

205

Printable Version of Topic

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

BlackSDA _ 3ABN _ Questions For 3abn Conservatives

Posted by: Clay Jul 26 2006, 05:52 PM

A great thread was started by Gregory Matthews on CA directed towards 3abn conservatives, but I am posting here because the questions are great... here they are....Bro Matthews said:

QUOTE

Introduction:

3-ABN appears to me to be a ministry dedicated to presenting the gospel from the standpoint of conservative Seventh-day Adventists. It speaks of it's mission as presenting the "undiluted" gospel. That clearly appears to me to be a conservative viewpoint that suggests that the gospel may have been diluted by some, and calls for a return to a purity in faith and proclamation.

It has been said that Linda Shelton got into trouble with her conservative SDA supporters due to the fact that they saw her as to liberal in her music. I know nothing as to the accuracy of that comment. But, it supports my view that 3-ABN is a ministry that derives major support from the conservative block within the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

If this is true, I consider that to be a positive rather than a negative. I am pleased to see that several blocks co-exist within the SDA Church. While I do think that some of the issues that seem to divide them will only be resolved by God, I am pleased that some diversity exists within the church that is my home. I am pleased that this conservative block can find a means to do the mission that they believe God has given them.

I personally hope for the time when the various blocks within the SDA Church can work more closely together in achieving a common goal, and/or mission.

As I have observed the unfold saga of events with 3-ABN I have been confused. I have had questions raised in my mind as to how certain events could unfold as they are doing, from a group of people that I see as conservative Seventh-day Adventists. Some aspects of this unfolding saga appear to me to lie outside of what I see as reflecting conservative SDA viewpoints.

Question # 1:

How does the position that 3-ABN seems to have taken in regard to divorce and remarriage coincide with the conservative SDA position?

As I have understood the conservative SDA position to be that divorce and re-marriage are only justified on the basis of actual adultery on the part of the other person. The conservatives that I have known have often decried the increasing liberalization that they see creeping into the SDA with a lowering of standards, as they see it, a denominational position that allows divorce and remarriage for just about any reason. I often hear them telling me that a recent General Conference is a good example of this increasing liberalization regarding divorce and remarriage.

In regard to Danny and Linda, official statements from 3-ABN have informed us that they have never had proof that Danny's wife committed physical adultery with another person. They have spoken about "spiritual adultery," which I am going to assume pertains to someone's thinking. Well, that seems to be a denial of the conservative position in regard to physical adultery being the only just cause. I am perplexed. This whole issue seems to be that of our conservatives now telling us that divorce and remarriage is justified on some ethereal basis that is not that of a previous

rigid conservative standard. How is it that those who have formerly decried the liberalization of the denomination, now seem to have gone to a much more liberal position, which denies the previous conservative position?

Of course there is another position held by some conservatives that people in positions of spiritual leadership should not hold those positions if they have been married to more than one person. Some even say that a spiritual leader should not marry the second time if the first marriage ended by death. Others would allow that, but not in the case of divorce.

I ask again: How does the position that 3-ABN seems to have taken in regard to divorce and remarriage coincide with the conservative SDA position?

Question 2:

How does the position that 3-ABN seems to have taken relate to the conservative position that God calls us to stand for truth, and righteousness?

The claim has been made, and I do not know if the claim is accurate, that regardless of truth, Linda should be sacrificed for the "good" of 3-ABN. My focus will not be on those who are said to have stated such thoughts. Whether true or not, no statement from 3-ABN that I am aware of has ever denied such claims. That silence has indicated to me that whether the specifics of the claim are true, such an attitude exists—it may be appropriate to sacrifice the one for the better good of God's ministry.

That attitude, regardless of the specifics strikes at the heart of conservative Seventh-day Adventists who as I have understood them have proclaimed that God expects His followers to stand for truth, righteousness, and justice regardless of popular opinion. The conservative position, as I have understood it, is that when an organization stands for truth, righteousness, and justice, God will take care of the rest. People are not to worry about the effect of taking such a stand. It is in God's hands.

I cannot help but be reminded of a Biblical passage that speaks to this issue. You will find it in John 11:50. Here the popular thinking was that it was better for one to be sacrificed than for the whole to suffer injury. As I do not know the accuracy of the specifics in this claim, I do not apply this verse to anyone.

Rather I am speaking to the attitude expressed by those who tell us that it was better for Linda to be sacrificed than for 3-ABN, God's chosen agency, to suffer harm.

I ask my question again, to those conservative SDAs: Where is your call to stand for truth, righteousness, and justice, wherever it leads? I do not see that coming from you. How did you work to bring truth and justice to the investigation of the charges against Linda? How did you treat her fairly, and give her full freedom to disprove the charges against her? How did you act in a manner to treat her by common standards of ethics, and fairness?

Question # 3:

How does the record of the manner in which Linda has been treated coincide with the call of many conservatives to treat people with compassion?

Conservatives in all venues generally attempt to portray themselves as compassionate conservatives. This is born out by 3-ABN that talks about mending broken people. So, I assume that it is the claim of 3-ABN to treat people with compassion.

Recently I was watching a 3-ABN interview with a couple dedicated to that call to mend broken people. The conversation included discussion of clergy sex abuse. Twice, in the conversation, Danny Shelton referenced his marital situation, without naming Linda, in regard to a professional seducing his former wife. Regardless of the truth of those statements, they were unnecessary. Nothing in the conversation otherwise called for them to be made. They simply served to trash a woman to whom

he was married for about two decades. This to me was not an example of compassion.

Danny and Linda Shelton are divorced, and Danny is remarried. Nothing can be done to restore a broken marriage. Compassion would allow those parties to get on with their lives. For Linda, that is assuming her carrier as a concert artist. As she has booked concerts, individuals have contacted the sponsors of those concerts, and provided them with negative information about her, that appears to be attempts to interfere with her occupation as a concert artist.

NOTE: I do not make any claims that this is being organized by 3-ABN. It is simply happening. Individuals are apparently doing such.

This has enraged many people. Women who have not taken the position that Linda is innocent are enraged at what seems to be efforts to interfere with her life. They state that regardless of her guilt or innocence, she should be allowed to move on, and support herself. Men are enraged at this also.

I ask again: How does conduct such as this coincide with the conservative call to treat people with compassion?

Question # 4:

How does the conservative call for truth coincide with a treatment of Linda that is often one-half of the story?

The truth can only be known, and justice can only be done, when the full story is known.

It is claimed that the 3-ABN Board acted at time when they refused to allow Linda and/or her supporters to attend and to personally respond to the charges. This places the Board in a situation where they may be perceived as only hearing one-half of the truth.

It is claimed that a recorded telephone conversation provides compelling evidence against Linda. Yet, it is acknowledged that the conversation only records Linda's comments, and not the other participant in the conversation. Fair people would most likely believe that little could be determined from such.

A certain pregnancy test kit is implied to be conclusive evidence of wrong doing. Possession, and/or purchase of such is not such evidence. I have purchased such a kit. Is that a presumption that I, a male, have become pregnant due to wrong doing? I can only be presumed to be pregnant by someone who follows the premise laid out in the movie THE RABBIT TEST.

