



Printable Version of Topic

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

BlackSDA _ 3ABN _ Letter From Linda Shelton @ [Www.lindashelton.org](http://www.lindashelton.org) - Feb. '07

Posted by: sonshineonme Feb 15 2007, 12:18 AM

NOTE: Her letter of demand, posted March 2nd, 2007 now on her website. To go right there, click here <http://www.lindashelton.org>

In keeping with Linda Shelton requiring an open and transparent ASI sponsored hearing, Linda has now published a letter that includes a clear demand that 3ABN and Danny Shelton produce the evidence they claim to have for inspection and verification to the entire church membership and to the stockholders in the pews. Danny Shelton in various forms and under various alias has repeatedly referenced evidence that he claims to have thereby giving him a basis for divorce and remarriage. The chairman of 3ABN on AToday has made it clear they have no proof of an adulterous affair. Linda Shelton and Arild Abrahamsen have repeatedly asserted that there is no basis for divorce, that no inappropriate relationship occurred and that there is no evidence to support the Danny Shelton claims.

We have repeatedly asserted that if there is no proof, then a remarriage would constitute an adulterous relationship. Danny Shelton was married at 3ABN in March 2006 to a Brandy Murray, a 3ABN employee that reportedly arrived at 3ABN of Thompsonville in July of 2004.

Here is the letter from Linda in its entirety and is also available at www.LindaShelton.org and on www.save3ABN.com . I believe it reflects the same Linda, a bit stronger and less naive than in the past, but as deeply committed to her relationship with the Lord as we all remember so well on that porch at 3ABN.

Linda Shelton does respond to e-mail and will be happy to have a concert or a deeply spiritual service at your location, wherever you may be.

February, 2007

My warmest greetings,

A couple approached me, with tears in their eyes, and said, "We have just missed you and we wanted to see you to make sure you were okay." As I saw the pain in their eyes, over the events that have transpired in my life in the last few years, it was as if my heart was pierced again. "We are just so happy to see you smiling, in church and still serving God." Our meeting took place a few months ago at the Bible Chapel Seventh-day Adventist Church, where I am a member. I enjoyed my visit with this caring Christian couple and the compassion and love they showed toward me.

Some people act surprised that I am still a member of the SDA church. But why? God is still the same awesome God that He always has been, the incredible Bible truths embraced by the Seventh-day Adventists are still just as true today as they ever were and although a "thousand shall fall on my right and a thousand fall on my left" nothing will ever change these facts. We must hold firm to our faith during troubled times!

Many have written to me over the past many months asking me to update my website. This I have prayerfully considered for quite some time, nearly a year. Quite frankly, I just have not known what to say. I feel that this scandal has made a large, festering open wound in my Church. Perhaps the truth revealed will ultimately bring the healing that everyone needs. Then we can grieve together and move on. I am certain, in essence, I have died a thousand deaths over the events of the last couple of years. But, with the Lords blessing, I will try to address issues which have been brought to my attention in the kindest manner possible.

For the first time in nearly three years I will not simply deny the accusations, but will directly address certain issues. I do not take pleasure in speaking of these things. I think I have always been the one who would rather receive hurt, than be the one to inflict hurt upon others. But during the course of this last year I learned some valuable lessons through Dr. Mable Dunbar of Pollys Place Network, she has been an incredible support and help to me. Mable is a woman who truly loves the Lord and is not afraid to stand up for what she believes is right, even if a whole army would stand against her.

Pollys Place Network is a ministry which empowers abused lives and aids them through their difficult circumstances. It is a marvelous organization and so needed for this age when Satan has focused his wrath upon breaking up the security and circle of love God intended for our families. I videotaped some interviews, for Pollys Place, at the SDA Conference office in Spokane, Washington with several individuals who had been through incredibly painful situations. Each of them, in essence, had the same healing story. It was when they were able to come forward and expressed the truth about what happened to them, that their healing came. Inspired by these individuals, now I can accept and believe it is Gods job to protect the ministry I have loved and co-founded, and its my right and my healing to tell the truth about what has occurred.

I am co-authoring a book and its purpose is to share the silver lining of the amazing lessons the Lord has taught me through this crisis. I feel the Lord has lifted a veil and allowed me to see the world that He sees, a world far different than we see. I see that the darts of false allegations that Satan has thrown toward me and my ministry were not directed solely for my downfall, but the aim was much wider. Although I was the apparent target, Satan was attempting to destroy the ministry I loved and co-founded and cripple the witness of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. My perspective has been forever changed through my experiences and my book will give me the opportunity to share these lessons more fully with all of you. (I will keep you posted as to the release date of this book.)

John Knox once said, "Kings (or leaders) have not an absolute power to do in their government what pleases them, but their power is limited by Gods Word; so that if they strike where God has not commanded, they are but murderers; and if they spare where God has commanded to strike, they and their thrones are criminal and guilty of the wickedness which abounds upon the face of the earth, for lack of punishment." John knew his Bible. It is a Biblical principle that if we see a wrong and only look the other way or feebly say, "I will let the Lord deal with that one," then that wickedness is applied to our slate, plain and simple.

The most devastating blow a televangelist can get is the false accusation of adultery. Although I have already made this statement on my website I want to address those of you who have loved and valued my Christianity, integrity and my ministry for the 19 years that I was at 3ABN. I want to clearly emphasize that I was 100% faithful to my husband. I loved, trusted and believed in him to a fault. Imagine my shock when I realized that the false allegations in the form of libel, slander and defamation directed my way were initiated by two of the closest people to me on planet earth; one was my beloved partner and the other was my closest lady friend. I loved them both and trusted them both to the point that their close communication did not bother me in the least. I know that sounds naive, but I did not believe that Dan would do anything that would harm the ministry we had built together.

In 2004 there was a tremendous outcry at my departure. There was suspicion over how swiftly I was fired from my position and divorced. There was suspicion over the fact that I never had the opportunity to talk to the Board and defend myself. There was suspicion over the fact that every trace of my presence was completely cleared out of the campus of 3ABN, even before my termination, as well as the website, television and radio broadcasts. I was made a sacrificial lamb in a scheme calculated to remove me from both my home and my ministry through an orchestrated campaign of malicious lies circulated around the globe. No words can begin to describe the absolute agony this has brought to my life, but there are other victims as well, and may God bless and spare the young lives and tender souls who have also felt the stinging thrust of this sword of scandal.

It has completely broken my heart to see the emails and letters which have come from the Chairman of the Board, Dan and others at 3ABN, to hear of the television and radio programs where erroneous references have been made to the situation, to watch the ministry that I helped build with much devotion used to destroy me and also to hear of the reports of what is being said on the SDA chat sites about me today by those bent on my destruction...nearly three years later.

It was the false accusation of adultery which caused the loss of my marriage, my reputation, my employment,

and everything else. I challenge the 3ABN Board to produce the "irrefutable evidence" which caused a co-founder, a life-time Board member, Vice-President and Secretary of the Board to be removed in that May, 2004 meeting! I am asking, no demanding, that the information is made public, at my request! Cast aside these pretended desires to "spare me"! The world is waiting with baited breath!

The stakes are high. I, as well as others, have personally experienced electronic surveillance, email theft, interception of cell phone calls, post divorce entry into my private residence to the point where charges were filed with the police. It is not easy to live your life when you feel that you can never know for sure if you are being followed, watched or recorded...even now. I have had invitations to do ministry thwarted because of continued allegations by those, who, like wolves in sheeps clothing, attempted to stop my ministry.

I want to make this absolutely clear: I left my home because I was not safe, I was not welcome. I was witnessing the murder of my reputation and ministry day by day. I stayed as long as I felt I could. I hoped, believed and prayed that things would change but they only got worse. The statements made that I left my husband for another man are absolutely and totally false. Any thinking person would realize that I had everything a Christian woman could have wanted in this life: a husband I loved and the opportunity to minister to millions of people about the tremendous love of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, though the ministry that we spent so many years building together. Although two of the people who I loved best have called me "Gomer", yet a more accurate term would be "Hosea", which I would only discover later. But I prefer simply, Linda, "SAVED by the Blood of the Lamb!"

I do not visit the chat sites. This has been a mega-trial for me and my way of coping has been to try and focus on other things. I realize that the individuals which make up our Church need healing from this disaster too. And perhaps the chat sites have served to help people give expression to their frustrations and hurts in this situation. I am grateful to each of you who have prayed and interceded for me. It has meant so much during my dark days. Youâ€™ll never know just how much!

Now my kids are grown and I am alone...but not really alone, although I have not husband. Now I belong to everyone and everyone belongs to me! And I still sing, "Thank you for being my family, thank you for being my friends: May God bless and keep you in all that you may do until we meet again!"

It is my goal to just make your journey and mine a little lighter and brighter. I have faith that the Lord still has a work for me to do, a new ministry. I am ready and available for church services, week of prayer, concerts, etc. as the Lord opens the doors. I do not know what my future holds, but God does and that's enough for me.

Just in closing I want to make an appeal to you to get out your binoculars, dust them off, bring them into focus and then search... Love your neighbor enough to be a Good Samaritan. When he is broken and bleeding in the middle of the road, focus your binoculars with the love of Christ, but don't stop there, reach out and meet his need in his time of crisis. Christianity is not something that "just happens". True Christianity occurs when a decided action is taken...when we search, when we fill a need, when we mend a broken heart and when we are just "there" for hurting people. There is a lot of them. But there are too few Christians who focus their binoculars with love.

Thank you for being my family! Stay close to the Shepherd!

Blessings to you and yours

Linda Shelton

Additional info to be considered before responding (this is also post #27.....

QUOTE

Folks, in regard to Linda's letter, I have the word:

Linda was working in connection with some other people to develop a letter that she could post on her website. That letter had NOT yet reached its final form.

The letter that was posted was a working draft. It had been extensively revised by another person working with Linda on its preparation. Some of Linda's comments were removed from that letter, and some comments from another person were added to it.

It was sent to Linda with the intention that she review it to see what changes, if any, she would make to that draft. Linda did not consider it to be in the final form that she wanted to post on her website.

She was not asked if she would permit it to be posted on the Internet prior to her posting it on her website. She would have denied permission if she had been asked. When Linda first learned that it was posted on the Internet, she asked that it be removed. She has been informed that it is too late to remove anything. So, the letter stands, and will remain posted on the Internet.

While the letter posted was not the final version of what Linda would have posted, she is clear that she was working with other people to prepare a letter to be posted on her website.

She plans to later post such on her website. She is considering her options in view of the fact that this draft was posted. She will probably make some revisions in the letter that she posts on her site. But, that will be done in the context of what has been posted here.

Posted by: Fran Feb 15 2007, 12:26 AM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Feb 15 2007, 12:18 AM) □

shall we all rise as we sing the Doxology!

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Feb 15 2007, 12:38 AM

Our prayers are with you, Linda. Keep leaning on those Everlasting Arms!

Posted by: erik Feb 15 2007, 01:43 AM

TO linda,

I realize you do not come here, but if you ever do, I have been praying that the Lord would open a Door to end this whole mess, and your courage I believe has opened that door.

Praise God whom controls all things in the end.

YOur story reminded me of some of my feeling after my baby son died, I learned to walk by faith for the first time and i can say that God Does work all things for good for those that Trust him.

Erik

Posted by: Fran Feb 15 2007, 03:08 AM

Linda;

One day I would like to meet you if it the Lord's will. I would like to tell you what your silent witness has done for me.

However, your walk has been so public, thanks to your ex-spouse, and I see that it took a miracle of love and grace for you to stand today. "You have been broken and spilled out for the love of You, Jesus."

Have you ever had a foam throw pillow that got buried under a heavy pile of blankets? Then one day you find it, but it is flatter than a pancake? Yet you take it out to give it room to expand and eventually it does!

We are like that pillow. Some of us have been under a heavy load for years, however, 3 years ago someone (God) took you away from your oppression and has given you room to grow. Just like that pillow, you can now stand tall and bring this travesty to an end.

May your "pillow" grow even larger than it ever was before.

We are family.

Much love,
Fran

Posted by: Grace Feb 15 2007, 04:54 AM

Praise the Lord for Linda's letter!!! I have been blessed reading it. It's very encouraging to see the Lord at work in her life. I'm so glad to see that though she's gone through the fire of terrible tribulations she's stayed firm in the Lord. Alleluia!!!

I'll be praying even more now. I imagine that the devil will do everything in his power to annul Linda's strong witness for truth. I pray for protection for Linda and for the Holy Spirit to work in peoples hearts so truth can shine. And, if possible, I would like for the 3ABN ministry to be spared through confession and repentance. Oh, Lord, hear our prayers! Amen!

Posted by: Observer Feb 15 2007, 05:30 AM


Linda's letter is not yet posted on her website. It is expected to be posted there shortly.

NOTE: Linda's reputation has been so trashed that she believes that she has nothing to lose by making everything public. So, 3-ABN, Danny, Dr. Thompson: Bring it on.

As stated, the issue of making it all public was a major factor in the failure of ASI to mediate a resolution to the issues. Linda wanted a public record for the world to see, where each person could make up their own mind. ASI (apparently 3-ABN, Danny ?) did not.

4
and
16

Posted by: Aletheia Feb 15 2007, 05:47 AM


In my opinion, this has no substance, for the most part it is just:  and I think all this talk of lawsuits, is what stirred this rally the troops letter.

What did she really say?

1. "I'm persecuted" -- No proof or evidence
2. "I don't visit the chat sites... " -- This is a bit much if you are acquainted with any of the behind the scenes garbage. In any case all her friends and supporters do, and her representatives have a website, slandering 3ABN and this letter will appear in both ...
3. Prove I committed Adultery!

Calling what you think is a bluff is not always good. Be careful what you ask for, you just might get it...

I know..



All I can say is THANK GOD THIS IS ALMOST OVER.

Posted by: Aletheia Feb 15 2007, 06:15 AM

QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 15 2007, 06:30 AM)

As stated, the issue of making it all public was a major factor in the failure of ASI to mediate a resolution to the issues. Linda wanted a public record for the world to see, where each person could make up their own mind. ASI (apparently 3-ABN, Danny ?) did not.

The facts are ASI was to consider the issue of Linda and Danny's divorce and his remarriage with evidence submitted by both sides, and witnesses for each. Their findings and the reasons for them were to be made PUBLIC.

Danny and 3 ABN agreed. Linda's side, including you, did not. You wanted to discuss other things...

Yet here comes Linda and all that she demands now to be made public is proof that she committed adultery??? That could have already been done had she agreed.


She must think people are stupid.

Posted by: Uncle Sam Feb 15 2007, 06:22 AM

Linda says she was 100% faithful to Danny. Was that only during the marriage? Was there ever a time she was with the Dr, romantically? What about when Danny's people say he took her to the airport so she could be with the Dr?

Posted by: awesumtenor Feb 15 2007, 06:38 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 06:47 AM) □

In my opinion, this has no substance, for the most part it is just:  and I think all this talk of lawsuits, is what stirred this rally the troops letter.

IMO, since glenetta was invited to leave you have taken up the mantle to trash Linda again... and you dont even have the benefit of being cute or fluffy

QUOTE

What did she really say?

1. "I'm persecuted" -- No proof or evidence

"No proof or evidence" that you are willing to acknowledge != no proof or evidence

QUOTE

2. "I don't visit the chat sites... " -- This is a bit much if you are acquainted with any of the behind the scenes garbage. In any case all her friends and supporters do, and her representatives have a website, slandering 3ABN and this letter will appear in both ...

Funny how when the same is alleged of Danny you dont have this response


QUOTE

3. Prove I committed Adultery!

Calling what you think is a bluff is not always good. Be careful what you ask for, you just might get it...
I know..

You're projecting again, Cindy... her situation is not your situation... so you know nothing

QUOTE



and when it is over, who will you turn your vitriol on, Cindy? You are still not over your own divorce; your continued projection issues and the obvious displaced anger in your posts shows that...that is what you should be concentrating on bringing to an end... seek professional help, Cindy... unless you actually want to die bitter and alone... if that is your intent then just keep doing what you're doing...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Feb 15 2007, 07:05 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 05:15 AM)

The facts are ASI was to consider the issue of Linda and Danny's divorce and his remarriage with evidence submitted by both sides, and witnesses for each. Their findings and the reasons for them were to be made PUBLIC.

Danny and 3 ABN agreed. Linda's side, including you, did not. **You wanted to discuss other things...**

Yet here comes Linda and all that she demands now to be made public is proof that she committed adultery??? That could have already been done had she agreed.
She must think people are stupid.

Al_etheia, your posts this morning certainly show the true spirit at work in you. All pretense has been dropped and the bitter pus is oozing.

I'll be praying for you, sister.

Posted by: Clay Feb 15 2007, 07:06 AM

good letter..... let's pin it to the top for awhile....

Posted by: Richard Sherwin Feb 15 2007, 07:11 AM

Not only is it a great letter but it's a chance for the apologist to show their true colors and advance Linda's cause by posting on this thread. As we've already seen this morning. (They just don't get it....)

Richard


QUOTE(Clay @ Feb 15 2007, 08:06 AM)

good letter..... let's pin it to the top for awhile....

Posted by: watchbird Feb 15 2007, 07:40 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 06:47 AM)

Calling what you think is a bluff is not always good. Be careful what you ask for, you just might get it...
I know..



All I can say is THANK GOD THIS IS ALMOST OVER.

Good advice, Cindy.

QUOTE(Richard Sherwin @ Feb 15 2007, 08:11 AM)


Not only is it a great letter but it's a chance for the appologist to show their true colors and advance Linda's cause by posting on this thread. As we've already seen this morning. (They just don't get it....)

Richard

Yes, it does seem as though not only does Linda reveal the same spirit which she has shown since "the beginning" of her ordeal, but that Cindy has also (and dramatically) revealed the spirit with which she has posted on this topic since "the beginning" of her time with us.

Scripture gives us the principle that when one judges others without sufficient cause, one reveals one's own self by the type of judgment one passes. But seldom does one so clearly portray their own inner attitude as Cindy as done for us here.... including her own execution and plea for it to be speedy.

Very interesting. Very interesting indeed.

God the Righteous Judge will continue guiding in the process of bringing both good and evil to the light of day..... 

Posted by: Observer Feb 15 2007, 07:42 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 05:15 AM)

The facts are ASI was to consider the issue of Linda and Danny's divorce and his remarriage with evidence submitted by both sides, and witnesses for each. Their findings and the reasons for them were to be made PUBLIC.

Danny and 3 ABN agreed. Linda's side, including you, did not. You wanted to discuss other things...

Yet here comes Linda and all that she demands now to be made public is proof that she committed adultery??? That could have already been done had she agreed.
She must think people are stupid.

land
/6

Aletheia, You have made several false statements. As I was involved in the ASI mediation, and you were not, as far as I know, but I really do not know who you are, your information is faulty.

To respond to you, I will post a series of responses. People will then be able to judge for themselves the truth.

Posted by: Observer Feb 15 2007, 07:55 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 05:15 AM)

The facts are ASI was to consider the issue of Linda and Danny's divorce and his remarriage with evidence submitted by both sides, and witnesses for each. Their findings and the reasons for them were to be made PUBLIC.

Danny and 3 ABN agreed. Linda's side, including you, did not. You wanted to discuss other things...

Yet here comes Linda and all that she demands now to be made public is proof that she committed adultery??? That could have already been done had she agreed.
She must think people are stupid.

Aletheia:

In early December, I recieved an e-mail from Mr. Lance. Quoted below are a couple of paragraphs from that e-mail that I believe are important:

QUOTE

I know there are many issues being discussed. I have counted at least 23 in the last few weeks. Some issues are already the subject of ongoing litigation. The request from the 3ABN Board of Directors to ASI was: ..."request to ASI that it establish a commission to evaluate and determine Danny's' legal and moral right to remarry". ASIs' membership criteria includes a component that requires the applicant or its leaders to be in regular standing with the SDA Church. We check that factor in every application. Membership in the SDA Church is the exclusive province of the local church (except for membership in the "Conference Church", not involved

here). The rather unique situation of the Church associated with 3ABN creates a different perspective from the typical SDA Church on matters of membership.

All of us know ASI has no jurisdiction to act as a court with authority to make orders and awards that disputants are required to follow. What we may have that could be of assistance is some stature and credibility that would make its' findings hard for the parties to ignore. This can only have a possibility of succeeding if the parties support and respect that potential. Because of ASI's membership requirements there is some logic for ASI's involvement on issues that directly reflect on 3ABNs' membership status in ASI. We believe that ASI could properly focus on issues revolving around the biblical appropriateness of the Shelton's divorce and Danny's subsequent remarriage, issues relating to Linda's and Danny's employment status at 3ABN and actions taken concerning Linda's membership in the local SDA Church.

SM:

1) You will note that ASI accepted a request from 3-ABN to examine Danny's legal and moral right to remarry. That is clearly a one-sided approach that appears to benefit Danny and 3-ABN. As you know, one of the issues was whether or not Linda had a Biblical right to divorce Danny and to remarry. In fairness, the examination should clearly have been expanded to include this aspect: Did Linda have a biblical right to divorce Danny and to remarry.

2) In mediation, an impartial mediator never accepts the boundaries that one party wants. Rather, the impartial mediator discusses boundaries and limitations with both sides. Only when both sides agree upon those limitations does mediation begin.

3) As I have said, several times: I agree with Mr. Lance that the majority of the issues lie outside of the ability of ASI to resolve. Those issues, if ever resolved lie in the area of the civil authorities.

QUOTE

You may have learned that it is the ASI position that there needs to be a balance between the process of being open and on the other hand be respectful of the legitimate privacy concerns of the parties. Government, worldly businesses, charitable organizations and the Church all recognize this need. When sensitive personnel matters are under consideration Boards typically go into executive session for such discussions. Accordingly we expect that this process would do the same and that information and documentation would be received and held in confidence by all of the parties and their representatives. At the conclusion of the matter the Panelists findings of facts and recommendations would become publicly available.

Altheia, Here Mr. Lance states that the facts and recommendations would become public. His statement is fairly clear that the reasons for those recommendations would be held in confidence. That was unacceptable to Linda. Her reputation has been so trashed that it was a fundamental position of ours that the reasons for the recommendations should be laid out in a manner that any person would be able to access those and decide themselves as to whether or not the charges were true. Linda believes that she has nothing to lose in this. There is a very clear difference of opinion on the issue of making things public. This was one of the reasons the ASI attempt failed.

Altheia, you are wrong when you attempt to imply that ASI wanted it to be more open than Linda wanted.

16

Posted by: Observer Feb 15 2007, 08:19 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 05:15 AM)

The facts are ASI was to consider the issue of Linda and Danny's divorce and his remarriage with evidence submitted by both sides, and witnesses for each. Their findings and the reasons for them were to be made PUBLIC.

Danny and 3 ABN agreed. Linda's side, including you, did not. You wanted to discuss other things...

Yet here comes Linda and all that she demands now to be made public is proof that she committed adultery??? That could have already been done had she agreed.
She must think people are stupid.

Aletheia:

Here is the response that I made to Mr. Lance. As it was a long response, I have removed material that appears to go beyond the issues that you suggested:

QUOTE

Response to ASI
HL 061203

Introduction:

Overall I was encouraged by the outreach that Harold Lance has made to us. It is a good start. It reflects a good tone (spirit). In many ways it reflects where I am. Of course, I am going to think a document is good when it agrees with me.

It seems to agree with my assessment of what must be accomplished if ASI can establish a panel that can achieve some degree of resolution. If he has read what I have previously posted on the Internet, he knows that I have stated that the following are the critical issues that the respective parties must agree upon if this panel is to be effective:

- 1) They must agree upon the issues to be considered.
- 2) They must agree upon the aim of the panel, or to put it another way, what the expected results are.
- 3) They must agree upon the process.

NOTE: In my previous public posts, I have expanded upon the above slightly.

