Printable Version of Topic

Click here to view this topic in its original format

177

BlackSDA _ 3ABN _ Is Danny Over Linda?

Posted by: Uncle Sam Aug 28 2006, 07:32 PM

I was talking to a friend of mine about this situation. She brought up some interesting ideas. She was saying it seems to her that Danny is not over Linda. If he were he would not have married someone so similar to Linda. Also, he would not be so obsessed about this whole situation. He would have just moved on and not thought anymore about Linda.

What do you all think about this theory?

Does anyone know how Brandi is handling all of this? I feel really bad for her to be in this situation...

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 28 2006, 07:37 PM

QUOTE(Uncle Sam @ Aug 28 2006, 06:32 PM)

I was talking to a friend of mine about this situation. She brought up some interesting ideas. She was saying it seems to her that Danny is not over Linda. If he were he would not have married someone so similar to Linda. Also, he would not be so obsessed about this whole situation. He would have just moved on and not thought anymore about Linda.

What do you all think about this theory?

Does anyone know how Brandi is handling all of this? I feel really bad for her to be in this situation...

Are we sure we want to go there??
I feel horrible for Brandy. She needs our prayers.
Ok, as for your theory? It's hard to "be over" someone you never treated with love and respect and honor and i could go on and on and on...but like I said, are you sure you want to go there...

Posted by: Uncle Sam Aug 28 2006, 07:44 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Aug 28 2006, 06:37 PM)

Are we sure we want to go there??
I feel horrible for Brandy. She needs our prayers.
Ok, as for your theory? It's hard to "be over" someone you never treated with love and respect and honor and i could go on and on and on...but like I said, are you sure you want to go there...

Were things really NEVER good? Did he never treat her right? I mean they seemed so happy until all of this whole mess started. Were they both just acting? If so, that seems so sad to me.....

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 28 2006, 07:51 PM

QUOTE(Uncle Sam @ Aug 28 2006, 06:44 PM)

Were things really NEVER good? Did he never treat her right? I mean they seemed so happy until all of this whole mess started. Were they both just acting? If so, that seems so sad to me.....

All I can tell you, and this is from personal expirence as well; it's amazing what you can do for the sake of other people (the "ministry"). It's very easy to sacrifice when it's for the good of everyone else - all that needs to be done - work work work. So acting, no. I believe with all my heart, because I know Linda, that she loved her husband deeply. She is in more shock than most people will ever ever know over ALL OF THIS and more. Dan did treat her right at times, for who knows for what motive. Only God. There are many sad things in the world.

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Aug 28 2006, 09:06 PM

QUOTE(Uncle Sam @ Aug 28 2006, 08:32 PM)

I was talking to a friend of mine about this situation. She brought up some interesting ideas. She was saying it seems to her that Danny is not over Linda. If he were he would not have married someone so similar to Linda. Also, he would not be so obsessed about this whole situation. He would have just moved on and not thought anymore about Linda.

What do you all think about this theory?

Does anyone know how Brandi is handling all of this? I feel really bad for her to be in this situation...

I know a man that married a woman that looked JUST LIKE HIS EX-GIRLFRIEND.
Flattering? I guess so....
Errie for the "new" woman? Yeah....
Proves that they are not "over" the original women? - Maybe/maybe not....

sn

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 28 2006, 09:36 PM

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Aug 28 2006, 08:06 PM)

I know a man that married a woman that looked JUST LIKE HIS EX-GIRLFRIEND.
Flattering? I guess so....
Errie for the "new" woman? Yeah....
Proves that they are not "over" the original women? - Maybe/maybe not....

sn

He is more interested in a particular temperament and ability to control/conceal things. The similar looks are really not there in my opinion.

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Aug 28 2006, 09:40 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Aug 28 2006, 10:36 PM)

He is more interested in a particular temperament and ability to control/conceal things. The similar looks are really not there in my opinion.

I have to agree about the looks - I don't see a resemblance. As far as the control thing - absolutely!

Posted by: seraph|m Aug 28 2006, 10:03 PM

Feel sorry for someone who opted in? Feel sorry for one who made the choice to go into a relationship as a consenting adult... Nope, I'm not feelin it.

Posted by: princessdi Aug 28 2006, 10:16 PM

Now, I totally disagree about Linda and Brandy looking alike. However, you may have a point about Danny being so obsessed with "keeping" Linda quiet, and he activities. It doesn't jibe with the one Wh truly believes Linda did him so wrong, and has dealt with the pain and moved on. I know myself I have heard references made about Linda just the other week. I know If I were Brandy, I would not appreciate this obsession, but then I don't believe that Brandy is exactly an innocent in all this either.

QUOTE(Uncle Sam @ Aug 28 2006, 06:32 PM)

I was talking to a friend of mine about this situation. She brought up some interesting ideas. She was saying it seems to her that Danny is not over Linda. If he were he would not have married someone so similar to Linda. Also, he would not be so obsessed about this whole situation. He would have just moved on and not thought anymore about Linda.

What do you all think about this theory?

Does anyone know how Brandi is handling all of this? I feel really bad for her to be in this

situation...

Posted by: Brenda Aug 29 2006, 02:02 AM

I once heard that great authority Dr Phil say that you know you are ready for divorce when you have NO feelings at all for the soon-to-be-ex. No love, no hate, no anger, no resentment, those things should be dealt with before going through a divorce.

Interesting advice - which would seem not to have been the way the Shelton divorce occurred.

Posted by: Uncle Sam Aug 29 2006, 07:27 AM

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Aug 28 2006, 08:40 PM)

I have to agree about the looks - I don't see a resemblance. As far as the control thing - absolutely!

She did not mean that they looked alike. They were both divorced with 2 small children, new to the aith, they both sing etc.....

Posted by: princessdi Aug 29 2006, 08:47 AM

Ahhhh yes Sam. That is a very troubling similarity. Not to minimize the recent charge of inappropriate behavior, we know for sure that Danny is able to "distance" himself from step children very easily, as he did with Linda's son. He basically acts as if he doesn't exist, and he was with this boy 20 years. As a older(not a word Steve or Kevin), how a man treats any family, especially any children he has sired and/or parented or not, is key to my involvement with him. It is a indication of his charater.

QUOTE(Uncle Sam @ Aug 29 2006, 06:27 AM)

She did not mean that they looked alike. They were both divorced with 2 small children, new to the faith, they both sing etc.....

Posted by: no_cults Aug 29 2006, 02:31 PM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Aug 28 2006, 11:16 PM)

Now, I totally disagree about Linda and Brandy looking alike. However, you may have a point about Danny being so obsessed with "keeping" Linda quiet, and he activities. It doesn't jibe with the one Wh truly believes Linda did him so wrong, and has dealt with the pain and moved on. I know myself

> I have heard references made about Linda just the other week. I know If I were Brandy, I would not appreciate this obsession, but then I don't believe that Brandy is exactly an innocent in all this either.