According to posts recently made, Linda is said to acknowledge that she purchased that pregnancy kit. It is said that she purchased it during the time she was married to one Danny Shelton, and was living with him. Folks that was important information that should have been told to us by the person mentioning that kit. In the posts mentioned at the first of this paragraph, we are told why Linda purchased that kit. Folks, do we have to get into the personal details of the marital relations between Linda and Danny? I would hope not. Let us simply say here that the implied charge against Linda apparently did not contain all of the truth about the matter.

I ask again: How does the conservative call for truth and justice coincide with a treatment of Linda that appears to often be one-half of the story?

what do you all think?

Posted by: Uncle Sam Jul 26 2006, 08:28 PM

I think most would consider me a conservative SDA. I am sickened by the way this whole thing

was handled. I cannot believe two "Christians" couldn't work this out. If they couldn't than I believe if one left they both should have. Linda should not have had a gag order on her unless Danny had the same. I am sick of hearing him make his "little" comments. I am unable to watch 3ABN since Danny remarried. I think it is a disgrace that he married a lady younger than his daughter.

I think it is a disgrace what they did to Linda and they let Danny's daughter on 3ABN. After her pregnancy and marriage. I am not sure what kind of place it is up there where marriage/divorce and remarriage seems to be normal. It is like a bad soap opera up there.

I personally loved Linda's music. I have heard from several people that they felt her music was questionable. And that all of 3ABN seemed to be getting too liberal. I rarely watched it except for Linda's talks on "the porch". If that is why they wanted her gone than why didn't they just say so instead of ruining her reputation?

I believe that we need to "demand" the proof that Danny says is there. The pregnancy test could be reasoned away, the phone call could have been twisted if there is only one side being heard. Walt says they never caught them in bed together, but he believes there was an affair. What other proof do they have? Danny wrote me and said Linda went on vacation with the Dr. How does he know? If you read Brenda's book you can see what stupid choices she made in her life, she seems to be continuing. I cannot imagine being married for 20+ years and give it up because he said/she said.

I would like for people to show something concrete once and for all what really happened. Why did Danny want Linda gone so bad? Where is the proof he had plans for him and Brandy? Why did all of 3ABN turn their back on Linda so easily? Where were her friends/co-workers when all of this was happening? I cannot believe that the people up there were so snowed by Danny. They had to know what kind of person Linda was, did they think she could fall so easily??????

Posted by: princessdi Jul 26 2006, 09:33 PM


I think those are excellent questions make the point I have made from the beginning. No matter what Linda actually did or did not do, I am really disturbed at 3ABN's handling of the whole situation. completely unCHRIST-like. All the while claiming to be leaders in christian living. And it is really disturbing that Danny sorry tail is yet and still running around like the victim! "a professional seduced his former wife"? Give me a break!!! He got his little young thing, give it a rest!!! Him and his friend are all going to be crispy critters!!

Ok, Sorry I just went there for a minute. I'm back now.....

Posted by: Spike Jul 27 2006, 09:18 AM

Uncle Sam I consider myself a conservative. (at least I think I am) I have all the same questions as you. Ive watched 3abn off and on sense 1991 and I could hardly stand to listen to Danny speak let alone hear any of the Sheltons sing. (I'm not sure who told that family that they could sing but they must of had a good laugh at the time.) Most people that I've talked with have been saying from the beginning when they heard about Linda supposedly having an affair that they didn't believe it. Linda was the one who blessed others with her ministry and you could tell she had a relationship with Jesus where as Danny only babbled. It was the same questions, comments, pat answers for every show or person interviewed and it's been that way for 20 yrs.


It's been said that 3abn is the face of the SDA church, but they are not what I think of when I think of SDA's. It should be Jesus and Him only that we hold up, and when we start putting a person or ministry upon a pedestal (especially if it's not what everyone agrees with) then there is

something wrong. I wish I had all the answers, but it tells me more then ever that if 3abn is the face of the SDA church then there must be something very wrong with our church. 


Posted by: Clay Jul 27 2006, 09:27 AM


amen Spike.... 

Posted by: caribbean sda Jul 27 2006, 09:37 AM

As we say in St. Thomas..."the whole long and short of it" is that Linda was becoming more popular and likeable than Danny. She made a true connection with the audience and Danny was not going to stand for that. 


Posted by: Clay Jul 27 2006, 09:41 AM


QUOTE(caribbean sda @ Jul 27 2006, 10:37 AM) 

As we say in St. Thomas..."the whole long and short of it" is that Linda was becoming more popular and likeable than Danny. She made a true connection with the audience and Danny was not going to stand for that. 

ahhh now that is an interesting view....

Posted by: Johann Jul 27 2006, 09:50 AM


QUOTE(Clay @ Jul 27 2006, 05:27 PM) 

amen Spike.... 

Honest people on the 3ABN crew will join your AMEN!

Posted by: Hersheys99 Jul 27 2006, 11:01 AM

QUOTE

As we say in St. Thomas..."the whole long and short of it" is that Linda was becoming more popular and likeable than Danny. She made a true connection with the audience and Danny was not going to stand for that. 

I have to agree I think that is it in a nutshell along with my personal opinion that Brandy forced his hand as well so have to marry her now. That was one reason I think he had to let his brother Kenny go as well back in the beginning because he was the one everyone liked & was getting a bigger

response from people. We all know that Danny has to be in complete control & charge of it all so we can't let anyone become bigger than us.

Posted by: Uncle Sam Jul 27 2006, 11:20 AM

I am not saying all that has been said about Danny is not true but, if he was/is all these things, why did God call him in the first place? Or do you all believe he wasn't called? From what I have read Danny has been like this from the beginning.....

Posted by: Jvat Jul 27 2006, 11:52 AM

Hey Uncle Sam, did God call Judas or did he just join the disciples? Did God really call Danny? And then there is also Saul whom God called as the King and yet he was a big disappointment!

Posted by: Clay Jul 27 2006, 11:56 AM

QUOTE(Jvat @ Jul 27 2006, 12:52 PM)

Hey Uncle Sam, did God call Judas or did he just join the disciples? Did God really call Danny? And then there is also Saul whom God called as the King and yet he was a big disappointment!

Judas was called..... just like the others...

Joh 6:67-71

(67) Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away?

(68) Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.

(69) And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.

(70) Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?

(71) He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve.

I like this rendering better...

QUOTE

John 6:67-71

(67) So Jesus asked the twelve apostles, "Do you want to leave me too?"

(68) Simon Peter answered Jesus, "Lord, to what person could we go? Your words give eternal life.

(69) Besides, we believe and know that you are the Holy One of God."

(70) Jesus replied, "I chose all twelve of you. Yet, one of you is a devil."

(71) Jesus meant Judas, son of Simon Iscariot. Judas, who was one of the twelve apostles, would later betray Jesus.

Posted by: Uncle Sam Jul 27 2006, 12:07 PM

I am not trying to defend Danny at all. These are just questions that come up in my mind as I hear more and more about the 3ABN situation. It is hard to believe all that has gone on in the past couple of years. It is like you cannot believe anything any of them say. I wrote to John Lomacang about something he said and he, I believe, was less than honest about what I questioned. It is such a shame that what they are doing is in the name of Christianity.....