In my understanding of what Harold has written, he also sees the above as critical issues.

I have reflected upon his document overnight. Without detracting from what I consider to be an excellent document, I will suggest that it contains a number of issues that need further

clarification, and agreement by the parties. It is my intention in my response to identify those and to comment upon them. Any references that I may make to "critical issues," unless otherwise identified, will reference the three listed above. To identify my point for discussion, I will quote from Harold's document with a "Re:" followed by either the quotation, or a brief summary of a point in his document.

Discussion:

a) Re: ". . . request to ASI [by 3-ABN] that it establish a commission to evaluate and determine Danny's' [sic] legal and moral right to remarry."

This falls under my critical issue # 1.

This request seems to limit the issues that are to be considered by this commission. Perhaps that is O.K., if the respective parties agree to this. In my mind, the marital issues, which have some importance, are much less important than other issues. Again, what do the respective parties want, and agree to?

A larger issue is that this wording restricts the marital issues to Danny and Linda, their divorce, and Danny's remarriage. I will suggest that the marital issues are much larger than this focus. Danny has been charged, rightly or wrongly, I do not know, with sexual misconduct, during the time that he was married to Linda, and following the divorce, prior to his marriage to Brandi. These issues are clearly marital issues, yet they lie outside of the narrow focus as requested by 3-ABN.

I acknowledge that this commission cannot be expected to consider every one of the issues that are considered important by everyone. But, I think it is important that this commission issue a statement of such limitations, and that therefore interested parties are free to pursue redress in other venues, to include the civil authorities. After all, God established civil government, and directed all of us to submit to its rule, when not in conflict with God. This all is related to my critical issue # 2.

Re: "ASI has no jurisdiction. . . [and is without} authority to make orders and awards that disputants are required to follow."

I agree wholeheartedly with the above. ASI is very limited in what it can accomplish. To place what Harold then states in words of my own: ASI can only make findings of fact, and recommendations. Again, this is related to my critical issue # 2. With this perspective, ASI cannot require binding resolution. There must be an acknowledgement that the parties are free to reject, and to see other venues for resolution. If any of the parties should do so, the findings of fact, and recommendations of the Commission would play a role as to how the SDA public perceived this situation. From this perspective, I believe that the parties would carefully consider such findings and recommendations, before rejecting them. I believe that this would be helpful.

c) Re: The Biblical appropriateness of the divorce and the remarriage.

We are on uncertain ground with this one, as important as it is. Regardless of the CHURCH MANUAL, we as a denomination do not agree with what constitutes Biblical grounds, and remarriage following divorce. In my personal opinion, as applied to this situation Biblical grounds must be limited to sexual misconduct, and what is commonly considered to be adultery. This presents us with a problem. Danny and 3-ABN (Dr. Thompson) have clearly stated, many times, that they have no proof that Linda violated what I have just laid out above. From this standpoint, by the thinking of some, with this admission from Danny and 3-ABN, the Commission can only find that Linda did not provide Danny with Biblical grounds for divorce. I agree with that position, until it is proven to me that she did commit adultery.

NOTE: In my mind, and that of many conservative SDAs so-called "spiritual adultery" and adultery in one's thoughts are not Biblical grounds. ASI will clearly, in my mind be off the conservative platform if it suggests any such do constitute Biblical grounds. Any such opinion coming from it will highly disturb its conservative base of support.

[I have removed a very short paragraph—GM.]

There is also another issue here that is raised due to the fact that the SDA church is divided in regard to what are Biblical grounds for divorce and remarriage. It is a fundamental issue under law that people be treated equally. It is likely that people are not treated equally in this issue, and are treated according to the congregation in which they find themselves. The ASI Committee should consider not only Biblical grounds, the CHRUCH MANUAL, but also the typical way that people are treated today in SDA congregations. I.e. They should not treat either Danny or Linda more strictly than they would be treated in the typical local congregation. This is required by basic fairness.

Retention in a position of spiritual leadership is an appropriate consideration. I.e. A person might be retained in church membership, yet removed from a position of major ministry. When such is done, there is an obligation to treat all in the same manner. E.g. If Linda is to be examined as to her conduct, and whether or not she should be retained in a position of spiritual leadership, so also should Danny be examined. And, her treatment should also be examined in relation to other people who may also have been charged with sexual misconduct.

d) Re: Issues of Danny and Linda's employment:

ASI can only recommend. It cannot enforce. ASI potentially could recommend that Danny be relieved from all employment at 3-ABN, if this was thought to be appropriate. However, it is a stretch of the imagination to believe that such would happen if ASI were to recommend it.

As to Linda: Realistically, she could not effectively return to 3-ABN unless there was a major change in leadership to include the Board. She simply would not be allowed to effectively work there, and would likely be marginalized.

e) Re: Issues regarding Linda's membership:

Linda is presently a member, in good standing, in a SDA Church recognized by a recognized SDA Conference. Her membership should not be an issue.

Should ASI consider how she was treated by her church of former membership? Perhaps? Maybe? I am not certain? What would be accomplished? Within the denominational rules that are supposed to govern such, local congregations have the authority, right or wrong. Perhaps the best that could be said might be so say that the relationship between Linda, the local congregation, the Conference and its leadership, and 3-ABN, was of such a nature that denominational rules in existence did not provide the guidance that was needed, and that therefore issues of potential ethical conflicts arise out of this situation.

NOTE: I am not attempting to prejudge the case, or to suggest that there is only one conclusion that the Committed may make. I think that there are many aspect of this case that present very hard questions and I am not certain that ASI can resolve them. Perhaps, however, they can raise issues that may be resolved for future situations should they rise again.

[I have removed a major section of material which deals with issues outside of what Aletheia mentioned—GM.]

The issue of a record is important. There must be enough detail to provide a historical record for the future.

'i) Re: Balance between privacy and openness.

There is a clear place for privacy. Women who accuse someone of sexual misconduct must have some expectation of privacy. Society in general recognizes such.

However, society distinguishes between common people and public figures. Danny and Linda are both public figures. Both have been accused publicly of major sins. Neither rightly has the

expectation of privacy that a common person might have. In any case, with the publication of their alleged sins for the world to read, privacy in [is] not the answer at this time. In fairness to both of them, a final report should report findings on the accusations that have been made against them. As public figures, the SDA public needs to know such findings. If this is not done, these issues will not go away. They will remain in public view and under public discussion.

I have removed a very short paragraph as it dwelt with an issue outside of what Aletheia mentioned—
SM.]

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 05:15 AM) □

The facts are ASI was to consider the issue of Linda and Danny's divorce and his remarriage with evidence submitted by both sides, and witnesses for each. Their findings and the reasons for them were to be made PUBLIC.

Danny and 3 ABN agreed. Linda's side, including you, did not. You wanted to discuss other things...

Yet here comes Linda and all that she demands now to be made public is proof that she committed adultery??? That could have already been done had she agreed.

She must think people are stupid.

Aletheia:

Writing to Mr. Lance on December 11, I stated the following:

QUOTE

Harold:

I appreciate the time and effort that you have expended in making this response. It is clear that you have thoughtfully read the comments that have been made to you. I agree with much of what you have said. This mess could turn into litigation that conceivably could result in the expenditure of several hundred thousand dollars. Under some circumstances the idea of it costing tens of thousands of dollars is a gross underestimate. I agree that the Church does not have a process that is suitable for the situation that we are facing. I also think that it is not possible for some of these issues to be resolved outside of the civil realm.

However, I do believe that it is possible for ASI to be involved in this situation in a manner that will be helpful. But, that is only if the respective parties can come to an agreement that allows for that. I am not certain that such an agreement will be reached.

I will make some personal responses to your post to us. I will identify them with my initials (GM), to distinguish them from your comments. It should be noted that my response is simply that, my personal response. It may, or may not agree with that of others of us. In this issue, Mr. Joy is the primary person who is representing the interests of Linda Shelton.

WILL OUR PROCESS CONFLICT WITH THE PENDING ASSET DIVISION LITIGATION?

GM: This is clearly an area that should not be decided by any independent panel. This belongs to the civil realm. In my opinion, it is Biblical for some issues to be left to the civil realm. Further, that is consistent with the CHURCH MANUEL. Some issues simply cannot be decided outside to the civil authorities. This also applies to a number of issues. Included in these would be criminal matters, and certain financial matters, and issues of taxation.

If we agree on the above, I believe that it is critical for the ASI panel to issue a statement that certain specific matters belong in the civil realm, and people who pursue those issues in civil courts, or cooperate with such, are on Biblical grounds for doing so.

Is ASI willing to issue such a statement?

IS ASI IMPARTIAL OR IN DANNY'S HIP POCKET?

GM: There will always be people who will believe that ASI should not be involved. In one sense, probably most people involved in this will have some sort of a bias. We are never going to change the mind of those who believe that ASI should not be involved. The issue is: Can we structure a process that the respective parties can agree to, and is as fair as possible?

SINCE THERE ARE MANY OTHER CONCERNS WHY LIMIT THE ISSUES TO THOSE SUGGESTED?

GM: You are correct that ASI probably cannot deal with all of the issues that have surfaced. There are many reasons for that. The decisions as to what issues to deal with cannot be made unilaterally. If ASI does that it will immediately be seen in a negative light. The decisions as to what issues to deal with must be made by the parties involved. That is the first issue: What are the issues to be considered?

The second issue is as I have referenced earlier: What about the other issues? How should people work to resolve them? As some are likely to only be resolved in the civil realm, will ASI publicly state that people who do such are acting appropriately?

DO ACTIVITIES AND PERSONNEL ACTIONS THREATEN LIABILITY FOR THE SDA CHURCH?

GM: I am one who has clearly raised this issue. In discussions that I have had with other people, it is clear to me that I have not been clear in what I was attempting to communicate. Let me attempt to state this issue in a better form: I DO NOT believe that either 3-ABN or the denomination has so-called ascending liability for the past actions of any person during a time when they were not

employed by 3-ABN. It would be a stretch to conclude otherwise. However, I do believe that should a person accused of prior criminal acts commit such acts in the future, while in a relationship with 3-ABN, that such could involve both 3-ABN and/or the IL Conference in liability. That liability could be based upon the failure of both 3-ABN and/or the IL Conference to exercise due prudence in assigning duties to an individual whom they knew has been accused of criminal or immoral acts in the past.

Re: "IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE INTERCHANGES, CONTAINING DEROGATORY INFORMATION, STOP AMONG THE PARTIES AND THEIR TEAM MEMBERS."

GM: Harold, you have been unable to stop Danny from fueling the fires that you understandably object to. Further, the supporters of 3-ABN are independent, and not controlled by Danny. They continue to engage in such. They can not be stopped. As long as they do such, others will respond.

So, also those who support Linda are independent, and not controlled by either Linda, or us. We cannot stop them. As long as people supporting Linda engage in such, those who support 3-ABN will respond.

Harold, I understand what you are asking. It is not possible for either you or for us.

SHOULD AN SDA JUDGE BE USED TO CONDUCT THE PROCEEDINGS?

GM: Point taken, if the parties agree to such.

DO PARTIES WHO MAY BE "PUBLIC FIGURES" GIVE UP THEIR RIGHT TO PRIVACY?

GM: No, anyone who understands the law knows that public figures do not give up all rights to privacy. But, U.S. law clearly limits the rights to privacy of public figures over non-public figures.

Further, public figures do have a right, if conditions are met, to recover damages for slander, libel, and defamation of character. Those who understand the law know that this cuts both ways. It is likely that neither side is guilty to the exclusion of the other side. Should one side litigate over these issues, it is likely that counter-suits will be filed against the side that initiated the litigation.

In addition, I could propose situation in which neither side would want to litigate these issues. It is correct that "truth" may sometimes not be a defense against such a lawsuit. But, I can imagine where a side would not want to litigate an issue that they might win due to discovery and public exposure during a trial.

One fundamental issue is simply this: Public charges have been made against public individuals, and 3-ABN that will not go away unless they are resolved in public. To publicly resolve them, there may have to be some public exposure of facts that are typically protected by confidentiality in denominational circles. A failure to do this will likely result in continued discussion in public.

Let me add an additional factor: The so-called media is following this more closely that some may know. I have been asked to write an article for publication on one aspect of this which I declined to write at that time. There are others who have been approached in a similar manner, to include the secular media. Herald, I predict that if this is not resolved, and fairly soon, the media, to include the secular media, will begin reporting aspects of this which none can control. If ASI cannot resolve this, the world at large may do so.

SHOULD THE PANEL INCLUDE EXPERTS THAT COULD ASSIST IN THEIR COMPREHENSION OF THE INFORMATION?

GM: My comment on "transference" could be satisfied by a witness, rather than a member. Regardless, my point is taken, and you seem to have heard it.

WHAT STANDARD IS TO BE USED IN WEIGHING THE BIBLICAL DIVORCE REMARRIAGE ISSUE?

GM: Yes the CHUCH MANUAL is the standard. But, that can be understood and enforced in various ways. As an attorney you know that while "statute law" is the standard, "case law is always considered. My point is made. As I have previously stated, the "gold standard" among conservative SDAs is physical adultery. It has been clearly stated by 3-ABN that proof of such does not exist. If ASI strays away from that gold standard of adultery, it will lose status among conservative SDAs.

WHAT STANDARD WILL BE USED IN ALLOWING INFORMATION TO BE CONSIDERED ?

GM: Sounds good as I understand it.

HOW WILL PANEL PROCEED AND THE QUESTIONING OCCUR?

GM: The representative must be the one chosen by the party. In other words, ASI cannot exclude anyone from being a representative.

Re: "The hearing will be confidential and private, not recorded or reported by the panel, the parties, or the representative."

GM: I understand. I have some concern. This scandal is public. There must be enough information given to the public to resolve their issues. Harold, the public has a stake in this. All parties, to include 3-ABN have a major interest in this being resolved in the mind of the public.

Re: "Thank you for your patience in awaiting my thoughts. Please read this carefully. If you have questions feel free to express them. Whenever we have clarified adequately we will put our process information into a document that we can all sign on to, then begin the details of scheduling, etc."

GM: And thank you for the effort you have put into this.

Gregory Matthews

Posted by: Observer Feb 15 2007, 08:32 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 05:15 AM)

The facts are ASI was to consider the issue of Linda and Danny's divorce and his remarriage with evidence submitted by both sides, and witnesses for each. Their findings and the reasons for them were to be made PUBLIC.

Danny and 3 ABN agreed. Linda's side, including you, did not. You wanted to discuss other things...

Yet here comes Linda and all that she demands now to be made public is proof that she committed adultery??? That could have already been done had she agreed. She must think people are stupid.

Aletheia:

I have other things to do. So, I am going to do them now.

Keep in mind that we who were involved in the attempt by ASI to mediate have pretty good records. If you want to debate and challenge us, we can probably rebut what you say.

You have clearly made statements that were inaccurate. I can provide further support for my position.

I am very serious in appreciateing the efforts of Mr. Lance to effect this resolution. But, certain of the positions that he and ASI took made an ASI mediated resolution impossible. He, in his statement posted on the 3-ABN website has made statements that are false. I do not attribute that to any personal dishonesty in him. I consider him to be an honest person. I could easily sit down with him and have a pleasent conversation with him. But, he failed to understand some of the dynamics that went on in the process. That failure contributed, in my mind, to the failure to obtain agreement on the process. He came to us with an agenda of what and how. In mediation all parties must have a part in selecting the what and the how. Otherwise failure occurs. The failure that occured clearly demonstrates the correctness of my position.

16

Posted by: awesumtenor Feb 15 2007, 08:35 AM

QUOTE(Uncle Sam @ Feb 15 2007, 07:22 AM)

Linda says she was 100% faithful to Danny. Was that only during the marriage? Was there ever a time she was with the Dr, romantically? What about when Danny's people say he took her to the airport so she could be with the Dr?

You're kidding, right?

If you have read all of what is on this site, you would know that these questions have been asked and answered.

If you have not read all of what is here then you need to do your homework. If you feel that is not worth the time it will take you would be better served not to engage in the topic than doing so ignorantly... but you're not Gordie Howe... so you shouldnt need to get someone to do your thinking for you...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Nuggie Feb 15 2007, 08:56 AM

As I was reading Linda's letter I kept wondering what spin the Danny apologists would put out there. At the end of the letter, I thought surely Linda's request for Danny to show all this rock-solid evidence that he claims he has would be welcomed by people on both sides of the argument. But, incredibly, I see by reading Alethia's response that they've sunk to a new low. I can't wait to see what darts the others have to throw.

I've never met Linda and have no feelings for her either way, but I am impressed with the tone of her letter. Unlike the vitriol and hate that seeps through every word posted by Danny and his crew, Linda never once bashed her accusers, even though some would say she would be completely justified in doing so, and never condemned them all to hell. Whether she's right or wrong, innocent or guilty, I appreciate her approach to the whole situation.

Posted by: simplysaved Feb 15 2007, 09:34 AM

I agree with you.... the tone of the letter is becoming a servant of Christ.

If nothing else, it definitely serves as a reminder of how we as Christians need to handle difficulty, criticism, and scrutiny...

QUOTE(Nuggie @ Feb 15 2007, 09:56 AM)

As I was reading Linda's letter I kept wondering what spin the Danny apologists would put out there. At the end of the letter, I thought surely Linda's request for Danny to show all this rock-solid evidence that he claims he has would be welcomed by people on both sides of the argument. But, incredibly, I see by reading Alethia's response that they've sunk to a new low. I can't wait to see what darts the others have to throw.

I've never met Linda and have no feelings for her either way, but I am impressed with the tone of her letter. Unlike the vitriol and hate that seeps through every word posted by Danny and his crew, Linda never once bashed her accusers, even though some would say she would be completely

justified in doing so, and never condemned them all to hell. Whether she's right or wrong, innocent or guilty, I appreciate her approach to the whole situation.

Posted by: Clay Feb 15 2007, 09:37 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 06:15 AM)

The facts are ASI was to consider the issue of Linda and Danny's divorce and his remarriage with evidence submitted by both sides, and witnesses for each. Their findings and the reasons for them were to be made PUBLIC.

Danny and 3 ABN agreed. Linda's side, including you, did not. You wanted to discuss other things...


Yet here comes Linda and all that she demands now to be made public is proof that she committed adultery??? That could have already been done had she agreed.
She must think people are stupid.

your comments reflect the fact that you have no clue... not to mention your favorite beverage must be waterade....



Posted by: erik Feb 15 2007, 09:41 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 03:47 AM)








In my opinion, this has no substance, for the most part it is just:  and I think all this talk of lawsuits, is what stirred this rally the troops letter.

What did she really say?

1. "I'm persecuted" -- No proof or evidence
2. "I don't visit the chat sites... " -- This is a bit much if you are acquainted with any of the behind the scenes garbage. In any case all her friends and supporters do, and her representatives have a website, slandering 3ABN and this letter will appear in both ...
3. Prove I committed Adultery!

Calling what you think is a bluff is not always good. Be careful what you ask for, you just might get it...

I know..

     argue   giljoti

All I can say is THANK GOD THIS IS ALMOST OVER.

Then bring the proof, if she is bluffing, other wise you are bluffing, so i say be quiet and let the proof speak for you.

Erik

Posted by: Rosyroi Feb 15 2007, 11:52 AM

"I don't visit the chat sites... " -- This is a bit much if you are acquainted with any of the behind the scenes garbage. In any case all her friends and supporters do, and her representatives have a website, slandering 3ABN and this letter will appear in both ...

Alethia,

Apparently you are acquainted with the behind the scenes garbage. How about some transparency and open explanation what you mean by that?

I don't know what you mean by supporter of Linda. If you mean spiritual supporter then I spiritually support Linda. If you ask me to be your spiritual supporter I will be happy to do that too. There is no conflict of interest. Last time I looked in the Bible God didn't say anything about supporting one person and not supporting another. Do you know that God even Loves Hitler?

When I read Linda's letter it contained the same loving caring Christ centered way she always portrayed when she would sit on the porch talking to us lifting us up to God in prayer when she was co-founder of 3ABN. This time her walk with Jesus is even closer than ever.

I am so sorry you are hurting so much. I will keep you in my prayers daily so that you and Jesus

can become good friends again and begin to heal so your heart can be so overfilled with Love that it spills out in your life to those around you and you can begin to minister to others showing them God healed you so God can heal them also.

Jesus loves me this I know. I die daily when I ask the Holy Spirit to take out my filthy rags righteousness and fill me up with Holy Spirit righteousness so I can be more loving and caring and helping to others around me and point to Jesus how Loves them too.

Sending Linda's letter to as many sites as possible will be a wonderful witness of Linda's relying on her relationship with Jesus. Thank you.

Rosyroi... A Rose for you to smell and think of Jesus and HIS Love for you.

Posted by: sonshineonme Feb 15 2007, 12:13 PM

Aletheia,

It is a curious thing, your behavior.

Do you seriously feel you are stating comments that cause a person to think? I don't think that is what you are about.

You might consider what your personal issues really are with Linda, because there is NOTHING productive about your attitude whatsoever.

Your comments only serve to show you angry, bias, and worshipful of a man in spite of the warnings and proof. You have only more pits to fall into at this rate.

This is sad.

And I too can't wait until this situation is resolved, in every area.

Posted by: Observer Feb 15 2007, 12:52 PM

Folks, in regard to Linda's letter, I have the word:

Linda was working in connection with some other people to develop a letter that she could post on her website. That letter had NOT yet reached its final form.

The letter that was posted was a working draft. It had been extensively revised by another person working with Linda on its preparation. Some of Linda's comments were removed from that letter, and some comments from another person were added to it.

It was sent to Linda with the intention that she review it to see what changes, if any, she would make to that draft. Linda did not consider it to be in the final form that she wanted to post on her website.

She was not asked if she would permit it to be posted on the Internet prior to her posting it on her website. She would have denied permission if she had been asked. When Linda first learned that it was posted on the Internet, she asked that it be removed. She has been informed that it is too late to remove anything. So, the letter stands, and will remain posted on the Internet.

While the letter posted was not the final version of what Linda would have posted, she is clear that she was working with other people to prepare a letter to be posted on her website.

5

She plans to later post such on her website. She is considering her options in view of the fact that this draft was posted. She will probably make some revisions in the letter that she posts on her site. But, that will be done in the context of what has been posted here.

Posted by: Clay Feb 15 2007, 12:57 PM

QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 15 2007, 12:52 PM)

Folks, in regard to Linda's letter, I have the word:

Linda was working in connection with some other people to develop a letter that she could post on her website. That letter had NOT yet reached its final form.

The letter that was posted was a working draft. It had been extensively revised by another person working with Linda on its preparation. Some of Linda's comments were removed from that letter, and some comments from another person were added to it.

It was sent to Linda with the intention that she review it to see what changes, if any, she would make to that draft. Linda did not consider it to be in the final form that she wanted to post on her website.

She was not asked if she would permit it to be posted on the Internet prior to her posting it on her website. She would have denied permission if she had been asked. When Linda first learned that it was posted on the Internet, she asked that it be removed. She has been informed that it is to late to remove anything. So, the letter stands, and will remain posted on the Internet.

While the letter posted was not the final version of what Linda would have posted, she is clear that she was working with other people to prepare a letter to be posted on her website.

She plans to later post such on her website. She is considering her options in view of the fact that this draft was posted. She will probably make some revisions in the letter that she posts on her site. But, that will be done in the context of what has been posted here.

so then what are we to do with the letter we have?

Posted by: Observer Feb 15 2007, 01:00 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Feb 15 2007, 11:57 AM)

so then what are we to do with the letter we have?

It can remain posted here. It is to late to recall it. Let it remain.

Posted by: Clay Feb 15 2007, 01:01 PM

QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 15 2007, 01:00 PM)

It can remain posted here. It is to late to recall it. Let it remain.

true.... but since it is a draft.... I will unpin it and hope that the finalized copy comes out soon....

