one that we have pinned to the top. That one, so far as I know is circa May of this year. I have one that I believe is identical to this one that seemed to have been a form letter sent out during June .... at least I had two copies of it to two different people, with nothing different except the addressees and some slight difference in wording of the introductory and closing paragraphs. It's just another "smoke and mirrors" attempt. No problem at all for a "6 year old mind" .... remember the "Emperor's New Clothes"?

This is just more of the stuff. designed to addle as many brains as possible.....

Watchbird
I posted this here because I had not seen it else where on the site and found that the information gave more detail as to danny's side of the story. I have collected ALL the information, known to me, of first hand accounts. This was the first time I have seen a detailed explainiation from danny's side. I am not out to get Danny, I am out to get the truth and In the intrestest and Fairness to Danny I felt it approprate to post it seprately so that people could take a look at it. If it has already been posted else where I am unaware of it. I check this site at least 4 times a week and have not seen it posted. If it is "hidden" else where, then it Would seem to show a bias against Danny and that minds have already been made up, mine is not. While i think that this is more Detail from the Danny Camp it still raises guestions as to Brenda Walsh's involvement and that is Where we should focus. What was her involvement in this? Was she sent to Norway to Make up information? What did she see? Danny says that he heard conversations on the telephone? what did he hear? He says there is a clip in Green Bay, lets see it. He says there is evidence of plane tickets and arranged meeting where is it. This make claims about linda that to me make her look guilty. overspending, possible coverup there is just more info. Detail, Details, Details. This post is more detailed then Walters previous responses.

In order to establish guilt we must have 3 things.
1. Motive, - who has a reason, Why?
2. Means, - who has the ability and resources
3. Oppetunity - who has the time and circumstances

If we appply this to Danny What is his ....
Motive-Why would danny end a 20 years relationships and risk his reputation, his ministery, friendship and Job over this. That is not logical unless you establish motive.
So here it is his possible motive.: Dr. abrahm.... wanted to help linda solve problem with here son. in trying to treat him he discovered Danny was part of the problem. Danny did not like what the Dr was saying he felt threatened he felt that he was either being lied about or was going to be exposed for being an abusive or neglectful step-parent. This was too much for him to handle, his pride and desire

for self preservation kicked in and he went on the attack to defend himself. In the process he took information facts, linda on the phone with the Dr. the trip to Norway, the spending and the pregenancy test to make it look like she was cheating, so he could get rid of her and not face his the reality of his bad parenting skills and the damage he and done to Linda.

The other option is Linda has motivation: so What is her motivation?

Linda for some time had been feeling like she wanted a change in her life. After being gilted by her Husband live on World TV about how he came to marry her was disillusioned, offend,hurt and humiliated. Inside she felt unappreaciated and betrayed. That combinde with the new found popularity of 3abn and the appreciation of the millions of adoring fans led her to conciously or unconciously look else where and get her need met through other means some legitmite and other not legitment. When Dr. abrahm came to visit and expressed concern for her son her heart was drawn to him because He and taken an intrest in her child who was important to her. This new found attention comined with the lack of attention from danny towards her and her children and the distance from an source of accountablity, lead to her spending more time than was aproprate with the Doctor. This eventrually lead to an inappropriate relationship. If sexual in nature there was certinaly an oppetuinty and would explain the pregnancy test. If not sexual then way past the dr./patient relaitionship. This would account for the phone calls.

Both of these are legitimate possiblities based on the evidence on hand. I do not know right now. I was really in favor of linda at first, but i must make room for the possibility I am wrong. In the intrest of obeying the Lord I do not want to bear false wittness. So until I have convincing proof I cannot say for certian. Many people have made up there mind. I have had to back off based on the evidence. This evidence cast doubht on the initial conclusions as to Danny's guilt and makes linda look not so innocent . I am sorry if that is not to peoples liking or beliefs, but I must be honest.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Sep 13 2006, 11:36 AM

IceDragon,
While your two scenerios are obviously speculation, your point is well taken. The truth of the situation is certainly hard to pin down.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Sep 13 2006, 09:40 PM

QUOTE(inga @ Sep 12 2006, 11:59 PM) ☐

That's a good question, and I'm at a loss to surmise the reason for leaving out the date.
If no one supplies it here, I'll try to find out from 'GM."

I would be interested in where this fits into the chronology . . .

Posted by: watchbird Sep 13 2006, 10:18 PM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Sep 13 2006, 11:36 AM) ☐

IceDragon,
While your two scenerios are obviously speculation, your point is well taken. The truth of the situation is certainly hard to pin down.

Not only speculation, but speculation that flies in the face of what multiple witnesses and participants have stated. Every item Icedragon mentions has already been addressed in the various discussions on each point. The "truth" is only "hard to pin down" when one does not decide who are credible witnesses and who are not. And I disagree that we need to go into all these exercises in finding "motives" that make sense to us. We can see what happened. We can decide whether Danny and Walt have been caught in lies or not. We can decide whether we trust the witness of Johann and Beartrap and Arild as primary actors in the events of 2004 and whether we trust the witness of other observers and friends of Linda. Once we make the basic decision as to who can be counted on to tell the truth, then it matters not how much the details are embroderied or how many times they are repeated. Repetitions do not make lies into truth.

Posted by: watchbird Sep 13 2006, 10:47 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 13 2006, 09:40 PM)

I would be interested in where this fits into the chronology . . .

I have waited to speak on this thinking that Gregory would respond or someone would contact him. Since that has not happened, I'll just say that I have a letter in my possession which is word for word identical with the one posted here. The date on the letter is June 13, 2006. (I also have the addressee's name, but I'll not divulge that other than to say it was to a private individual rather than being a mass mailing as the one from Thompson that we have pinned seems to be.)

I also have another one which came to me a few days later that is identical to this one except for the opening and closing paragraphs. This one is also addressed to an individual. This leads me to think that this must have been a basic form letter which was slightly adapted when sent out to individuals.

As for how it fits into the "time line"..... The Thompson letter which is pinned was sent out as a mass mailing to the 3ABN "family and friends" sometime in early April. (The earliest firm date I found for its posting on BSDA is April 19, 2006, though it had been posted at Club Adventist previous to that time.) Internal evidence in the letter itself may be found in the first sentence which begins, "Two years ago....."

This present letter was sent out privately at least to two different persons in mid-June 2006. If the two letters are compared, one finds that the second is merely an expanded version of the first, with more emphasis being given to justifying Brandy's presence and marriage. Internal evidence of the accuracy of this date can be found in the second paragraph, which reads: "Let me summarize some of the events as viewed from my perspective during the past couple years."

The Arild Abrahamsen letter (which is pinned along with the Thompson letter of ca April 19) was interiorly dated June 20, 2006, though it was not officially released until July 13. 2006. If one compares the Abrahamsen letter with the two Thompson letters, it is very plain to see that only one author can be telling the truth. The differences are two great to be accomodated by any mere "different perspectives".

I strongly suggest that it is Abrahamsen who speaks the truth, and I believe we had already posted confirming evidence of that long before we received his letter.