Posted by: simplysaved Jul 27 2006, 12:11 PM

I agree with your well-made points. My experience was that there was too much of ALL of them and not enough diversity to reflect the Seventh-day Adventist Church--in every area. I found it to be like watching Jim and Tammy Faye Baker---Paul and Jan Crouch....and for those that do watch TBN from time to time, you will notice that they are not seen no where near as much as they used to on "Praise the Lord". You see other people hosting and a more diversity representation of genres and shows---including It Is Written & Lifestyle Magazine.

QUOTE(Spike @ Jul 27 2006, 09:18 AM)

Uncle Sam I consider myself a conservative. (at least I think I am) I have all the same questions as you. Ive watched 3abn off and on sense 1991 and I could hardly stand to listen to Danny speak let alone hear any of the Sheltons sing. (I'm not sure who told that family that they could sing but they must of had a good laugh at the time.) Most people that I've talked with have been saying from the beginning when they heard about Linda supposedly having an affair that they didn't believe it. Linda was the one who blessed others with her ministry and you could tell she had a relationship with Jesus where as Danny only babbled. It was the same questions, comments, pat answers for every show or person interviewed and it's been that way for 20 yrs.

It's been said that 3abn is the face of the SDA church, but they are not what I think of when I think of SDA's. It should be Jesus and Him only that we hold up, and when we start putting a person or ministry upon a pedestal (especially if it's not what everyone agrees with) then there is something wrong. I wish I had all the answers, but it tells me more then ever that if 3abn is the face of the SDA church then there must be something very wrong with our church.

Posted by: princessdi Jul 27 2006, 01:18 PM

You are right, Sarah. I check them nearly everyday, because you don't know who is going to be hosting. I really like the diversity on there. I just recently asked my sister about not seeing Paul and Jan, but I sure enjoy their guest hosts.

QUOTE(simplysaved @ Jul 27 2006, 11:11 AM)

I agree with your well-made points. My experience was that there was too much of ALL of them and not enough diversity to reflect the Seventh-day Adventist Church--in every area. I found it to be like watching Jim and Tammy Faye Baker---Paul and Jan Crouch....and for those that do watch TBN from time to time, you will notice that they are not seen no where near as much as they used to on "Praise the Lord". You see other people hosting and a more diversity representation of genres and shows---including It Is Written & Lifestyle Magazine.

Posted by: Clay Jul 27 2006, 01:23 PM

QUOTE(princessdi @ Jul 27 2006, 02:18 PM)

You are right, Sarah. I check them nearly everyday, because you don't know who is going to be hosting. I really like the diversity on there. I just recently asked my sister about not seeing Paul and Jan, but I sure enjoy their guest hosts.

is that the lady with the big pink hair? Yep it is... she has a diversity of colors right there on her face and hair....



Posted by: watchbird Jul 28 2006, 06:14 AM

QUOTE(Uncle Sam @ Jul 27 2006, 11:20 AM)

I am not saying all that has been said about Danny is not true but, if he was/is all these things, why did God call him in the first place? Or do you all believe he wasn't called? From what I have read Danny has been like this from the beginning.....



There is a very real sense in which God calls everyone. That call is to leave their life of sin, follow Him, and become His representative. Not everyone responds to that call. And not everyone who **claims** to have had not only that general call, but some special call, is telling the truth.

Danny had a "track record" of being a con man, of looking for a way to make an easy buck, of taking


advantage of others and "ripping them off" long before he claims to have had this "call of God" to this "special ministry". But it is "by their fruit ye shall know them". And one of the first "fruits" is that of repentance. And repentance always includes restitution. Looking back, where were the fruits of repentance and restitution at the time that Danny claims to have had this "vision" from God that appointed him, Danny, to this special work? If we look at the records, the official histories that have been written about Danny and 3ABN, do we find any mention of the kinds of repentance which bring forth restitution of the monies, goods, and reputations of those he had specifically "sinned against" in the past? I have found none. What we do find is a continuation of his same patterns of life that had earned him the reputation of being a "con man" in the past. And we find this great ministry that he **claimed** he was given in a vision by God being "validated" by "lying miracles"--that is to say by claiming "miracles" that in fact did not even happen, but were deliberately fabricated for the purpose of attracting the gullible.

I really don't think the question as to whether God called him in the first place is an appropriate one. The question is, if there was such a "call", how did Danny respond? Did he bring forth fruits--including those of conviction of specific sins in his own life, contrition for those, repentance from the harm he had brought to others, and restitution in so far as he was able for this harm? Were the old habits exchanged for new ones? Did he become a man of integrity and truthfulness? These and many more questions could and should be asked. And if the answer is always "no", then the answer is also "no" to question of whether he was "called of God" in the sense of being given any special "anointing" from God, and the answer is "no" to the question of whether he should continue to be considered a true representative of God and the one who "represents the SDA church to the world." The "face of Adventism" indeed. We may have those among us who exhibit the characteristics Danny has exhibited, but we are not as a whole group so degraded as to be fairly represented by Danny Shelton.

Posted by: simplysaved Jul 28 2006, 06:25 AM

Steven, SHAME ON YOU!   rofl

On the serious side, those that know her state that she is truly an anointed woman and has one of the most beautiful spirit....she is very well thought of here (one of the major TBN studios is right outside of Goodlettsville, TN) .

QUOTE(Clay @ Jul 27 2006, 02:23 PM) 

is that the lady with the big pink hair? Yep it is... she has a diversity of colors right there on her face and hair....



Posted by: Chez Jul 28 2006, 09:00 AM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Jul 28 2006, 06:14 AM)

There is a very real sense in which God calls everyone. That call is to leave their life of sin, follow Him, and become His representative. Not everyone responds to that call. And not everyone who **claims** to have had not only that general call, but some special call, is telling the truth.

I really don't think the question as to whether God called him in the first place is an appropriate one. The question is, if there was such a "call", how did Danny respond? Did he bring forth fruits--including those of conviction of specific sins in his own life, contrition for those, repentance from the harm he had brought to others, and restitution in so far as he was able for this harm? Were the old habits exchanged for new ones? Did he become a man of integrity and truthfulness? These and many more questions could and should be asked. And if the answer is always "no", then the answer is also "no" to question of whether he was "called of God" in the sense of being given any special "anointing" from God, and the answer is "no" to the question of whether he should continue to be considered a true representative of God and the one who "represents the SDA church to the world." The "face of Adventism" indeed. We may have those among us who exhibit the characteristics Danny has exhibited, but we are not as a whole group so degraded as to be fairly represented by Danny Shelton.

Don't forget that Samuel (God's prophet and servant) anointed Saul to be the King of Israel. However, Saul conducted himself in a less than anointed manner which seemed to begin when he (in his mind) was upstaged by David. He convinced people that David was out to kill him, which was not true. These accusations were spread abroad and people deemed David to be a criminal and that he should be executed for treason. In addition, these false accusations dominated Saul's mind to the point that he blatantly disobeyed God by not waiting on Samuel and later he visited the Witch of Endor after Samuel died. David was a man after God's own heart. Linda is a woman who truly loves God.

In my mind, there seems to be a parallel between Saul's experience/demise and Danny's experience/demise. I believe that Danny will self-destruct. God will get tired of this mess and put an end to this foolishness.

Posted by: princessdi Jul 28 2006, 09:09 AM

Steve, you are WRONG, just WRONG for that!



QUOTE(Clay @ Jul 27 2006, 12:23 PM)

is that the lady with the big pink hair? Yep it is... she has a diversity of colors right there on her face and hair....