Posted by: SoulEspresso Feb 15 2007, 01:17 PM

Well, we have the general idea, anyway.

I applaud Linda for working on this. Hopefully it will lead to greater healing of her own hurt as well as to resolution of this issue as a smudge on the church's reputation.

Then, will it lead to the openness in dealing with all the other problems at 3ABN?

Posted by: Nuggie Feb 15 2007, 02:12 PM

QUOTE

Here is the letter from Linda in its entirety and is also available at www.LindaShelton.org and on www.save3ABN.com .

The question I have is why was this letter presented here as something Linda was ready to publish. Implicit in the OP was that Linda had approved the letter. Makes me wonder what else has been presented as "fact" that really isn't.

Posted by: sonshineonme Feb 15 2007, 02:28 PM

QUOTE(Nuggie @ Feb 15 2007, 12:12 PM)

The question I have is why was this letter presented here as something Linda was ready to publish. Implicit in the OP was that Linda had approved the letter. Makes me wonder what else has been presented as "fact" that really isn't.

The letter was understood as being the final copy. That was a misunderstanding. The final is to come soon. It won't change in context. It was a simple misunderstanding and it was caught immediately and also comminicated immediately here. Observer explained it well. Mistakes happen. It was acknowledged and that speaks for it'self. We are only human

Posted by: Aletheia Feb 15 2007, 02:34 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Feb 15 2007, 03:28 PM) □

The letter was understood as being the final copy. That was a misunderstanding. The final is to come soon. It won't change in context. It was a simple misunderstanding and it was caught immediately and also communicated immediately here. Observer explained it well. Mistakes happen. It was acknowledged and that speaks for it'self. We are only human □

Well I'm certainly interested in what editing and changes will be in the final copy, after the replies here...

Posted by: Observer Feb 15 2007, 02:48 PM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 01:24 PM) □

Watchbird and PB why don't you go answer Uncle Sam in the appropriate thread so he can answer you too?

Off topic discussion is never caused by just one...

Observer, I just read your really long multiple replies to me ... □

have you ever heard of the KISS principle? as in Keep it simple silly?

I'll get back to you, with a simple rebuttal.

Yes, I have heard of the KISS (Keep It Simple Stupid) mantra.

But, that mantra does not work with some people.

You kept it simple, without any backup documentation. Thus I could not respond to a simple cited item of documentation. To keep from being accuse of selective editing, I had to respond to you at some length.

However, in reality, I did keep it short in relation to the amount of material published. So, I did adhere to your mantra.

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Feb 15 2007, 01:28 PM) □

The letter was understood as being the final copy. That was a misunderstanding. The final is to come soon. It won't change in context. It was a simple misunderstanding and it was caught immediately and also communicated immediately here. Observer explained it well. Mistakes happen. It was acknowledged and that speaks for it'self. We are only human □

As I have said many times, we are imperfect. You will catch us in mistakes. This will not be the last one.

However, I would rather publish a mistake that I have discovered than to be accused of covering it up in the hope that no one would learn about it.

I do not know exactly what Linda will publish on her website. I do not know in what ways it will differ from the letter posted here. But, I do believe that whatever Linda published on her website will be close to what was posted here. In any case, we will just have to wait to see.

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 01:34 PM)

Well I'm certainly interested in what editing and changes will be in the final copy, after the replies here...

It is nice to know that you are now a fan of Linda's literary efforts.

Posted by: Noahswife Feb 15 2007, 02:56 PM

QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 15 2007, 03:48 PM)

However, I would rather publish a mistake that I have discovered than to be accused of covering it up in the hope that no one would learn about it.

Well spoken observer.

nw

Posted by: Panama_Pete Feb 15 2007, 03:06 PM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 15 2007, 06:15 AM)

Yet here comes Linda and all that she demands now to be made public is proof that she committed adultery??? That could have already been done had she agreed.
She must think people are stupid.

This is what you said in December, Aletheia. I highlighted a few of your sentences.

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Dec 20 2006, 08:50 PM)

1. I didn't come here asking for people to just say things, anybody can say anything, even liars and deceivers. **I have only been looking for verifiable facts and evidence.** My questions have been concerned with getting to that.
2. I am not trying to defend Danny personally, for I don't know him, but I can't help but notice there is an awful lot about him on this forum which hasn't been proven.
3. **I am concerned about the truth** and I am concerned about 3ABN's ministry and outreach, it is a wonderful tool to reach millions all over the world and I hope to see it continue to be so, to the glory Of God, and help reach his people and prepare them.
4. If people can't understand that, then I guess that's their problem, not mine.

~ Aletheia

Linda is also demanding the verifiable facts and evidence and truth as are you.

Since you are concerned about the truth, as you say you are, you should be pleased with Linda's demand for the exact same evidence, which 3ABN has claimed to have in their possession.

You also said:

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Jan 23 2007, 07:51 AM)

On the otherhand, if I had such defending me, **I'd have to speak up for myself** and ask them to stop from shame, and embarassment.

Thus my question **on several occasions**:

Where is Linda's voice in all this?

Linda is speaking up for herself as you can see from this rough draft of her letter.

You're hearing "Linda's voice" as you have requested "on several occasions."

Once again, you should be pleased with that.

Posted by: Clay Feb 15 2007, 03:07 PM

gonna move the questions about the pregnancy test to that thread.....

Posted by: SoulEspresso Feb 15 2007, 05:52 PM

I posted to this effect the other day but I'll say it again (I hope this doesn't count as double posting): unless you're an eyewitness yourself, anything anyone tells you is hearsay--until established in a court of law.

I don't know whether scans of original documents count--legally speaking. And this isn't a court

anyway, no such thing as an online court. I'm not a legal person, but I've had enough contact with this sort of stuff to know you have to be careful.

You don't come to the Internet, generally, looking for verifiable evidence on a topic like this. Especially not a message board.

What you can do is look at the various versions of hearsay and try to weigh them. It can be exhausting, reading all the threads; I reviewed them this morning again. I don't pretend to have covered all of them, but the overall picture is that there's a lot of nefarious business at the network, and no one there can seem to refute it.

I say "there" and mean "here." 3ABN folks post here all the time trying to spin the discussion in every way they can, but if they had any good proof they could talk about -- wouldn't it have come up by now? The pregnancy test? Please.

Linda has done the whole church a service by beginning this letter. The hearsay stops, the real evidence begins to emerge--such as it is.

NOTE: I've gone back and edited some of my posts to use more precise language. I've changed none of the content. This one I'm leaving like it is so the conversation with PB makes sense to lurkers. PB believed that I was muddying the waters by the use of the term "hearsay." I meant it in a legal sense, but that nuance might be lost on some lurkers. What we see here on these boards is one person's word against another, but I've spent hours and hours reading through this stuff and the pattern that emerges is this: 3ABN has some stuff to hide, maybe a lot. Probably a lot. That's my interpretation of what I see here and elsewhere on the net, including save3abn.com.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Feb 15 2007, 07:40 PM

QUOTE(SoulEspresso @ Feb 15 2007, 04:52 PM) □

I posted to this effect the other day but I'll say it again (I hope this doesn't count as double posting): unless you're an eyewitness yourself, anything anyone tells you is hearsay--until established in a court of law.

I don't know whether scans of original documents count--legally speaking. And this isn't a court anyway, no such thing as an online court. I'm not a legal person, but I've had enough contact with this sort of stuff to know you have to be careful.

You don't come to the Internet, generally, looking for verifiable evidence on a topic like this. Especially not a message board.

What you can do is look at the various versions of hearsay and try to weigh them. It can be exhausting, reading all the threads; I reviewed them this morning again. I don't pretend to have covered all of them, but the overall picture is that there's a lot of nefarious business at the network, and no one there can seem to refute it.

I say "there" and mean "here." 3ABN folks post here all the time trying to spin the discussion in every way they can, but if they had any good proof they could talk about -- wouldn't it have come up by now? The pregnancy test? Please.

Linda has done the whole church a service by beginning this letter. The hearsay stops, the real evidence begins to emerge--such as it is.

SoulEspresso,

I agree that this isn't an online court and we must take care when attempting to discern what is true and equally take care when we decide that what we see is actual evidence. However, in this particular instance, we have a wealth of information that comes from first-hand eyewitnesses, folks that have actually experienced the saga for themselves. They can provide their pieces of the puzzle and, when looked at as a whole, we can get a pretty good indication of what the true picture is.

To date, no one from the Thompsonville/West Frankfort area has challenged Tommy's emailed confession that is posted over on save3abn.com. So, unless someone brings convincing proof that it is fake I believe the heresy was stopped for that subject and the real evidence is emerging.

This draft copy of Linda's letter that we are now privy to adds to the picture that is developing.

PB

Posted by: Observer Feb 15 2007, 09:38 PM

QUOTE(Nuggie @ Feb 15 2007, 01:12 PM)

The question I have is why was this letter presented here as something Linda was ready to publish. Implicit in the OP was that Linda had approved the letter. Makes me wonder what else has been presented as "fact" that really isn't.

Linda has been charged with being responsible for just about everything that her supporters say about her. They tell us that we who support her could not know X if Linda had not told us X.

Well, the publication of this draft letter demonstrates that people who support Linda are not acting under her control.

Here is how the situation developed, and the facts became known.

1) Daryl F. of MSDAOL, and I acting independently checked our Linda's website and noted that it had not been posted there. Both of us attempted to make contact with Linda. Daryl succeeded before I made contact with her.

2) When Daryl made the contact, and Linda told him the facts, Daryl contacted me. I attempted to contact Linda, and succeeded. Linda told me, as I related it here. /

3) When I discovered that the letter had not been posted on Linda's website, I wondered. However, in the early days of Linda's website, Linda was working with others, as I recall, to keep the website going. As I remember, sometimes her letters, etc. were not posted immediately on her website by the webmaster. So, I thought that might have been the case. But, I wanted to tell Linda about the letter that had been posted on three forums.

4) Then when Daryl informed me of his contact with Linda, I re-doubled my efforts to contact her, and I did.

So that is how this all came about.

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 15 2007, 09:41 PM

QUOTE(Nuggie @ Feb 15 2007, 10:56 AM)

....I've never met Linda and have no feelings for her either way, but I am impressed with the tone of her letter. Unlike the vitriol and hate that seeps through every word posted by Danny and his crew, *Linda never once bashed her accusers, even though some would say she would be completely justified in doing so, and never condemned them all to hell. **Whether she's right or wrong, innocent or guilty, I appreciate her approach to the whole situation.***

...because - even if (big **IF**) she was guilty - she has handled this in a very CHRISTlike way. Danny and the gang on the other hand have talked about her worse than a dog. With which; makes one wonder if they are being CHRISTlike or no....



QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Feb 15 2007, 02:13 PM)

Aletheia,

It is a curious thing, your behavior.

Do you seriously feel you are stating comments that cause a person to think? I don't think that is what you are about.

You might consider what ***your personal issues*** really are with Linda, because **there is NOTHING productive about your attitude whatsoever.**

Your comments only serve to show you angry, bias, and worshipful of a man inspite of the warnings and proof. You have only more pits to fall into at this rate.

This is sad.

And I too can't wait until this situation is resolved, in every area.

Posted by: mystery- man Feb 16 2007, 02:10 AM

I am glad that she is finally speaking because hopefully the truth can come out. I think we are at a cross road here, either Linda is a liar or she is telling the truth there is no middle ground. She has express 100% that she is not guilty of adultery. She has asked for the proof that Danny has stated that He had concerning her supposed adultery. Now if Danny does not provide the proof Him and the others at 3abn in my eyesight will forever be tainted as liars and mere pretenders.

I find it very difficult to understand how the board members could dismiss Linda without providing her with the reason as to why. The fact that she must ask for that information is by its very nature suspect to say the least. And why would they not just give her the information before now so she could do what she wanted with it? I have been in many a board meeting where the individual that was being disfellowshipped or put our was not there, in every case we the board sent them a letter explaining the reason we disfellowshipped them and all pertinent information via a certified letter.

4

I have enjoyed the many years that I watched Danny, Linda on 3abn but I am impartial to either of them. I have also contibuted to them finacially tho I have stopped at this time. It is my prayer that Her request is answered promptly without excuse.

Posted by: SoulEspresso Feb 16 2007, 06:52 AM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Feb 15 2007, 07:40 PM)

SoulEspresso,

I agree that this isn't an online court and we must take care when attempting to discern what is true and equally take care when we decide that what we see is actual evidence. However, in this particular instance, we have a wealth of information that comes from first-hand eyewitnesses, folks that have actually experienced the saga for themselves. They can provide their pieces of the puzzle and, when looked at as a whole, we can get a pretty good indication of what the true picture is.

To date, no one from the Thompsonville/West Frankfort area has challenged Tommy's emailed confession that is posted over on save3abn.com. So, unless someone brings convincing proof that it is fake I believe the heresay was stopped for that subject and the real evidence is emerging.

This draft copy of Linda's letter that we are now privy to adds to the picture that is developing.

PB

I'm using hearsay in a technical sense. What I mean is this; unless I'm an eyewitness myself, anything anyone tells me is hearsay to me until it's been established in a court of law and/or by other evidence.

I tip heavily toward believing Linda was wronged (and that there's other nefarious business afoot) because much of the hearsay on this site and on save3abn.com is more credible. Why is it more credible? Because these other people are eyewitnesses and have posted documentation--and some of them have identified themselves, bless them. Those than haven't identified themselves want to keep their jobs, I understand that.

But since I'm not an eyewitness, haven't seen the original copies of the documents, I still consider it hearsay. In other words, it's not hearsay to them because they saw it with their own eyes, but it's hearsay to me when they tell me. Does that make sense?

Another reason I believe Linda was wronged and that there's other nefarious business afoot is the attitude of certain posters who will go to great lengths to defend Danny and try to paint 3ABN in a good light, even when they have to misquote, contradict themselves, etc. They claim to be eyewitnesses, too, but they don't have names and dates like the others do--all they have is the desire to stir things up and defend their boy.

The third reason? AToday's article. AToday is a news magazine, and they can't publish libelous stuff. What they got was established enough by credible sources that they figured their story would stand up in court--not as testimony, but that it wasn't libel the way it was written.

Those of us who find ourselves frustrated with these people are sometimes guilty of a rough spirit--no worse than theirs, mind you, but they're not the Standard (by the way, I haven't seen in any of that in you, PB). I've tried to keep myself in a positive tone but when I catch them in an obvious act of deception I get mad.

20

It's too bad there's no arbiter in this case. Because it fell through, this tale is going to hit the secular press soon. I bet they're lurking, waiting for as much data as possible before blowing open the story. And they will be merciless, far more than AToday--because they don't care about a church or its reputation.

Posted by: Observer Feb 16 2007, 07:26 AM

QUOTE

It's too bad there's no arbiter in this case. Because it fell through, this tale is going to hit the secular press soon. I bet they're lurking, waiting for as much data as possible before blowing open the story. And they will be merciless, far more than AToday--because they don't care about a church or its reputation.

A few comments, and you are on target:

I was once asked to write an article for the media. I refused to write one with the focus they wanted.

A major figure in this mess was approached, some time back, and asked to cooperate in writing a an article for major national publication in the seccular media (i.e. not associated with the SDA press). That person also refused.

Some of us believe that once litigation begins, the seccular media will begin to run with this developing story. We think that it is possible that 3-ABN/Danny will soon begin litigation. That litigation may be focused on issues that are not of great interest to the seccular media--trademark issues associated with the website <save31bn>. But, if a lawsuit is filed against Linda, the media may jump on that like a flea jumping on a dog, on a hot summer day. That, in my opinion, would be a public relations disaster for 3-ABN.

Frankly, God is more concerned about truth, righteous, justice, mercy, and other such, than reputation. As 3-ABN is independent, and not a denominational entity, the reputation of the denomination may not suffer as much as some would have us to beleive.

In any case, the reputation of the denomination is less important than is God's standards of righteousness. It is better for us to take damage to reputation than to cover-up wrong doing, if that is the case.

We say that we do not want to destroy 3-ABN. I do not believe that we could do so, if we wanted to do so. 3-ABN is in God's hands for as long as 3-ABN is in compliance with the mission of God for it. If 3-ABN is destroyed, whatever that may mean, it will be because such was in the will of God for it.

The Bible is clear that there are times in human and spiritual history that God does destroy, so to speak, so that God can build anew.

God destroyed the Earth with a flood, so that God could build anew.

God will at a later tieme destroy the Earth with fire so that God can build anew.

God burned Battle Creek so that God could build anew out of the ashes of Battle Creek. That destruction came only after God had sent warnigs by humans, which were rejected.

If God allows 3-ABN to be destroyed, so to speak, there are two possibilities:

a) God can reconstitute 3-ABN again, out of those ashes, and 3-ABN can again fill the role that God

gives it.

God can leave it in ashes, as Hope TV may fill the role that God intended for 3-ABN, and for which 3-ABN departed, and went another direction. I am not saying that 3-ABN has done such. I am saying that God is in charge. God will accomplish His purpose with or without 3-ABN, according to 3-ABNs willingness to follow what God lays out for them.

Posted by: Aletheia Feb 16 2007, 07:53 AM

QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 16 2007, 08:26 AM)

We say that we do not want to destroy 3-ABN. I do not believe that we could do so, if we wanted to do so. 3-ABN is in God's hands for as long as 3-ABN is in compliance with the mission of God for it. If 3-ABN is destroyed, whatever that may mean, it will be because such was in the will of God for it.

The Bible is clear that there are times in human and spiritual history that God does destroy, so to speak, so that God can build anew.

God destroyed the Earth with a flood, so that God could build anew.

God will at a later tieme destroy the Earth with fire so that God can build anew.

God burned Battle Creek so that God could build anew out of the ashes of Battle Creek. That destruction came only after God had sent warnigns by humans, which were rejected.

If God allows 3-ABN to be destroyed, so to speak, there are two possibilities

There is a big difference here. In your examples God carried out the judgments, NOT MAN. His servants role was only to rebuke and warn...

You claim "**if** God allows 3ABN to be destroyed.." that indicates it is others attempting to do the destroying.

And indeed such appears to be the situation.

What will you conclude **IF** God does not allow 3ABN to be destroyed?

Posted by: Observer Feb 16 2007, 08:46 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 16 2007, 06:53 AM)

There is a big difference here. In your examples God carried out the judgments, NOT MAN. His servants role was only to rebuke and warn...

You claim "IF* God allows 3ABN to be destroyed.." that indicates it is others attempting to do the destroying.

And indeed such appears to be the situation.

What will you conclude IF* God does not allow 3ABN to be destroyed?

letheia:

So, I am not indicating that others are attempting to destroy 3-ABN. If a lightning bolt set a building on fire, God would have allowed it, but humans would not have done it. Your logic is a typical misrepresentation of my statement.

If God does not allow 3-ABN to be destroyed, I will give thanks to God that God has been able to reform 3-ABN, and again use it according to God's purpose.

Yes, in my examples, God did not use humans to destroy. However, I assume that you know Scripture well enough to know that there are many examples in the Bible where God did use people to destroy so that God could rebuild. So, I do not think that I will need to cite them here.

Again, the questions as to humans destroying 3-ABN is not relevant for our purpose. Its destruction is not our goal. If it is destroyed, it will likely be because people rejected God's call to change. In that examples that I gave (flood, etc.) that is very clear. It is upon those people that the responsibility for the destruction that came rests.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Feb 16 2007, 10:43 AM

QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 16 2007, 10:46 AM) □

. . . Its destruction is not our goal . . .

Gregory,

In regards to this, and I posted this in the Thursday night thread but it applicable here, how is one to interpret the following statements in Gailon Joy's plea to G. Spence at the save3abn site?

"Will require very aggressive litigation team but assets of the ministry, it's founder and directors are substantial."

"In my experience, strong possibility of recovery from jury demand and believe we have documentary foundation for punitive damages"

The very site that claims it exists to "save" the ministry for God has petitioned a high power attorney to assist in draining it of its financial resources. How is one not to come to the conclusion that there are those in the "small group", of which you are a part, that 3ABN's demise is the desired outcome?

This along with other comments made on various BBS and on Gailon's site indicate that there are a number of individuals who do desire to see 3ABN disappear. Their desire is to take a ministry that has reached tens of thousands of people with the love of God and the message of His soon return and the joy that each one of us can be carried away in the clouds - and shut it down.

FHB

14

Posted by: Observer Feb 16 2007, 11:18 AM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Feb 16 2007, 09:43 AM)

Gregory,

In regards to this, and I posted this in the Thursday night thread but it applicable here, how is one to interpret the following statements in Gailon Joy's plea to G. Spence a the save3abn site?

"Will require very aggressive litigation team but assets of the ministry, it's founder and directors are substantial."

"In my experience, strong possibility of recovery from jury demand and believe we have documentary foundation for punitive damages"

The very site that claims it exists to "save" the ministry for God has petitioned a high power attorney to assist in draining it of its financial resources. How is one not to come to the conclusion that there are those in the "small group", of which you are a part, that 3ABN's demise is the desired outcome?

This along with other comments made on various BBS and on Gailon's site indicate that there are a number of individuals who do desire to see 3ABN disappear. Their desire is to take a ministry that has reached tens of thousands of people with the love of God and the message of His soon return and the joy that each one of us can be carried away in the clouds - and shut it down.

- FHB

O. K. Let us apply the above to the situation in a court of law:

1) If punitive damages were to be awarded, it is a stretch to believe that they would be awarded in an amount that would destroy 3-ABN. Most of the time U. S. courts have some modicum of reasonableness. Look at the tobacco companies. Punitive damages have not been awarded in an amount that has destroyed them.

2) Certainly some punitive damages could (?) be awarded to a number of people to include Linda. But, again, I find it a stretch to believe that any court would order the assets of 3-ABN to be liquidated in order to pay damages. Look to the Roman Catholic church. Regional assets that belong to it have not been liquidated in total.

3) Under the right set of circumstances, should they come into being, a court could potentially order a change in management, and policy.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Feb 16 2007, 11:24 AM

QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 16 2007, 01:18 PM)

O. K. Let us apply the above to the situation in a court of law:

- 1) If punitive damages were to be awarded, it is a stretch to believe that they would be awarded in an amount that would destroy 3-ABN. Most of the time U. S. courts have some modicum of reasonableness. Look at the tobacco companies. Punitive damages have not been awarded in an amount that has destroyed them.
- 2) Certainly some punitive damages could (?) be awarded to a number of people to include Linda. But, again, I find it a stretch to believe that any court would order the assets of 3-ABN to be liquidated in order to pay damages. Look to the Roman Catholic church. Regional assets that belong to it have not been liquidated in total.
- 3) Under the right set of circumstances, should they come into being, a court could potentially order a change in management, and policy.

Gregory,

While your response is reasoned and contains a possible logical look at what could happen, it doesn't answer my question or comment on my point.

My point: It seems obvious that Gailon Joy and others in his "small group" do want to see an end to 3ABN.

My question: How is one to interpret his statements any other way than supporting the idea that he has no problem with the disappearance of 3ABN.

FHB

Posted by: Daryl Fawcett Feb 16 2007, 11:26 AM

QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 15 2007, 11:38 PM) □

Linda has been charged with being responsible for just about everything that her supporters say about her. They tell us that we who support her could not know X if Linda had not told us X.

Well, the publication of this draft letter demonstrates that people who support Linda are not acting under her control.

Here is how the situation developed, and the facts became known.

1) Daryl F. of MSDAOL, and I acting independently checked our Linda's website and noted that it had not been posted there. Both of us attempted to make contact with Linda. Daryl succeeded before I made contact with her.

2) When Daryl made the contact, and Linda told him the facts, Daryl contacted me. I attempted to contact Linda, and succeeded. Linda told me, as I related it here.