Posted by: paleface Sep 13 2006, 11:05 PM

Our private forward e-mail letter dated 4/13/06 7:41:43 Pacific Daylight Time- Subj: 3ABN From Walter Thompson.
Letter from Dr. Arild Abrahamsen, dated June 20, 2006 with the BlackSDA. web site was how we found BSDA. It was in our local church mail and the rest is history.

Posted by: icedragon Sep 14 2006, 10:41 AM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Sep 13 2006, 12:36 PM)

IceDragon,
While your two scenerios are obviously speculation, your point is well taken. The truth of the situation is certainly hard to pin down.

I think speculation is the wrong word. Speculation is making statments with out fact or evidence to support it, picking a side and hoping the evidence will support it. Stock speculators, in the stock market used to pick stock based on hope, gossip, and current market conditions, Hot or cold. Stock analyist on the other make decisions and predications based on the financial condition of the companies they are recommending and the market indicators. they use fact to project resonable conclusions, to make more accurate decisons.

The same has I have tried to do. I have tried to stay away from speculation and inuenendo, unlike many people around here. I gathered all the information from first hand information scources and put them in one place, unfortunately it was not posted in it's completeness. After careful analaysis and discussion with friend who are i respect for there analitical skills. These are the 2 possible situations that could have occured more or less, based on the information, some minor details maybe changable but to the greater extent these are the options. right now we have no smoking Gun to absloutely to accuse Linda or Danny. of wrong doing. while i have leanings i have had to back off Those leanings. I think that analysis is a better word.

Posted by: Green Cochoa Sep 14 2006, 11:05 AM

QUOTE(icedragon @ Sep 14 2006, 10:41 AM)

The same has I have tried to do. I have tried to stay away from speculation and inuenendo, unlike many people around here. I gathered all the information from first hand information scources and put them in one place, unfortunately it was not posted in it's completeness. After careful analaysis and discussion with friend who are i respect for there analitical skills. These are the 2 possible situations that could have occured more or less, based on the information, some minor details maybe changable but to the greater extent these are the options. right now we have no smoking Gun to absloutely to accuse Linda or Danny. of wrong doing. while i have leanings i have had to back off Those leanings. I think that analysis is a better word.

Icedragon, I could give you some other scenarios, based on some eyewitness accounts which I have heard firsthand. They are no less plausible, to one who knows the facts, but to the casual observer would seem much more far-fetched--like an ongoing soap "As the Stomach Churns." As it is said, "Truth is stranger than fiction." I think it is best to keep surmising out of this situation, and allow the facts to speak. 1) Because, we as humans, have poor motives with our sin-sick hearts, and thus blind

ourselves to proper discernment; and 2) because as we put forth an opinion, it strengthens us in that very belief, whether or not it were true at the beginning. It is, in fact, that second point which has caused many to truly believe a lie. A third point of still greater magnitude that I might add here has much to do with the Arch-Deceiver, and his practiced art of placing walls between even the closest of friends by causing each one to misunderstand, and misappropriate the motives of the other for some small, innocent detail of life.

Posted by: summertime Sep 14 2006, 02:19 PM

[
[/quote]

Why do not all of you go to the new posting here today which does a whole Dr. Bacchiocchi Biblical Study of the Linda/Danny relationship. For one thing he quotes: Particular emphasis is placed upon the Christian character of a church leader, exemplified by his temperate life-style, loyalty to his wife, and spiritual leadership in the home. The reason is that a pastor or a TV evangelist serve as role models to the congregation or viewing audience entrusted to them. A man divorced and remarried several times, can hardly serve as a role model to his congregation or viewing audience. Thus, fidelity to the biblical teachings demands that spiritual leadership is to be entrusted to men who have proven to be faithful to their wives and to be moral and spiritual leaders in the home. According to Paul's teachings, the solution to Danny and Linda's marital conflicts, should have been, not the filing for a hasty divorce in Guam, but the filing of a legal separation which would have left the door open for a possible reconciliation. , Danny has remarried a twice divorced woman who is 20 years younger. The facts speak for themselves. In the light of this situation, the only honorable thing for Danny to do is to resign from his present position as Director of 3ABN and let someone with a clean record serve as the leader of a station committed to preach the true Gospel of Jesus Christ. He can still work at 3ABN but in a less conspicuous position. The longer he holds on to his position, the more people will become disenchanted with him and 3ABN. In an age of instant communication, one cannot cover up past mistakes for very long.

(These quotes came directly from the posting originating from Dr. Bacchiocchi Biblical Studies. Dr. Bacchiocchi is a retired Religious Professor at Andrews University. They were forwarded to us today and are under the 3ABN listings.)

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Sep 14 2006, 02:51 PM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Sep 13 2006, 09:18 PM)

Not only speculation, but speculation that flies in the face of what multiple witnesses and participants have stated. Every item Icedragon mentions has already been addressed in the various discussions on each point. The "truth" is only "hard to pin down" when one does not decide who are credible witnesses and who are not. And I disagree that we need to go into all these exercises in finding "motives" that make sense to us. We can see what happened. We can decide whether Danny and Walt have been caught in lies or not. We can decide whether we trust the witness of Johann and Beartrap and Arild as primary actors in the events of 2004 and whether we trust the witness of other observers and friends of Linda. Once we make the basic decision as to who can be counted on to tell the truth, then it matters not how much the details are embroderied or how many times they are repeated. Repetitions do not make lies into truth.

I see that you have had more time to weigh the evidence here than I have and may feel more comfortable in making the judgement call as to who is telling the truth and who is lying. I have only been weighing this evidence for a short time so I don't feel comfortable with throwing my self onto one side or the other yet. I don't think that I have a "6-year-old" brain. I just like to get the whole

story best I can before making that big leap.

> **QUOTE(watchbird @ Sep 13 2006, 09:47 PM)**
>
> I strongly suggest that it is Abrahamsen who speaks the truth, and I believe we had already posted confirming evidence of that long before we received his letter.

Watchbird, could you tell me where to find the thread containing the confirming evidence so I can go and read it? Thanks

> **QUOTE(icedragon @ Sep 14 2006, 09:41 AM)**
>
> I think speculation is the wrong word. Speculation is making statments with out fact or evidence to support it, picking a side and hoping the evidence will support it. Stock speculators, in the stock market used to pick stock based on hope, gossip, and current market conditions, Hot or cold. Stock analyist on the other make decisions and predications based on the financial condition of the companies they are recommending and the market indicators. they use fact to project resonable conclusions, to make more accurate decisons.
>
> The same has I have tried to do. I have tried to stay away from speculation and inuenendo, unlike many people around here. I gathered all the information from first hand information scources and put them in one place, unfortunately it was not posted in it's completeness. After careful analaysis and discussion with friend who are i respect for there analitical skills. These are the 2 possible situations that could have occured more or less, based on the information, some minor details maybe changable but to the greater extent these are the options. right now we have no smoking Gun to absloutely to accuse Linda or Danny. of wrong doing. while i have leanings i have had to back off Those leanings. I think that analysis is a better word.