Posted by: watchbird Jul 28 2006, 09:15 AM

QUOTE(Chez @ Jul 28 2006, 09:00 AM)

Don't forget that Samuel (God's prophet and servant) anointed Saul to be the King of Israel. However, Saul conducted himself in a less than anointed manner which seemed to begin when he (in his mind) was upstaged by David. He convinced people that David was out to kill him, which was not true. These accusations were spread abroad and people deemed David to be a criminal and that he should be executed for treason. In addition, these false accusations dominated Saul's mind to the point that he blatantly disobeyed God by not waiting on Samuel and later he visited the Witch of Endor after Samuel died. David was a man after God's own heart. Linda is a woman who truly loves God.

In my mind, there seems to be a parallel between Saul's experience/demise and Danny's experience/demise. I believe that Danny will self-destruct. God will get tired of this mess and put an end to this foolishness.

Before you put too much weight on the Saul/Danny parallel, it would be a good idea to look at their lives previous to the time of Saul's anointing as compared to Danny's before his self-proclaimed "call".

Posted by: Tammy Jul 31 2006, 05:06 AM

QUOTE

QUOTE(Jvat @ Jul 27 2006, 12:52 PM)

Hey Uncle Sam, did God call Judas or did he just join the disciples? Did God really call Danny? And then there is also Saul whom God called as the King and yet he was a big disappointment!

This is what the Spirit of Prophecy says about Judas linking up with the disciples....

QUOTE

While Jesus was preparing the disciples for their ordination, **one who had not been summoned urged his presence among them.** It was Judas Iscariot, a man who professed to be a follower of Christ. He now came forward, soliciting a place in this inner circle of disciples. With great earnestness and apparent sincerity he declared, "Master, I will follow Thee whithersoever Thou goest." *Jesus neither repulsed nor welcomed him,* but uttered only the mournful words: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay His head." Matt. 8:19, 20. Judas believed Jesus to be the Messiah; and by joining the apostles, he hoped to secure a high position in the new kingdom. This hope Jesus designed to cut off by the statement of His poverty. {DA 293.2}

The disciples were anxious that Judas should become one of their number. He was of commanding appearance, a man of keen discernment and executive ability, and they commended him to Jesus as one who would greatly assist Him in His work. *They were surprised that Jesus received him so coolly.* {DA 294.1}

I believe from reading this quote, that Judas just *joined* the disciples...."without being summoned."

Posted by: Clay Jul 31 2006, 07:59 AM

QUOTE(Tammy @ Jul 31 2006, 05:06 AM)

This is what the Spirit of Prophecy says about Judas linking up with the disciples....

I believe from reading this quote, that Judas just *joined* the disciples..."without being summoned."

that is NOT what the bible says... Jesus said he called 12 and one was a devil...

QUOTE

John 6:67-71

(67) Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away?

(68) Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.

(69) And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.

(70) Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?

(71) He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve.

Now.... who you gonna trust? (the adventist conundrum rears its head...)

Posted by: watchbird Jul 31 2006, 08:20 AM

QUOTE(Tammy @ Jul 31 2006, 05:06 AM)

This is what the Spirit of Prophecy says about Judas linking up with the disciples....

QUOTE

While Jesus was preparing the disciples for their ordination, one who had not been summoned urged his presence among them. It was Judas Iscariot, a man who professed to be a follower of Christ. He now came forward, soliciting a place in this inner circle of disciples. With great earnestness and apparent sincerity he declared, "Master, I will follow Thee whithersoever Thou goest." Jesus neither repulsed nor welcomed him, but uttered only the mournful words: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay His head." Matt. 8:19, 20. Judas believed Jesus to be the Messiah; and by joining the apostles, he hoped to secure a high position in the new kingdom. This hope Jesus designed to cut off by the statement of His poverty. {DA 293.2}

The disciples were anxious that Judas should become one of their number. He was of commanding appearance, a man of keen discernment and executive ability, and they commended him to Jesus as one who would greatly assist Him in His work. They were surprised that Jesus received him so coolly. {DA 294.1}

I believe from reading this quote, that Judas just *joined* the disciples..."without being summoned."

QUOTE(Clay @ Jul 31 2006, 07:59 AM)

that is NOT what the bible says... Jesus said he called 12 and one was a devil...

QUOTE

John 6:67-71

(67) Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away?

(68) Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.

(69) And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.

(70) Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?

(71) He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve

Now.... who you gonna trust? (the adventist conundrum rears its head...)

I don't think it has to be a "conundrum". I think they can be seen as complementary. Ellen can quite well mean that Jesus did not go out looking for Judas, nor "call" him to leave his place of employment as he did with some others. She also says that he did not "repluse" him. And he did accept him and ordain him as he did the others--which can, as you indicate scripture makes more clear, be interpreted as an official "call" to join the 12.

And his statement as recorded in scripture can be interpreted to mean that He knew Judas was a "devil" from the beginning and "ordained" him anyway, or that He really had hopes that Judas would change his character through his association with Himself and the other disciples.

Which ever way we take it, it still comes out meaning that it is not correct to assume that just because God once "calls" someone to a task, or even to ministry, that that guarantees that the man should continue to be regarded as one who "represents God" no matter what the fruits of his life show.

Posted by: Clay Jul 31 2006, 08:37 AM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Jul 31 2006, 08:20 AM)

I believe from reading this quote, that Judas just *joined* the disciples.... "without being summoned."

Now.... who you gonna trust? (the adventist conundrum rears its head...)

I don't think it has to be a "conundrum". I think they can be seen as complementary. Ellen can quite well mean that Jesus did not go out looking for Judas, nor "call" him to leave his place of employment as he did with some others. She also says that he did not "repluse" him. And he did accept him and ordain him as he did the others--which can, as you indicate scripture makes more clear, be interpreted as an official "call" to join the 12.

And his statement as recorded in scripture can be interpreted to mean that He knew Judas was a "devil" from the beginning and "ordained" him anyway, or that He really had hopes that Judas would change his character through his association with Himself and the other disciples.

Which ever way we take it, it still comes out meaning that it is not correct to assume that just because God once "calls" someone to a task, or even to ministry, that that guarantees that the man should continue to be regarded as one who "represents God" no matter what the fruits of his

life show.

don't see it as complimentary at all... EGW fills in a lot of info that the bible is silent on... When the bible says that Jesus "called" twelve, either he did or didn't.... the scenario painted in DA (one of my avs) is not found in scripture and while some are comfortable sharing that as the gospel truth, I am not...

Posted by: Jvat Jul 31 2006, 09:38 AM

Well, on face value, Clay, you seem to make sense.

But if you look at the text that you quoted again, we see that Jesus said that he **CHOSE** and not **CALLED** twelve. So with the difference in these words in mind, (that he could have chosen him, after his disciples recommended Judas, even after not intentionally calling him), we can give Watchbird's take some credence, can we not? And still get the message that "once chosen is not always chosen"?

Posted by: Clay Jul 31 2006, 10:13 AM

QUOTE(Jvat @ Jul 31 2006, 09:38 AM)

Well, on face value, Clay, you seem to make sense.