3) When I discovered that the letter had not been posted on Linda's website, I wondered. However, in the early days of Linda's website, Linda was working with others, as I recall, to keep the website going. As I remember, sometimes her letters, etc. were not posted immediately on her website by the webmaster. So, I thought that might have been the case. But, I wanted to tell Linda about the letter that had been posted on three forums.

4) Then when Daryl informed me of his contact with Linda, I re-doubled my efforts to contact her, and I did.

So that is how this all came about.

'es, I did wonder why it wasn't on even one of those two websites, particularly Linda's own website, especially when I was told they were on there. This prompted me to inquire about it to Linda and to the main person of the other website, which prompted Linda to respond accordingly. Linda, at first asked me if they could be removed, but before I could respond, she realized it was too late and decided to leave them there.

In light of the draft letter, I will be glad when the final one appears.

Posted by: awesumtenor Feb 16 2007, 11:31 AM

The charge that there is a desire to destroy 3ABN only flies if one believes that 3ABN cannot exist without DS and the current leadership.

If this is the case, then it is not God's ministry... the benefit derived from it by viewers notwithstanding.

God doesn't do single points of failure; if it is truly His ministry then He will, if need be raise someone up who had nothing to do with the failings of the current leadership to carry it forward.

God doesn't need DS... or any other man and just because someone may hold a position now does not mean that he is indispensable

As was shown with Nebuchadnezzar, God can depose and maintain without the one engulfed by his hubris... there be a lesson in that for those with ears to hear...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: SoulEspresso Feb 16 2007, 11:32 AM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Feb 16 2007, 11:24 AM)

Gregory,

While your response is reasoned and contains a possible logical look at what could happen, it doesn't answer my question or comment on my point.

My point: It seems obvious that Gailon Joy and others in his "small group" do want to see an end to 3ABN.

My question: How is one to interpret his statements any other way than supporting the idea that he has no problem with the disappearance of 3ABN.

- FHB

Well, you can't tell from what you posted here that he "has no problem" with the disappearance of 3ABN. All we know is that he believes that substantial punitive damages are possible or even likely. The existence of 3ABN doesn't factor into his statements.

I think what Greg is saying is that courts don't award such large punitive damages that those who have to pay them are wiped out.

But even the court of public opinion would eventually forgive the channel, if Danny loses in court. They may not forgive him. People are more tolerant of adultery than public and malicious deceit.

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Feb 16 2007, 11:33 AM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Feb 16 2007, 01:31 PM)

. . . God doesn't need DS...

Mr. J

On this point you and Danny agree as he said the same last night.

FHB

Posted by: Daryl Fawcett Feb 16 2007, 11:49 AM

I am not aware of anybody, especially in this so-called small group, that wants 3ABN itself to come to an end.

I, for one, definitely doesn't want to see 3ABN come to an end.

Posted by: watchbird Feb 16 2007, 12:01 PM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Feb 16 2007, 12:31 PM)

The charge that there is a desire to destroy 3ABN only flies if one believes that 3ABN cannot exist without DS and the current leadership.

If this is the case, then it is not God's ministry... the benefit derived from it by viewers notwithstanding.

God doesn't do single points of failure; if it is truly His ministry then He will, if need be raise someone up who had nothing to do with the failings of the current leadership to carry it forward.

God doesn't need DS... or any other man and just because someone may hold a position now does not mean that he is indispensable

As was shown with Nebuchadnezzar, God can depose and maintain without the one engulfed by his hubris... there be a lesson in that for those with ears to hear...

In His service,
Mr. J

Exactly, Kevin... and the "charge" is MADE because those who make it equate Danny with 3abn such that any move against Danny is equated with a move against 3abn as a separate entity.

The facts are... as we have noted here on BSDA many times... that it is Danny himself that makes that equation... and who has said multiple times that 3abn in HIS baby... and that NO ONE is going to take HIS BABY" away from him.

Those who are uncovering the evil at 3abn are wanting to SAVE 3abn from the evil being perpetrated by its present owner/directors. If those owner/directors will not allow 3abn to be saved from the evil that has exuded from its pores increasingly over the years... then they themselves will be the ones who destroy 3abn. And those who wished to have saved it for future use by God will have failed in their mission.... even though they succeed in exposing and destroying the evil.

It looks to be a hopeless muddle ... from a human point of view... But God is still working through the events and persons responsible... on all sides of the issue... and eventually He will reveal to all ... all that needs to be revealed. And eventually Right and Justice will prevail.

Posted by: awesumtenor Feb 16 2007, 12:34 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Feb 16 2007, 12:33 PM)

On this point you and Danny agree as he said the same last night.

- FHB

The difference is, I actually believe it...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: SoulEspresso Feb 16 2007, 12:41 PM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Feb 16 2007, 12:34 PM)

The difference is, I actually believe it...

In His service,
Mr. J

Well, if Danny meant what he said, he should step down immediately and allow a free and open inquiry into all aspects in question at 3ABN.

But if he doesn't believe God just has to have him, why are his acolytes equating him with the "anointed ones" of the Bible? (Hebrew--"messiahs") Why is questioning him the same as questioning God? This isn't hearsay either, it was broadcast over 3ABN ...

Posted by: awesumtenor Feb 16 2007, 12:45 PM

QUOTE(SoulEspresso @ Feb 16 2007, 01:41 PM)

Well, if Danny meant what he said, he should step down immediately and allow a free and open inquiry into all aspects in question at 3ABN.

But if he doesn't believe God just has to have him, why are his acolytes equating him with the "anointed ones" of the Bible? (Hebrew--"messiahs") Why is questioning him the same as questioning God? This isn't hearsay either, it was broadcast over 3ABN ...

guess you no longer need a golden calf to have idolatry in the camp...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: andithomas1 Feb 16 2007, 01:05 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Feb 16 2007, 10:43 AM)

Gregory,

In regards to this, and I posted this in the Thursday night thread but it applicable here, how is one to interpret the following statements in Gailon Joy's plea to G. Spence a the save3abn site?

"Will require very aggressive litigation team but assets of the ministry, it's founder and directors are substantial."

"In my experience, strong possibility of recovery from jury demand and believe we have documentary foundation for punitive damages"

The very site that claims it exists to "save" the ministry for God has petitioned a high power attorney to assist in draining it of its financial resources. How is one not to come to the conclusion that there are those in the "small group", of which you are a part, that 3ABN's demise is the desired outcome?

This along with other comments made on various BBS and on Gailon's site indicate that there are a number of individuals who do desire to see 3ABN disappear. Their desire is to take a ministry that has reached tens of thousands of people with the love of God and the message of His soon return and the joy that each one of us can be carried away in the clouds - and shut it down.

- FHB

If you will look in the Bible-God used others to bring judgement on Israel when they wouldn't repent and do his will. What makes you think God won't bring judgement on 3ABN if they don't come clean. Israel was supposed to do much more than 3abn could ever do-look what happened to them in their

history. No human institution has the right to trample on God's people and think they are immune from judgement.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Feb 16 2007, 05:58 PM

QUOTE(SoulEspresso @ Feb 16 2007, 05:52 AM) □

I'm using hearsay in a technical sense. What I mean is this; unless I'm an eyewitness myself, anything anyone tells me is hearsay to me until it's been established in a court of law and/or by other evidence.

I tip heavily toward believing Linda was wronged (and that there's other nefarious business afoot) because much of the hearsay on this site and on save3abn.com is more credible. Why is it more credible? Because these other people are eyewitnesses and have posted documentation--and some of them have identified themselves, bless them. Those than haven't identified themselves want to keep their jobs, I understand that.

But since I'm not an eyewitness, haven't seen the original copies of the documents, I still consider it hearsay. In other words, it's not hearsay to them because they saw it with their own eyes, but it's hearsay to me when they tell me. Does that make sense?

SoulEspresso,

Yes, now I do understand. You are using the word "hearsay" as it applies in a legal setting. My only hesitation is that there are some here who would misread your intended usage, those who have been charging many of us with believing in and spreading rumors. As you'll notice, the common usage of the word "hearsay" would tend to bolster their claims of rumor, gossip and slander, if they did not discern that you were using it in the legal sense.

From TheFreeDictionary:

Hearsay, n.

1. Unverified information heard or received from another; rumor.
2. Law Evidence based on the reports of others rather than the personal knowledge of a witness and therefore generally not admissible as testimony.

Since this forum is not a legal courtroom, the process of building a case for truth is held to a slightly different standard. If Duane Clem tells me that he was a victim of pastoral sexual abuse as a young man by the pastor of his church and then I read the emailed confession Duane received from that very pastor, I believe that I can safely conclude that Duane's testimony is truthful. In this court of public opinion, the use of the word "hearsay" may be a bit of a sticky wicket, diverting the minds of some from the fine points that you are bringing forward.

In the case of those people who have been eye witnesses to certain events, such as sister and HOTY, etc., our job is to determine whether or not they are credible witnesses. If deemed credible, their first-hand testimonies should be able to be viewed as factual. I believe it is an injustice to them to characterize their testimonies as hearsay when repeated by others. Certainly, if we were to be witnesses in a court of law, reporting what we have heard from them would qualify as hearsay - but not here and not in normal every day life.

QUOTE

Another reason I believe Linda was wronged and that there's other nefarious business afoot is the

attitude of certain posters who will go to great lengths to defend Danny and try to paint 3ABN in a good light, even when they have to misquote, contradict themselves, etc. They claim to be eyewitnesses, too, but they don't have names and dates like the others do--all they have is the desire to stir things up and defend their boy.

The third reason? AToday's article. AToday is a news magazine, and they can't publish libelous stuff. What they got was established enough by credible sources that they figured their story would stand up in court--not as testimony, but that it wasn't libel the way it was written.

Those of us who find ourselves frustrated with these people are sometimes guilty of a rough spirit--no worse than theirs, mind you, but they're not the Standard (by the way, I haven't seen in any of that in you, PB). **I've tried to keep myself in a positive tone but when I catch them in an obvious act of deception I get mad.**

It's too bad there's no arbiter in this case. Because it fell through, this tale is going to hit the secular press soon. I bet they're lurking, waiting for as much data as possible before blowing open the story. And they will be merciless, far more than AToday--because they don't care about a church or its reputation.

From all that I have seen lately, you have done a great job keeping your positive tone. I understand how tempting it is to get frustrated or mad at the deceptive practices of some. Just try to keep seeing them through the eyes of Jesus and divert that emotion with a little prayer for them.

'B

Posted by: Lee Feb 16 2007, 10:14 PM

QUOTE(andithomas1 @ Feb 16 2007, 02:05 PM)

If you will look in the Bible-God used others to bring judgement on Israel when they wouldn't repent and do his will. What makes you think God won't bring judgement on 3ABN if they don't come clean. Israel was supposed to do much more than 3abn could ever do-look what happened to them in their history. No human institution has the right to trample on God's people and think they are immune from judgement.

What makes people think God won't bring judgment on them for all the lies/insinuations/insinuations/suggestions and outright blatant gossip against a ministry God set up? It is a serious thing to go against the will of God--to desire to work against his purposes!

Posted by: Panama_Pete Feb 16 2007, 11:05 PM

QUOTE(Lee @ Feb 16 2007, 10:14 PM)

What makes people think God won't bring judgment on them for all the lies/insinuations/insinuations/suggestions and outright blatant gossip against a ministry God set up? **It is a serious thing to go against the will of God --to desire to work against his purposes!**

Yes, it is a serious thing to go against the will of God.

<http://preteristarchive.com/StudyArchive/t/televangelists.html> warns us this way:

"The Holy Ghost is upon me...The day is coming when those that attack us will drop dead. You say, 'What did you say?' I speak this under **the anointing** of the Spirit. Can I tell you something? Don't touch God's servants; it's deadly...Woe to you that touch God's servants. You're going to pay. 'And the day will come," **the Lord said that to me.** He said, "The day will come when I will punish instantly. **Woe to those that touch my chosen.**' They will fear us. Hear this: today they mock us; tomorrow they will fear us." - "Miracle Invasion Rally," Anaheim Convention Center, 11/22/91

Do you think that it would be deadly for me to question Benny Hinn? He is the Lord's chosen, isn't he? If he says the Holy Ghost is upon him, do I have a right to question that?

God told Benny Hinn, right?

If I have relatives that want to climb up on the stage with Benny at the Miracle Invasion "Rally" do I have a right to say anything, or will my opposition to "the chosen" cause my demise?

Notice also that Benny Hinn has "the anointing." Can I question someone who has been anointed?

And remember, when the chosen has been anointed, that's just not for one day, either, as I learned watching 3ABN on a Thursday night.

Things to think about.

Posted by: Observer Feb 17 2007, 05:23 AM

QUOTE(Lee @ Feb 16 2007, 09:14 PM)

What makes people think God won't bring judgment on them for all the lies/insinuations/insinuations/suggestions and outright blatant gossip against a ministry God set up?

It is a serious thing to go against the will of God--to desire to work against his purposes!

God established a ministry at Battle Creek. And the people learned that establishment by God did not mean that it would always remain God's ministry doing God's will. It's leadership rejected the leading of God, and went their own way. God sent warnings. They refused to listen. God burned Battle Creek, and out of those ashes built a ministry that was again in conformity to God's will. In that process the leadership either repented of their rebellion or they were removed and replaced.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Feb 17 2007, 08:56 AM

QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 17 2007, 04:23 AM)

God established a ministry at Battle Creek. And the people learned that establishment by God did not mean that it would always remain God's ministry doing God's will. It's leadership rejected the leading of God, and went their own way. God sent warnings. They refused to listen. God burned

Battle Creek, and our of those ashes built a ministry that was again in conformity to God's will. In that process the leadership either repented of their rebellion or they were removed and replaced.


This is an excellent example. Thank you.

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 17 2007, 09:32 AM

GOD can establish something - (the Garden of Eden) and if those that he "establishes" with don't act right (Adam & Eve) GOD can evict them....

Didn't he do that?

Merinate on dat.




Posted by: jene Feb 17 2007, 11:43 AM

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Feb 17 2007, 10:32 AM)


GOD can establish something - (the Garden of Eden) and if those that he "establishes" with don't act right (Adam & Eve) GOD can evict them....

Didn't he do that?

Merinate on dat.




'ou betta preach girl!!!!



Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 17 2007, 01:06 PM

QUOTE(jene @ Feb 17 2007, 01:43 PM)

You betta preach girl!!!!



'm jes sayin'.....you know?



Posted by: lurker Feb 17 2007, 01:23 PM

The annointed one is Jesus isn't he? The messiah? The christ? Does that make others who claim to be the annointed one **antichrists**?

Posted by: watchbird Feb 17 2007, 01:46 PM


QUOTE(lurker @ Feb 17 2007, 02:23 PM)

The annointed one is Jesus isn't he? The messiah? The christ? Does that make others who claim to be the annointed one **antichrists**?

Oooooooooooooo..... you WENT there.....

yes you did.....

.....




Posted by: sonshineonme Feb 17 2007, 01:54 PM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Feb 17 2007, 11:46 AM)

Oooooooooooooo..... you WENT there.....

yes you did.....

.....



Yes - he did.

You beat me WB. I was thinking of a reply to this thought....

This is not the first time that this "thought" has come to mind.

It is an interesting time we live in.

Posted by: watchbird Feb 17 2007, 02:28 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Feb 17 2007, 02:54 PM)

Yes - he did.

You beat me WB. I was thinking of a reply to this thought....

This is not the first time that this "thought" has come to mind.

It is an interesting time we live in.

Pentecostals frequently say things that are downright blasphemous if we stop to think about them. See <http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?s=&showtopic=12554&view=findpost&p=178837> where he uses Benny Hinn as an example. Problem is, that they are said in such a pious tone surrounded by so much "God talk" that turning our "thinker" off is almost as automatic as bowing our heads and closing our eyes for prayer. (Or has the Pentecostal influence taken hold so much that we don't bow our heads or close our eyes in prayer any more?)

Maybe we need to move past "Kindergarten Ten Commandments" class content.... where "taking the Lord's name in vain" applies only to using swear words.... and move on to "Basic Principles of Ten Commandment Applications 101"... where it is recognized that "taking the Lord's Name in vain" applies also to a lot of other areas.... including even calling ourselves "Christian" whether or not we live like Christians would. To say nothing of applying to ourselves labels and terms used in scripture for God's specially chosen prophets and messengers.

What a sad day for Adventism when we allow our church to be represented by those who spout Pentecostal jargon that is indistinguishable from the most extreme of popular Pentecostal Televangelists..... and even dare to label it "conservative Adventism"!

Posted by: Panama_Pete Feb 17 2007, 02:43 PM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Feb 17 2007, 02:28 PM)

Pentecostals frequently say things that are downright blasphemous if we stop to think about them. See <http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?s=&showtopic=12554&view=findpost&p=178837> where he uses Benny Hinn as an example.

What a sad day for Adventism when we allow our church to be represented by those who spout Pentecostal jargon that is indistinguishable from the most extreme of popular Pentecostal Televangelists..... and even dare to label it "conservative Adventism"!

And because we don't frequent Pentecostal meetings many of us remain unaware of the source of this Pentecostal jargon. Yes, it truly will be a sad day when our theology becomes indistinguishable from the Pentecostal theology.


Posted by: Aletheia Feb 17 2007, 04:23 PM


QUOTE


lurker Posted Today, 02:23 PM:


The annointed one is Jesus isn't he? The messiah? The christ? Does that make others who claim to be the annointed one antichrists?

watchbird Posted Today, 02:46 PM


Oooooooooooooo..... you WENT there..... 

yes you did..... 







sonshineonme @ Feb 17 2007, 02:54 PM:

Yes - he did. 

You beat me WB. I was thinking of a reply to this thought....

This is not the first time that this "thought" has come to mind. 

It is an interesting time we live in. 

watchbird' 03:28 PM:

Pentecostals frequently say things that are downright blasphemous if we stop to think about them. See <http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?s=&showtopic=12554&view=findpost&p=178837> where he uses Benny Hinn as an example. Problem is, that they are said in such a pious tone surrounded by so much "God talk" that turning our "thinker" off is almost as automatic as bowing our heads and closing our eyes for prayer. (Or has the Pentecostal influence taken hold so much that we don't bow our heads or close our eyes in prayer any more?)

Maybe we need to move past "Kindergarten Ten Commandments" class content.... where "taking the Lord's name in vain" applies only to using swear words.... and move on to "Basic Principles of Ten Commandment Applications 101"... where it is recognized that "taking the Lord's Name in vain" applies also to a lot of other areas.... including even calling ourselves "Christian" whether or not we live like Christians would. To say nothing of applying to ourselves labels and terms used in scripture for God's specially chosen prophets and messengers.

What a sad day for Adventism when we allow our church to be represented by those who spout Pentecostal jargon that is indistinguishable from the most extreme of popular Pentecostal

Televangelists..... and even dare to label it "conservative Adventism"!



Panama_Pete Posted Today, 03:43 PM:

And because we don't frequent Pentecostal meetings many of us remain unaware of the source of this Pentecostal jargon. Yes, it truly will be a sad day when our theology becomes indistinguishable from the Pentecostal theology.

What about biblical Jargon?

Yes, Jesus is, the Christ, ***THE* anointed one**, even as he is ***THE* light of the world**, yet he said: "*Ye are the light of the world*"

Why?

Jo 4:4 Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world.

Every Priest was anointed in the Old Covenant, and in the New?

Pe 2:5 Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.

We are ALL called to the ministry of God, All called to bear the good news, and to be witnesses for our Creator and his truth.

It is sad to me that in seeking to find fault with DS or a3ABN, you mock and ridicule, feigning shock and treating sacred truths like a joke. Petacostalism? It seems plain, "You err, not knowing the scriptures":. Why, rather than denying truth, should these words not apply to yourselves? Our God is good he is gracious and merciful and gives plentifully to all who come to him in faith.

Jo 2:18 Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time.

9 They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would [no doubt] have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.

10 But ye have an **unction[anointing]** from the Holy One, and ye know all things.

11 I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth.

Jo 2:24-27 Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the father. And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life. These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you. But **the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you**, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as **the same anointing** teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him. And now, little children, abide in him; that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming. If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him.

Cr 1:20 For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us. **Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God**; Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.

Let's stick to and be grounded in The Word.

~ Aletheia

Posted by: Richard Sherwin Feb 17 2007, 04:31 PM

So we are all anointed? Then are people saying that Danny is more anointed than the rest of us?

Richard

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 17 2007, 05:23 PM) □

What about biblical Jargon?

Yes, Jesus is, the Christ, *THE* anointed one, even as he is *THE* light of the world, yet he said":Ye are the light of the world"

Why?

1Jo 4:4 Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world.

Every Priest was anointed in the Old Covenant, and in the New?

1Pe 2:5 Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.

We are ALL called to the ministry of God, All called to bear the good news, and to be witnesses for our Creator and his truth.

It is sad to me that in seeking to find fault with DS or a3ABN, you mock and ridicule, feigning shock and treating sacred truths like a joke. Petacostalism? It seems plain, "You err, not knowing the scriptures":. Why, rather than denying truth, should these words not apply to yourselves? Our God is Good he is gracious and merciful and gives plentifully to all who come to him in faith.

1Jo 2:18 Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time.

19 They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would [no doubt] have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.

20But ye have an **unction[anointing]** from the Holy One, and ye know all things.

:21I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth.

1Jo 2:24-27 Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father. And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life. These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you. But **the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you**, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as **the same anointing** teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him. And now, little children, abide in him; that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming. If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him.

2Cr 1:20 For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us. **Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God**; Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts. And now, little children, abide in him; that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his

coming. If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him.

Let's stick to and be grounded in The Word.

~ Aletheia

Posted by: watchbird Feb 17 2007, 04:40 PM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 17 2007, 05:23 PM)

Let's stick to and be grounded in The Word.

~ Aletheia

This would be a very good principle. It will not, however, be helpful unless we have learned enough spiritual discernment to recognize Pentecostal "scripture twisting" when we see it. For there is hardly anyone who quotes more scripture than a Pentecostal.

But when the fundamental belief system upon which we stand when we read scripture is different... then the interpretations and applications are going to be different.

And we will drift from a truly scriptural ground to a spiritualistical ground.... and we will not know when Satan insinuates himself into the doctrines in his predicted "angel of light" disguise.

Posted by: Aletheia Feb 17 2007, 04:44 PM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Feb 17 2007, 12:05 AM)

Yes, it is a serious thing to go against the will of God.

<http://preteristarchive.com/StudyArchive/t/televangelists.html> warns us this way:

"The Holy Ghost is upon me...The day is coming when those that attack us will drop dead. You say, 'What did you say?' I speak this under **the anointing** of the Spirit. Can I tell you something? Don't touch God's servants; it's deadly...Woe to you that touch God's servants. You're going to pay. 'And the day will come,' **the Lord said that to me.** He said, "The day will come when I will punish instantly. **Woe to those that touch my chosen.**' They will fear us. Hear this: today they mock us; tomorrow they will fear us." - "Miracle Invasion Rally," Anaheim Convention Center, 11/22/91

Do you think that it would be deadly for me to question Benny Hinn? He is the Lord's chosen, isn't he? If he says the Holy Ghost is upon him, do I have a right to question that?

God told Benny Hinn, right?

If I have relatives that want to climb up on the stage with Benny at the Miracle Invasion "Rally" do I have a right to say anything, or will my opposition to "the chosen" cause my demise?

Notice also that Benny Hinn has "the anointing." Can I question someone who has been anointed?

And remember, when the chosen has been anointed, that's just not for one day, either, as I learned watching 3ABN on a Thursday night.

Things to think about.

We aren't cult Busters Pete, that would be those in the antichrist system.

We are to bring down NO ministry, whether Benny Hinn's or 3ABN's.

Warn about sin and error? Yes, only as as did Christ

Church discipline within our own denomination? Yes, only as Christ commanded.