IceDragon, I stand corrected. Your reasonable conclusions are very interesting. I also try to stay away from speculation, innuendo and hearsay because the whole reason I came here was to search for truth. And that's what I intend to keep pursuing.

Posted by: inga Sep 14 2006, 03:28 PM

> **QUOTE(icedragon @ Sep 13 2006, 12:09 PM)**
>
> [regarding Linda:]
> This eventrually lead to an inapproprate relationship. If sexual in nature there was certinaly an oppetuinty and would explain the pregnancy test.

This is precisely what I have not found -- the "opportunity" you mention. All I know of are speculations based on flimsy evidence that Linda had supposedly met the doctor here or there. Some very specific, supposedly "provable" meetings did not take place, because Linda was at an entirely different place at the time, according to Johann who is a first-hand witness with **no** stake in this other than that he stands for truth.

There is speculation that she spent time alone with the doctor in Norway. Johann can probably speak to this "opportunity" as well.

What **is** quite apparent is that Danny Shelton and Walt Thompson have been doing their best to make it appear that there was opportunity for an affair to take place.

Posted by: watchbird Sep 14 2006, 05:43 PM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Sep 13 2006, 10:18 PM)

Not only speculation, but speculation that flies in the face of what multiple witnesses and participants have stated. Every item Icedragon mentions has already been addressed in the various discussions on each point. The "truth" is only "hard to pin down" when one does not decide who are credible witnesses and who are not. And I disagree that we need to go into all these exercises in finding "motives" that make sense to us. We can see what happened. We can decide whether Danny and Walt have been caught in lies or not. We can decide whether we trust the witness of Johann and Beartrap and Arild as primary actors in the events of 2004 and whether we trust the witness of other observers and friends of Linda. Once we make the basic decision as to who can be counted on to tell the truth, then it matters not how much the details are embroderied or how many times they are repeated. Repetitions do not make lies into truth.

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Sep 14 2006, 02:51 PM)

I see that you have had more time to weigh the evidence here than I have and may feel more comfortable in making the judgement call as to who is telling the truth and who is lying. I have only been weighing this evidence for a short time so I don't feel comfortable with throwing my self onto one side or the other yet. I don't think that I have a "6-year-old" brain. I just like to get the whole story best I can before making that big leap.

QUOTE(watchbird @ Sep 13 2006, 10:47 PM)

I strongly suggest that it is Abrahamsen who speaks the truth, and I believe we had already posted confirming evidence of that long before we received his letter.

QUOTE

Watchbird, could you tell me where to find the thread containing the confirming evidence so I can go and read it? Thanks

Yes, I have indeed "had more time to weigh the evidence", and not only that, I started with the advantage of being a long time friend of Johann's, of working with him in several venues, and of having confidence in his honesty and kindly character. So when I asked him for an explanation of what was meant by the terse announcements on the 3abn webpage in May and June, 2004, there was no question in my mind whose version of the story to believe. But of course there is no way for me to hand you my confidence in Johann....

What I can do, however, is to make a few suggestions as to how to go about studying the material and making decisions as to who to believe. First of all, there are no real shortcuts .... this is one more situation which proves the truth of the old saw, "The long way around is the shortest way home." And another .... "The best place to begin is at the beginning.... that's the very best place to start."

Here, then, are some suggestions. They will require some note taking, a printer, and lots of patience.

1) In the pinned section, print off the three letters there .... the ones from Johann Thorvaldsson, Arild Abrahamson, and Walt Thompson. (Don't run Arild's and Walt's letters together. Be sure they are

separate files.) From the beginning of this thread, print off the other letter from Thompson.

2) Now notice the dates on each, July 29, 2004 for Johann's, May 2006 for the first of Walt's, and June 2006 for the other, and July 14 for Arild's.

3) Compare them closely. Use some system of marking passages 1) which are in essential agreement, 2) which could be different views of the same thing, and 3) which are contradictory. I believe you will find that Johann's and Arild's are in essential agreement, in spite of the fact that they were written nearly 2 years apart so that Arild's covers more time than Johann's. I also believe that you will find a few differences between Walt's two letters. And I think you will find enough differences between Walt's and the other two so it becomes obvious to you that one side or the other must be lying. There is simply no way to reconcile the two stories in many places.

4) Accept this as fact. Don't sweat the details. At this point the only conclusion that you should reach is that one or the other is lying. And don't let go of that. No matter how contrived the arguments get from anyone .... don't let go of this basic fact. There is no use trying to reconcile the differences. They are simply too great for that.

Now .... how to determine which side is truthful and which is giving out lies ....

Here is where I think the only way to really get there is to start at the beginning.

The beginning was 2004, and you will find the threads started at that time mostly at the very end of the 3ABN menu. (When you pass your cursor over the thread titles, a box containing the date it was started will appear.) There were not many threads that were begun in 2004, and it is such ancient history now that it may seem unnecessary .... but I think walking with those who were trying to sort things out at the time will give you a better feel for why some now are so certain about where they stand.

When you are finished with those, then move to those begun in 2006, after Danny's remarriage. This was when interest really picked up. And once Sister begins to appear in the threads, leave those and go take the "guided tour" through her "Unauthorized History of 3ABN" which you will find pinned at the top.

But don't stop there. Remember that all the time she was putting those up, other threads were running concurrently. Try to work your way through them all. But do it slowly. It simply can't be done in a day.

And as you read, keep in mind the two sets of letters that you read. When you come across a post that speaks to some point on those letters ... either side .... make a note of it. One way I have found helpful is to click on the post number, which gives me the exact url of that post, which I can then paste into a document, along with a sentence or two about the contents. Eventually you will run across the "confirming evidence" that I mentioned above. Once you have picked these out you will be in a position to decide which "side" has the most credibility.

And once you have decided who is lying and who is telling the truth, the liars will not be able to bewilder you any more.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Sep 14 2006, 07:41 PM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Sep 14 2006, 04:43 PM)

Yes, I have indeed "had more time to weigh the evidence", and not only that, I started with the advantage of being a long time friend of Johann's, of working with him in several venues, and of having confidence in his honesty and kindly character. So when I asked him for an explanation of

what was meant by the terse announcements on the 3abn webpage in May and June, 2004, there was no question in my mind whose version of the story to believe. But of course there is no way for me to hand you my confidence in Johann....

What I can do, however, is to make a few suggestions as to how to go about studying the material and making decisions as to who to believe. First of all, there are no real shortcuts .... this is one more situation which proves the truth of the old saw, "The long way around is the shortest way home." And another .... "The best place to begin is at the beginning.... that's the very best place to start."

Here, then, are some suggestions. They will require some note taking, a printer, and lots of patience.

Thank you for your recommendations on how to look for the truth. I have already done some of what you have suggested. I haven't gone clear back to the beginning but have tried to pay close attention to comparing letters, etc.

Thanks again.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Sep 14 2006, 08:06 PM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Sep 14 2006, 06:43 PM)

And as you read, keep in mind the two sets of letters that you read. When you come across a post that speaks to some point on those letters ... either side .... make a note of it. One way I have found helpful is to click on the post number, which gives me the exact url of that post, which I can then paste into a document, along with a sentence or two about the contents. Eventually you will run across the "confirming evidence" that I mentioned above. Once you have picked these out you will be in a position to decide which "side" has the most credibility.