But if you look at the text that you quoted again, we see that Jesus said that he **CHOSE** and not **CALLED** twelve. So with the difference in these words in mind, (that he could have chosen him, after his disciples recommended Judas, even after not intentionally calling him), we can give Watchbird's take some credence, can we not? And still get the message that "once chosen is not always chosen"?

f that works for you, that's fine.... it doesn't work for me.... btjm.....

Posted by: awesumtenor Jul 31 2006, 12:43 PM

QUOTE(Jvat @ Jul 31 2006, 10:38 AM)

Well, on face value, Clay, you seem to make sense.

But if you look at the text that you quoted again, we see that Jesus said that he **CHOSE** and not **CALLED** twelve. So with the difference in these words in mind, (that he could have chosen him, after his disciples recommended Judas, even after not intentionally calling him), we can give Watchbird's take some credence, can we not? And still get the message that "once chosen is not always chosen"?

you are reading DOA into the text...producing a position that is inherently eisegetical.

*luk 6:12-16 And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God. (13) **And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles;** (14) Simon, (whom he also*

named Peter,) and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, (15) Matthew and Thomas, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon called Zelotes, (16) And Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot, which also was the traitor.

Had Judas not been one of those counted his disciples, he would not have been present to be chosen. We are not informed how he came to be in that number... but he was called along with the rest when the time for choosing the 12 came to pass.

No getting around it, no explaining it away in order to reconcile DOA with the scriptural record... I suppose it begs the question of why it is so important to Adventists that EGW be infallible when deemed to be speaking ex cathedra... but that is another topic altogether.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: västergötland Jul 31 2006, 12:53 PM

Mar 3:9 And he spake to his disciples, that a small ship should wait on him because of the multitude, lest they should throng him.
 Mar 3:10 For he had healed many; insomuch that they pressed upon him for to touch him, as many as had plagues.
 Mar 3:11 And unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God.
 Mar 3:12 And he straightly charged them that they should not make him known.
 Mar 3:13 And he goeth up into a mountain, and calleth unto him whom he would: and they came unto him.
 Mar 3:14 And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach,
 Mar 3:15 And to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils:
 Mar 3:16 And Simon he surnamed Peter;
 Mar 3:17 And James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, The sons of thunder:
 Mar 3:18 And Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus, and Simon the Canaanite,
 Mar 3:19 And Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed him: and they went into an house.

Luk 6:12 And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God.
 Luk 6:13 And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles;
 Luk 6:14 Simon, (whom he also named Peter,) and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew,
 Luk 6:15 Matthew and Thomas, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon called Zelotes,
 Luk 6:16 And Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot, which also was the traitor.
 Luk 6:17 And he came down with them, and stood in the plain, and the company of his disciples, and a great multitude of people out of all Judaea and Jerusalem, and from the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, which came to hear him, and to be healed of their diseases;

From these two accounts, it seems clear that being one of Jesus disciples and being one of the twelve is two different things. Thus Judas could have just quietly joined the disciples and then later when Jesus called the twelve out of his more numerous disciples, he was called aswell. Its a possibility which Mark and Luke open the door for.

Posted by: Clay Jul 31 2006, 01:06 PM

QUOTE(västergötland @ Jul 31 2006, 01:53 PM)

From these two accounts, it seems clear that being one of Jesus diciples and being one of the twelve is two different things. Thus Judas could have just quietly joined the diciples and then later when Jesus called the twelve out of his more numerous diciples, he was called aswell. Its a possibility which Mark and Luke open the door for.

the adventist conundrum..... alive and well.... Judas was called....

now let's go to this can of worms... given that these accounts were written AFTER all those events occurred, it is not unreasonable to see how the disciples included some editorializing.... i.e. Judas the traitor, or Judas the one who betrayed Jesus.....the account was written from the perspective of those who remained....

Posted by: västergötland Jul 31 2006, 01:48 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Jul 31 2006, 08:06 PM)

the adventist conundrum..... alive and well.... Judas was called....

Ordained, called or chosen, in either case the same applies to Judas as to the other apostles. I thought I was clear on that?

QUOTE(Clay @ Jul 31 2006, 08:06 PM)

now let's go to this can of worms... given that these accounts were written AFTER all those events occurred, it is not unreasonable to see how the disciples included some editorializing.... i.e. Judas the traitor, or Judas the one who betrayed Jesus.....the account was written from the perspective of those who remained....

Why is this a can of worms? Isnt this quite plain?

Posted by: Johann Jul 31 2006, 03:54 PM

Why is this a can of worms? Intertwined? Danny Shelton has at times referred to the success of 3ABN Sweden to prove that he is innocent of the accusations. And also that the leaders in Scandinavia have been willing to talk to his people show that they trust him and believe he is innocent and that Linda is guilty. Do you get the connection?

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

206

Printable Version of Topic

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

BlackSDA _ 3ABN _ Dr. Thompson Letter:

Posted by: Observer May 6 2006, 05:14 PM

Reference has been made to a letter that Dr. Thompson circulated, and comments that were made by Gregory Matthews about that letter in another Adventist Forum. Here is that letter, and those comments:

" From Walter Thompson

>

> Chairman, 3ABN board of Directors

>

> Regarding Danny's marriage

>

> Dear Family and Friends of 3ABN,

>

> Two years ago 3ABN was challenged by the most difficult battle

> the ministry has ever faced. It was a battle that threatened

> the very existence of the ministry and the work of preaching

> the end time message of the Three Angel's to the world. It is

> only because of the grace and power of God Almighty, and the

> faithful support of you, the 3ABN family, that the ministry

> has survived to preach another day. Today, the ministry is

> stronger than it has ever been and its reach into the world

> even broader and more powerful for the cause of truth.

>

> [See Note 1—GM.]

>

> As is always the case when in the public eye, questions arise,

> stories abound, and rumors spread. We thank God that you have

> trusted the leadership and board of 3ABN during this time and

> have stayed with us in ministry. More recently some of you

> have heard that Danny has found one to comfort him in his

> loneliness and sorrow. You may have also heard rumors about an

> allegedly illegal divorce occurring without Biblical grounds.

> This letter is an attempt to fill you in with the facts.

>

> [See Note 2—GM.]