That is all.

And you and Observer (post#64) both ignored Lee's question about what kind of judgments will God bring for slander talebearing, gossip, etc?

--edited for content by Aletheia--

Posted by: Observer Feb 17 2007, 04:57 PM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 17 2007, 03:44 PM)

We aren't cult Busters Gregory, that is the antichrist.

We are to bring down NO ministry, whether Benny Hinn's or 3ABN's.

Warn about sin and error? Yes, as did Christ

Church discipline within our own denomination? Yes,as Christ commanded.

That is all.

And you ignored Lee's question what kind of judgments will God bring for slander talebearing, gossip, etc?

Aletheia, your quote was from Panama Pete, not me--Gregory Matthews.

Posted by: Treniece Feb 17 2007, 04:57 PM

Here is my human judgment. Based upon my observation of Linda on 3abn she doesn't seem to be a person who would commit adultery easily, so I don't think she committed adultery with the doctor. However, she does seem to be a very head strong person who is very confident of herself and the decisions that she makes. I have not read all of the threads, but from my understanding she was advised by several persons concerning her relationship with the doctor and that it was unnecessary to take a trip to see him. It seems that she was ignoring all the advice given to her,

that is probably why she is being accused now of things she may not have done.

Linda's letter sounds good but has she ever given any detailed proof of her whereabouts with the doctor at all times she was with him. Was she ever alone with him behind closed doors for a long period of time. Maybe she should give some proof that she did not commit adultery with the doctor since the other side doesn't have any proof that she did commit adultery.

The question arises in my mind: Was Linda a person who was willing to take advice from other persons. Yes, Danny may have major faults, but I think Linda has helped to contribute to her dismissal from 3abn.

These thoughts are my human judgment, I may be wrong.

Posted by: Observer Feb 17 2007, 05:08 PM

QUOTE

I think Linda has helped to contribute to her dismissal from 3abn.

It has been said that many people at 3-ABN did not like her, and were glad to see her gone (not an exact quote). So what? I do not have to like my boss. I have to work with him. People at 3-ABN did not have to like her.

Other statements have been made about Linda that reflect badly upon her leadership. So what? According to statements released by 3-ABN she was fired due to an inappropriate relationship with a male not her husband. On that basis nothing else is important. If the real issue had been Linda's incompetence, she could have been fired if found to be incompetent. That was not why she was fired.

We who are on the so-called Linda's Team have never claimed that Linda was perfect.

Our issue is what we believe to be false charges that imply adultery, on some level, and the way she was treated in this process.

If she had been fired because the staff did not like her, or that she was incompetent, we would not be in this situation today.

Linda worked at 3-ABN for some 18 - 20 years. That was more than enough time for people to see her faults, and fire her, if those faults existed. Why would any organization keep an employee for going on almost 20 years if they were not liked by the staff, and incompetent?

4

Posted by: Aletheia Feb 17 2007, 05:16 PM

QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 17 2007, 05:57 PM) □

Aletheia, your quote was from Panama Pete, not me--Gregory Matthews.

OoOops... I apologise for my mistake. I'll edit my post. Thanks for letting me know.

Posted by: Treniece Feb 17 2007, 05:16 PM

Where is the proof that she committed adultery and where is the proof that she did not commit adultery. Everyone seems to be using their own human judgment, including Danny Shelton and the other person who it seems helped in making the accusation of adultery.

Posted by: Observer Feb 17 2007, 05:22 PM

QUOTE

2Cr 1:20 For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us. Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts. And now, little children, abide in him; that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming. If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him.

I like to check Scriptural references. The above quote appears to be from the KJV (not the NKJV), and a mis-mash from 2 Corinthians 1: 20 and 21 and I John 2:28. So it does not appear to me to be a direct quote from I Cor. 1:20, but additional Biblical material was added, with out giving the source.

It is clear that the Bible does refer to God's people being anointed, especially in the Old Testament, but also in the New Testament. That is more often used in reference to OT prophets, and kings.

But, to use a phrase such as "The Anointed One," is much more specific. Used in that way one might justly think of Christ.

In any case, I would not use such a phrase to apply to a human unless I considered that person to be either comparable to Christ, or to be a prophet such as Samuel in the OT.

I would not use that of Danney Shelton, as I do not make those comparisons.

Posted by: jene Feb 17 2007, 05:28 PM

QUOTE(Treniece @ Feb 17 2007, 05:57 PM)

Here is my human judgment. Based upon my observation of Linda on 3abn she doesn't seem to be a person who would commit adultery easily, so I don't think she committed adultery with the doctor. However, she does seem to be a very head strong person who is very confident of herself and the decisions that she makes. I have not read all of the threads, but from my understanding she was advised by several persons concerning her relationship with the doctor and that it was unnecessary to take a trip to see him. It seems that she was ignoring all the advice given to her, that is probably why she is being accused now of things she may not have done.

Linda's letter sounds good but has she ever given any detailed proof of her whereabouts with the doctor at all times she was with him. Was she ever alone with him behind closed doors for a long period of time. Maybe she should give some proof that she did not

commit adultery with the doctor since the other side doesn't have any proof that she did commit adultery.

The question arises in my mind: Was Linda a person who was willing to take advice from other persons. Yes, Danny may have major faults, but I think Linda has helped to contribute to her dismissal from 3abn.

These thoughts are my human judgment, I may be wrong.

JK Treniece, before everyone has a coniction fit please read the posts and other threads for that matter. Linda feels that she was given biased advice (<http://www.lindashelton.org/questions.html>) After reading more info from first hand eyewitnesses I think that you may be able to see that Linda's naivete was definitely preyed upon.

As for your quote in bold up above.....How in the world can you prove that you did not do something? can say that you, Treniece are a whore who was "working" last night. How are you going to prove that is not true? You can't!! I know I'm being way too dramatic but please understand my point. It is for that reason that our justice system is built on the principle of innocent until **proven** guilty, not the other way around. There is a certain amount of insecurity and paranoia at hand when a husband does not want his wife to fly out and meet or conversate with a doctor who is treating her son. A doctor I might add that may very well be her only son's last resort.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Feb 17 2007, 05:34 PM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Feb 17 2007, 04:44 PM)

We aren't cult Busters Gregory, that is the antichrist.

We are to bring down NO ministry, whether Benny Hinn's or 3ABN's.

Warn about sin and error? Yes, as did Christ

Church discipline within our own denomination? Yes,as Christ commanded.

That is all.

And you ignored Lee's question what kind of judgments will God bring for slander talebearing, gossip, etc?

Actually, it was I who mentioned Benny Hinn, not Gregory.

As for Lee's question, it seems to be based on the false premise that concerns have been falsehoods, and that judgement is the next order of business. I think that conclusion is a little presumptuous, herefore, the question is, at the very least, premature.

As for Benny Hinn in my post, there's nothing there about "bringing down" Benny Hinn or anybody else.

Some have now thought that maybe Hope Channel would be better. Therefore, they have mentioned going to the cable companies and seeing if room could be found for Hope Channel, even if it means replacing 3ABN.

If Hope Channel did replace 3ABN on some cable systems, technically, that would be correct to say that some were requesting 3ABN be removed. As Seventh-day Adventists, there should be nothing wrong with promoting the Hope Channel.

I realize that some people will see promoting the Hope Channel as "bringing down" 3ABN. However, if the 3ABN folks can't get their act together, that's the way the cookie is going to crumble.

And there's no need to re-edit your post, I already saw it and I am responding to it.

Posted by: sonshineonme Feb 17 2007, 05:36 PM

QUOTE(Treneice @ Feb 17 2007, 02:57 PM)

Here is my human judgment. Based upon my observation of Linda on 3abn she doesn't seem to be a person who would commit adultery easily, so I don't think she committed adultery with the doctor. However, she does seem to be a very head strong person who is very confident of herself and the decisions that she makes. I have not read all of the threads, but from my understanding she was advised by several persons concerning her relationship with the doctor and that it was unnecessary to take a trip to see him. It seems that she was ignoring all the advice given to her, that is probably why she is being accused now of things she may not have done.

Linda's letter sounds good but has she ever given any detailed proof of her whereabouts with the doctor at all times she was with him. Was she ever alone with him behind closed doors for a long period of time. Maybe she should give some proof that she did not commit adultery with the doctor since the other side doesn't have any proof that she did commit adultery.

The question arises in my mind: Was Linda a person who was willing to take advice from other persons. Yes, Danny may have major faults, but I think Linda has helped to contribute to her dismissal from 3abn.

These thoughts are my human judgment, I may be wrong.

Treneice,

Recall that Linda went to Norway with Brenda (her then best friend) to visit her son Nathan in treatment. They were there 3 days I think it was. Wasn't that the only time she was there during her marriage? Those advising her were doing so based on what they were fed by DS, which with the help of Brenda, was the outward begining of getting rid of Linda.

Posted by: Treniece Feb 17 2007, 05:59 PM

Brenda seems to be a nice person. Never judge a book by its cover - I guess. It seems the things said about Tommy are true and I never would have thought him to be that type of a person, in fact I thought he was a long time Adventist.

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 17 2007, 06:01 PM

SDA's are rapist, thieves, liars, molesters, spousal abusers, even murders.

I know you aren't - but we should not ever get it twisted. This denomination does everything and anything..... why? Because sin exists!

Posted by: sonshineonme Feb 17 2007, 06:10 PM

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Feb 17 2007, 04:01 PM) □

SDA's are rapist, thieves, liars, molesters, spousal abusers, even murders.

I know you aren't - but we should not ever get it twisted. This denomination does everything and anything..... why? Because sin exists!

It ALWAYS gets me when I hear someone say "but, I thought he/she is an SDA" or "but they are adventists" or "not an adventist". The presumption that being an SDA makes you something other than a sinful person, someone exempt from a particular behaviour, has often become a surprising disappointment. We put these kinds of expectations on people simply because they claim to be SDA, which is also why we have so much righteous judgement that goes on too - you know, being an SDA gives you the authority to judge because YOU know better, because you are special, you are an SDA after all! You suddenly have been elevated to a super-christian position.... I had a boss that saw himself this way and the judgement of others always came rolling from his lips.....he felt justified to make the calls everytime. He hurt many people and never seem to care.

The devil has thought of everything. The scary similarity is that the Jews did the same thing. And they missed the proverbial boat. □

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 17 2007, 06:11 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Feb 17 2007, 08:10 PM) □

It ALWAYS gets me when I hear someone say "but, I thought he/she is an SDA" or "but they are adventists" or "not an adventist". The presumption that being an SDA makes you something other than a sinful person, someone exempt from a particular behaviour, has often become a surprising disappointment. We put these kinds of expectations on people simply because they claim to be SDA, which is also why we have so much righteous judgement that goes on too - you know, being an SDA gives you the authority to judge because YOU know better, because you are special, you are an SDA after all! You suddenly have been elevated to a super-christian position.... I had a boss that saw himself this way and the judgement of others always came rolling from his lips.....he felt justified to make the calls everytime. He hurt many people and never seem to care.

The devil has thought of everything. The scary similarity is that the Jews did the same thing. And they missed the proverbial boat. □

OOOoooo!!!

Dead on pernt!



Posted by: Observer Feb 17 2007, 06:38 PM

QUOTE

And you and Observer (post#64) both ignored Lee's question about what kind of judgments will God bring for slander talebearing, gossip, etc?

O.K. Aletheia: When did you stop beating your husband with a cat-o-nine tails?

I know that the above question is an example of a classic question that is taught in many classes devoted to debate and other such. The best response is simply to ignore it. You probably will respond to my question. You will probably do so successfully. But the classic response to a question of that type is to simply ignore it.

You reference a question in that same classic mode that I simply ignored, in part. However, I did address it in part. Your question assumed that a ministry God began would continue to be a ministry of God. I pointed out that in the past ministries which God began departed from the plan of God, and reached a point where they were no longer ministries of God. I spoke in part to your question!

NOTE: For the purists here who would like a response from me in regard to my question: I do not know anything at all as to whether or not Aletheia is married, to a male, or whether or not she beats a husband with a cat-o-nine tails. Please do not assume that I am making a statement in my question to her as to how she relates to a husband.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Feb 17 2007, 08:50 PM

QUOTE(Treniece @ Feb 17 2007, 04:59 PM)

Brenda seems to be a nice person. Never judge a book by its cover - I guess. It seems the things said about Tommy are true and I never would have thought him to be that type of a person, in fact I thought he was a long time Adventist.

Treniece,

Just out of curiosity, how have you come to the conclusion that the things said about Tommy are true? While I am inclined to agree with you, I'm interested in how you got there.

I also have had a hard time believing that the Brenda I thought I knew from watching her on cooking shows, Kids Time and various other productions would do the things she is reported to have done. Of course, how well do we actually know someone by their actions on the television screen?

Regarding thinking Tommy was a long time Adventist, I think you hit on a key, or at least a significant problem here. Unless one is privy to the behind-the-scenes lives of the folks on 3abn, viewers are left to conclude that those participating in the 3abn ministry are SDA.

PB

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 17 2007, 09:15 PM


QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 17 2007, 08:38 PM)

O.K. Aletheia: When did you stop beating your husband with a cat-o-nine tails?

I know that the above question is an example of a classic question that is taught in many classes devoted to debate and other such. The best response is simply to ignore it. You probably will respond to my question. You will probably do so successfully. But the classic response to a question of that type is to simply ignore it.

You reference a question in that same classic mode that I simply ignored, in part. However, I did address it in part. Your question assumed that a ministry God began would continue to be a ministry of God. I pointed out that in the past ministries which God began departed from the plan of God, and reached a point where they were no longer ministries of God. I spoke in part to your question!

NOTE: For the purists here who would like a response from me in regard to my question: I do not know anything at all as to whether or not Aletheia is married, to a male, or whether or not she beats a husband with a cat-o-nine tails. Please do not assume that I am making a statement in my question to her as to how she relates to a husband.



I'm okay....carry on.....



Posted by: SoulEspresso Feb 18 2007, 01:20 AM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Feb 16 2007, 05:58 PM)

SoulEspresso,

Yes, now I do understand. You are using the word "hearsay" as it applies in a legal setting. My only hesitation is that there are some here who would misread your intended usage, those who have been charging many of us with believing in and spreading rumors. As you'll notice, the common usage of the word "hearsay" would tend to bolster their claims of rumor, gossip and slander, if they did not discern that you were using it in the legal sense.

From TheFreeDictionary:

Hearsay, n.

1. Unverified information heard or received from another; rumor.
2. Law Evidence based on the reports of others rather than the personal knowledge of a witness and therefore generally not admissible as testimony.

Since this forum is not a legal courtroom, the process of building a case for truth is held to a

slightly different standard. If Duane Clem tells me that he was a victim of pastoral sexual abuse as a young man by the pastor of his church and then I read the emailed confession Duane received from that very pastor, I believe that I can safely conclude that Duane's testimony is truthful. In this court of public opinion, the use of the word "hearsay" may be a bit of a sticky wicket, diverting the minds of some from the fine points that you are bringing forward.

In the case of those people who have been eye witnesses to certain events, such as sister and HOTY, etc., our job is to determine whether or not they are credible witnesses. If deemed credible, their first-hand testimonies should be able to be viewed as factual. I believe it is an injustice to them to characterize their testimonies as hearsay when repeated by others. Certainly, if we were to be witnesses in a court of law, reporting what we have heard from them would qualify as hearsay - but not here and not in normal every day life.

'B,

Thanks for the good point. I don't know if I'll be able to correct my posts (I'm sure there's a way to do them all in one spot if I could figure it out) but I'll see what I can do. Anyway I'll try to find a better way of putting it in future.

'eah, I believe these people, all of them--particularly Duane. I don't know any man who would make up a story like that just to bring someone else down. They are credible witnesses to me and I don't want to cast a bad light on their story.

Soul

Posted by: SoulEspresso Feb 18 2007, 01:52 AM

Okay, a lot of it's fixed--no content changed, just precision of language. The last thing I want to do is cast doubt on the testimony of people I happen to believe.

I left this conversation pretty much intact because it wouldn't make sense to delete every reference to and explanation of hearsay.

Hope this clarifies.

Posted by: ida Feb 18 2007, 04:28 AM


QUOTE(Lee @ Feb 17 2007, 04:14 AM)

What makes people think God won't bring judgment on them for all the lies/insinuations/insinuations/suggestions and outright blatant gossip against a ministry God set up? It is a serious thing to go against the will of God--to desire to work against his purposes!

Are you really saying that since God set up this ministry, no repulsive sin can enter inside those sacred walls?

Posted by: Observer Feb 18 2007, 05:15 AM

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Feb 17 2007, 08:15 PM)



I'm okay....carry on.....



In my approach to life, it is O.K. to interject some humor into situaitons.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Feb 18 2007, 06:04 PM

QUOTE(SoulEspresso @ Feb 18 2007, 12:52 AM)

Okay, a lot of it's fixed--no content changed, just precision of language. The last thing I want to do is cast doubt on the testimony of people I happen to believe.

I left this conversation pretty much intact because it wouldn't make sense to delete every reference to and explanation of hearsay.

Hope this clarifies.



Posted by: sonshineonme Feb 19 2007, 06:54 PM

I just received an update from Linda regarding her letter and website.

She has been working making a few minor revisions (grammar changes, etc.) to her already released letter. The content and context will remain the same and it will be posted on her website.

With that, Linda is updating and changing the question and letter sections on her website as well as posting an event schedule section showing some of her upcoming engagements.

Her website is due to be updated sometime this week. As soon as her Webmaster gets it loaded there, I will bring the letter back here. I will leave the original and add the second below it. At that time, I will ask Clay if he can re-pin it.

(Thanks Clay!)

Posted by: wwjd Feb 19 2007, 09:13 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Feb 19 2007, 06:54 PM)

I just received an update from Linda regarding her letter and website.

posting an event schedule section showing some of her upcoming engagements.

Her website is due to be updated sometime this week. As soon as her Webmaster gets it loaded there, I will bring the letter back here. I will leave the original and add the second below it. At that time, I will ask Clay if he can re-pin it.

(Thanks Clay!)

I thought you and watchbird had said before that you were not getting your info from Linda. Watchbird told otherwise last week and now so are you. So all of the puppet on a string comments have been and are true. Everything you post is from her and has her spin on it. Everyone already knew it anyway, just glad you admit it.

Posted by: sonshineonme Feb 19 2007, 09:33 PM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Feb 19 2007, 07:13 PM)

I thought you and watchbird had said before that you were not getting your info from Linda. Watchbird told otherwise last week and now so are you. So all of the puppet on a string comments have been and are true. Everything you post is from her and has her spin on it. Everyone already knew it anyway, just glad you admit it.

So, do you have a question then? Or did you want to move on to another thread now and post some more of your "type" of comments? You know, the jealous, hateful, evil kind. Sad.

p.s. you should take lessons on your kind of thinking, just a suggestion.

Posted by: watchbird Feb 19 2007, 10:14 PM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Feb 19 2007, 10:13 PM)

I thought you and watchbird had said before that you were not getting your info from Linda. Watchbird told otherwise last week and now so are you. So all of the puppet on a string comments have been and are true. Everything you post is from her and has her spin on it. Everyone already knew it anyway, just glad you admit it.


Isn't it interesting that because someone says they got one piece of information from Linda you assume that Linda is their ONLY source of information.

Isn't it interesting that you equate getting information from someone as being a "puppet on a string".

Since neither is true... either with me or with sonshineonme... and since neither assumption qualifies as a general rule as to how people relate to each other or to their information sources.... I am left with only one conclusion.... and that is that this is the way you must relate to YOUR sole information

source.

Very interesting.....

So sad..... 

Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Feb 20 2007, 01:03 AM

QUOTE(wwj d @ Feb 19 2007, 09:13 PM)

I thought you and watchbird had said before that you were not getting your info from Linda. Watchbird told otherwise last week and now so are you. So all of the puppet on a string comments have been and are true. Everything you post is from her and has her spin on it. Everyone already knew it anyway, just glad you admit it.

Doing everything seemingly possible except refuting accusatory talk in our neighborhood.

(can you break the code?)

Posted by: IMM Feb 20 2007, 07:06 AM

QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Feb 20 2007, 01:03 AM)

Doing everything seemingly possible except refuting accusatory talk in our neighborhood.


(can you break the code?)

Good one, Duane!

Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Feb 20 2007, 11:17 AM

QUOTE(IMM @ Feb 20 2007, 07:06 AM)

Good one, Duane!

Thank you.....thank you....  than

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 20 2007, 12:49 PM


QUOTE(wwjd @ Feb 19 2007, 11:13 PM)

I thought you and watchbird had said before that you were not getting your info from Linda. Watchbird told otherwise last week and now so are you. So all of the puppet on a string comments have been and are true. Everything you post is from her and has her spin on it. Everyone already knew it anyway, just glad you admit it.

...and everything you post is from Danny/Tommy/Funky Bunch and has a spin on it.

Whut?

Glad you admitted it too.... (by omission)....



Posted by: sister Feb 20 2007, 01:07 PM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Feb 19 2007, 10:13 PM)

I thought you and watchbird had said before that you were not getting your info from Linda. Watchbird told otherwise last week and now so are you. So all of the puppet on a string comments have been and are true. Everything you post is from her and has her spin on it. Everyone already knew it anyway, just glad you admit it.

Actually, WWJD, you are confusing the ladies that post here, I am the one who stated that I have never posted any information that I received from Linda Shelton. I wrote the entire "An Unauthorized History of 3ABN" without any input from Linda Shelton.

Sister

Posted by: Bystander Feb 20 2007, 01:50 PM

QUOTE(sister @ Feb 20 2007, 01:07 PM)

Actually, WWJD, you are confusing the ladies that post here, I am the one who stated that I have never posted any information that I received from Linda Shelton. I wrote the entire "An Unauthorized History of 3ABN" without any input from Linda Shelton.

Sister

Never? never have posted anything told to you by Linda? Maybe you should start reading all the way back to your first posts up until now. You might want to rethink that statement.

Posted by: Clay Feb 20 2007, 01:54 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 20 2007, 01:50 PM)

Never? never have posted anything told to you by Linda? Maybe you should start reading all the way back to your first posts up until now. You might want to rethink that statement.

you might want to cut sister some slack.... remember it was you who said you were not ever coming back, but like a modern day Thomas Jefferson you have repeatedly returned to the slave quarters to meet with Sally Hemmings..... the only difference between you and T.J. you have not been able to have your way with us.... though you continue to try....

Posted by: Bystander Feb 20 2007, 02:03 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Feb 20 2007, 01:54 PM)

you might want to cut sister some slack.... remember it was you who said you were not ever coming back, but like a modern day Thomas Jefferson you have repeatedly returned to the slave quarters to meet with Sally Hemmings..... the only difference between you and T.J. you have not been able to have your way with us.... though you continue to try....

Clay, can you not come up with some more original material? I would be rich if I had a quarter for everytime you have brought that up. I changed my mind when I saw more and more lies being told. Get over it.

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 20 2007, 02:06 PM

How can you take the toothpick outta your brother's eye when you have a telephone pole in your own?



I see.....



Posted by: Clay Feb 20 2007, 02:08 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 20 2007, 02:03 PM)

Clay, can you not come up with some more original material? I would be rich if I had a quarter for everytime you have brought that up. I changed my mind when I saw more and more lies being told. Get over it.

you get over it... or do you have jungle fever?

Posted by: Bystander Feb 20 2007, 02:13 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Feb 20 2007, 02:08 PM)

you get over it... or do you have jungle fever?

Maybe we could take up a collection to get you some better material.

Posted by: Clay Feb 20 2007, 02:15 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 20 2007, 02:13 PM)

Maybe we could take up a collection to get you some better material.

you learned how to take up collections from Danny I am sure.... but that's okay.... this is about you and your addiction to us.... you can admit you have "the fever" its okay.... really it is....