And once you have decided who is lying and who is telling the truth, the liars will not be able to bewilder you any more.

About comparing letters.

You may also have to ask questions.

For instance, Walter Thompson mentions Linda's "lady friend." This "lady friend" glides off of Dr. Thompson's tongue quite easily. Who is she? I have found you really have to seriously question every noun and adjective in Thompson's letters.

QUOTE

Our committee of the board invited a lady friend [Kuzma] of Linda's to sit with us, thinking that, being a woman, she would be able to make Linda comfortable. As soon as she heard Linda's story, she confided to Linda that she was wrong, and needed to correct the problem. Linda requested her to query some of the 3ABN leadership to hear their views. she did this, only to find that Linda used the negative feedback she received as evidence she was not a friend to her cause. Linda would not talk to her again - the same as she had done to the friend [Walsh] that went with her to Norway.

Thompson mentions these two, Kuzma and Walsh, as Linda's friends.

Kuzma wrote an e-mail to Calvin located here:

http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?showtopic=1664

where Kuzma stated,

> **QUOTE**
>
> Although I will not comment further about what happened to lead up to Linda's departure from 3ABN, we know that the other man had been to the States and spent time with Linda before she left Danny, and that immediately after she left Danny, the other man was with Linda. A few weeks later they spent time traveling together through Europe.

Did Linda really go travelling through Europe with Arild Abrahamsen as Kay said?

Notice how Thompson's subsequent letter differs:

> **QUOTE**
>
> One of the things was that Linda had made arrangements to meet the doctor in Norway to spend 10 days with him touring the pretty places in the country during the following June.

Danny and Linda were divorced by June 26, 2004, so you can see how this travelling did not take place "the following June."

This is important, because the 3ABN Board, undoubtedly, was told about the romantic romps through Europe. They were encouraged to vote based on false information. Why should the board discount such an esteemed *Adventist Review* contributor such as the illustrious Kay Kuzma?

You have to look really closely (almost under a microscope) with Thompson, unlike his own 3ABN appointed "fact finder" Kay Kuzma. Thompson doesn't say that Abrahamsen and Linda Shelton travelled anywhere. This is an important change in the story. Why don't these Kuzma and Thompson stories match on a topic so damaging and so critical to Linda's reputation?

Well, of course, Linda Shelton refused further calls from this Kuzma "3ABN fact-finder committee" woman when she saw this hatchet job under way. You would, too, if your "friend" implied to strangers you were travelling around Europe with your lover.

Those are the types of questions you will have to ask yourself. You have to say, if Linda Shelton and Arild Abrahamsen did not travel through Europe for 10 days, why would Linda's supposed "lady friend" be sending out e-mail saying that they did?

You also need to know that Danny, shortly thereafter, put Kay Kuzma in charge of 3ABN Books. Does Danny tolerate people who are sympathetic to his ex-wife? Ask yourself questions. The fact that Kay Kuzma remained in the good graces of Danny Shelton may tell you on which side of the pizza Kay Kuzma's cheese was melting. Same goes for the Linda's other "friend" mentioned.

So, you will have to read all of the letters very carefully and note the changes and where they don't match the other letters and ask yourself why.

Posted by: justme Sep 14 2006, 09:30 PM

3ABN BOOKS: A real money maker. And Kuzma is in charge of it. You may remember that her very first "new" projects was to RE-WRITE the "history of 3ABN. It very conveniently "forgot" what Linda did for 3ABN.

Re: SKY ANGEL ... Danny acts like SKY ANGEL's rejection of 3ABN is no big deal. SO few viewers and so on. It was SKY ANGEL that literally put 3ABN on the map across the USA. AND SKY ANGEL offered "LIFETIME MEMBERSHIP SUBSCRIPTIONS" to get enough funds to get DOMINION SKY ANGEL Progamming really going. Robert, founder of Dominion SKY ANGEL need start-up money, which came mostly from SDA's by virtue of the interest in 3ABN. Then DISH came along and offered the viewer a smaller, more compact DISH ANTENNA at 19-inches across instead of the 6-7 feet mesh dishes used earlier.

For Danny to downplay the importance of Dominion SKY ANGEL is to deny the reality of it all.

To see the importance of the loss of SKY ANGEL a satellite system installer told me he could not get the new "HOPE" systems in fast enough to keep with the demand.

HOWEVER, it now is dropped off to a stand-still. No one want 3ABN anymore, but they love "HOPE".

Kuzma is trying really hard to justify her job there ay 3ABN, so far, playing "fast-n-loose" with the "facts" that go into the books makes it easier to become a P.R. tool for 3ABN rather than an evangelistic tool for God. Her books glorify 3ABN staff and individuals that appear there.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Sep 14 2006, 09:43 PM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 14 2006, 06:06 PM)

About comparing letters.

You may also have to ask questions.

For instance, Walter Thompson mentions Linda's "lady friend." This "lady friend" glides off of Dr. Thompson's tongue quite easily. Who is she? I have found you really have to seriously question every noun and adjective in Thompson's letters.
Thompson mentions these two, Kuzma and Walsh, as Linda's friends.

Kuzma wrote an e-mail to Calvin located here:

http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?showtopic=1664

where Kuzma stated,
Did Linda really go travelling through Europe with Arild Abrahamsen as Kay said?

Notice how Thompson's subsequent letter differs:
Danny and Linda were divorced by June 26, 2004, so you can see how this travelling did not take place "the following June." This is important, because the 3ABN Board, undoubtedly, was told about the romantic romps through Europe. They were encouraged to vote based on false information.
Why should the board discount such an esteemed *Adventist Review* contributor such as the illustrious Kay Kuzma?

snip

So, you will have to read all of the letters very carefully and note the changes and where they don't match the other letters and ask yourself why.

found it quite easy to figure out that the letter was refering to Kay and Brenda.

just don't see how you can conclude that Linda and Arild couldn't have traveled through Europe)ecause Danny and Linda were divorced by June 26, 2004. How does the divorce make a trip mpossible? Am I missing something?

Posted by: beartrap Sep 14 2006, 09:58 PM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Sep 14 2006, 09:43 PM)

I found it quite easy to figure out that the letter was refering to Kay and Brenda.

I just don't see how you can conclude that Linda and Arild couldn't have traveled through Europe because Danny and Linda were divorced by June 26, 2004. How does the divorce make a trip impossible? Am I missing something?

)anny claims that they travelled through Europe while he they were married... LIE! It never ıappened, but if it did after the divorce, is it any worse than Danny spending nights with Brenda Walsh, and moving Brandy into the house across the street form him (Way out in the woods where her is privacy) and then marrying her after whaterver the time across the street (in privacy) may ıave produced? Alot of people seem to be obssesed with pounding square pegs through round holes to ry and fit their fallacious hypothesis, but round is round, and square is square. No matter how you)ound, twist, turn, or otherwise attempt to create a nice, neat fit, it won't happen.