>

> As chairman of the board I have been in the midst of this long

> and drawn out ordeal from the beginning. I was there when we

> counseled with Linda over and over again. I was present during

> the pleas and prayers, seeking to get her to give up her

> relationship with the doctor. I have seen and heard the

> evidence upon which the board has taken the action that it has

> taken. I have been one that has plead with Linda to keep her

> marriage and her ministry and offered to provide counseling

> for them. I have known Danny and Linda almost from the

> beginning of the ministry and have been in their home many

> times. They had a good marriage. It was not until this third

> party got in the middle did things begin to fall apart. It is

> also true that Danny really did want to get back together

> again, but when it became obvious that couldn't happen, he

> correctly had to close the door on that part of his history
> lest it destroy him and the ministry.
>
> [See Note 3—GM]
>
> The divorce was a mutually agreed thing, even the choice to
> get it from Guam where there would be no long wait. Linda had
> originally planned to move to Las Vegas long enough to become
> a resident there so as to get a divorce there. They then
> discovered the possibility of a divorce from Guam, checked it
> out and found it to be legal, and decided to go that route.
> Though I believe Guam has now stopped the program, the
> legality of a Guam divorce had previously been taken to the
> U.S. Supreme Court where it was ruled legitimate. As chairman
> of the board, I did not try to influence the decision, but I
> will say that had they not obtained a quick divorce, the
> ministry would have been placed at much greater risk since the
> situation was causing so much dysfunction with leadership and
> staff. I believe time has verified the correctness of what was
> done then, both by Danny and by the board for the ministry.
>
> [See Note 4—GM.]
>
> Linda's web site recently stated that she and Danny were not
> divorced. She wrote this after the judge made the decision in
> Danny's favor. She claims she did not know this when she wrote
> it. Her web site referred to an e mail I sent to Johann
> Thorvaldson a year earlier saying that I had never accused her
> of adultery. I believe that exchange with him was in response
> to an accusation by him that we had fired her because of
> adultery. I was merely saying that she was not fired for
> adultery, but because she had defied the board in not
> discontinuing a relationship that was threatening to destroy
> the ministry. (I might add that the doctor also told me he
> would not break off the relationship, even though I pled with
> him to do so.) That letter to Johann was correct, and it is
> true that I have never directly accused her of adultery. That
> does not mean that I believe Linda is innocent. If by adultery
> one must be caught in bed with another person, I cannot prove
> Linda has committed adultery. If, on the other hand, hard
> evidence indicates that Linda was involved in an unacceptable
> relationship with another man qualifies for adultery, then
> there is no question about Danny's moral right to marry again.
> As a board, we have chosen not to make the details of the
> evidence available to the public. I believe Satan is the
> accuser of the brethren. We have chosen to take the "high
> road" in this whole situation and say nothing more than we
> have been forced to say to try to quell rumors. We care about
> Linda and have tried not to do anything to hurt her more than
> she has already been hurt. I can tell you that I personally
> spent a great deal of time at 3ABN during those months when
> this was all happening. I spoke with Linda and Danny on
> numerous occasions. A sub committee of the board met and
> prayed with Danny and Linda and pled with Linda to call off
> the relationship. Danny and Linda spent an 8 hour session with
> a pair of Christian counselors (non-Adventist in an attempt to
> avoid bias) who had no doubts about the nature of Linda's
> conduct. We offered to provide Linda with the opportunity to
> go away for counseling with a counselor agreeable to both she

- > and us. She did not respond to that offer or request. Finally,
- > the full board met, reviewed Linda's letter of explanation,
- > and voted unanimously to remove her from the ministry and her
- > seat on the board. Other church leaders who have been privy to
- > some of the evidence we have are in full agreement with our
- > decision.
- >
- > [See Note 5—GM.]
- >
- > The relationship Linda had with the Norwegian Dr. was not a
- > normal doctor-patient relationship as she claims. It is true.
- > Linda was very concerned about her son Nathan. He was the
- > vehicle through which the Dr. reached Linda. Our evidence
- > leaves no question that this became much more than a
- > doctor-patient relationship. We know that the long hours on
- > the phone together were not about Nathan and have hard
- > evidence to support this knowledge - nor were times spent
- > together on both sides of the Atlantic. Furthermore, she
- > refused to break it off, even after weeks of pleading with her
- > to do so. We, the board believe the evidence we have clearly
- > justifies the divorce and gives Danny the moral and legal
- > right to remarry. Those in church leadership with whom we have
- > shared some of this evidence agree with us. Out of concern for
- > Linda we have been reluctant to make details public.
- >
- > [See Note 6—GM.]
- >
- > No, Danny is not to blame for what has happened here. On the
- > contrary, he has bent over backwards trying to make things
- > work and meeting her requests. Yet, she has never acknowledged
- > that it was wrong for her to have another "friend".
- >
- > [See Note 7—GM.]
- >
- > The things I have stated here are accurate and correct. As far
- > as the lady Danny has married is concerned, I can only say I
- > believe his new wife is a very good person and will be a real
- > asset to him as he carries on his heavy responsibilities. Just
- > to clarify any rumor you may have heard, this relationship
- > began long after the divorce. I was at 3ABN when this lady
- > came from Florida looking for work. There was nothing going on
- > before that time, and Danny definitely was not trying to
- > "dump" Linda. I was with him during much of the time he
- > agonized and mourned her loss. It is one thing to lose a loved
- > one in death. It is much different to lose one to another
- > lover - like cutting a dog's tail off one inch at a time! As
- > to the matter of age difference, I will say that I do not
- > believe that is any of my business. I find nothing in the
- > Bible, and I don't remember any thing in the SOP indicating
- > age differences for married couples. If it is legal, and
- > morally correct, and if entered into with honesty, sincerity
- > and earnest prayer for God's guidance, as I know happened
- > here, it is not for me to criticize. In my own musings about
- > this, I have concluded that it was no accident that brought
- > Brandy to 3ABN. Either the devil was behind it, or God was.
- > There is no question in my mind which one it was.
- >
- > [See Note 8—GM.]
- >

- > (Archo Dart was for many years a family and marriage counselor
- > in the Adventist church. When in his 80's, he married one of
- > my patients, who was then in her 50's. She loved and admired
- > him till death many years later.)
- >
- >
- >
- > I have had an interesting thought this week that I will share
- > with you. It is this. God lost one of his closest companions
- > when Lucifer went astray. More than that, myriads more angels
- > left with him when he left heaven. Talk about grief or
- > emotional pain. Experiences such as this with Linda, I think,
- > help us to understand the pain of loss, and the reality of the
- > war between God and Satan. Some have claimed it takes two to
- > divorce. I don't think that is categorically true!
- >
- >
- >
- > This has been a terrible injury that has hit 3abn and Danny,
- > and yes, Linda too, but it is one that I believe God
- > understands - and He continues to bless his servants.
- >
- >
- >
- > We recognize that we live in a world at war, and are working
- > with a ministry that the devil would like to see destroyed.
- > The war is real, and as in any other war there are real
- > casualties. War is never pleasant, and spiritual battles may
- > be some of the worst. Our hearts still ache for those who have
- > been wounded. Our prayers continue to ascend on their behalf.
- > Should acknowledgement of wrongdoing and penitence ever occur,
- > we would be the first to forgive and forget. Unfortunately,
- > that has not happened, and we must move on.
- >
- >
- >
- > Some who have been aware of the growing relationship and the
- > possibility of marriage have thought they should wait for a
- > longer period of time before marrying. In discussions before
- > the event, the 3ABN board reviewed the events of the past
- > couple years and have agreed that there was no moral or legal
- > reason precluding marriage. Realizing the heavy burdens
- > resting on Danny and of his need for companionship, we, the
- > board did not see any reason not to give our blessing to their
- > union. We hope you, our 3ABN family, will agree too, and with
- > us, welcome Brandy with open arms.
- >
- > [See Note 9—GM.]
- >
- > Should you have any questions that I might answer, please feel
- > free to send them to me at 3ABN and I will do my best to try
- > to answer them.
- >
- >
- >
- > Sincerely in the precious name of Jesus,
- >
- >
- >

>
 >
 > Walter Thompson
 >
 > Chairman, 3ABN Board of Directors.
 >
 > Walter Thompson MD

 Gregory

Post Extras: Manage this thread

Gregory Matthews
 Chaplain

Reged: May 10 2000
 Posts: 6090

Loc: Colorado, USA Re: The Dr. Thompson Letter. [Re: Gregory Matthews]
 #213462 - Mon Apr 10 2006 10:45 AM Edit Reply Quote Quick Reply

At this point, I will place the comments that I have referenced above.