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 20 2007, 02:31 PM

Da-da-da-da-dum-dee-da-da-da-da-dum-de-da-da-da-da-dum-dee-...
"we're in love...."



Posted by: sonshineonme Feb 21 2007, 08:00 PM

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Feb 20 2007, 12:31 PM)

Da-da-da-da-dum-dee-da-da-da-da-dum-de-da-da-da-da-dum-dee-...
"we're in love...."






Posted by: Treniece Feb 24 2007, 05:21 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Feb 17 2007, 06:10 PM) □

It ALWAYS gets me when I hear someone say "but, I thought he/she is an SDA" or "but they are adventists" or "not an adventist". The presumption that being an SDA makes you something other than a sinful person, someone exempt from a particular behaviour, has often become a surprising disappointment. We put these kinds of expectations on people simply because they claim to be SDA, which is also why we have so much righteous judgement that goes on too - you know, being an SDA gives you the authority to judge because YOU know better, because you are special, you are an SDA after all! You suddenly have been elevated to a super-christian position.... I had a boss that saw himself this way and the judgement of others always came rolling from his lips.....he felt justified to make the calls everytime. He hurt many people and never seem to care.

The devil has thought of everything. The scary similarity is that the Jews did the same thing. And they missed the proverbial boat. 

When I said I thought he was a long time adventist I did not mean that being an adventist makes you something other than a sinful person. I only was expressing my shock to find out that he was a pastor of another organization, because I thought all the Shelton brothers were adventist.

I agree with your statements.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Feb 24 2007, 06:23 PM

QUOTE(Treniece @ Feb 24 2007, 05:21 PM) □

I only was expressing my shock to find out that he was a pastor of another organization, because I thought all the Shelton brothers were adventist.

I agree with your statements.

The <http://www.save3abn.com/tommy-shelton-ordination-suspended.htm> was addressed to the Reverend Tommy Shelton.

Linda was, and is, an Adventist. Yet, it was Linda Shelton who was the wayward soul who needed to be replaced as programming manager with Reverend Tommy Shelton? I cannot buy into the logic of that argument. (I doubt the 3ABN Board of Directors has an answer for that one, either.)

Posted by: Richard Sherwin Feb 24 2007, 06:56 PM

The 3abn board? aka Danny's rubber stamp?

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Feb 24 2007, 07:23 PM)

The <http://www.save3abn.com/tommy-shelton-ordination-suspended.htm> was addressed to the Reverend Tommy Shelton.

Linda was, and is, an Adventist. Yet, it was Linda Shelton who was the wayward soul who needed to be replaced as programming manager with Reverend Tommy Shelton? I cannot buy into the logic of that argument. (I doubt the 3ABN Board of Directors has an answer for that one, either.)

Posted by: Fran Feb 24 2007, 07:13 PM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Feb 24 2007, 06:23 PM)

The <http://www.save3abn.com/tommy-shelton-ordination-suspended.htm> was addressed to the Reverend Tommy Shelton.

Linda was, and is, an Adventist. Yet, it was Linda Shelton who was the wayward soul who needed to be replaced as programming manager with Reverend Tommy Shelton? I cannot buy into the logic of that argument. (I doubt the 3ABN Board of Directors has an answer for that one, either.)

I am really curious.

How many of Danny's brothers and sisters are Seventh-day Adventists in good standing?

There are many, many 3ABN viewers that think he, Tommy, is/was an Adventist.

He was an Adventist at one time wasn't he?

Why did he leave Adventism?

Is Kenny still a preacher?

To what denomination does he belong?

Did he ever start an Adventist supporting ministry?

What happened?

Does he still have this ministry?

Is he an Adventist church member today?

Is Ronnie a credintialed Adventist pastor?

Is Tammy an Adventist?

Who am I missing?

How many non-Adventists are there at 3ABN as employees or in TV programming?

Posted by: wwjd Feb 24 2007, 09:38 PM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Feb 24 2007, 06:23 PM)

The <http://www.save3abn.com/tommy-shelton-ordination-suspended.htm> was addressed to the Reverend Tommy Shelton.

Linda was, and is, an Adventist. Yet, it was Linda Shelton who was the wayward soul who needed to be replaced as programming manager with Reverend Tommy Shelton? I cannot buy into the logic of that argument. (I doubt the 3ABN Board of Directors has an answer for that one, either.)

This would imply that Linda being an adventist automatically made her a better christian than someone of another denomination. Next, at the Time of Linda's replacement, as you all have pointed out he was no longer "reverend" and hadn't been for some years.

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 24 2007, 11:32 PM

One mo' gen....

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Feb 20 2007, 04:06 PM)

How can you take the toothpick outta your brother's eye when you have a telephone pole in your own?



I see.....



Posted by: JustTana Feb 25 2007, 11:29 AM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Feb 24 2007, 10:38 PM)

This would imply that Linda being an adventist automatically made her a better christian than someone of another denomination. Next, at the Time of Linda's replacement, as you all have pointed out he was no longer "reverend" and hadn't been for some years.

So? What does that prove, WWJD??!

JT

Posted by: Johann Feb 25 2007, 03:06 PM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Feb 25 2007, 05:38 AM)

This would imply that Linda being an adventist automatically made her a better christian than someone of another denomination. Next, at the Time of Linda's replacement, as you all have pointed out he was no longer "reverend" and hadn't been for some years.

And which church did you claim to belong to?

Posted by: sonshineonme Feb 26 2007, 12:36 AM

Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Feb 26 2007, 10:20 AM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Feb 24 2007, 09:38 PM)

This would imply that Linda being an adventist automatically made her a better christian than someone of another denomination. Next, at the Time of Linda's replacement, as you all have pointed out he was no longer "reverend" and hadn't been for some years.

Really?

<http://www.dailyregister.com/calendar/?showdate=2006-09-24>

(halfway down, left side of page)

Posted by: Clay Feb 26 2007, 10:26 AM


QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Feb 26 2007, 10:20 AM)

Really?
<http://www.dailyregister.com/calendar/?showdate=2006-09-24>
 (halfway down, left side of page)

you were referring to this announcement?

QUOTE
 - Gospel concert 6 p.m. at Faith Chapel (9555 Old Route 13) west of Harrisburg with the Rev. Gary Clark, **the Rev. Tommy Shelton (musician)** and the Rev. Chuck Jackson (music minister). For details, you may call (618) 982-2389 or 841-7590.



Posted by: Johann Feb 28 2007, 03:41 PM



- why not get back to the topic: When will 3ABN make known the real reason - trustworthy reason - why Linda was dismissed?



Posted by: watchbird Feb 28 2007, 04:34 PM

QUOTE(Johann @ Feb 28 2007, 04:41 PM)
 - why not get back to the topic: When will 3ABN make known the real reason - trustworthy reason - why Linda was dismissed?


It is doubtful if 3abn will ever officially admit anything about anything. But the reason Linda was dismissed is very plain.... She was dismissed because Danny didn't want her around any more.

Now as to why he didn't want her around..... there is probably no single answer to that. And since speculating about motives is not a good thing to do, we shall probably have to be content to notice what things he has changed since he got rid of her. The most obvious, of course, is that he has a new wife..... one that is much younger.

But there may be other changes also that are significant in other areas.... types of programming.... doctrinal emphases..... the way workers are treated..... perhaps others more familiar with things both before and after Linda left may have noticed changes that may be significant.

Of course, we do not know that spring 2004 was actually the watershed. It could be that Danny was already making changes.... at least some of which caused added friction between the two. Some have seen their going for a private jet plane as a significant watershed. Some have seen the court case over the property tax exemption as significant. It would be interesting to hear what others observed in the way of significant changes over the last 5 years or so.

Posted by: Bystander Feb 28 2007, 05:25 PM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Feb 28 2007, 04:34 PM)

It is doubtful if 3abn will ever officialy admit anything about anything. But the reason Linda was dismissed is very plain.... She was dismissed because Danny didn't want her around any more.

But there may be other changes also that are significant in other areas.... types of programming.... doctrinal emphases..... the way workers are treated..... perhaps others more familiar with things both before and after Linda left may have noticed changes that may be significant.

Though I usually ignore your posts, watchbird, I could not help but respond to this one. You are making big statements by saying Danny didn't want her around...Unless you are a physic mind reader, you couldn't possibly know what DS was thinking about anything. I have never seen it addressed here, how DS catered to her, bragged on her to everyone, constantly told her and others how beautiful he thought she was..and then all of a sudden....he wanted to get rid of her? c'mon. Anyone that was around them for any length of time would reach for a "hurl" bucket at the way he "fawned" over her and gave her her way about most everything. His biggest fault was putting her up on a pedestal so, in a way, he was somewhat responsible for her resulting attitude. Also, if he just "wanted to get rid of her" why, right after the divorce, did he degrade himself buy taking her to the airport to catch her flight to Norway (without Nathan) knowing where she was going and who she was going to see, and still, tried to talk her into reconciliation all the way there? BTW, since the doc and LS was strickley a professional relationship over her son, why was she going to Norway to see him, without Nathan, right after the divorce. mmm maybe she was out of phone minutes

As far as your "changes" remark at 3abn. Yes, the programming improved significantly according to the biggest percentage of viewers. And, "the way workers were treated" vastly improved once LS was gone. Most employees would tell you that. Some said "it was like a load was lifted off of their shoulders while others said the whole atmosphere had become so much more spirit filled. Then, according to some that I knew that worked on the 3abn truck crew LS had their pay at a pathetic level and would not give them a raise. As soon as she was gone, her replacement couldn't believe how little they were being paid and immediately rectified the pay scale. After all they have a huge sacrifice having to be away from their families for weeks at a time. Truthfully,if you ask most of the workers, they will tell you they can't really think of anything negative that has come from her, not, being at 3abn.



Posted by: watchbird Feb 28 2007, 05:39 PM


QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 28 2007, 06:25 PM)

Though I usually ignore your posts, watchbird, I could not help but respond to this one.

You'd do better to keep on ignoring 'em, Bystander. You're wasting your time rehashing the same old

lines that I've heard over and over again.


Didn't buy them the first time around... ain't buying them now.  

Shove off now..... 

Posted by: Richard Sherwin Feb 28 2007, 06:02 PM

So Linda was less than perfect. But we all knew that.


QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 28 2007, 06:25 PM) 

Though I usually ignore your posts, watchbird, I could not help but respond to this one. You are making big statements by saying Danny didn't want her around...Unless you are a physic mind reader, you couldn't possibly know what DS was thinking about anything. I have never seen it addressed here, how DS catered to her, bragged on her to everyone, constantly told her and others how beautiful he thought she was..and then all of a sudden....he wanted to get rid of her? c'mon. Anyone that was around them for any length of time would reach for a "hurl" bucket at the way he "fawned" over her and gave her her way about most everything. His biggest fault was putting her up on a pedestal so, in a way, he was somewhat responsible for her resulting attitude. Also, if he just "wanted to get rid of her" why, right after the divorce, did he degrade himself buy taking her to the airport to catch her flight to Norway (without Nathan) knowing where she was going and who she was going to see, and still, tried to talk her into reconciliation all the way there? BTW, since the doc and LS was strickley a professional relationship over her son, why was she going to Norway to see him, without Nathan, right after the divorce. mmm maybe she was out of phone minutes 

As far as your "changes" remark at 3abn. Yes, the programming improved significantly according to the biggest percentage of viewers. And, "the way workers were treated" vastly improved once LS was gone. Most employees would tell you that. Some said "it was like a load was lifted off of their shoulders while others said the whole atmosphere had become so much more spirit filled. Then, according to some that I knew that worked on the 3abn truck crew LS had their pay at a pathetic level and would not give them a raise. As soon as she was gone, her replacement couldn't believe how little they were being paid and immediately rectified the pay scale. After all they have a huge sacrifice having to be away from their families for weeks at a time.

Truthfully,if you ask most of the workers, they will tell you they can't really think of anything negative that has come from her, not, being at 3abn.



Posted by: princessdi Feb 28 2007, 06:14 PM


 Ok, Sorry! I jes' couldn't help it! I likes that WB!

 snr


QUOTE(watchbird @ Feb 28 2007, 03:39 PM) 

You'd do better to keep on ignoring 'em, Bystander. You're wasting your time rehashing the same old lines that I've heard over and over again.



Didn't buy them the first time around... ain't buying them now.  


Shove off now..... 

Posted by: Bystander Feb 28 2007, 06:25 PM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Feb 28 2007, 05:39 PM) 

You'd do better to keep on ignoring 'em, Bystander. You're wasting your time rehashing the same old lines that I've heard over and over again.

Didn't buy them the first time around... ain't buying them now.  



Shove off now..... 

Honestly, the truth doesn't have to be "bought". It is what it is. Also no one has rehashed anymore than you. No matter how hard you try to give your "tarnished" version of events, someone will always be around to tell what "really" happened. So, you better run along to bow and scrape and get a new story for tomorrow.

Posted by: princessdi Feb 28 2007, 06:27 PM

Problem for me BS is that Linda never came here lying through her teeth, to my knowledge, Danny did, so based on his own actions Danny's credibility is in the toilet, at least for me. I'll say it again, I hates a thief and a liar, nothing worse except somebody who will lie if they look at you! An unsolicited lie, if you please. I will also reiterate that Danny cut off his nose in spite of his face, because he is the reason we can't ask questions of Linda. Now, by his own hand he is the only one left to answer the accusers. That is how satan leads you out onto a brand while he is sawing it off at the base. Shame isn't it?

BTW, right "after" the divorce LS was free to fly, drive, walk or crawl to "see" anybody she wanted. That is a moot point. Now, is she was like Danny, and remarried to said Dr. then you would at least have a leg to stand, right now, you need to let that one go.

Also, BS, taking pots shots at LS while you know she can't defend herself is beneath you. Down right un-Christ-like. Danny can come here anytime(and probably does) to defend anything said here about him, Linda can't. Cheap shots, especially on a woman, speak volumes about your own manhood.....BTJM....  

QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 28 2007, 03:25 PM) 

Though I usually ignore your posts, watchbird, I could not help but respond to this one. You are making big statements by saying Danny didn't want her around...Unless you are a physic mind reader, you couldn't possibly know what DS was thinking about anything. I have never seen it addressed here, how DS catered to her, bragged on her to everyone, constantly told her and others how beautiful he thought she was..and then all of a sudden....he wanted to get rid of her? c'mon.

Anyone that was around them for any length of time would reach for a "hurl" bucket at the way he "fawned" over her and gave her her way about most everything. His biggest fault was putting her up on a pedestal so, in a way, he was somewhat responsible for her resulting attitude. Also, if he just "wanted to get rid of her" why, right after the divorce, did he degrade himself by taking her to the airport to catch her flight to Norway (without Nathan) knowing where she was going and who she was going to see, and still, tried to talk her into reconciliation all the way there? BTW, since the doc and LS was strickley a professional relationship over her son, why was she going to Norway to see him, without Nathan, right after the divorce. mmm maybe she was out of phone minutes

As far as your "changes" remark at 3abn. Yes, the programming improved significantly according to the biggest percentage of viewers. And, "the way workers were treated" vastly improved once LS was gone. Most employees would tell you that. Some said "it was like a load was lifted off of their shoulders while others said the whole atmosphere had become so much more spirit filled. Then, according to some that I knew that worked on the 3abn truck crew LS had their pay at a pathetic level and would not give them a raise. As soon as she was gone, her replacement couldn't believe how little they were being paid and immediately rectified the pay scale. After all they have a huge sacrifice having to be away from their families for weeks at a time.

Truthfully, if you ask most of the workers, they will tell you they can't really think of anything negative that has come from her, not, being at 3abn.

Posted by: Laurenced Feb 28 2007, 06:46 PM

QUOTE(Bystander)

No matter how hard you try to give your "tarnished" version of events, someone will always be around to tell what "really" happened. So, you better run along to bow and scrape and get a new story for tomorrow.

ust a suggestion...

'ou could improve your image and credibility with others by about 35% if you not post things like this. t only adds to the impression that we're dealing with a character here that's sarcastic, feels cornered, as gotten scorched, and is fairly immature. This kind of unChrist-like sarcastic tone supercedes and vipes away anything good you may have to say.

Posted by: Panama_Pete Feb 28 2007, 07:56 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 28 2007, 05:25 PM)

Though I usually ignore your posts, watchbird, I could not help but respond to this one. You are making big statements by saying Danny didn't want her around...Unless you are a physic mind reader, you couldn't possibly know what DS was thinking about anything. I have never seen it addressed here, how DS catered to her, bragged on her to everyone, constantly told her and others how beautiful he thought she was..and then all of a sudden....he wanted to get rid of her? c'mon. Anyone that was around them for any length of time would reach for a "hurl" bucket at the way he "fawned" over her and gave her her way about most everything. His biggest fault was putting her up on a pedestal so, in a way, he was somewhat responsible for her resulting attitude.

Also, if he just "wanted to get rid of her" why, right after the divorce, did he degrade himself by taking her to the airport to catch her flight to Norway (without Nathan) knowing where she was going and who she was going to see, and still, tried to talk her into reconciliation all the way there? BTW, since the doc and LS was strickley a professional relationship over her son, why was she going to Norway to see him, without Nathan, right after the divorce. mmm maybe she was out of phone minutes [r]

As far as your "changes" remark at 3abn. Yes, the programming improved significantly according to the biggest percentage of viewers. And, "the way workers were treated" vastly improved once LS was gone. Most employees would tell you that. Some said "it was like a load was lifted off of their shoulders while others said the whole atmosphere had become so much more spirit filled. Then, according to some that I knew that worked on the 3abn truck crew LS had their pay at a pathetic level and would not give them a raise. As soon as she was gone, [/b] couldn't believe how little they were being paid and immediately rectified the pay scale. After all they have a huge sacrifice having to be away from their families for weeks at a time.

Truthfully, if you ask most of the workers, they will tell you they can't really think of anything negative that has come from her, not, being at 3abn.

1. Linda Shelton has already responded to this. She says she had no power over how much employees were paid. Linda said she wanted to give Sandra Juarez a raise, but was overruled by her ex-husband, Danny Shelton. **Danny does all hiring and firing. Period. Everybody knows that. You know it. I know it. So just stop with this nonsense.**

2. Her Replacement = Tommy Shelton. We already know who "her replacement" was, so you might as well spell it out: Linda was replaced by a Reverend dismissed by another denomination. His name is **Tommy Shelton**, but I suppose just calling him "her replacement" sounds better? You have your marching orders to focus everyone's attention on demonizing Linda - and away from all other core issues? That's what you're getting paid to do as part of your "mending broken people" agenda? Just asking.

3. As for any trip to Norway, the Norwegian doctor, Arild Abrahamsen, has already written and distributed his account.

4. **Linda lost her health insurance** when she was summarily fired by her ex-husband. **You know that.** The Norwegian doctor, aware of what had happened, gave Linda access to his medical clinic after the loss of the insurance. Why keep trying to make that something it is not. Even you, yourself, say Linda Shelton was already divorced at that time.

5. I was in Thompsonville shortly after Danny asked for a divorce. I saw no such fawning as you describe. When Linda started the radio network on December 31, 1999, Danny went on the air shortly hereafter and said several times, "I have no vision for radio," **with Linda Shelton sitting right next to him on the air.** This certainly didn't look like bragging over Linda to me. It came across to me as a message to viewers saying, "Radio is not part of the Great Danny Shelton Vision, so please take note, everyone." But Linda's radio network succeeded anyway, despite Danny's admonition to his viewers. And things were never the same after that.

Linda held a 3ABN Radio School beginning on Monday, March 8, 2004. It was a sold-out event. The Radio Network was succeeding. Danny could see that and he was not happy. If Danny was going to get rid of Linda, he'd have to do it before she added a dozen more radio stations.

Danny demanded his divorce, the night before the radio school started, on Sunday, March 7, 2004. Danny just couldn't handle Linda's success and he was determined to put a stop to it. Linda, not being streetwise, could not suspect what was going on or how her demise was linked to her own success in radio.

Mollie Steenson had gone to India, and I believe she was not in Thompsonville, on Sunday evening, March 7, 2004, when Danny demanded his divorce and put his plan into action. Mollie came back to

4

Thompsonville and was in her office by midweek, but everything was already in motion. My opinion is that Mollie Steenson either couldn't be trusted to help destroy Linda Shelton, or Mollie wanted to distance herself from the planned event, so it was done while she, Mollie, was out of the country - in India, no less. Was that trip to India planned in advance by someone for such a reason? I've decided in my own mind that it was.

6. I don't see that "programming improved" with the Reverend Tommy Shelton sitting in Linda's old office. But that's in the eye of the beholder. Maybe an endless array of scolding, talking heads at 3ABN pleases you. There's nothing special about Shelley Quinn with her veiled excoriation using "John the Baptist" or John Lomacang's version of the same using his "Moses - Touch Not the Lord's Anointed" blatherments. The expoundings of these two strike me as nothing but desperate and weird.

6. Bystander, you keep regurgitating the same old garbage over and over trying so hard to re-write history. It is not working, so give it up. The reason you skip responding to Watchbird is that she knows the timeline, and you cannot deal with that; Your job is to deliver your mudballs to people who **you think** cannot tell the difference.

7. The entire 3ABN defense from the very beginning has been, "Nobody will be able to criticize us, because they are all stupid and will never be able to figure out what we did for sure," *id est*, "Nobody knows me and Linda" *ad infinitum*. Your only purpose on this forum, Bystander, is to muddy the waters with your little mudballs and to make sure it all stays muddy. Everybody can see that, **so this must be about your personal paycheck**. It certainly cannot be about truth or justice. Not knowing who you are, this is all about your own personal bank account, right? Are you willing to do anything to keep those paychecks coming, no matter what? Am I close? I think I am right on target. I think it is all about money, your money, Bystander, and nothing else. I think everything and everyone comes a distant second with you.

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Feb 28 2007, 08:02 PM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Feb 28 2007, 08:56 PM)

5. I was in Thompsonville shortly after Danny asked for a divorce. I saw no such fawning as you describe. When Linda started the radio network on December 31, 1999, Danny went on the air shortly thereafter and said several times, "I have no vision for radio," **with Linda Shelton sitting right next to him on the air**. This certainly didn't look like bragging over Linda to me. It came across to me as a message to viewers saying, "Radio is not part of the Great Danny Shelton Vision, so please take note, everyone." But Linda's radio network succeeded anyway, despite Danny's admonition to his viewers. And things were never the same after that.

No, PP, I didn't see the "fawning" over Linda either. But I did see him belittle her in front of people many times.

It's all a game. One face on camera. One face off. Same old, same old.

Posted by: Clay Feb 28 2007, 08:05 PM

thanks Pete for outlining the info we have covered... sometimes its good to see it outlined like that and remind those whose goal it is to distract that we still have a grasp of the basic facts... not theory but facts....

Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Feb 28 2007, 11:23 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 28 2007, 05:25 PM)

Also, if he just "wanted to get rid of her" why, right after the divorce, did he degrade himself buy taking her to the airport to catch her flight to Norway (without Nathan) knowing where she was going and who she was going to see, and still, **tried to talk her into reconciliation all the way there?**

Now, since we all know how much you HATE hearsay and second hand information, one has to assume you were in the car with them on this trip. Is that correct?

Posted by: Johann Mar 1 2007, 04:20 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 1 2007, 01:25 AM)

Also, if he just "wanted to get rid of her" why, right after the divorce, did he degrade himself buy taking her to the airport to catch her flight to Norway (without Nathan) knowing where she was going and who she was going to see, and still, tried to talk her into reconciliation all the way there?

This is another sign that truth is not in Bystander. Who told you Danny drove Linda to the airport when she came to see us in Norway? I very well remember what Linda looked like after how Danny had treated her in connection with the divorce. She needed to get away, and Irmgard and I were so happy to see her again after her ordeal. She did not ride with Danny to the airport. This is but another attempt by Danny to project his actions in a different direction attempting thereby to gain the sympathy of others for actions he claims he did, but which he actually never did.