Why would you not believe Brandy is innocent? She met Danny after he divorce and subsequently married him.

Are you saying she is not innocent due to the fact that Danny may not have had Biblical Grounds for divorce?

Posted by: princessdi Aug 29 2006, 02:43 PM

Why would you not believe Brandy is innocent? She met Danny after the divorce and subsequently married him.

Because I truly believe she predates Linda's departure period. I think she came some years before her departure. In fact, since Danny even had teh nerve to accuse Linda of a fictional sin, I have been waiting for the other shoe to drop. I have said from the beginning, he was having a mid-life crisis and he should have just bought a sports car. Danny is no different than any other middle-aged man who wanted to toss his wife for a younger model. They rarely end the one relationship before beginning the next. They usually run concurrent, most often without the wife's knowledge. Danny had just one complication, he was the head of a telelvision network that claimed to be the leader in christian living and a member of a church who rules say the biblical grounds for divorce were adutlery ONLY. Brandy is no different from any other woman who got caught dating a married man. **Now this is all from the Book of Princess, so I just put it out there as my opinion, and gut feeling**.

Are you saying she is not innocent due to the fact that Danny may not have had Biblical Grounds for divorce?

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Aug 29 2006, 03:27 PM

> **QUOTE(no_cults @ Aug 29 2006, 03:31 PM)**
>
> Why would you not believe Brandy is innocent? She met Danny after the divorce and subsequently married him.
> Are you saying she is not innocent due to the fact that Danny may not have had Biblical Grounds for divorce?

You need to do some more digging in the posts...but I'll give you a heads up.

Dan knew Brandi years...and years...and years before.

Only after getting Brandi groomed - you know - new style of hair, clothing, makeup - was she put in the spotlight.

Posted by: princessdi Aug 29 2006, 03:32 PM

Come on now HOTY!!! Somebeody is actually there doing hair and makeup for those people?

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Aug 29 2006, 02:27 PM)

You need to do some more digging in the posts...but I'll give you a heads up.

Dan knew Brandi years...and years...and years before.

Only after getting Brandi groomed - you know - new style of hair, clothing, makeup - was she put in the spotlight.

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Aug 29 2006, 03:37 PM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Aug 29 2006, 04:32 PM)

Come on now HOTY!!! Somebeody is actually there doing hair and makeup for those people?

No - let me rephrase -

Brandi was - how should I say it - less than what many would accept a modest lady married to Dan Shelton to look like. So, months before they were married, Brandi got a makeover - you know- to look more of the part. One could say she was whipped into shape.

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 29 2006, 03:44 PM

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Aug 29 2006, 02:37 PM)

No - let me rephrase -

Brandi was - how should I say it - less than what many would accept a modest lady married to Dan Shelton to look like. So, months before they were married, Brandi got a makeover - you know- to look more of the part. One could say she was whipped into shape.

That fits. I believe you. b

Posted by: princessdi Aug 29 2006, 04:32 PM

Ahhhhhh! So she was already looking the part when she *happened* into T'ville without a pot or a window?

> **QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Aug 29 2006, 02:37 PM)**
>
> No - let me rephrase -
>
> Brandi was - how should I say it - less than what many would accept a modest lady married to Dan Shelton to look like. So, months before they were married, Brandi got a makeover - you know- to look more of the part. One could say she was whipped into shape.

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Aug 29 2006, 05:01 PM

> **QUOTE(princessdi @ Aug 29 2006, 05:32 PM)**
>
> Ahhhhhh! So she was already looking the part when she *happened* into T'ville without a pot or a window?

I didn't say that -

Dan tried to pass her off as an employee - who moved around... a lot! Her makeover came later...

Posted by: PaperTigers Aug 29 2006, 06:15 PM

> **QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Aug 29 2006, 07:01 PM)**
>
> I didn't say that -
>
> Dan ***tried*** to pass her off as an employee - who moved around... a lot! Her makeover came later...

I do believe that ***tried*** is the operative word ...
I know myself and several others who saw right through it to begin with....
it just didn't sit right....

Posted by: princessdi Aug 29 2006, 06:33 PM

No, he didn't?

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Aug 29 2006, 04:01 PM)

I didn't say that -

Dan tried to pass her off as an employee - who moved around... a lot! Her makeover came later...

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Aug 29 2006, 07:13 PM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Aug 29 2006, 07:33 PM)

No, he didn't?

I may have missed a step or two but she basically started out in the Call Center and was moved to the reception desk which was even shorter than her time at the Call Center. Then worked in Production for about a week and then disappeared - but I bet she still draws a weekly salary - just like Melody...

Posted by: princessdi Aug 29 2006, 07:17 PM

....Ok, and who was that askin' why I was saying Brandy was not an innocent in this?

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Aug 29 2006, 05:13 PM)

I may have missed a step or two but she basically started out in the Call Center and was moved to the reception desk which was even shorter than her time at the Call Center. Then worked in Production for about a week and then disappeared - but I bet she still draws a weekly salary - just like Melody...

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Aug 29 2006, 07:24 PM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Aug 29 2006, 08:17 PM)

....Ok, and who was that askin' why I was saying Brandy was not an innocent in this?

You know - aside from everything else. Brandy is an extremely nice person.

I don't think she realized what she was getting into. Of her faults - naitivity is probably numero uno.

Posted by: princessdi Aug 29 2006, 07:29 PM

HOTY, some very nice women, just want a man.....and yes they do get caught up and don't make the best choices. Now, this may also account for one of the reasons Danny is insisting on pushing th adultery thing with Linda. You are not the first person who has said this about Brandy.

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Aug 29 2006, 06:24 PM)

You know - aside from everything else. Brandy is an extremely nice person.

I don't think she realized what she was getting into. Of her faults - naitivity is probably numero uno.

Posted by: inga Aug 29 2006, 07:52 PM

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Aug 29 2006, 08:24 PM)

You know - aside from everything else. Brandy is an extremely nice person.

I don't think she realized what she was getting into. Of her faults - naitivity is probably numero uno.

From what I've read about Brandy, I imagine her fitting the profile of a young woman I knew in my youth. She was fairly attractive, dressed provocatively, was nearly always surrounded by men, but was always sweet and nice to the girls as well as the boys, even though the girls looked at her a little askance. She always spoke very softly, fluttered her eye lashes a lot, no matter who she was talking to. ... I think she was looking for love but didn't know how to connect in a meaningful way with the girls. She also seemed naive. I have no idea what happened to her, but I can imagine her finding "love" with the wrong men. Seeing that Brandy was already divorced twice, that may be her story ...

Now that I have more experience in life, I tend to suspect something not quite right in the family history ... possibly even molestation ... and that reminds me ...