Posted by: Johann Sep 14 2006, 11:04 PM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Sep 15 2006, 05:43 AM)

I found it quite easy to figure out that the letter was refering to Kay and Brenda.

I just don't see how you can conclude that Linda and Arild couldn't have traveled through Europe because Danny and Linda were divorced by June 26, 2004. How does the divorce make a trip impossible? Am I missing something?

have asked Walt Thompson what evidence he has that this visit took place. He replied there was)ood evidence. I asked him if he had seen it. He admitted he had not, but that he had heard it. . . .

My wife and I were spending most of our time in the vicinity of Dr. Arild Abrahamsen, she received requent treratments from him, and we were in daily communication with Arild. It would have been a nillionth of a chance we could have missed Linda's visit to Europe during that period. This is merely)ne more of a multitude of lies emanating from 3ABN. So what can you trust of whata they say?

Posted by: vonessa Sep 15 2006, 12:16 AM

I have truly enjoyed reading this topic. Even though the subject is sad, it has been fun putting the pieces together and seeing the whole picture. Thanks for all the people who have spent time doing this - it has been amazing to see it all!

Again, I know that it is sad and what not, but it is a true story, and we can now talk to the real people who were there and saw it happen. Much better than 99% of what's on television, including 3ABN!

Posted by: inga Sep 15 2006, 12:38 AM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 14 2006, 09:06 PM)

About comparing letters.

You may also have to ask questions.

For instance, Walter Thompson mentions Linda's "lady friend." This "lady friend" glides off of Dr. Thompson's tongue quite easily. Who is she? I have found you really have to seriously question every noun and adjective in Thompson's letters.
Thompson mentions these two, Kuzma and Walsh, as Linda's friends.

This "lady friend" in Thompson's latest letter had me puzzled. Now I can't believe that he actually called Kay Kuzma a lady friend!! Was she **ever** a friend to Linda??

I can understand calling Brenda Walsh a "friend," because Linda apparently really thought that Brenda was a friend. But Kay??

Thanks for this analysis, Pete.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Sep 15 2006, 12:41 AM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Sep 14 2006, 10:43 PM)

I found it quite easy to figure out that the letter was refering to Kay and Brenda.

I just don't see how you can conclude that Linda and Arild couldn't have traveled through Europe because Danny and Linda were divorced by June 26, 2004. How does the divorce make a trip impossible? Am I missing something?

Perhaps you're thinking that all of this refers to after the divorce.

Kay says, "**Immediately** after she left Danny, the other man was with Linda. A few weeks later they spent time traveling together through Europe."

Immediately, according to the dicitonary: "Without delay or hesitation; with no time intervening."

Thompson only says there were travel plans made for June, 2004, after a divorce was filed. Divorces always involve a time interval - even a quickie divorce on Guam.

Thompson doesn't even write that those travel plans ever became a reality. So, where does Kay Kuzma's travel information come from?

Posted by: Panama_Pete Sep 15 2006, 12:55 AM

QUOTE(Johann @ Sep 15 2006, 12:04 AM)

I have asked Walt Thompson what evidence he has that this visit took place. He replied there was good evidence. I asked him if he had seen it. He admitted he had not, but that he had heard it. . . .

My wife and I were spending most of our time in the vicinity of Dr. Arild Abrahamsen, she received frequent treatments from him, and we were in daily communication with Arild. It would have been a millionth of a chance we could have missed Linda's visit to Europe during that period. This is merely one more of a multitude of lies emanating from 3ABN. So what can you trust of whata they say?

And certainly, if Arild and Linda had left to do some "traveling together through Europe" his patients would have noticed he was missing.

Posted by: Uncle Sam Sep 15 2006, 07:07 AM

[quote name='beartrap' date='Sep 14 2006, 08:58 PM' post='151963']
Danny claims that they travelled through Europe while he they were married... LIE! It never happened, but if it did after the divorce, is it any worse than Danny spending nights with Brenda Walsh, and moving Brandy into the house across the street form him (Way out in the woods where ther is privacy) and then marrying her after whaterver the time across the street (in privacy) may have produced?

Did Linda and the Dr ever "vacation" together? After the divorce?

Posted by: watchbird Sep 15 2006, 08:45 AM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 15 2006, 12:55 AM)

And certainly, if Arild and Linda had left to do some "traveling together through Europe" his patients would have noticed he was missing.

Yes, indeed, and Arild's patient records would be a good source for someone seriously interested in

researching his exact location during the times he is rumored to have been with Linda on some other continent. There are two problems with doing this, however.... one is that Arild is a very private person and is not noted for granting interviews to reporters, and the other is that those who make accusation have been very vague in their dates as to when he was, according to the accusation, spending time with Linda in some place in the US.

But back to the "traveling together through Europe" story.... I would guess that this has its "seed of truth" in one of the medical appointments that Linda had with Abrahamson ... that we discussed elsewhere at some length. (Sorry I don't have time to search for the exact urls of that discussion, maybe someone else can find it and bring it to this place.) To refresh the memories who were here for the discussion.... when Linda was left with no medical insurance, and no stateside friends to help her out, Dr Abrahamsen offered to treat her without charge. At the time of her divorce, he was "on location" with patients in Switzerland, so this is where she went (after her divorce) for her medical treatments. When finished she joined Irmgard and Johann in Norway, where she spent some additional time in "retreat" at their home.

The interesting (almost ironic) thing about this trip is that Danny was having her trailed by Private Investigators all the way..... which means that he was effectively (and unwittingly) providing her with a set of "chaparones" .... or should we say a rock solid protection against false accusations. For surely, had there been any shadow of a doubt in the PI minds about her morality on that trip, they would have reported it to Danny and he would have been waving it in triumph ever since.

So I think in this case, we have not only the affirmations of Linda, Arild, Johann, and Irmgard, that she was not following up on a "romantic liason" but we can rest assured that she was so impeccable in her behaviour that even a professional PI team could "find no fault in her" to report to their employers.

Could this be a case of a fulfillment of God's promise that he would not only protect against the "snares of the enemy" but would turn such attempts to snare into a wall of protection for the righteous?

In response to Uncle Sam's question, Linda vacationed with Johann and Irmgard at times during the next year or so after the divorce. They lived in Norway. Not anywhere near Arild's clinic. But at times they ALL went to Arild's clinic, as both Irmgard and Linda were taking treatments from Dr. Abrahamson. (Again ... this is all by way of review. Johann has described these times elsewhere on BSDA, and doubtless he will do so again.) So yes, Linda vacationed in Norway. No she did not vacation with Arild .... with the implications that this carries of them being alone together for extended periods of time.

Posted by: icedragon Sep 15 2006, 09:26 AM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 12 2006, 09:41 PM)

What is the actual and honest date of this email?

that is what was posted on msdaol. I took it as it was. ask Daryal.

Posted by: Uncle Sam Sep 15 2006, 09:56 AM

Thanks Watchbird for clearing that up. I knew I had read about that before but Beartrap's post kindof cofused me. Saying IF she had gone after the divorce...