Note 1: Those of us who may be considered critics are loyal supporters of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and of the work of God on planet Earth. We acknowledge that God led Danny and Linda Shelton to establish 3-ABN, a ministry that for many years has been led by God. We are thankful for what God has accomplished in the ministry of 3-ABN. To many people, 3-ABN is the face of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Now a scandal has tarred the face of that ministry. People are asking if God is still leading in the ministry of 3-ABN, and/or if God is using present leadership of 3-ABN to guide it in its ministry. These questions are sincere, and valid. Those who have supported 3-ABN in the past, have honest questions. We believe that God is still leading, not only in human life on this planet, but in the ministry of those whom God has called to leadership. But, we are reminded of times in the history of our denomination when human leaders made mistakes. God intervened, and in some cases, but not all, removed those leaders, and allowed old ministries to be replaced by new ones that were more receptive to the leading of the Holy Spirit.

We are waiting to see how God leads in the ministry of 3-ABN. We do not know what God has in mind for 3-ABN. But, we do know that if its leadership fails to follow the leading of the Holy Spirit, God will act in whatever manner God knows is best.

Note 2: None of us who know the law, have ever challenged the right of Guam to issue a divorce to citizens of the United States. We were aware that the U. S. Supreme Court had previously ruled on that question. However, even when divorces are obtained in one of the States of the United States, they may be subject to challenge. Some felt that the Guam divorce was subject to challenge. An IL State Court has dismissed that challenge. The Guam divorce is legal.

As to the issue of Biblical grounds for Danny to divorce Linda, and then to remarry another, that is a much more complex question. Some of the more liberal SDAs believe in multiple grounds for divorce and remarriage. But, in general, those who are the strongest supporters of 3-ABN believe that divorce followed by remarriage is only Biblical when the other has committed physical adultery. When those people hear (read) 3-ABN say that Danny had Biblical grounds, they understand that to mean that Linda physically committed adultery. They simply do not understand "Biblical grounds" for divorce and remarriage in any other way.

Note 3: I find the last sentence very interesting. Here it is said that Danny faced a decision between his marriage and his ministry and he chose his ministry. No ministry is dependent upon one person. The ministry of 3-ABN could go on without its present leadership. God is involved, and God will both remove and provide.

Note 4: One might say that the divorce was mutually agreed upon. That does not mean that both parties wanted the divorce. Often in a divorce, one party wants the divorce, the other agrees to it due to the fact that that party sees no option for reconciliation. I have found that one can often understand some of the dynamics that are going on in a divorce by looking at who it is that filed the action to divorce.

Note 5: Court rulings are complex. Sometimes non-lawyers misunderstand what a court has decided. There was a period of time where Linda and others were misinformed as to the ruling of the IL Court. All who did so regret that misunderstanding.

I am not aware of any time in which anyone has officially accused Linda of physical adultery. But when one talks about Biblical grounds, moral rights, and inappropriate relationships, many of the 3-ABN supporters will hear adultery. From the practical standpoint, 3-ABN might just as well have claimed that Linda committed such. In many ways, I believe that such lack of focus as to what Linda did has hurt her more than an actual charge of adultery would have damaged her. One can rebut a specific charge. It is very hard to rebut a non-specific charge.

Note 6: Again, words and terms are used that communicate physical adultery to 3-ABN supporters. It is implied the Linda and the MD had a relationship that was more than professional. There is a clear implication that the 3-ABN Board has evidence that cannot be questioned. One of my questions regarding this is to what extent was Linda allowed to present a defense. Accusations were made, and people testified before the Board. Was Linda allowed to present a defense in person? Was she allowed to bring witnesses to the Board to testify? If she was not granted all of the above, and more, the Board cannot say that they have evidence that cannot be questioned.

I raise these questions because of what has been circulated by others, to include supporters of 3-ABN. It has been said that the Board once heard evidence that the previous night Linda had spent the night with an adult male, not a relative that was married to another woman. It is also said that because Linda was not allowed to be present, and to present witnesses, that the Board never heard that the previous night the referenced male, and his wife, had spent the night with Linda, with both helping her to prepare her written defense, as she was not going to be allowed to be personally present.

Note 7: This entire situation is a tragedy. I have not, and do not intend to criticize Danny for his remarriage. But, that is probably because I may be more liberal than are many of the 3-ABN supporters. If the Board is wrong about the relationship that Linda had with that Dr., then the Board is wrong to tell people that Danny had Biblical grounds.

Note 8: I agree, so what if there is an age difference. Nothing should be made of that. Your second from the last sentence is interesting.

Note 9: Brandy should not be the focus of this. Regardless of right or wrong, the issues do not lie with her. The rights or wrongs lie with others. I join you in hoping that people on all sides of this issue will welcome her and the children that she brings to this marriage with both open arms, and with the love of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Gregory "

If you wish, you can find the above posts in that forum.

Posted by: Clay May 6 2006, 05:24 PM

everyone is not a member of Club Adventist, so they may not have access to that particular thread... that is why it was posted here in another thread....

Thank you for sharing this info.....

Posted by: beanchild May 8 2006, 08:56 AM

more and more propaganda.

puttin folks bizness in the streets.

love me some sdas.

oh yeah, & shame on me for even clicking on the thread.



Posted by: Johann Jul 13 2006, 04:06 AM

I suppose it is about time someone replies to this letter by Walt Thompson. I will at least question some of the statements he makes. I will place my remarks in brackets [] below, deleting those Gregory Matthews made earlier.

[quote name='Observer' date='May 7 2006, 01:14 AM' post='129538']

Reference has been made to a letter that Dr. Thompson circulated, and comments that were made by Gregory Matthews about that letter in another Adventist Forum. Here is that letter, and those comments:

" From Walter Thompson

>

> Chairman, 3ABN board of Directors

>

> Regarding Danny's marriage

>

> Dear Family and Friends of 3ABN,

>

> Two years ago 3ABN was challenged by the most difficult battle

> the ministry has ever faced. It was a battle that threatened

> the very existence of the ministry and the work of preaching

> the end time message of the Three Angel's to the world. It is

> only because of the grace and power of God Almighty, and the

> faithful support of you, the 3ABN family, that the ministry

> has survived to preach another day. Today, the ministry is

> stronger than it has ever been and its reach into the world

> even broader and more powerful for the cause of truth.

>

> [Is 3ABN really stronger today?]

>

> As is always the case when in the public eye, questions arise,

> stories abound, and rumors spread. We thank God that you have

> trusted the leadership and board of 3ABN during this time and

> have stayed with us in ministry. More recently some of you

> have heard that Danny has found one to comfort him in his

> loneliness and sorrow. You may have also heard rumors about an

> allegedly illegal divorce occurring without Biblical grounds.

> This letter is an attempt to fill you in with the facts.

>

> [For the past couple of years we have been praying that 3ABN would stop circulating false rumors and biased reports to discredit Linda and destroy her ministry. The Lord cannot intervene when there is no desire to cooperate.]

>

> As chairman of the board I have been in the midst of this long
> and drawn out ordeal from the beginning. I was there when we
> counseled with Linda over and over again. I was present during
> the pleas and prayers, seeking to get her to give up her
> relationship with the doctor.