I still vividly remember a seminar in which a former victim of abuse was the featured speaker. Her chief point was that abusers know who to pick as victims. She used to draw abusers like a magnet, and she shared how it was still hard for her to speak in front of people. She had had to reinvent

herself, learning how to walk differently, carry herself differently, look people in the eye, etc. Without such "reinvention," those who have been abused by one lover/husband, will likely be abused by the next one, because they will draw the wrong men. And I suspect that most of you who are a little older have actually observed such a pattern ...

HOTY's comment that naivete is probably Brandy's chief fault seems to indicate that she may be a "pleaser" (i.e. is "nice" to everyone and wants to make everyone happy/think well of her) and an abuser would see her as a suitable subject ...

I also wonder whether Linda was originally a bit of a "pleaser" but developed into a mature woman with a mind of her own ...

Just musings ...

Posted by: princessdi Aug 29 2006, 08:03 PM

I understand, completely.

QUOTE(inga @ Aug 29 2006, 06:52 PM)

From what I've read about Brandy, I imagine her fitting the profile of a young woman I knew in my youth. She was fairly attractive, dressed provocatively, was nearly always surrounded by men, but was always sweet and nice to the girls as well as the boys, even though the girls looked at her a little askance. She always spoke very softly, fluttered her eye lashes a lot, no matter who she was talking to. ... I think she was looking for love but didn't know how to connect in a meaningful way with the girls. She also seemed naive. I have no idea what happened to her, but I can imagine her finding "love" with the wrong men. Seeing that Brandy was already divorced twice, that may be her story ...

Now that I have more experience in life, I tend to suspect something not quite right in the family history ... possibly even molestation ... and that reminds me ...

I still vividly remember a seminar in which a former victim of abuse was the featured speaker. Her chief point was that abusers know who to pick as victims. She used to draw abusers like a magnet, and she shared how it was still hard for her to speak in front of people. She had had to reinvent herself, learning how to walk differently, carry herself differently, look people in the eye, etc. Without such "reinvention," those who have been abused by one lover/husband, will likely be abused by the next one, because they will draw the wrong men. And I suspect that most of you who are a little older have actually observed such a pattern ...

HOTY's comment that naivete is probably Brandy's chief fault seems to indicate that she may be a "pleaser" (i.e. is "nice" to everyone and wants to make everyone happy/think well of her) and an abuser would see her as a suitable subject ...

I also wonder whether Linda was originally a bit of a "pleaser" but developed into a mature woman with a mind of her own ...

Just musings ...

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Aug 29 2006, 08:18 PM

QUOTE(inga @ Aug 29 2006, 08:52 PM)

From what I've read about Brandy, I imagine her fitting the profile of a young woman I knew in my youth. She was fairly attractive, dressed provocatively, was nearly always surrounded by men, but was always sweet and nice to the girls as well as the boys, even though the girls looked at her a little askance. She always spoke very softly, fluttered her eye lashes a lot, no matter who she was talking to. ... I think she was looking for love but didn't know how to connect in a meaningful way with the girls. She also seemed naive. I have no idea what happened to her, but I can imagine her finding "love" with the wrong men. Seeing that Brandy was already divorced twice, that may be her story ...

Now that I have more experience in life, I tend to suspect something not quite right in the family history ... possibly even molestation ... and that reminds me ...

I still vividly remember a seminar in which a former victim of abuse was the featured speaker. Her chief point was that abusers know who to pick as victims. She used to draw abusers like a magnet, and she shared how it was still hard for her to speak in front of people. She had had to reinvent herself, learning how to walk differently, carry herself differently, look people in the eye, etc. Without such "reinvention," those who have been abused by one lover/husband, will likely be abused by the next one, because they will draw the wrong men. And I suspect that most of you who are a little older have actually observed such a pattern ...

HOTY's comment that naivete is probably Brandy's chief fault seems to indicate that she may be a "pleaser" (i.e. is "nice" to everyone and wants to make everyone happy/think well of her) and an abuser would see her as a suitable subject ...

I also wonder whether Linda was originally a bit of a "pleaser" but developed into a mature woman with a mind of her own ...

Just musings ...

Inga,
I must say that I hadn't thought of these things. But you definitely have a point. Brandy definitely fits into the pleaser category. It's difficult to say, and I may get some negative feedback, but she really seems genuine.

(Abusers of any kind pick and choose their victims.)

Posted by: inga Aug 29 2006, 09:24 PM

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Aug 29 2006, 09:18 PM)

Inga,
I must say that I hadn't thought of these things. But you definitely have a point. Brandy definitely fits into the pleaser category. It's difficult to say, and I may get some negative feedback, but she really seems genuine.

(Abusers of any kind pick and choose their victims.)

There's no reason Brandy should not be genuine -- even after two divorces.

Let's assume that she knew she was getting involved with a married man--something we do not know. In that case, she would be meeting *his* needs, as far as she felt -- needs his wife could not fulfill. (Poor Danny!) I think you probably know the spiel ...

Women who do not have a good foundation of a strong sense of *self* do not have the tools to cope with men like Danny.

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Aug 29 2006, 09:31 PM

QUOTE(inga @ Aug 29 2006, 10:24 PM)

There's no reason Brandy should not be genuine -- even after two divorces.

Let's assume that she knew she was getting involved with a married man--something we do not know. In that case, she would be meeting *his* needs, as far as she felt -- needs his wife could not fulfill. (Poor Danny!) I think you probably know the spiel ...

Women who do not have a good foundation of a strong sense of *self* do not have the tools to cope with men like Danny.

I couldn't agree more. It is hard enough with any man - but especially those like...

Posted by: princessdi Aug 29 2006, 09:55 PM

Ok, Inga, Danny is not Joe Blow off the street. He was on the TV with his wife each and every day for pretty close to 20 years. She could only not know if she was living under a rock. Yes, that be the "story " allmen tella bout their wives....."she just doesnt' understand me", etc.

QUOTE(inga @ Aug 29 2006, 08:24 PM)

There's no reason Brandy should not be genuine -- even after two divorces.

Let's assume that she knew she was getting involved with a married man--something we do not know. In that case, she would be meeting *his* needs, as far as she felt -- needs his wife could not fulfill. (Poor Danny!) I think you probably know the spiel ...

Women who do not have a good foundation of a strong sense of *self* do not have the tools to cope with men like Danny.

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 29 2006, 10:09 PM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Aug 29 2006, 08:55 PM)

> Ok, Inga, Danny is not Joe Blow off the street. He was on the TV with his wife each and every day for pretty close to 20 years. She could only not know if she was living under a rock. Yes, that be the "story " allmen tella bout their wives....."she just doesnt' understand me", etc.

)i, how'd you get to be so smart? 

Posted by: beartrap Aug 29 2006, 11:31 PM

> **QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Aug 29 2006, 08:13 PM)**
>
> ...but I bet she still draws a weekly salary - just like Melody...

\ person might ask Cheri Peters where that salary was funneled through. She might know.