Posted by: justme Sep 15 2006, 11:00 AM

Did I read earlier on BSDA something to the effect that the "Accused Doctor" in in his mid-60's, but Linda is in her late forties?

Again, IF Linda has opportunity to spend time time with the accused Doctor, they certainly would have a lot in common. If he is available and she is available and they each have "rights" to visit each other, then WHY NOT? Linda deserves all the love and support she can find.

He seems like a fine Christian gentleman. Even IF they had no "desires" for each other at the beginning, they may have developed some along the way. It sounds like a really good match so far.

Should they (Linda and the doctor) AVOID each other just because Danny couldn't wait to get rid of Linda???

Someone help me out here ..

Oh yeah, and they could have wedding rings, too, a far as I'm concerned.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Sep 15 2006, 11:01 AM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 14 2006, 11:41 PM)

Perhaps you're thinking that all of this refers to after the divorce.

Kay says, "**Immediately** after she left Danny, the other man was with Linda. A few weeks later they spent time traveling together through Europe."

Immediately, according to the dicitonary: "Without delay or hesitation; with no time intervening."

Thompson only says there were travel plans made for June, 2004, after a divorce was filed. Divorces always involve a time interval - even a quickie divorce on Guam.

Thompson doesn't even write that those travel plans ever became a reality. So, where does Kay Kuzma's travel information come from?

I seem to be confused about the dates of things. When was their divorce filed? When was their divorce final? Did they both go to Guam to effect the divorce?

If it was filed on June 26, 2004 and the claim was that Linda traveled in Europe before this date she and Danny were still married. Right? If the divorce became final on June 26, 2004, were they still married up to this point. Do you understand my confusion?

Posted by: justme Sep 15 2006, 11:29 AM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Sep 15 2006, 12:01 PM)

I seem to be confused about the dates of things. When was their divorce filed? When was their divorce final? Did they both go to Guam to effect the divorce?

If it was filed on June 26, 2004 and the claim was that Linda traveled in Europe before this date she and Danny were still married. Right? If the divorce became final on June 26, 2004, were they still married up to this point. Do you understand my confusion?

ılso, as I recall, back as early as March of 2004, Danny had already begun his campaign to smear and :liminate Linda. That's when he began to build his case and that's when he put together his "spies" ınd "henchmen" to help him accomplish his task. he already had the support of his "Bored", but they ıeeded to put together "evidence" to support their upcoming plans.

remember watching 3ABN in March and April and seeing Linda siting on a chair at the back of the ;tage/platform, gazing woefully in a daze, wringing her habds. I told my wife at the time, there is ;omething amiss at 3ABN. Danny was acting ELATED" and Linda looked as if she had lost her very last riend.

Posted by: Fran Sep 15 2006, 11:44 AM

QUOTE(justme @ Sep 15 2006, 11:00 AM)

Did I read earlier on BSDA something to the effect that the "Accused Doctor" in in his mid-60's, but Linda is in her late forties?

Again, IF Linda has opportunity to spend time time with the accused Doctor, they certainly would have a lot in common. If he is available and she is available and they each have "rights" to visit each other, then WHY NOT? Linda deserves all the love and support she can find.

He seems like a fine Christian gentleman. Even IF they had no "desires" for each other at the beginning, they may have developed some along the way. It sounds like a really good match so far.

Should they (Linda and the doctor) AVOID each other just because Danny couldn't wait to get rid of Linda???

Someone help me out here ..

Oh yeah, and they could have wedding rings, too, a far as I'm concerned.

ly desire for Linda is that she will find her soul mate. Some one that she can lean on and he can lean ın her. Someone that is a spiritual leader that will share with Linda the joys of worhiping the King of ‹ings.

want her to have a heavenly marriage. I want her to experience a bit of heaven on earth! God knows vhat she suffered while being with Danny. She now can see what went on behind her back, while she vas the blind wife.

want her to be loved with a true love. One that will be lasting and comfortable; one where the two vill share everything with each other.

Jow, should that be Dr A, so be it. The who is irrelevant. What is important is that Linda and the other

person have a holy love! I do not believe now, or before, that Linda or the doctor had any thing intimate going on while Linda was married.

What happened after Danny divorced Linda is not any of our business. She was free to see whoever she wanted to see. Danny cannot fault that since he was reportedly sleeping with Brenda and he had already brought Brandy on the scene.

So to answer your question, I just want her happiness. She has lost everything because of Danny. I want her to have this Godly relationship with whom ever she chooses, even if it is Dr A!

Come to think of it, I think he would be a wonderful choice! However, Linda is in control of her life and I will ACCEPT her choice no matter WHO it is. She may have been hurt so badly that she may choose not to ever marry again. I guess what I am trying to say is that her happiness is what I want!

Posted by: watchbird Sep 15 2006, 11:49 AM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Sep 15 2006, 11:01 AM)

I seem to be confused about the dates of things. When was their divorce filed? When was their divorce final? Did they both go to Guam to effect the divorce?

If it was filed on June 26, 2004 and the claim was that Linda traveled in Europe before this date she and Danny were still married. Right? If the divorce became final on June 26, 2004, were they still married up to this point. Do you understand my confusion?

My information from files dated 8/22/2004 was that Linda traveled to Europe "a month after the divorce was final". One reason she did that was because Danny was harassing her so badly where she was living in Southern Illinois.... yes, even after the divorce.... and after she was living in a different place.

It is my understanding that no one has to appear in person in Guam. All they have to do is to fill out the paperwork. (You can find more information about this on BSDA ... I think even the sample forms are there ... or perhaps a link to where they may be views on web."

The confusion that has at times surfaced on BSDA as to when the divorce was final stems from the fact that, a year or so after the divorce was final, Linda learned that there was a possibility that the state of Illinois did not recognize the validity of a Guam divorce. That information, coupled with information that showed that she could have sued Danny for divorce on morals charges had she only known at the time, led her to test the validity of the Guam divorce in the Illinois court. Had the court there agreed that it was not valid, she would have been free to apply for a divorce on the basis of the new information she had about Danny's unfaithfulness. With that knowledge, is it any wonder that Danny "fought" for the validity of the Guam divorce? It was the final decision of the Illinois court (that Illinois would indeed accept the Guam divorce as final) that occurred just a few days before Danny remarried. But the Guam divorce was valid all of that time. Only if the Illinois court had declared it invalid would it have become so.

As for Kay Kuzma .... obviously she did not know any of this at the time she was supposedly following Danny's orders and trying to persuade Linda to remain with Danny. While I don't have a very high regard for Kay, I have not seen anything that would lead me to conclude that she .... and Mark Finley as well .... were in collusion with Danny's real purpose ... that of getting rid of Linda. I think they all bought into his pretense that he wanted her to stay, so they were bending every effort to persuade her to do just that. And of course the more they went along with his pretense, the more they alienated Linda, so they had less and less chance of finding out the truth of the other side of the story .... which was not only that Linda was innocent of Danny's charges, but also that Danny was

actively trying to drive her away... from both him and 3abn.