It is true that Danny drove to the airport, but not in the same car as Linda. He merely projects Linda over into his car. Linda was greatly surprised to see him at the airport. It was dawning on him he made a grave mistake by divorcing Linda, and that he had to tell his audience stories to gain their sympathy. This is but one of his many vain attempts, and you, Bystander, accept his delusions, line hook and sinker, in an attempt to deceive the world. One more star in that crown of deception you are presenting on this net.

You even claimed he was attempting all the way to the airport to get Linda to reconsider. Since you are so certain, were you in that car?

Posted by: Nuggie Mar 1 2007, 05:53 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 28 2007, 06:25 PM)

Though I usually ignore your posts, watchbird, I could not help but respond to this one. You are making big statements by saying Danny didn't want her around...Unless you are a physic mind reader, you couldn't possibly know what DS was thinking about anything. I have never seen it addressed here, how DS catered to her, bragged on her to everyone, constantly told her and others

how beautiful he thought she was..and then all of a sudden....he wanted to get rid of her? c'mon. Anyone that was around them for any length of time would reach for a "hurl" bucket at the way he "fawned" over her and gave her her way about most everything. His biggest fault was putting her up on a pedestal so, in a way, he was somewhat responsible for her resulting attitude. Also, if he just "wanted to get rid of her" why, right after the divorce, did he degrade himself by taking her to the airport to catch her flight to Norway (without Nathan) knowing where she was going and who she was going to see, and still, tried to talk her into reconciliation all the way there? BTW, since the doc and LS was strickley a professional relationship over her son, why was she going to Norway to see him, without Nathan, right after the divorce. mmm maybe she was out of phone minutes

As far as your "changes" remark at 3abn. Yes, the programming improved significantly according to the biggest percentage of viewers. And, "the way workers were treated" vastly improved once LS was gone. Most employees would tell you that. Some said "it was like a load was lifted off of their shoulders while others said the whole atmosphere had become so much more spirit filled. Then, according to some that I knew that worked on the 3abn truck crew LS had their pay at a pathetic level and would not give them a raise. As soon as she was gone, her replacement couldn't believe how little they were being paid and immediately rectified the pay scale. After all they have a huge sacrifice having to be away from their families for weeks at a time.

Truthfully,if you ask most of the workers, they will tell you they can't really think of anything negative that has come from her, not, being at 3abn.

OK, let me see if I've got this straight...you want us to believe that Linda had so much power at 3ABN that she controlled programming, employee morale and workers' salary? You want us to believe that Danny was impotent and powerless to do anything to break Linda's control. You want us to believe that Danny, the founder and person to whom God gave this wonderful "vision" let Linda get all the power and control everything he felt that the Lord specifically gave to him. Yet with all this power that she supposedly had the 3ABN board was quick to summarily dismiss her and bind her up with a gag order. Yeah...OK...and Bill Gates is just a front for Microsoft...I'm really the President...

Posted by: Observer Mar 1 2007, 06:33 AM

QUOTE

Danny was impotent . . .

While I know what you meant, and said, it would be best if you do not post anything that might result in others accusing us of posting inaccurate, or inappropriate information about a medical condition. The way some people attempt to twist what is posted, I can imagine someone doing such. And, I am thinking of one person who might quickly jump on that. That person regularly mis-quotes me.

Posted by: watchbird Mar 1 2007, 07:26 AM

QUOTE(Johann @ Mar 1 2007, 05:20 AM)

This is another sign that truth is not in Bystander. Who told you Danny drove Linda to the airport when she came to see us in Norway? I very well remember what Linda looked like after how Danny had treated her in connection with the divorce. She needed to get away, and Irmgard and I were so happy to see her again after her ordeal. She did not ride with Danny to the airport. This is but

another attempt by Danny to project his actions in a different direction attempting thereby to gain the sympathy of others for actions he claims he did, but which he actually never did.

It is true that Danny drove to the airport, but not in the same car as Linda. He merely projects Linda over into his car. Linda was greatly surpriced to see him at the airport. It was dawning on him he made a grave mistake by divorcing Linda, and that he had to tell his audience stories to gain their sympathy. This is but one of his many vain attempts, and you, Bystander, accept his delusions, line hook and sinker, in an attempt to deceive the world. One more star in that crown of deception you are presenting on this net.

Didn't you mispeak, Johann? Rather than calling this a "star in that crown of deception" should you not be calling it "one more knot in the web of deception" BS is weaving for presentation to this net?

QUOTE

You even claimed he was attempting all the way to the airport to get Linda to reconsider. Since you are so certain, were you in that car?

Doesn't work. If he were actually in "that car".... then then he could not be "certain" of something that was not true. So either BS is the creator of this particular "knot" or is a direct accomplice to the intruth of the assertion.... or else he is someone who accepts what Danny says as the truth and passes it off to the world as though he (BS) actually knew the difference between facts and fabrications.

Some questions this brings to mind, Johann..... When Danny drove to the airport.... was he following Linda? Did he know she was headed for the airport? If so, how did he know? Did he know her destination? If so, how did he know? If not, was his purpose in following her an attempt to learn her destination? At what point did the hired Private Investigators pick up Linda's trail? And the final question..... Doesn't it strike you as strange that he kept her under surveillance even AFTER the divorce was final?

Posted by: Johann Mar 1 2007, 03:24 PM

QUOTE(watchbird @ Mar 1 2007, 03:26 PM)

And the final question..... Doesn't it strike you as strange that he kept her under surveillance even AFTER the divorce was final?

It takes a lot of surveillance to attempt to cover one's tracks. Danny once told me that his friend, Garvin McNeilus would never desert him, regardless of what he'd do. He claimed that is true friendship. Danny also told me that Garvin would pay for Private Investigators as long as Linda is alive. What does he need that for since he divorced her?


19

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 2 2007, 06:35 PM

QUOTE(Johann @ Mar 1 2007, 05:24 PM)

It takes a lot of surveillance to attempt to cover one's tracks. Danny once told me that his friend, Garvin McNeilus would never desert him, regardless of what he'd do. He claimed that is true friendship. Danny also told me that Garvin would pay for Private Investigators as long as Linda is alive. **What does he need that for since he divorced her?**

This speaks **volumes**....



Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 2 2007, 07:02 PM

Control control control. Control freak.

QUOTE(Johann @ Mar 1 2007, 04:24 PM)

It takes a lot of surveillance to attempt to cover one's tracks. Danny once told me that his friend, Garvin McNeilus would never desert him, regardless of what he'd do. He claimed that is true friendship. Danny also told me that Garvin would pay for Private Investigators as long as Linda is alive. What does he need that for since he divorced her?

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 2 2007, 07:10 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Feb 14 2007, 10:18 PM)

NOTE: Her letter of demand, posted March 2nd, 2007 now on her website. To go right there, click here <http://www.lindashelton.org>

In keeping with Linda Shelton requiring an open and transparent ASI sponsored hearing, Linda has now published a letter that includes a clear demand that 3ABN and Danny Shelton produce the evidence they claim to have for inspection and verification to the entire church membership and to the stockholders in the pews. Danny Shelton in various forms and under various alias has repeatedly referenced evidence that he claims to have thereby giving him a basis for divorce and remarriage. The chairman of 3ABN on AToday has made it clear they have no proof of an adulterous affair. Linda Shelton and Arild Abrahamsen have repeatedly asserted that there is no basis for divorce, that no inappropriate relationship occurred and that there is no evidence to

support the Danny Shelton claims.

We have repeatedly asserted that if there is no proof, then a remarriage would constitute an adulterous relationship. Danny Shelton was married at 3ABN in March 2006 to a Brandy Murray, a 3ABN employee that reportedly arrived at 3ABN of Thompsonville in July of 2004.

Here is the letter from Linda in its entirety and is also available at www.LindaShelton.org and on www.save3ABN.com. I believe it reflects the same Linda, a bit stronger and less naive than in the past, but as deeply committed to her relationship with the Lord as we all remember so well on that porch at 3ABN.

Linda Shelton does respond to e-mail and will be happy to have a concert or a deeply spiritual service at your location, wherever you may be.

February, 2007

My warmest greetings,

A couple approached me, with tears in their eyes, and said, "We have just missed you and we wanted to see you to make sure you were okay." As I saw the pain in their eyes, over the events that have transpired in my life in the last few years, it was as if my heart was pierced again. "We are just so happy to see you smiling, in church and still serving God." Our meeting took place a few months ago at the Bible Chapel Seventh-day Adventist Church, where I am a member. I enjoyed my visit with this caring Christian couple and the compassion and love they showed toward me.

Some people act surprised that I am still a member of the SDA church. But why? God is still the same awesome God that He always has been, the incredible Bible truths embraced by the Seventh-day Adventists are still just as true today as they ever were and although a "thousand shall fall on my right and a thousand fall on my left" nothing will ever change these facts. We must hold firm to our faith during troubled times!

Many have written to me over the past many months asking me to update my website. This I have prayerfully considered for quite some time, nearly a year. Quite frankly, I just have not known what to say. I feel that this scandal has made a large, festering open wound in my Church. Perhaps the truth revealed will ultimately bring the healing that everyone needs. Then we can grieve together and move on. I am certain, in essence, I have died a thousand deaths over the events of the last couple of years. But, with the Lords blessing, I will try to address issues which have been brought to my attention in the kindest manner possible.

For the first time in nearly three years I will not simply deny the accusations, but will directly address certain issues. I do not take pleasure in speaking of these things. I think I have always been the one who would rather receive hurt, than be the one to inflict hurt upon others. But during the course of this last year I learned some valuable lessons through Dr. Mable Dunbar of Pollys Place Network, she has been an incredible support and help to me. Mable is a woman who truly loves the Lord and is not afraid to stand up for what she believes is right, even if a whole army would stand against her.

Pollys Place Network is a ministry which empowers abused lives and aids them through their difficult circumstances. It is a marvelous organization and so needed for this age when Satan has focused his wrath upon breaking up the security and circle of love God intended for our families. I videotaped some interviews, for Pollys Place, at the SDA Conference office in Spokane, Washington with several individuals who had been through incredibly painful situations. Each of them, in essence, had the same healing story. It was when they were able to come forward and expressed the truth about what happened to them, that their healing came. Inspired by these individuals, now I can accept and believe it is Gods job to protect the ministry I have loved and co-founded, and its my right and my healing to tell the truth about what has occurred.

I am co-authoring a book and its purpose is to share the silver lining of the amazing lessons the Lord has taught me through this crisis. I feel the Lord has lifted a veil and allowed me to see the world that He sees, a world far different than we see. I see that the darts of false allegations that Satan has thrown toward me and my ministry were not directed solely for my downfall, but the aim was much wider. Although I was the apparent target, Satan was attempting to destroy the ministry I loved and co-founded and cripple the witness of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. My perspective has been forever changed through my experiences and my book will give me the

opportunity to share these lessons more fully with all of you. (I will keep you posted as to the release date of this book.)

John Knox once said, "Kings (or leaders) have not an absolute power to do in their government what pleases them, but their power is limited by Gods Word; so that if they strike where God has not commanded, they are but murderers; and if they spare where God has commanded to strike, they and their thrones are criminal and guilty of the wickedness which abounds upon the face of the earth, for lack of punishment." John knew his Bible. It is a Biblical principle that if we see a wrong and only look the other way or feebly say, "I will let the Lord deal with that one," then that wickedness is applied to our slate, plain and simple.

The most devastating blow a televangelist can get is the false accusation of adultery. Although I have already made this statement on my website I want to address those of you who have loved and valued my Christianity, integrity and my ministry for the 19 years that I was at 3ABN. I want to clearly emphasize that I was 100% faithful to my husband. I loved, trusted and believed in him to a fault. Imagine my shock when I realized that the false allegations in the form of libel, slander and defamation directed my way were initiated by two of the closest people to me on planet earth; one was my beloved partner and the other was my closest lady friend. I loved them both and trusted them both to the point that their close communication did not bother me in the least. I know that sounds naive, but I did not believe that Dan would do anything that would harm the ministry we had built together.

In 2004 there was a tremendous outcry at my departure. There was suspicion over how swiftly I was fired from my position and divorced. There was suspicion over the fact that I never had the opportunity to talk to the Board and defend myself. There was suspicion over the fact that every trace of my presence was completely cleared out of the campus of 3ABN, even before my termination, as well as the website, television and radio broadcasts. I was made a sacrificial lamb in a scheme calculated to remove me from both my home and my ministry through an orchestrated campaign of malicious lies circulated around the globe. No words can begin to describe the absolute agony this has brought to my life, but there are other victims as well, and may God bless and spare the young lives and tender souls who have also felt the stinging thrust of this sword of scandal.

It has completely broken my heart to see the emails and letters which have come from the Chairman of the Board, Dan and others at 3ABN, to hear of the television and radio programs where erroneous references have been made to the situation, to watch the ministry that I helped build with much devotion used to destroy me and also to hear of the reports of what is being said on the SDA chat sites about me today by those bent on my destruction...nearly three years later.

It was the false accusation of adultery which caused the loss of my marriage, my reputation, my employment, and everything else. I challenge the 3ABN Board to produce the "irrefutable evidence" which caused a co-founder, a life-time Board member, Vice-President and Secretary of the Board to be removed in that May, 2004 meeting! I am asking, no demanding, that the information is made public, at my request! Cast aside these pretended desires to "spare me"! The world is waiting with baited breath!

The stakes are high. I, as well as others, have personally experienced electronic surveillance, email theft, interception of cell phone calls, post divorce entry into my private residence to the point where charges were filed with the police. It is not easy to live your life when you feel that you can never know for sure if you are being followed, watched or recorded...even now. I have had invitations to do ministry thwarted because of continued allegations by those, who, like wolves in sheeps clothing, attempted to stop my ministry.

I want to make this absolutely clear: I left my home because I was not safe, I was not welcome. I was witnessing the murder of my reputation and ministry day by day. I stayed as long as I felt I could. I hoped, believed and prayed that things would change but they only got worse. The statements made that I left my husband for another man are absolutely and totally false. Any thinking person would realize that I had everything a Christian woman could have wanted in this life: a husband I loved and the opportunity to minister to millions of people about the tremendous love of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, though the ministry that we spent so many years building together. Although two of the people who I loved best have called me "Gomer", yet a more accurate term would be "Hosea", which I would only discover later. But I prefer simply, Linda, "SAVED by the Blood of the Lamb!"

I do not visit the chat sites. This has been a mega-trial for me and my way of coping has been to try and focus on other things. I realize that the individuals which make up our Church need healing from this disaster too. And

perhaps the chat sites have served to help people give expression to their frustrations and hurts in this situation. I am grateful to each of you who have prayed and interceded for me. It has meant so much during my dark days. Youâ€™ll never know just how much!

Now my kids are grown and I am alone...but not really alone, although I have not husband. Now I belong to everyone and everyone belongs to me! And I still sing, "Thank you for being my family, thank you for being my friends: May God bless and keep you in all that you may do until we meet again!"

It is my goal to just make your journey and mine a little lighter and brighter. I have faith that the Lord still has a work for me to do, a new ministry. I am ready and available for church services, week of prayer, concerts, etc. as the Lord opens the doors. I do not know what my future holds, but God does and that's enough for me.

Just in closing I want to make an appeal to you to get out your binoculars, dust them off, bring them into focus and then search... Love your neighbor enough to be a Good Samaritan. When he is broken and bleeding in the middle of the road, focus your binoculars with the love of Christ, but don't stop there, reach out and meet his need in his time of crisis. Christianity is not something that "just happens". True Christianity occurs when a decided action is taken...when we search, when we fill a need, when we mend a broken heart and when we are just "there" for hurting people. There is a lot of them. But there are too few Christians who focus their binoculars with love.

Thank you for being my family! Stay close to the Shepherd!

Blessings to you and yours

Linda Shelton

Additional info to be considered before responding (this is also post #27.....

Here is her completed letter. As I mentioned in a post earlier on this thread, once she finished her letter, I would also post it under the first letter. Her letter is on her website as well.. 

February, 2007

My warmest greetings,

A couple approached me, with tears in their eyes, and said, "We have just missed you and we wanted to see you to make sure you were okay." As I saw the pain in their eyes, over the events that have transpired in my life in the last few years, it was as if my heart was pierced again. "We are just so happy to see you smiling, in church and still serving God." Our meeting took place a few months ago at the Bible Chapel Seventh-day Adventist Church, where I am a member. I enjoyed my visit with this caring Christian couple and the compassion and love they showed toward me.

Some people act surprised that I am still a member of the SDA church. But why? God is still the same awesome God that He always has been, the incredible Bible truths embraced by the Seventh-day Adventists are still just as true today as they ever were and although a "thousand shall fall on my right and a thousand fall on my left" nothing will ever change these facts. We must hold firm to our faith during troubled times!

Many have written to me over the past many months asking me to update my website. This I have prayerfully considered for quite some time, nearly a year.

Quite frankly, I just have not known what to say. I feel that this scandal has made a large, festering open wound in my Church. Perhaps the truth revealed will ultimately bring the healing that everyone

needs. Then we can grieve together and move on. I am certain, in essence, I have died a thousand deaths over the events of the last couple of years. But, with the Lords blessing, I will try to address issues which have been brought to my attention in the kindest manner possible.

For the first time in nearly three years I will not simply deny the accusations, but will directly address certain issues. I do not take pleasure in speaking of these things. I think I have always been the one who would rather receive hurt, than be the one to inflict hurt upon others. But during the course of this last year I learned some valuable lessons through Dr. Mable Dunbar of Pollys Place Network, she has been an incredible support and help to me.

Mable is a woman who truly loves the Lord and is not afraid to stand up for what she believes is right, even if a whole army would stand against her.

Pollys Place Network is a ministry which empowers abused lives and aids them through their difficult circumstances. It is a marvelous organization and so needed for this age when Satan has focused his wrath upon breaking up the security and circle of love God intended for our families. I videotaped some interviews, for Pollys Place, at the SDA Conference office in Spokane, Washington with several individuals who had been through incredibly painful situations. Each of them, in essence, had the same healing story. It was when they were able to come forward and expressed the truth about what happened to them, that their healing came. Inspired by these individuals, now I can accept and believe it is Gods job to protect the ministry I have loved and co-founded, and its my right and my healing to tell the truth about what has occurred.

I am co-authoring a book and its purpose is to share the silver lining of the amazing lessons the Lord has taught me through this crisis. I feel the Lord has lifted a veil and allowed me to see the world that He sees, a world far different than we see. I see that the darts of false allegations that Satan has thrown toward me and my ministry were not directed solely for my downfall, but the aim was much wider. Although I was the apparent target, Satan was attempting to destroy the ministry I loved and co-founded and cripple the witness of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. My perspective has been forever changed through my experiences and my book will give me the opportunity to share these lessons more fully with all of you. (I will keep you posted as to the release date of this book.)

John Knox once said, "Kings (or leaders) have not an absolute power to do in their government what pleases them, but their power is limited by Gods Word; so that if they strike where God has not commanded, they are but murderers; and if they spare where God has commanded to strike, they and their thrones are criminal and guilty of the wickedness which abounds upon the face of the earth, for lack of punishment." John knew his Bible. It is a Biblical principle that if we see a wrong and only look the other way or feebly say, "I will let the Lord deal with that one," then that wickedness is applied to our slate, plain and simple.

The most devastating blow a televangelist can get is the false accusation of adultery. Although I have already made this statement on my website I want to address those of you who have loved and valued my Christianity, integrity and my ministry for the 19 years that I was at 3ABN. I want to clearly emphasize that I was 100% faithful to my husband. I loved, trusted and believed in him to a fault. Imagine my shock when I realized that the false allegations in the form of libel, slander and defamation directed my way were initiated by two of the closest people to me on planet earth; one was my beloved partner and the other was my closet lady friend. I loved them both and trusted them both to the point that their close communication did not bother me in the least. I know that sounds naive, but I did not believe that Dan would do anything that would harm the ministry we had built together.

In 2004 there was a tremendous outcry at my departure. There was suspicion over how swiftly I was fired from my position and divorced. There was suspicion over the fact that I never had the opportunity to talk to the Board and defend myself. There was suspicion over the fact that every trace of my presence was completely cleared out of the campus of 3ABN, even before my termination, as well as the website, television and radio broadcasts. I was made a sacrificial lamb in a scheme calculated to remove me from both my home and my ministry through an orchestrated campaign of malicious lies circulated around the globe.

No words can begin to describe the absolute agony this has brought to my life, but there are other victims as well, and may God bless and spare the young lives and tender souls who have also felt the stinging thrust of this sword of scandal.

It has completely broken my heart to see the emails and letters which have come from the Chairman of the Board, Dan and others at 3ABN, to hear of the television and radio programs where erroneous references have been made to the situation, to watch the ministry that I helped build with much devotion used to destroy me and also to hear of the reports of what is being said on the SDA chat sites about me today by those bent on my destruction...nearly three years later.

It was the false accusation of adultery which caused the loss of my marriage, my reputation, my employment, and everything else. I challenge the 3ABN Board to produce the "irrefutable evidence" which caused a co-founder, a life-time Board member, Vice-President and Secretary of the Board to be removed in that May, 2004 meeting! I am asking, no demanding, that the information is made public, at my request! Cast aside these pretended desires to "spare me"!

The world is waiting with baited breath!

The stakes are high. I, as well as others, have personally experienced electronic surveillance, email theft, interception of cell phone calls, post divorce entry into my private residence to the point where charges were filed with the police. It is not easy to live your life when you feel that you can never know for sure if you are being followed, watched or recorded...even now. I have had invitations to do ministry thwarted because of continued allegations by those, who, like wolves in sheeps clothing, attempted to stop my ministry.

I want to make this absolutely clear: I left my home because I was not safe, I was not welcome. I was witnessing the murder of my reputation and ministry day by day. I stayed as long as I felt I could. I hoped, believed and prayed that things would change but they only got worse. The statements made that I left my husband for another man are absolutely and totally false. Any thinking person would realize that I had everything a Christian woman could have wanted in this life: a husband I loved and the opportunity to minister to millions of people about the tremendous love of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, through the ministry that we spent so many years building together. Although two of the people who I loved best have called me "Gomer", yet a more accurate term would be "Hosea", which I would only discover later. But I prefer simply, Linda, "SAVED by the Blood of the Lamb!"

I do not visit the chat sites. This has been a mega-trial for me and my way of coping has been to try and focus on other things. I realize that the individuals which make up our Church need healing from this disaster too.

And perhaps the chat sites have served to help people give expression to their frustrations and hurts in this situation. I am grateful to each of you who have prayed and interceded for me. It has meant so much during my dark days. You will never know just how much!

Now my kids are grown and I am alone...but not really alone, although I have no husband. Now I belong to everyone and everyone belongs to me! And I still sing, "Thank you for being my family, thank you for being my friends: May God bless and keep you in all that you may do until we meet again!"

It is my goal to just make your journey and mine a little lighter and brighter. I have faith that the Lord still has a work for me to do, a new ministry. I am ready and available for church services, week of prayer, concerts, etc. as the Lord opens the doors. I do not know what my future holds, but God does and that's enough for me.

Just in closing I want to make an appeal to you to get out your binoculars, dust them off, bring them into focus and then search... Love your neighbor enough to be a Good Samaritan. When he is broken and bleeding in the middle of the road, focus your binoculars with the love of Christ, but don't stop there, reach out and meet his need in his time of crisis. Christianity is not something that "just happens". True Christianity occurs when a decided action is taken...when we search, when we fill a

need, when we mend a broken heart and when we are just "there" for hurting people. There are many of them. But there are too few Christians who focus their binoculars with love.