Posted by: inga Aug 30 2006, 01:19 AM

> **QUOTE(princessdi @ Aug 29 2006, 10:55 PM)**
>
> Ok, Inga, Danny is not Joe Blow off the street. He was on the TV with his wife each and every day for pretty close to 20 years. She could only not know if she was living under a rock.

was being charitable in not assuming for sure that she was involved with him while he was still narried.

> **QUOTE**
>
> Yes, that be the "story " allmen tella bout their wives....."she just doesnt' understand me", etc.

'up ... and the sad thing is that many, if not most, women who hear them believe them! 

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Aug 30 2006, 05:05 AM

> **QUOTE(beartrap @ Aug 30 2006, 12:31 AM)**
>
> A person might ask Cheri Peters where that salary was funneled through. She might know.

ımmm, interesting.

'his is something new...

+ow is Cheri involved?

Posted by: justme Aug 31 2006, 06:08 PM

Is Danny over Linda???
Consider this. When Danny kicked Linda our of 3ABN he was quoted as as saying "the president no longer wants the vice president". It doesn't mean he is over Linda.
Is it possible that he simply wanted to change "partners" and still keep control over Linda. To say he is OVER Linda would imply that he no longer lover her.
To some people who have so much power, it is impossible to truly love anyone else as we think of love. The many types of love could include the kind of love that you have when you love chocolate ice cream. The kind of love you feel when you feel loved. The kind of love that you have when you are feeling erotic. The kind of love you feel when you have just finished giving a great performance. The kind of love that one may feel when one has total control of another life.
Danny would not likely be "over Linda" in term of having lost his affection for her and having it replaced by Brandy's love. Most commonly people of power, men or women, love the feeling of having the attentions and affections of BOTH the current and the former interest.
When one of the no longer "bows to the power" or "surrenders to the dictator" that one is kicked aside. But the one in power never "gets over it".
To the one in power there is never an excuse for not surrendering to the power.
To be "Over Linda" in term of marital loyalty and Godly love" it has to first exist in reality before it can even qualify as something to be "Over".
The kind of love Jesus spoke of is "Husbands love you wives as God loves His church". Total single-minded love, self sacrificing love, love with an eye singly given to Hid bride, as if there is not another in the whole world. Did that exist in his heart for Linda?
What part of his love for Linda is Danny supposed to get over?
If he truly was over Linda, he would let her speak her mind. Open her heart. He would let have her very own ministry with his total blessing. By the very act of having slandered her he proved he is not over her.
What he lost when Linda was gone, he is trying to replace by using Brandy. Someone to submit, to yield, to bow in obeisance.
To get over Linda means that he is no longer bothered by the fact that he was called into question over her dismissal. Everything about Linda will haunt him continually.
Find someone just like Linda? Yup. If possible. He wants more of the same soft spirit, some musical ability, common interests, an attitude of submission, .. for as long as he can have it.
When she starts to think for herself, he feels threatened. If she doesn't cower under his temper she will be replaced as well. It is not the person he loves, it is the feeling of power that she makes him feel. He loves the feeling that he feels when someone makes him feel the fantasys he has inside.
When one cannot see himself as others see him he is called a "psychopath", I think...
When one thinks that he has no responsibility for other people, he is a "sociopath", right .. someone help me with this ..
When someone thinks the world is talking behind his back he is a "neurotic", right?
Do we see any of these things in the "Televangelist".

I expect that the flood gates will soon open and Linda will be seen as truthful all along the way.

Someone look at the latest CD by Linda and notice that it has an insert that says something to the effect that, "I dedicate this CD to my blessed husband, Danny, who has made this possible. Thank you my dear husband. I love you."
Does that sound like a woman in search of another? Not in the least.

Someone find it an give us the exact quote. (to think of the stories he made up about her during the time she was making this CD, dedicated to her husband, Danny). It'll send chills up your spine.

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Aug 31 2006, 06:13 PM

It is
"To my husband...
bless you
thank you
love you

Linda"

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 31 2006, 06:24 PM

QUOTE(justme @ Aug 31 2006, 05:08 PM)

Is Danny over Linda???
Consider this. When Danny kicked Linda our of 3ABN he was quoted as as saying "the president no longer wants the vice president". It doesn't mean he is over Linda.
Is it possible that he simply wanted to change "partners" and still keep control over Linda. To say he is OVER Linda would imply that he no longer lover her.
To some people who have so much power, it is impossible to truly love anyone else as we think of love. The many types of love could include the kind of love that you have when you love chocolate ice cream. The kind of love you feel when you feel loved. The kind of love that you have when you are feeling erotic. The kind of love you feel when you have just finished giving a great performance. The kind of love that one may feel when one has total control of another life.
Danny would not likely be "over Linda" in term of having lost his affection for her and having it replaced by Brandy's love. Most commonly people of power, men or women, love the feeling of having the attentions and affections of BOTH the current and the former interest.
When one of the no longer "bows to the power" or "surrenders to the dictator" that one is kicked aside. But the one in power never "gets over it".
To the one in power there is never an excuse for not surrendering to the power.
To be "Over Linda" in term of marital loyalty and Godly love" it has to first exist in reality before it can even qualify as something to be "Over".
The kind of love Jesus spoke of is "Husbands love you wives as God loves His church". Total single-minded love, self sacrificing love, love with an eye singly given to Hid bride, as if there is not another in the whole world. Did that exist in his heart for Linda?
What part of his love for Linda is Danny supposed to get over?
If he truly was over Linda, he would let her speak her mind. Open her heart. He would let have her very own ministry with his total blessing. By the very act of having slandered her he proved he is not over her.
What he lost when Linda was gone, he is trying to replace by using Brandy. Someone to submit, to yield, to bow in obeisance.
To get over Linda means that he is no longer bothered by the fact that he was called into question over her dismissal. Everything about Linda will haunt him continually.
Find someone just like Linda? Yup. If possible. He wants more of the same soft spirit, some musical ability, common interests, an attitude of submission, .. for as long as he can have it. When she starts to think for herself, he feels threatened. If she doesn't cower under his temper she will be replaced as well. It is not the person he loves, it is the feeling of power that she makes him feel. He loves the feeling that he feels when someone makes him feel the fantasys he has inside.
When one cannot see himself as others see him he is called a "psychopath", I think...
When one thinks that he has no responsibility for other people, he is a "sociopath", right .. someone help me with this ..
When someone thinks the world is talking behind his back he is a "neurotic", right?
Do we see any of these things in the "Televangelist".

I expect that the flood gates will soon open and Linda will be seen as truthful all along the way.

> Someone look at the latest CD by Linda and notice that it has an insert that says something to the effect that, "I dedicate this CD to my blessed husband, Danny, who has made this possible. Thank you my dear husband. I love you."
> Does that sound like a woman in search of another? Not in the least.
>
> Someone find it an give us the exact quote. (to think of the stories he made up about her during the time she was making this CD, dedicated to her husband, Danny). It'll send chills up your spine.