I would hope that sooner or later they would not only realize the extent to which they were duped but would be man and woman enough to admit that not only did they not act jucidiously in not closely examining all avenues of truth that were open to them .... including not only Linda, but Johann, Arild, Derrell, and a number of others ..... but they were so seriously misled that they were not even really doing what they thought they were .... pleasing Danny by trying to "save" his and Linda's marriage.

And do notice that I did not include Walt Thompson in the ones that I think may have been "duped". He spoke quite plainly regarding the real reason that the board voted to get rid of Linda ... not because of adultery on her part .... but simply because Danny wanted her gone. Whatever his motives, I cannot at this point find it in my heart to believe that he was so deceived as the others. (Of course, maybe I am wrong about them also. Maybe they were only playing Danny's game of pretense. Maybe time will tell. Maybe it will hold on to its secrets. We shall have to all wait and see on some of this.)

Posted by: justme Sep 15 2006, 11:53 AM

[size=7]
THANK YOU!
YESSSS
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAMMMMMMMENNNNNNNNNNN!!

QUOTE(Fran @ Sep 15 2006, 01:44 PM)

My desire for Linda is that she will find her soul mate. Some one that she can lean on and he can lean on her. Someone that is a spiritual leader that will share with Linda the joys of worhiping the King of Kings.

I want her to have a heavenly marriage. I want her to experience a bit of heaven on earth! God knows what she suffered while being with Danny. She now can see what went on behind her back, while she was the blind wife.

I want her to be loved with a true love. One that will be lasting and comfortable; one where the two will share everything with each other.

Now, should that be Dr A, so be it. The who is irrelevant. What is important is that Linda and the other person have a holy love! I do not believe now, or before, that Linda or the doctor had any thing intimate going on while Linda was married.

What happened after Danny divorced Linda is not any of our business. She was free to see whoever she wanted to see. Danny cannot fault that since he was reportedly sleeping with Brenda and he had already brought Brandy on the scene.

So to answer your question, I just want her happiness. She has lost everything because of Danny. I want her to have this Godly relationship with whom ever she chooses, even if it is Dr A!

Come to think of it, I think he would be a wonderful choice! However, Linda is in control of her life and I will ACCEPT her choice no matter WHO it is. She may have been hurt so badly that she may choose not to ever marry again. I guess what I am trying to say is that her happiness is what I want!

THANK YOU!
YESSSS
AMEN!!

Posted by: inga Sep 15 2006, 01:54 PM

QUOTE(justme @ Sep 15 2006, 12:00 PM)

Did I read earlier on BSDA something to the effect that the "Accused Doctor" in in his mid-60's, but Linda is in her late forties?

Again, IF Linda has opportunity to spend time time with the accused Doctor, they certainly would have a lot in common. If he is available and she is available and they each have "rights" to visit each other, then WHY NOT? Linda deserves all the love and support she can find.

He seems like a fine Christian gentleman. Even IF they had no "desires" for each other at the beginning, they may have developed some along the way.

From the vantage point of over six decades of life experience, I can say that the type of false accusations brought up against Linda and the doctor very often have the effect of throwing people together and *generating* the very feelings of which they are accused. This is especially true when one person is being harassed, as Linda is. The man's protective instinct comes into play, and the woman feels sheltered and protected -- with both having feelings that are pre-cursors to romantic love.

If this has happened to Linda and the doctor, they are in a real dilemma. If they should start to keep company, become a couple and look like they might get married, everyone will think that the original accusations are true.

How very sad!!!!

QUOTE

It sounds like a really good match so far.

Should they (Linda and the doctor) AVOID each other just because Danny couldn't wait to get rid of Linda???

Posted by: Ralph Sep 15 2006, 04:07 PM

QUOTE(inga @ Sep 15 2006, 01:54 PM)

From the vantage point of over six decades of life experience, I can say that the type of false accusations brought up against Linda and the doctor very often have the effect of throwing people together and *generating* the very feelings of which they are accused. This is especially true when one person is being harassed, as Linda is. The man's protective instinct comes into play, and the woman feels sheltered and protected -- with both having feelings that are pre-cursors to romantic

> love.
>
> If this has happened to Linda and the doctor, they are in a real dilemma. If they should start to keep company, become a couple and look like they might get married, everyone will think that the original accusations are true.
>
> How very sad!!!!

hope that the parties involved are aware of the snare that you mentioned. "To be forewarned is to be orearmed." You have given the warning.

Posted by: inga Sep 15 2006, 04:55 PM

> **QUOTE(Ralph @ Sep 15 2006, 05:07 PM)**
>
> I hope that the parties involved are aware of the snare that you mentioned. "To be forewarned is to be forearmed." You have given the warning.

3ut isn't it rather unjust for people who *could* be a "good match," as some suggest, to remain forever ıpart because of the unfounded slander of unprincipled folks?

Posted by: Green Cochoa Sep 15 2006, 06:22 PM

...And wasn't it rather unjust that when there was perfectly good, healthful and beautiful fruit in front of her, Eve was forbidden to eat it?

Just or unjust, true happiness can only be found in following God's plans for our life.

"Marriage is something that will influence and affect your life both in this world and in the world to come. A sincere Christian will not advance his plans in this direction without the knowledge that God approves his course. He will not want to choose for himself, but will feel that God must choose for him. We are not to please ourselves, for Christ pleased not Himself. I would not be understood to mean that anyone is to marry one whom he does not love. This would be sin. But fancy and the emotional nature must not be allowed to lead on to ruin. God requires the whole heart, the supreme affections. " (AH 44)

I believe everyone should **FAST and PRAY** before saying "Yes!" to marriage, lest we in haste accept the devils plan to ruin our lives before God has presented His offer for our happiness.

Posted by: princessdi Sep 15 2006, 06:34 PM

Yes, God WILL restore all that Linda lost, as He did with Job.

Just a little reminder, though Fran. I know it is easy to venture into the areas of what was "reported" or rumored, but please let's stick to the facts. Thanks!

> **QUOTE(Fran @ Sep 15 2006, 10:44 AM)**
>
> My desire for Linda is that she will find her soul mate. Some one that she can lean on and he can lean on her. Someone that is a spiritual leader that will share with Linda the joys of worhiping the

King of Kings.

I want her to have a heavenly marriage. I want her to experience a bit of heaven on earth! God knows what she suffered while being with Danny. She now can see what went on behind her back, while she was the blind wife.

I want her to be loved with a true love. One that will be lasting and comfortable; one where the two will share everything with each other.

Now, should that be Dr A, so be it. The who is irrelevant. What is important is that Linda and the other person have a holy love! I do not believe now, or before, that Linda or the doctor had any thing intimate going on while Linda was married.

What happened after Danny divorced Linda is not any of our business. She was free to see whoever she wanted to see. Danny cannot fault that since he was reportedly sleeping with Brenda and he had already brought Brandy on the scene.

So to answer your question, I just want her happiness. She has lost everything because of Danny. I want her to have this Godly relationship with whom ever she chooses, even if it is Dr A!