[Since I was in constant contact with Linda through this whole period I know that Linda could not give up a relationship which wasn't there. Danny made demands of her which Walt is not mentioning here, and therefore these statements are fully absurd.]

I have seen and heard the

> evidence upon which the board has taken the action that it has
> taken.

[Why is Walt unwilling to produce the evidence?]

I have been one that has plead with Linda to keep her

> marriage and her ministry and offered to provide counseling
> for them.

[Linda did not need your pleading because this is what she wanted more than anyone else. It was Danny who did not want to remain married to Linda, in spite of the remarks he made for the gallery for the sake of the 3ABN contributors. Towards Linda and us he did not have the slightest interest in staying married to Linda.]

Besides what real counseling did you provide? Absolutely none that was willing to listen to Linda!]

I have known Danny and Linda almost from the

> beginning of the ministry and have been in their home many
> times. They had a good marriage. It was not until this third
> party got in the middle did things begin to fall apart. It is
> also true that Danny really did want to get back together
> again, but when it became obvious that couldn't happen, he
> correctly had to close the door on that part of his history
> lest it destroy him and the ministry.

>

> [You have forgotten what you told us earlier, that Danny's and Linda's marriage would have collapsed anyhow, and that Dr. Arild Abrahamsen came in as a convenient excuse! I understand how inconvenient it is now to admit you ever made such a statement!]

>

> The divorce was a mutually agreed thing, even the choice to
> get it from Guam where there would be no long wait. Linda had
> originally planned to move to Las Vegas long enough to become
> a resident there so as to get a divorce there.

[This is a false statement. Linda never had plans of moving to Las Vegas. Danny tried to get her to do that, and even offered her thousands of dollars if she would move to Las Vegas. But Linda did not want a divorce.]

They then

> discovered the possibility of a divorce from Guam, checked it
> out and found it to be legal, and decided to go that route.
> Though I believe Guam has now stopped the program, the
> legality of a Guam divorce had previously been taken to the
> U.S. Supreme Court where it was ruled legitimate. As chairman

> of the board, I did not try to influence the decision, but I
 > will say that had they not obtained a quick divorce, the
 > ministry would have been placed at much greater risk since the
 > situation was causing so much dysfunction with leadership and
 > staff. I believe time has verified the correctness of what was
 > done then, both by Danny and by the board for the ministry.
 >
 > [It was Danny who discovered this, as he has claimed in an earlier letter. Pressure was building
 up demanding that Linda accept divorce as a solution!]
 >
 > Linda's web site recently stated that she and Danny were not
 > divorced. She wrote this after the judge made the decision in
 > Danny's favor. She claims she did not know this when she wrote
 > it.

[How can you claim she did not know? Did you check all of her communication?]

Her web site referred to an e mail I sent to Johann
 > Thorvaldson a year earlier saying that I had never accused her
 > of adultery. I believe that exchange with him was in response
 > to an accusation by him that we had fired her because of
 > adultery. I was merely saying that she was not fired for
 > adultery, but because she had defied the board in not
 > discontinuing a relationship that was threatening to destroy
 > the ministry. (I might add that the doctor also told me he
 > would not break off the relationship, even though I pled with
 > him to do so.)

[The doctor will soon answer that question.]

That letter to Johann was correct, and it is
 > true that I have never directly accused her of adultery. That
 > does not mean that I believe Linda is innocent. If by adultery
 > one must be caught in bed with another person, I cannot prove
 > Linda has committed adultery. If, on the other hand, hard
 > evidence indicates that Linda was involved in an unacceptable
 > relationship with another man qualifies for adultery, then
 > there is no question about Danny's moral right to marry again.
 > As a board, we have chosen not to make the details of the
 > evidence available to the public. I believe Satan is the
 > accuser of the brethren. We have chosen to take the "high
 > road" in this whole situation and say nothing more than we
 > have been forced to say to try to quell rumors. We care about
 > Linda and have tried not to do anything to hurt her more than
 > she has already been hurt. I can tell you that I personally
 > spent a great deal of time at 3ABN during those months when
 > this was all happening. I spoke with Linda and Danny on
 > numerous occasions. A sub committee of the board met and
 > prayed with Danny and Linda and pled with Linda to call off
 > the relationship. Danny and Linda spent an 8 hour session with
 > a pair of Christian counselors (non-Adventist in an attempt to
 > avoid bias) who had no doubts about the nature of Linda's
 > conduct.

[I was in communication both with Linda and Danny before and after that trip to Kansas. That
 counseling started with Danny indicating he would give that couple a substantial contribution. After
 that Danny downgraded Linda at least 50% of the time, and you know that Danny told you what
 he told the counselors as if they had said it. This is also how many of Danny's interviews run on
 TV. Here again, you listened merely to Danny's report of what happened, and ignored what Linda

had to say, as you have done through this whole process.

Since we feel you are giving a false report, why can't we see the evidence you claim you have? Is it not substantial?]

We offered to provide Linda with the opportunity to

- > go away for counseling with a counselor agreeable to both she
- > and us. She did not respond to that offer or request. Finally,
- > the full board met, reviewed Linda's letter of explanation,
- > and voted unanimously to remove her from the ministry and her
- > seat on the board. Other church leaders who have been privy to
- > some of the evidence we have are in full agreement with our
- > decision.

>

- > [Here again, it was counseling that you provided. Brainwashing?]

>

- > The relationship Linda had with the Norwegian Dr. was not a
- > normal doctor-patient relationship as she claims. It is true.
- > Linda was very concerned about her son Nathan. He was the
- > vehicle through which the Dr. reached Linda. Our evidence
- > leaves no question that this became much more than a
- > doctor-patient relationship. We know that the long hours on
- > the phone together were not about Nathan and have hard
- > evidence to support this knowledge - nor were times spent
- > together on both sides of the Atlantic.

[What is your evidence? Why can't we see it? What time did Arild and Linda spend together on both sides of the Atlantic? In another letter you state that they spent 10 days together in Norway in June. What evidence do you have for this? I have plenty of evidence that this was impossible because I was in close contact with Arild during that whole period.]

Furthermore, she

- > refused to break it off, even after weeks of pleading with her
- > to do so. We, the board believe the evidence we have clearly
- > justifies the divorce and gives Danny the moral and legal
- > right to remarry. Those in church leadership with whom we have
- > shared some of this evidence agree with us. Out of concern for
- > Linda we have been reluctant to make details public.

>

- > [Linda refused to admit what she had not done. Danny demanded she declare that Arild was a devil, and that she refused to do. That is the evidence you have, and nothing else, unless you show it to us.]

>

- > No, Danny is not to blame for what has happened here. On the
- > contrary, he has bent over backwards trying to make things
- > work and meeting her requests. Yet, she has never acknowledged
- > that it was wrong for her to have another "friend".

>

- > [I was in constant communication with Linda during this period, and I know that you are stretching this beyond the limits of what is permissible for a Christian.]

>

- > The things I have stated here are accurate and correct. As far
- > as the lady Danny has married is concerned, I can only say I
- > believe his new wife is a very good person and will be a real
- > asset to him as he carries on his heavy responsibilities. Just
- > to clarify any rumor you may have heard, this relationship
- > began long after the divorce. I was at 3ABN when this lady
- > came from Florida looking for work. There was nothing going on
- > before that time, and Danny definitely was not trying to