Heart breaking. Linda and I talked about this the other day - about if he ever really loved her. It is so sad. She has learned so many things about the man she thought she knew....her heart is truly broken, in many ways, and seems the more she learns, the more it breaks in shock and of feeling foolish at the same time. Things she says like "how could I have not known?" so many times over and over....

It makes me cry (really, I am teared up) to feel her pain. But, she is so much more then people know. She feels christs love and pity for him still - hoping that he will respond to God one day, repent and be forgiven. She has forgiven him, but also as she learns more (she has such a childlike naiveness to herself, I know, I have said this before, but it just amazes me), and feels the emotions of frustration and hurt, she also moves quickly to the stance of Jesus. As though Jesus is holding her hand and pulling her on down the path, for she doesn't resist His leading. She is very connected and I see Jesus living through her in each instance of 'love' she shows still with regard to Dan. Not the kind a wife has for a husband, for that is ruined and all trust is gone, but the kind the Jesus has for those that are lost and have hurt Him, meaning to and not meaning to. She is human, makes mistakes like we all do, but her walk with the Lord has inspired me so much, for I see it carry her through each step & each day of his mess. She has learned many things I think, we all can learn from this mess. But mostly, she is keeping her eye on the future and the saviors coming.

P.S. It will be interesting to see what her next CD is about, and who it's dedicated to.

Posted by: justme Aug 31 2006, 07:15 PM

h o y , thank you. I new it was something like that. I haven't seen it for along time. After I made my mp3's of it I lost track of it.

Sonshine you hit it right on the nose! Linda is a real person. Unsophisticated, humble, human, sweet as they come, kinda "precious". Last time I talked with her she had nothing bad to say about the man who she used to call "husband" (German for 'house-band'), the one whom God designates to "bind together the home". She felt sorry for his chronic neck pain all these years. She wants him to learn to know the real Jesus personally.
I have been rough an him sometimes, from a man's point of view. A man, a real man, protects his woman!
Linda is a one-of-a-kind in my book. She doesn't want to be elevated over anyone else because of her fame, or because of her music, or because of her teaching and sharing. She is who she IS! And she IS A Precious Lady!
EVeryone of us had been "duped" by someone before and i with the heavy schedules they had in their work, there was very little time to "be alone" and
Together" as a couple in love. Most of what they did and who they were was wrapped up in travelling, speaking, producing, directing, busy busy busy. It's hard to be aware of all the nuances that are around them all the time.
Let's all pray that "he" will come to his senses and repent and ask for God's forgiveness and forsake his ways, surrender his will to God, become humble, and submissive to God.
Linda still loves him as God loves him. That's the least we can do for her sake.

Posted by: princessdi Aug 31 2006, 09:49 PM

I was being charitable in not assuming for sure that she was involved with him while he was still married.

That was very nice of you, too, Inga!

Yup ... and the sad thing is that many, if not most, women who hear them believe them!

OK? You know I would slap all the taste out of some man's mouth if he even tried to form his lips to tell that lie. Ooops! Did I say that out loud? Had to go sista' gurl on that one!

Posted by: inga Aug 31 2006, 11:33 PM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Aug 31 2006, 10:49 PM)

I was being charitable in not assuming for sure that she was involved with him while he was still married.

That was very nice of you, too, Inga!

Yup ... and the sad thing is that many, if not most, women who hear them believe them!

OK? You know I would slap all the taste out of some man's mouth if he even tried to form his lips to tell that lie. Ooops! Did I say that out loud? Had to go sista' gurl on that one!

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Sep 1 2006, 09:52 AM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Aug 31 2006, 10:49 PM)

OK? You know I would slap all the taste out of some man's mouth if he even tried to form his lips to tell that lie. Ooops! Did I say that out loud? Had to go sista' gurl on that one!

thats

Posted by: Hersheys99 Sep 1 2006, 11:30 AM

QUOTE

QUOTE(princessdi @ Aug 31 2006, 10:49 PM) *

OK? You know I would slap all the taste out of some man's mouth if he even tried to form his lips to tell that lie. Ooops! Did I say that out loud? Had to go sista' gurl on that one!

[x] rofl

Posted by: jodi Sep 6 2006, 11:10 PM

Just a little food for thought....Brandi's second divorce was in 1999. She has two children, ages 12 and 6. Do the math~~~her second was out of wedlock and some have commented on how this child resembles Danny.

Danny and Linda have been divorced two years. It would seem that Danny and Brandi have been involved for some time, long before her 'employment' at 3ABN.

I was married to a man that had numerous affairs during our 16 year marriage and people like Danny don't give up one woman until they have another firmly in place!! The signs were there all along and I told Linda all she had to do was to wait and see who the woman was. It didn't take long, did it?

I don't believe for one moment that Brandi is innocent in all of this. Young and dumb maybe, but not innocent. Can't be, with two marriages and divorces in her history!!

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Sep 7 2006, 06:02 AM

QUOTE(jodi @ Sep 7 2006, 12:10 AM)

Just a little food for thought....Brandi's second divorce was in 1999. She has two children, ages 12 and 6. Do the math~~~her second was out of wedlock and some have commented on how this child resembles Danny.

I know that I am not a mathmetician here, but it seems that if she were pregnant in 99, had the child in 2000, that it is not illogical for the child, in fact, to be 6 years old is it?

Posted by: lurker Sep 7 2006, 06:52 AM

The divorce for her **first** marriage was in 1999. She remarried in 2000. I have pm'd Jodi and husbandoftheyear with more details.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Sep 7 2006, 08:58 AM

QUOTE(jodi @ Sep 7 2006, 12:10 AM)

Just a little food for thought....Brandi's second divorce was in 1999. She has two children, ages 12 and 6. Do the math~~~her second was out of wedlock and some have commented on how this child resembles Danny.

Danny and Linda have been divorced two years. It would seem that Danny and Brandi have been involved for some time, long before her 'employment' at 3ABN.

How do you make this jump in logic? Danny and Linda have been apart for two years (I am assuming it is around this amount of time, maybe slightly longer). Brandy's chlidren are 12 and 6, meaning that at the time of the original seperation the youngest was 4. Now if your logic holds, that means that Danny and Brandy were in contact at least five years prior (at the least four years and nine months). Your logic doesn't stand. Simply because someone says that an individual looks like someone else is no way to go about presenting truth and fact.

The only way that this could be presented as anything other than mere speculaton based on not much at all would be a DNA test. So since that isn't going to happen this notion needs to "stricken from the record" in an effort to only present that which is provable.

- fhb

Posted by: Denny Sep 7 2006, 09:27 AM

Just as we do not want to speculate about what happened to the first Mrs Shelton we should not speculate about who fathered Brandy's children. Unlike the Shelton marriage breakdown none of these things can be confirmed here. Looking like someone means nothing I look like plenty of people and are related to none of them.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Sep 7 2006, 11:40 AM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 7 2006, 09:58 AM)

Now if your logic holds, that means that Danny and Brandy were in contact at least five years prior (at the least four years and nine months). Your logic doesn't stand.