Come to think of it, I think he would be a wonderful choice! However, Linda is in control of her life and I will ACCEPT her choice no matter WHO it is. She may have been hurt so badly that she may choose not to ever marry again. I guess what I am trying to say is that her happiness is what I want!

Posted by: lurker Sep 15 2006, 06:42 PM

Don't go matchmaking where there is no interest. Did it ever occur to anyone that there never was **that kind** of interest between Linda and the Doctor. It is really embarrassing to have people assume there is when there is nothing.

Linda behaved herself and acted like a married person. Another married woman on the other hand was supposed to have been flirting with him but his attention was directed neither Linda or the other married woman but to a non Adventist lady had who was single as he was single and whom he had invited as his guest.

Posted by: watchbird Sep 15 2006, 06:58 PM

QUOTE(lurker @ Sep 15 2006, 06:42 PM) ☐

Don't go matchmaking where there is no interest. Did it ever occur to anyone that there never was **that kind** of interest between Linda and the Doctor. It is really embarrassing to have people assume there is when there is nothing.

Linda behaved herself and acted like a married person. Another married woman on the other hand was supposed to have been flirting with him but his attention was directed neither Linda or the other married woman but to a non Adventist lady had who was single as he was single and whom he had invited as his guest.

"Matchmaking" is very inappropriate .... and very "outdated". Let's simply not go there.

Posted by: sonshineonme Sep 15 2006, 07:02 PM

QUOTE(lurker @ Sep 15 2006, 05:42 PM)

Don't go matchmaking where there is no interest. Did it ever occur to anyone that there never was **that kind** of interest between Linda and the Doctor. It is really embarrassing to have people assume there is when there is nothing.

Linda behaved herself and acted like a married person. Another married woman on the other hand was supposed to have been flirting with him but his attention was directed neither Linda or the other married woman but to a non Adventist lady had who was single as he was single and whom he had invited as his guest.

Linda and the Dr. have had nothing but a friendship from the beginning till now. That's just how it is. She has been fortunate to have his friendship through all this too. Will she someday be married or date, only time will tell, the hurt and betrayal she has been through and is experiencing now will take her much time to work through (she told me it will take her a while) and she is smart enough to know this. Even if she meets prince charming somewhere along her journey, it will take her time to really trust again. I'm sure she will do what she can (reading books, counseling,etc) to get the healing and learn from it all. She is a smart lady - a bit on the naive side - but SMART and INTELLIGENT still!!

Posted by: Brennen Sep 15 2006, 08:15 PM

Something is missing here. What happened to the marriage between Linda and Danny Shelton before the Doctor. got into the picture. If she was so intense with the Doctor, what happened before that relationship?. Nothing happens in a vacuum, and certainly not with Linda Shelton. I suggest the Linda would not have done anything to destroy her marriage and she did not. The marriage was weak and gone long before all of this. Why is Dr. Walter Thompson leaving out the most crucial points. If she did as he said, what would lead a woman to need another relationship outside of her marriage? Was the relationship with the doctor a deep friendship? If so, why should it end. I suggest that the Shelton's marriage was long gone down the drain long before all of this. When we focus on Linda's side it look very bad (to the untrained eye). But when we look at the total picture, I see a snake in the grass. Let us all ask the question: "What was wrong in the marriage one year before all of this happened? Was Danny Shelton truly abusive. Dr. Thompson suggestion is that only physical abuse is really bad. As a specialist in dealing with toxic intimacy, I know that emotional, verbal and psychological abuse is just a deadly and oftentimes worse. Come on Dr. Thompson, tell us more. Be honest. Or do you really know all the dark secrets long before all of this.

Posted by: justme Sep 15 2006, 09:24 PM

We are told in inspiration that Satan likes nothing better than to put together two people in marriage who will later turn against each other; because it destroys the children, the families

from each side, and all their friends. To put together two individuals who do not belong together is Satan's most efficient tool to hurt the children of God. It destroys all the good that God designed to come from a Godly union.

The top priorities in considering marriage are:
Will this union Glorify God?
Will this marriage do more to glorify God than we can do individually as single people?

Give the idea of the marriage to God and ask if He WANTS it to be. Then, in purity of heart realize that each person belongs first to God, not to "me".

If God gives you back to each other then proceed carefully, with scripture in hand. There is no greater love for another than that placed there by God Himself.

Matchmaking is a tool of Satan. It is diabolical in it's premise. It falls into the realm of parapsychology to suggest that two people, not guided by God, should pursue each other.

For others to suggest that two "might otta" date each other is to supplant the Holy Spirit in their lives. Tell them to surrender to God and see whom HE suggests.

As mentioned before by someone "with six decades of experience", that all too often two hurting souls find solace in each other's company. They may marry. The source of the hurting dies away and now they no longer have anything in common. They wonder why they married in the first place.

Jacob had a potential wife selected FOR him, by his father's servant. When he actually saw her in person, the one God chose for him, he "loved her and went into his mother's tent to marry her". Notice that, even tho' God chose her, it was still up to Jacob to love her, or not to love her. Ultimately it WAS Jacob's choice to love or not to love, but God gave Jacob God's first choice for a wife.

I can tell you from experience that there is no greater joy than to be married to a woman who was sent by God. It proves itself true every year, every decade. It's as though you are reborn each and every day. God knows how to do it, ... right!

Posted by: simplysaved Sep 17 2006, 06:41 PM

That was beautiful! Thank you for sharing that testimony.....it is very encouraging.

QUOTE(justme @ Sep 15 2006, 10:24 PM)

We are told in inspiration that Satan likes nothing better than to put together two people in marriage who will later turn against each other; because it destroys the children, the families from each side, and all their friends. To put together two individuals who do not belong together is Satan's most efficient tool to hurt the children of God. It destroys all the good that God designed to come from a Godly union.

The top priorities in considering marriage are:
Will this union Glorify God?
Will this marriage do more to glorify God than we can do individually as single people?

Give the idea of the marriage to God and ask if He WANTS it to be. Then, in purity of heart realize that each person belongs first to God, not to "me".

If God gives you back to each other then proceed carefully, with scripture in hand. There is no greater love for another than that placed there by God Himself.

Matchmaking is a tool of Satan. It is diabolical in it's premise. It falls into the realm of parapsychology to suggest that two people, not guided by God, should pursue each other.

For others to suggest that two "might otta" date each other is to supplant the Holy Spirit in their lives. Tell them to surrender to God and see whom HE suggests.

As mentioned before by someone "with six decades of experience", that all too often two hurting souls find solace in each other's company. They may marry. The source of the hurting dies away and now they no longer have anything in common. They wonder why they married in the first place.

Jacob had a potential wife selected FOR him, by his father's servant. When he actually saw her in person, the one God chose for him, he "loved her and went into his mother's tent to marry her". Notice that, even tho' God chose her, it was still up to Jacob to love her, or not to love her. Ultimately it WAS Jacob's choice to love or not to love, but God gave Jacob God's first choice for a wife.

I can tell you from experience that there is no greater joy than to be married to a woman who was sent by God. It proves itself true every year, every decade. It's as though you are reborn each and every day. God knows how to do it, ... right!