The only way that this could be presented as anything other than mere speculaton based on not much at all would be a DNA test.
- fhb

First, two points about your statement:

1. Sometime back, someone stated that Brandy had been to 3ABN with her parents, as a child, and had sung at 3ABN. They said that Danny has known Brandy's family for many years.

2. I was just looking at the birth certificate of someone in my family. It lists **both** the father and the

mother. Both parents of the baby were at the hospital when the baby was born and filled out the information for the birth certificate at that time. Since I can read, I did not need a DNA test to figure out who the parents were.

Now, on to something else that needs to be repeated.

With time, most things come out in the wash, one way or the other.

My personal opinion is that men dump their wives for younger women every day of the week. It is so commonplace that it doesn't even qualify for debate. Most people are not going to stop and analyze things every time they see a Grandpa with a Prom Queen and try to put it into terms of Predicate or Propositional Logic. Their day just isn't long enough for that.

The stories put out by 3ABN about "spiritual adultery" were just plain foolish. Naturally, this left everyone on their own to speculate as to what really happened. And that's what is logical.

By making serious charges, and then refusing to present their "unquestionable" evidence in any reasonable way, 3ABN clearly lost in the court of public opinion.

If 3ABN makes continuing commentary on television, they better be able to back it up. And 3ABN seems totally unable to do that. So, telling people that their "logic doesn't stand" is rather pointless at this late date. It's a public relations disaster for 3ABN, any way you look at it.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Sep 7 2006, 11:57 AM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 7 2006, 12:40 PM)

First, two points about your statement:

1. Sometime back, someone stated that Brandy had been to 3ABN with her parents, as a child, and had sung at 3ABN. They said that Danny has known Brandy's family for many years.

2. I was just looking at the birth certificate of someone in my family. It lists **both** the father and the mother. Both parents of the baby were at the hospital when the baby was born and filled out the information for the birth certificate at that time. Since I can read, I did not need a DNA test to figure out who the parents were.

There are individuals that I have meet throughout the years who I have had no more contact with, accidentally ran into later on. Simply the meeting of the family is not substantial enough to speculate that because of the one time meeting there was a later intimate relationship. That is far to weak to stand on.

An adopted child's birth certificate has the names of the adoptive parents on it. There isn't a second one that contains the biological parents names on it for obvious legal reasons. You are correct that a DNA test isn't the only way to determine paternity - however it is rather definitive and carry's more wieght than a birth certificate that could be forged, altered after the fact, etc.

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 7 2006, 12:40 PM)

Now, on to something else that needs to be repeated.

> By making serious charges, and then refusing to present their "unquestionable" evidence in any reasonable way, 3ABN clearly lost in the court of public opinion.
>
> If 3ABN makes continuing commentary on television, they better be able to back it up. And 3ABN seems totally unable to do that. So, telling people that their "logic doesn't stand" is rather pointless at this late date. It's a public relations disaster for 3ABN, any way you look at it.

The reason for making the statement that the logic doesn't cut it is based on my position that in a situation like this if you have a "side", you stand a much greater chance of proving it's veracity if you stick to what "IS", meaning you have the evidence in hand and it is indisputable. The post I responded to was only speculative at best. Thus for those who have come into this flow of imformation late myself included) I think the point I make isn't pointless.

Your comment that 3ABN doesn't seem to be able to back up their claims does have a flip side. Maybe they do have it and do not want to add to anyone elses pain or embarassment. (I know that this line will get jumped on, so let me be proactive here and say I am not advocating one side over the other just making the common sense observation that there is a plausible alternative)

I would agree that the continual defensive approach taken by some of the individuals at 3ABN does create a perception that is damaging from a PR perspective. If in fact they do have "evidence to convict" and are choosing to take the high road and not embarass Linda further - they should at the very least ignore the opposition against them so as not to create the perception that they are trying to hide something - but to date they haven't.

fhb

Posted by: inga Sep 7 2006, 12:21 PM

> **QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 7 2006, 12:57 PM)** ☐
>
> Your comment that 3ABN doesn't seem to be able to back up their claims does have a flip side. Maybe they do have it and do not want to add to anyone elses pain or embarassment. (I know that this line will get jumped on, so let me be proactive here and say I am not advocating one side over the other just making the common sense observation that there is a plausible alternative)
>
> I would agree that the continual defensive approach taken by some of the individuals at 3ABN does create a perception that is damaging from a PR perspective. If in fact they do have "evidence to convict" and are choosing to take the high road and not embarass Linda further - they should at the very least ignore the opposition against them so as not to create the perception that they are trying to hide something - but to date they haven't.

I know Dan & cohorts are arguing that they are taking the "high road." However, that argument utterly fails because the direct statements and continuing insinuations do more damage than revealing the worst that Linda could possibly have done.

What is the most incriminating evidence they possibly could have? Is it a video of Linda committing adultery? Is it a recording of Linda's confession of committing adultery? Is it someone else's confession of committing adultery with Linda? Would the revealing of any of this evidence do Linda more damage than what the statements and insinuations have done/are doing?

3ABN is definitely taking the **lowest** road by their practice! The "high road" would have been to make

no statements re Linda's "guilt" in the matter and allow her to leave over "personal differences" or whatever ...

If Linda is so guilty, why was she coerced into signing a gag order? Is that a "high road"?

What is so damaging about the 3ABN approach is that, without concrete evidence, folks **do** imagine the worst. After all, Danny is "God's chosen messenger," right? And he can do no wrong. And it is likely that's precisel why we see no more specific statements from 3ABN than we have. They know that human nature will imagine the worst -- worse than anything Linda is likely to have done even if she is "guilty."

That "high-road" argument just doesn't hold water!

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Sep 7 2006, 12:44 PM

> **QUOTE(inga @ Sep 7 2006, 01:21 PM)**
>
> If Linda is so guilty, why was she coerced into signing a gag order? Is that a "high road"?

Okay, for arguments sake I will respond to this one. If Linda is/was guilty as charged it is entirely possible that she would have still wanted to stay a part of the organization. If she did want to stay and wouldn not "leave over personal/creative/spiritual differences" (which ever word you want to use) then she would be perceived as a potentially hostile/disgruntled employee who could spread slanderous lies and rumors about the organization. Kind of like, "If I can't have it, then I will make sure no one else does either." If this was the perception then any organization would have required a gag order, no compete clause, etc.

> **QUOTE(inga @ Sep 7 2006, 01:21 PM)**
>
> What is so damaging about the 3ABN approach is that, without concrete evidence, folks **do** imagine the worst. After all, Danny is "God's chosen messenger," right? And he can do no wrong. And it is likely that's precisel why we see no more specific statements from 3ABN than we have. They know that human nature will imagine the worst -- worse than anything Linda is likely to have done even if she is "guilty."
>
> That "high-road" argument just doesn't hold water!

I have begun to ask individuals, those who would have some frame of reference (because there are those in the church who really do not know much more about 3ABN then it is a telelvision station), if they would classify Danny as "the face of Adventism" or "God's chosen messenger." Almost to a person they do not see either one as reflecting their perception of Danny. Needless to say they would not, then, think that he could "do no wrong." I think the perception here that Danny is the "grand pubah" of Adventism might only exist here. Most of the people I talked to reference shows other than 3ABN Live, which is the scheduling venue you would most like see Danny in. If I were to assign priority of importance of the individuals mentioned by those who shared their thoughts with me, Doug Bachelor and Shaun Boonstra (sp?) garner much more mention than Danny. Next would come many of the individuals who do the cooking shows.

There may very well have been intent to take a high road approach (again common sense has to admit this is plausible), imperfect humans who at times get exasperated and "hot under the collar" do not adhere to their original plan. It is tough to say since none of us were there when this was

discussed and decided on. High road or not, there are two sides to the coin, the story, and to understand it one must allow for the possibility that what was once accepted as truth in the end may not be such.

- fhb

Posted by: princessdi Sep 7 2006, 01:18 PM

.....and is or will be 7.....I work in finance.....

This is why we are going to leave this type of speculation alone. The children, whom ever they belong to are defintiely innocent in all of this. We are sticking to the events at 3ABN.

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Sep 7 2006, 05:02 AM)

I know that I am not a mathmetician here, but it seems that if she were pregnant in 99, had the child in 2000, that it is not illogical for the child, in fact, to be 6 years old is it?

Posted by: calvin Sep 7 2006, 01:31 PM

Yep, leave this Speculation alone folks.

Posted by: sonshineonme Sep 7 2006, 05:55 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 7 2006, 11:44 AM)

I have begun to ask individuals, those who would have some frame of reference (because there are those in the church who really do not know much more about 3ABN then it is a telelvision station), if they would classify Danny as "the face of Adventism" or "God's chosen messenger." Almost to a person they do not see either one as reflecting their perception of Danny. Needless to say they would not, then, think that he could "do no wrong." I think the perception here that Danny is the "grand pubah" of Adventism might only exist here. Most of the people I talked to reference shows other than 3ABN Live, which is the scheduling venue you would most like see Danny in. If I were to assign priority of importance of the individuals mentioned by those who shared their thoughts with me, Doug Bachelor and Shaun Boonstra (sp?) garner much more mention than Danny. Next would come many of the individuals who do the cooking shows.
- fhb

I too have talked to individuals - not planning to, but more of a happen to have it come up type thing, and I think I have talked about this in another post - but very different types of people, both react to Dan the same "what? Are you kidding, he is choosen by God, after all, LOOK at him, he is there - HE started this minstry and HE is STILL there..." (yes in quote but mostly my paraphrase, as they were two diff people). I was in shock as the conversation in one was only about "what if's" as in, what if things are not as they appear to be - what if Dan is not being straight about things...what I have seen is people's knee-jerk reaction to DAN being "he's a saint" more or less. This disturbed me

deeply, and has ever sense. I realize that I will have to have the court documents to put in front of their face and then HOPE they will accept what they see then, because what I see now is that people DO see him as a saint - choosen by God. Again, very different people, don't know each other, live in the same enviornments, or even the same age. It terrifed me to think that what I was seeing before my eyes was WORSHIP of a person. Like it or not, that is what it is. People have been set up and don't see it. Yes, there are others like Boonstra, Batchelor, and we should all be careful to keep it clear in our minds they are ONLY men. Human and sinful, as are we all. It's a striking lesson to learn that someone you have held up so high, realizing it or not, can and does fall now and again. It's life. It's sin. It's going to end one day, and I look very forward to that.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Sep 7 2006, 07:30 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 7 2006, 12:57 PM)

Your comment that 3ABN doesn't seem to be able to back up their claims does have a flip side. Maybe they do have it and do not want to add to anyone elses pain or embarassment. (I know that this line will get jumped on, so let me be proactive here and say I am not advocating one side over the other just making the common sense observation that there is a plausible alternative)

- fhb

You're right, it will get jumped on, and here's why:

There is no "flip side" or "plausible alternative" because the **accused** parties have stated, **for the record**, that there is no such evidence.

And to date, **no such evidence has been presented by 3ABN** in any credible manner.

For 3ABN to say they have evidence, if it doesn't exist, is certainly **not** the high road. It's the very lowest, stagnant, swamp there is, but it is certainly no road.

So, if withholding evidence is meant to lessen pain and embarrassment, it certainly has been a gigantic failure on 3ABN's part.

That's the basic 3ABN dilemma: A charge with no evidence. There's really no way for 3ABN to get around that one except to say, "We have evidence, but nobody's ever going to see it." That's right up there with, "The dog ate my homework."

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Sep 7 2006, 08:04 PM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 7 2006, 08:30 PM)

There is no "flip side" or "plausible alternative" because the **accused** parties have stated, **for the record**, that there is no such evidence.

The accused always claim innocence. There is nothing so surprising about that. Danny blames/accuses Linda she pleads innocent. Linda balmes/accuses Danny, he pleads innocent.

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 7 2006, 08:30 PM)

That's the basic 3ABN dilemma: A charge with no evidence. There's really no way for 3ABN to get around that one except to say, "We have evidence, but nobody's ever going to see it." That's right up there with, "The dog ate my homework."

I am curious, let's say that all parties end up in court over some aspect of this. 3ABN provides the evidence they have and it is clear that this evidence is significant and convicting - would you change your mind about the whole situation?

- fhb

Posted by: princessdi Sep 7 2006, 08:37 PM

The accused always claim innocence. There is nothing so surprising about that. Danny blames/accuses Linda she pleads innocent. Linda balmes/accuses Danny, he pleads innocent.

Here is the point you are missing, Linda hasn't accused Danny of enything, she can talk about it at all.

I am curious, let's say that all parties end up in court over some aspect of this. 3ABN provides the evidence they have and it is clear that this evidence is significant and convicting - would you change your mind about the whole situation?

- fhb
That would depend on when it had come to court. If it came to court now, and.....Voila!.....this evidence suddenly appears, then no(all that ocmputer generation and all). Had it appeared when they first went to court(when Linda was contesting the divorce) then yes. It is not like Danny has not had an opportunity to present whatever evidence he claims to have, but he hasn't. We are not going to even talk about his initial accusations were not os a sexual affiar, it was the now infamous "spiritual adultery". Something that he thought didn't need anymore evidence than his word about some phone calls that lasted longer than he thought they should.

Posted by: sonshineonme Sep 7 2006, 09:31 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 7 2006, 07:04 PM)

I am curious, let's say that all parties end up in court over some aspect of this. 3ABN provides the evidence they have and it is clear that this evidence is significant and convicting - would you

> change your mind about the whole situation?
>
> - fhb

THERE IS NO EVIDENCE.

Wait, let me add, IF you call a one sided conversation that Dan transcripbed, EDITED and ALSO EXPLAINED WHAT THIS AND THAT MEANT, WITHOUT asking Linda (or anyone else asking Linda) if such things meant or were to mean such and such...well, lets just say, that is still NOT EVIDENCE. It's called a MAGICAL ALLUSION that nobody took serious - but only TOOK THE WORD OF SOMEONE who had nothing to do with any conversation....hmm, if you were a duck hunter, would you go shoot a chicken, dress it up to look like a duck, maybe get some little do-dad to stick in it's mouth so if you squeexed it it make something like a duck sound, and then presented it to a group of people who already would believe anything you said and told them "by golly, this IS a duck!" And they didn't really look closely (that might require some real looking and thinking and annalyzing of the appearance, sounds, etc) but just said "sure thing, whatever you say, must be a duck". One more BIG thing on the deceit and stretch and exagerate and minipulation" list, I'd say. Hence, there is no EVIDENCE.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Sep 7 2006, 10:18 PM

> **QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 7 2006, 09:04 PM)**
>
> The accused always claim innocence. There is nothing so surprising about that. Danny blames/accuses Linda she pleads innocent. Linda balmes/accuses Danny, he pleads innocent.

Linda accuses nobody. She's under that gag order. She is silent. It's the employees and people around Linda who saw what was going on that are doing the talking. 3ABN did not expect that employees would speak up.

Remember, the original charges were against Linda, and not against Danny Shelton. Linda is innocent until proven guilty, the innocent party does not have to "plead" at all. She does not have to "claim" innocence. You've got it completely backwards: 3ABN has to "claim" she is guilty and prove it. And they, clearly, are unable to do that. As Sonshineonme says, "There is no evidence."

> **QUOTE**
>
> I am curious, let's say that all parties end up in court over some aspect of this. 3ABN provides the evidence they have and it is clear that this evidence is significant and convicting - would you change your mind about the whole situation?
>
> - fhb

Your "what if" proposition about 3ABN's actions down the road is what you, yourself would call "weak" if used by anybody except yourself.

"What if" propositions include my favorite, "What if Julius Caesar had owned a Beechcraft Bonanza? How would world history be different? "

(Photo of Beechcraft)
Considering a "what if" proposal is a pointless exercise in futility.

However, I will say this that is not "what if." When a person goes into court, their "gag" order does not hold up. If the judge says "speak," Linda speaks -- gag order or not. That information would likely end up in the hands of the public, whatever that information might be.

The bottom line is: 3ABN has presented no evidence to support the charges that originated with **3ABN.** Very foolish, indeed.

Therefore, there is no need for Linda to "plead" against non-existent evidence.

And, no, 3ABN is not withholding evidence to "help" Linda. Based on reports of phone calls to Polly's Place and other individuals disparaging Linda Shelton, we know that the idea of "help" is absolutely ludicrous. Help for Linda Shelton is absolutely the opposite of 3ABN's intentions.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Sep 7 2006, 10:38 PM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 7 2006, 11:18 PM)

Remember, the original charges were against Linda, and not against Danny Shelton. Linda is innocent until proven guilty, the innocent party does not have to "plead" at all. She does not have to "claim" innocence. You've got it completely backwards: 3ABN has to "claim" she is guilty and prove it. And they, clearly, are unable to do that. As Sonshineonme says, "There is no evidence."

If one uses the court metaphor then the accused must enter a plea - it is the very first step. There must be a response to the charges, usually in the form of a claim of innocence or admission of guilt.

> **QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 7 2006, 11:18 PM)**
>
> Therefore, there is no need for Linda to "plead" against non-existent evidence.

When the accused faces the charges they must plea ~before~ any evidence is presented.

> **QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 7 2006, 11:18 PM)**
>
> Your "what if" proposition about 3ABN's actions down the road is what you, yourself would call "weak" if used by anybody except yourself.

My inquiry was much less about the potential of evidence being presented in a court of law than it was to know if you were open to the possibility of being wrong. I am prepared to be wrong and admit it, I was curious if you were willing to do the same.

This isn't a claim of you being wrong, just wondering how set in your position you are.

- fhb

Posted by: Panama_Pete Sep 7 2006, 11:28 PM

> **QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 7 2006, 10:38 PM)**
>
> I am prepared to be wrong and admit it, I was curious if you were willing to do the same.
>
> This isn't a claim of you being wrong, just wondering how set in your position you are.
>
> - fhb

Since there is no such thing as "spiritual adultery," the original charge, how would one change their position on that?

Do you have any suggestions? Maybe 150 *Hail Marys* in the chapel or something?

Posted by: Observer Sep 8 2006, 06:49 AM

One said: "If one uses the court metaphor then the accused must enter a plea - it is the very first step. There must be a response to the charges, usually in the form of a claim of innocence or admission of guilt."

That is true for a criminal case, with one exception: In criminal cases, there are three, not two, pleas that can be entered: Guilty, Not guilty, and "nolo contendre (No contest, which is not a plea of innocense).

However, in a civil case, one in not required to enter any plea. One may not have to prove that something is false.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Sep 8 2006, 07:35 AM

> **QUOTE(Observer @ Sep 8 2006, 07:49 AM)**
>
> One said: "If one uses the court metaphor then the accused must enter a plea - it is the very first step. There must be a response to the charges, usually in the form of a claim of innocence or admission of guilt."
>
> That is true for a criminal case, with one exception: In criminal cases, there are three, not two, pleas that can be entered: Guilty, Not guilty, and "nolo contendre (No contest, which is not a plea of innocense).
>
> However, in a civil case, one in not required to enter any plea. One may not have to prove that something is false.

Ah, very true. I forgot about "nolo contendre."

> **QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Sep 8 2006, 12:28 AM)**
>
> Since there is no such thing as "spiritual adultery," the original charge, how would one change their position on that?

When first I heard the phrase "spiritual adultry" I Googled it, both in the regular engine and in the scholar engine, and was shocked about the wealth of debate, dialogue, and exposition on the subject. With that many people, many of them highly educated and steeped in Biblical tradition, talking about it it is a concept to be grappled with. Does it apply here - I'll reserve judgement on that one until I understand it better and not dismiss it out of hand.

-fhb

Posted by: Denny Sep 8 2006, 08:10 AM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Sep 8 2006, 02:35 PM)

Ah, very true. I forgot about "nolo contendre."
When first I heard the phrase "spiritual adultry" I Googled it, both in the regular engine and in the scholar engine, and was shocked about the wealth of debate, dialogue, and exposition on the subject. With that many people, many of them highly educated and steeped in Biblical tradition, talking about it it is a concept to be grappled with. Does it apply here - I'll reserve judgement on that one until I understand it better and not dismiss it out of hand.

-fhb

And how many of these scholars equated spiritul adultery to a phone conversation from a married person to a doctor or had it as a reason for divorce?