Thank you for being my family! Stay close to the Shepherd!


Blessings to you and yours,

Linda Shelton

NOTE: Her letter of demand, posted March 2nd, 2007 now on her website. To go right there, click here <http://www.lindashelton.org>

Posted by: wwjd Mar 2 2007, 09:07 PM

[quote name='sonshineonme' date='Mar 2 2007, 07:10 PM' post='181762']

Here is her completed letter. As I mentioned in a post earlier on this thread, once she finished her letter, I would also post it under the first letter. Her letter is on her website as well. 

Why is this being posted again. Wasn't the first one that got jerked off ,already posted here, and the second "corrected" one posted also. And as mentioned, it is also posted on her web. One can only take so much nausea, before one hurls.

Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 2 2007, 09:13 PM

wwjd wrote:

QUOTE

Why is this being posted again. Wasn't the first one that got jerked off ,already posted here, and the second "corrected" one posted also. And as mentioned, it is also posted on her web. One can only take so much nausea, before one hurls.

So did anyone force you to read it? I'm glad it got posted again personally. In fact I think we should all make a few copies to hand out at church tomorrow.

Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 2 2007, 09:19 PM

If any man would hurl on thy coat, offer him you cloak also. Wait....how does that go? And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. Mat 5:40

QUOTE(wwjd)

One can only take so much nausea, before one hurls.

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 2 2007, 09:42 PM

QUOTE(Richard Sherwin @ Mar 2 2007, 07:13 PM)

wwjd wrote:Why is this being posted again. Wasn't the first one that got jerked off ,already posted here, and the second "corrected" one posted also. And as mentioned, it is also posted on her web. One can only take so much nausea, before one hurls.

Read it again...you could use it.
It was never "jerked" off anywhere.

It was posted before it was grammatically corrected, etc.
I told all, as I posted the first letter with the understanding it was complete, that I would post the finished one again (I can tell you don't really take the time to read the posts here) and that is just what I did. Why don't you get seek some personal counseling/attention for your apparent issues. I'm sure they are hindering peace and happiness in your life.

You can't possibly post these kinds of comments and expect to gain "credibility", but you only gain negative attention and seek to provoke a less than christian spirit back at you. But I will only say this, I pray for you and those like you, that you let go and let God heal your spirit.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 2 2007, 10:53 PM

QUOTE(Richard Sherwin @ Mar 2 2007, 08:13 PM)

wwjd wrote:
So did anyone force you to read it? I'm glad it got posted again personally. In fact I think we should all make a few copies to hand out at church tomorrow.

Why that's a great idea!

Posted by: Treniece Mar 3 2007, 09:53 AM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Feb 17 2007, 08:50 PM)

Treniece,
Just out of curiosity, how have you come to the conclusion that the things said about Tommy are true? While I am inclined to agree with you, I'm interested in how you got there.

I also have had a hard time believing that the Brenda I thought I knew from watching her on cooking shows, Kids Time and various other productions would do the things she is reported to have done. Of course, how well do we actually know someone by their actions on the television

screen?

Regarding thinking Tommy was a long time Adventist, I think you hit on a key, or at least a significant problem here. Unless one is privy to the behind-the-scenes lives of the folks on 3abn, viewers are left to conclude that those participating in the 3abn ministry are SDA.

PB

am inclined to believe the things said about Tommy are true after reading the thread on the article produced by the AToday magazine (I think thats the name of the magazine). Too many allegatins at different times by more than 3 persons.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 3 2007, 11:21 AM

QUOTE(Treniece @ Mar 3 2007, 08:53 AM)

I am inclined to believe the things said about Tommy are true after reading the thread on the article produced by the AToday magazine (I think thats the name of the magazine). Too many allegatins at different times by more than 3 persons.

Treniece,

believe you are wise in your method of verifying truth!

'B

Posted by: Bystander Mar 3 2007, 02:22 PM

QUOTE(Treniece @ Mar 3 2007, 09:53 AM)

I am inclined to believe the things said about Tommy are true after reading the thread on the article produced by the AToday magazine (I think thats the name of the magazine). Too many allegatins at different times by more than 3 persons.

As far as believing anything from A today, where do you think they got most of their information? Try the joy/pickle website.

Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Mar 4 2007, 12:18 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 3 2007, 02:22 PM)

As far as believing anything from A today, where do you think they got most of their information? Try the joy/pickle website.

Wonder where all the victims and their families got *their* information?

Posted by: SoulEspresso Mar 4 2007, 01:08 AM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 3 2007, 02:22 PM)

As far as believing anything from A today, where do you think they got most of their information? Try the joy/pickle website.

20

Nope, they're better journalists than that. If you know how journalists work (I was one for awhile), you can look at the paragraphs and see who they talked to. People at the churches. People at the conference. Heck, they even talked to Danny.

QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Mar 4 2007, 12:18 AM)

Wonder where all the victims and their families got *their* information?

Clearly ... from the article they talked to victims too. Otherwise they wouldn't have published their names.

Posted by: wwjd Mar 4 2007, 02:41 AM

QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Mar 4 2007, 12:18 AM)

Wonder where all the victims and their families got *their* information?

Duane, a post was written to you some time ago. I don't know if you didn't want to answer (which is your prerogative) or if you just missed it, so I will ask again.

Did you write a reply to TS's letter you say was sent to you. If so why was it not published also? My other question. You say all you are seeking is an apology, if so, wasn't that what the letter was about? Please don't say that there are others he needs to apologize to. If so, that is between him, them and God. You are only responsible for you and him alone. If that is his letter, he apologized a long time ago, so why are you here if that is all you wanted?

Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Mar 4 2007, 06:54 AM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Mar 4 2007, 02:41 AM)

Duane, a post was written to you some time ago. I don't know if you didn't want to answer (which


is your prerogative) or if you just missed it, so I will ask again.

Did you write a reply to TS's letter you say was sent to you. If so why was it not published also? My other question. You say all you are seeking is an apology, if so, wasn't that what the letter was about? Please don't say that there are others he needs to apologize to. If so, that is between him, them and God. You are only responsible for you and him alone. If that is his letter, he apologized a long time ago, so why are you here if that is all you wanted?

I feel no need to answer someone who hides behind a screen name to try to discredit me. I'll be happy to answer when someone is man or woman enough to sign their name to the question.

Another thought: If all the ones speaking out are in the wrong, why do we have no problem signing our names while the "defenders of the truth" hide in anonymity?

Just wondering....




Posted by: Eirene Mar 4 2007, 08:14 AM

QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Mar 4 2007, 06:54 AM) □


I feel no need to answer someone who hides behind a screen name to try to discredit me. I'll be happy to answer when someone is man or woman enough to sign their name to the question.

Another thought: If all the ones speaking out are in the wrong, why do we have no problem signing our names while the "defenders of the truth" hide in anonymity?

Just wondering....



I'm just wondering....



how T. Shelton is to stopped, and prevented from molesting

any other boys, if no one is willing to go to the authorities and report any of this, and sign their name?

Whether someone signs their name or not, I think this is an important concern which needs to be addressed. I think that this should be the #1 concern here, but I don't see anyone talking about protecting future victims, or preventing more abuse.

What is your thinking on this, Mr Clem? Do you know what, if anything, is being done about this?

Posted by: wwjd Mar 4 2007, 08:21 AM


QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Mar 4 2007, 06:54 AM) □

I feel no need to answer someone who hides behind a screen name to try to discredit me. I'll be happy to answer when someone is man or woman enough to sign their name to the question.

Another thought: If all the ones speaking out are in the wrong, why do we have no problem signing

our names while the "defenders of the truth" hide in anonymity?

Just wondering....



fair enough if you don't want to answer. But who are your defenders of truth? Watchbird, sonshineonme, sister, peacefully bewildered, lurker, panama pete, lookin4truth, hershey99, paper tiger, soul expresso, DrRe, shall I continue?.....

Posted by: Johann Mar 4 2007, 05:04 PM

QUOTE(wwj d @ Mar 4 2007, 04:21 PM)

Fair enough if you don't want to answer. But who are your defenders of truth? Watchbird, sonshineonme, sister, peacefully bewildered, lurker, panama pete, lookin4truth, hershey99, paper tiger, soul expresso, DrRe, shall I continue?.....

Honestly, I think many of them have better reasons to hide their identity than you do. Isn't that right Mr. wwjd? So why don't just show then how to do it? I am not hiding.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 4 2007, 08:24 PM

QUOTE(Johann @ Mar 4 2007, 05:04 PM)

Honestly, I think many of them have better reasons to hide their identity than you do. Isn't that right Mr. wwjd? So why don't just show then how to do it? I am not hiding.

You "think" they have better reasons to hide than I do?

Posted by: Johann Mar 4 2007, 09:17 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 04:24 AM)

You "think" they have better reasons to hide than I do?

Yes, unless you are hiding from Mr. L. Westphal.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 4 2007, 09:23 PM

QUOTE(Johann @ Mar 4 2007, 09:17 PM)

Yes, unless you are hiding from Mr. L. Westphal.

Oh, so you are saying that some of them are....Like ex employees of Mr. L
Thanks, that helps a bunch.....

Posted by: Johann Mar 4 2007, 09:52 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 05:23 AM)

Oh, so you are saying that some of them are....Like ex employees of Mr. L
Thanks, that helps a bunch.....

Helping whom?

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 4 2007, 11:41 PM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Mar 4 2007, 07:21 AM)

Fair enough if you don't want to answer. But who are your defenders of truth? Watchbird, sonshineonme, sister, peacefully bewildered, lurker, panama pete, lookin4truth, hershey99, paper tiger, soul expresso, DrRe, shall I continue?.....

wwjd,

My husband is an unbeliever but allows me to pursue truth as I judge important. When I checked out this 3abn forum to see if what a friend was saying was true, I searched and found truth indeed! My husband is not happy that I am involved in this hot-button issue, but he sees the importance of exposing the abuse that has been reported and even he sees as verified.

One condition he has asked me to honor is for me to remain anonymous. He feels that what he has heard of Danny Shelton's tactics are of concern enough that he doesn't want one of his hired "thugs" showing up on our doorstep to try to intimidate this old grandma into backing down from this pursuit.

BTW, when I tried to get the story from Danny and others at 3abn, all I got was snubbed. I did not enjoy the free access that Bystander, wwjd and others have had.

PB

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 5 2007, 12:05 AM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 4 2007, 09:41 PM)

wwjd,

My husband is an unbeliever but allows me to pursue truth as I judge important. When I checked out this 3abn forum to see if what a friend was saying was true, I searched and found truth indeed! My husband is not happy that I am involved in this hot-button issue, but he sees the importance of exposing the abuse that has been reported and even he sees as verified.

One condition he has asked me to honor is for me to remain anonymous. He feels that what he has heard of Danny Shelton's tactics are of concern enough that he doesn't want one of his hired "thugs" showing up on our doorstep to try to intimidate this old grandma into backing down from this pursuit.

BTW, when I tried to get the story from Danny and others at 3abn, all I got was snubbed. I did not enjoy the free access that Bystander, wwjd and others have had.

PB

Wow PB, this has been quite a journey for you, and your husband. He sounds very wise as well.

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 5 2007, 12:14 AM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Mar 4 2007, 11:05 PM)

Wow PB, this has been quite a journey for you, and your husband. He sounds very wise as well.

I have to admit that this journey has not taken me where I thought I would go. Truth is surprising that way sometimes!

My husband is wise and a sweetheart. I pray that he will one day open his heart to the Lord again.

Posted by: Fran Mar 5 2007, 12:16 AM

QUOTE(Johann @ Mar 4 2007, 09:17 PM)

Yes, unless you are hiding from Mr. L. Westphal.

Boy, Johann, I understand what you are saying! I am so glad I came tonight!

Posted by: Ralph Mar 5 2007, 12:23 AM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 4 2007, 10:41 PM)

One condition he has asked me to honor is for me to remain anonymous. He feels that what he has heard of Danny Shelton's tactics are of concern enough that he doesn't want one of his hired "thugs" showing up on our doorstep to try to intimidate this old grandma into backing down from this pursuit.

Your husband is very wise. I keep everything backed up. Even if my PC were compromised, I would lose very little information.

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 5 2007, 12:23 AM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 4 2007, 10:14 PM)

I have to admit that this journey has not taken me where I thought I would go. Truth is surprising that way sometimes!

My husband is wise and a sweetheart. I pray that he will one day open his heart to the Lord again.

He will. I will pray for him.

Posted by: Johann Mar 5 2007, 12:44 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 5 2007, 05:23 AM)


Oh, so you are saying that some of them are....Like ex employees of Mr. L
Thanks, that helps a bunch.....

That leaves him (LW) pretty much alone. I understand he was trying to make an impression on the graduates of Loma Linda University last week-end. How many helpers does he have left by now? He was trying to cover up some of the pictures he displayed! Smart!!!! rofl

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Mar 6 2007, 10:04 PM

QUOTE(Johann @ Mar 5 2007, 01:44 PM)

That leaves him (LW) pretty much alone. I understand he was trying to make an impression on the graduates of Loma Linda University last week-end. How many helpers does he have left by now?

He was trying to cover up some of the pictures he displayed! Smart!!!! 

am a little lost. Care to give more info into this new subject between you, WWJD, and BS.

Posted by: Johann Mar 7 2007, 05:03 AM

QUOTE(Fran @ Mar 5 2007, 08:16 AM)

Boy, Johann, I understand what you are saying! I am so glad I came tonight!

t's good that you are around, Fran. I'd better get back to the Nobel story.

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Mar 7 2007, 06:04 AM)

I am a little lost. Care to give more info into this new subject between you, WWJD, and BS.

We'll leave that to the investigation of the Internal Intelligence.

Posted by: Johann Mar 12 2007, 12:57 PM

QUOTE(husbandoftheyear @ Mar 7 2007, 06:04 AM)

I am a little lost. Care to give more info into this new subject between you, WWJD, and BS.

ust a slight clue. Mr. L. Westphal was recently featured with a cover portrait on 3ABN World Magazine. He is evidently a very valuable man to 3ABN because of the millions he gets 3ABN annually in annuities. His main office was, when I last talked to him, at Loma Linda, CA, and I suspect he is still here because a few days he was seen putting up a booth for 3ABN by the University. In connection with that booth he was displaying a large poster where he made a futile attempt covering up the center picture featuring Danny and Linda.

Why was he using this? Why was he attempting to conceal the center picture?

Posted by: Noahswife Mar 12 2007, 01:29 PM

QUOTE(Johann @ Mar 12 2007, 01:57 PM)

In connection with that booth he was displaying a large poster where he made a futile attempt covering up the center picture featuring Danny and Linda.

And now paraphrasing a famous radio commentator,

get the "rest of the story"



Thanks.

nw
C:"

Posted by: Johann Mar 16 2007, 05:05 AM

QUOTE(Noahswife @ Mar 12 2007, 09:29 PM)

And now paraphrasing a famous radio commentator,

I get the "rest of the story"



Thanks.

nw
C:"

And in a few hours we can all enjoy resting in the Lord on His Holy Day - the Sabbath! What a joy!

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 18 2007, 06:44 PM

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Mar 2 2007, 06:10 PM)

Bumping up.

To keep balance in this, it helps to remember all the pieces of this puzzle. Linda finally speaks here. That's her right. Will DS dislike this little kink in things? I think so. Does she have anything to lose by requesting full disclosure? NO, unless she were guilty of the trash that has been told of her. Does DS have the guts to admit he went to far?

February, 2007

My warmest greetings,

A couple approached me, with tears in their eyes, and said, "We have just missed you and we wanted to see you to make sure you were okay." As I saw the pain in their eyes, over the events that have transpired in my life in the last few years, it was as if my heart was pierced again. "We

are just so happy to see you smiling, in church and still serving God." Our meeting took place a few months ago at the Bible Chapel Seventh-day Adventist Church, where I am a member. I enjoyed my visit with this caring Christian couple and the compassion and love they showed toward me.

Some people act surprised that I am still a member of the SDA church. But why? God is still the same awesome God that He always has been, the incredible Bible truths embraced by the Seventh-day Adventists are still just as true today as they ever were and although a "thousand shall fall on my right and a thousand fall on my left" nothing will ever change these facts. We must hold firm to our faith during troubled times!

Many have written to me over the past many months asking me to update my website. This I have prayerfully considered for quite some time, nearly a year.

Quite frankly, I just have not known what to say. I feel that this scandal has made a large, festering open wound in my Church. Perhaps the truth revealed will ultimately bring the healing that everyone needs. Then we can grieve together and move on. I am certain, in essence, I have died a thousand deaths over the events of the last couple of years. But, with the Lords blessing, I will try to address issues which have been brought to my attention in the kindest manner possible.

For the first time in nearly three years I will not simply deny the accusations, but will directly address certain issues. I do not take pleasure in speaking of these things. I think I have always been the one who would rather receive hurt, than be the one to inflict hurt upon others. But during the course of this last year I learned some valuable lessons through Dr. Mable Dunbar of Pollys Place Network, she has been an incredible support and help to me.

Mable is a woman who truly loves the Lord and is not afraid to stand up for what she believes is right, even if a whole army would stand against her.

Pollys Place Network is a ministry which empowers abused lives and aids them through their difficult circumstances. It is a marvelous organization and so needed for this age when Satan has focused his wrath upon breaking up the security and circle of love God intended for our families. I videotaped some interviews, for Pollys Place, at the SDA Conference office in Spokane, Washington with several individuals who had been through incredibly painful situations. Each of them, in essence, had the same healing story. It was when they were able to come forward and expressed the truth about what happened to them, that their healing came. Inspired by these individuals, now I can accept and believe it is Gods job to protect the ministry I have loved and co-founded, and its my right and my healing to tell the truth about what has occurred.

I am co-authoring a book and its purpose is to share the silver lining of the amazing lessons the Lord has taught me through this crisis. I feel the Lord has lifted a veil and allowed me to see the world that He sees, a world far different than we see. I see that the darts of false allegations that Satan has thrown toward me and my ministry were not directed solely for my downfall, but the aim was much wider. Although I was the apparent target, Satan was attempting to destroy the ministry I loved and co-founded and cripple the witness of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. My perspective has been forever changed through my experiences and my book will give me the opportunity to share these lessons more fully with all of you. (I will keep you posted as to the release date of this book.)

John Knox once said, "Kings (or leaders) have not an absolute power to do in their government what pleases them, but their power is limited by Gods Word; so that if they strike where God has not commanded, they are but murderers; and if they spare where God has commanded to strike, they and their thrones are criminal and guilty of the wickedness which abounds upon the face of the earth, for lack of punishment." John knew his Bible. It is a Biblical principle that if we see a wrong and only look the other way or feebly say, "I will let the Lord deal with that one," then that wickedness is applied to our slate, plain and simple.

The most devastating blow a televangelist can get is the false accusation of adultery. Although I have already made this statement on my website I want to address those of you who have loved and valued my Christianity, integrity and my ministry for the 19 years that I was at 3ABN. I want to

clearly emphasize that I was 100% faithful to my husband. I loved, trusted and believed in him to a fault. Imagine my shock when I realized that the false allegations in the form of libel, slander and defamation directed my way were initiated by two of the closest people to me on planet earth; one was my beloved partner and the other was my closet lady friend. I loved them both and trusted them both to the point that their close communication did not bother me in the least. I know that sounds naive, but I did not believe that Dan would do anything that would harm the ministry we had built together.

In 2004 there was a tremendous outcry at my departure. There was suspicion over how swiftly I was fired from my position and divorced. There was suspicion over the fact that I never had the opportunity to talk to the Board and defend myself. There was suspicion over the fact that every trace of my presence was completely cleared out of the campus of 3ABN, even before my termination, as well as the website, television and radio broadcasts. I was made a sacrificial lamb in a scheme calculated to remove me from both my home and my ministry through an orchestrated campaign of malicious lies circulated around the globe.

No words can begin to describe the absolute agony this has brought to my life, but there are other victims as well, and may God bless and spare the young lives and tender souls who have also felt the stinging thrust of this sword of scandal.

It has completely broken my heart to see the emails and letters which have come from the Chairman of the Board, Dan and others at 3ABN, to hear of the television and radio programs where erroneous references have been made to the situation, to watch the ministry that I helped build with much devotion used to destroy me and also to hear of the reports of what is being said on the SDA chat sites about me today by those bent on my destruction...nearly three years later.

It was the false accusation of adultery which caused the loss of my marriage, my reputation, my employment, and everything else. I challenge the 3ABN Board to produce the "irrefutable evidence" which caused a co-founder, a life-time Board member, Vice-President and Secretary of the Board to be removed in that May, 2004 meeting! I am asking, no demanding, that the information is made public, at my request! Cast aside these pretended desires to "spare me"!

The world is waiting with baited breath!

The stakes are high. I, as well as others, have personally experienced electronic surveillance, email theft, interception of cell phone calls, post divorce entry into my private residence to the point where charges were filed with the police. It is not easy to live your life when you feel that you can never know for sure if you are being followed, watched or recorded...even now. I have had invitations to do ministry thwarted because of continued allegations by those, who, like wolves in sheeps clothing, attempted to stop my ministry.

I want to make this absolutely clear: I left my home because I was not safe, I was not welcome. I was witnessing the murder of my reputation and ministry day by day. I stayed as long as I felt I could. I hoped, believed and prayed that things would change but they only got worse. The statements made that I left my husband for another man are absolutely and totally false. Any thinking person would realize that I had everything a Christian woman could have wanted in this life: a husband I loved and the opportunity to minister to millions of people about the tremendous love of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, through the ministry that we spent so many years building together. Although two of the people who I loved best have called me "Gomer", yet a more accurate term would be "Hosea", which I would only discover later. But I prefer simply, Linda, "SAVED by the Blood of the Lamb!"

I do not visit the chat sites. This has been a mega-trial for me and my way of coping has been to try and focus on other things. I realize that the individuals which make up our Church need healing from this disaster too.

And perhaps the chat sites have served to help people give expression to their frustrations and hurts in this situation. I am grateful to each of you who have prayed and interceded for me. It has meant so much during my dark days. You will never know just how much!

Now my kids are grown and I am alone...but not really alone, although I have no husband. Now I belong to everyone and everyone belongs to me! And I still sing, "Thank you for being my family, thank you for being my friends: May God bless and keep you in all that you may do until we meet again!"

It is my goal to just make your journey and mine a little lighter and brighter. I have faith that the Lord still has a work for me to do, a new ministry. I am ready and available for church services, week of prayer, concerts, etc. as the Lord opens the doors. I do not know what my future holds, but God does and that's enough for me.

Just in closing I want to make an appeal to you to get out your binoculars, dust them off, bring them into focus and then search... Love your neighbor enough to be a Good Samaritan. When he is broken and bleeding in the middle of the road, focus your binoculars with the love of Christ, but don't stop there, reach out and meet his need in his time of crisis. Christianity is not something that "just happens". True Christianity occurs when a decided action is taken...when we search, when we fill a need, when we mend a broken heart and when we are just "there" for hurting people. There are many of them. But there are too few Christians who focus their binoculars with love.

Thank you for being my family! Stay close to the Shepherd!

Blessings to you and yours,

Linda Shelton

NOTE: Her letter of demand, posted March 2nd, 2007 now on her website. To go right there, click here <http://www.lindashelton.org>

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 22 2007, 08:13 PM

Bump (yes, I want to bump this again)

Posted by: mozart Mar 22 2007, 09:41 PM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Feb 28 2007, 07:56 PM)

1. Linda Shelton has already responded to this. She says she had no power over how much employees were paid. Linda said she wanted to give Sandra Juarez a raise, but was overruled by her ex-husband, Danny Shelton. **Danny does all hiring and firing. Period. Everybody knows that. You know it. I know it. So just stop with this nonsense.**

2. Her Replacement = Tommy Shelton. We already know who "her replacement" was, so you might as well spell it out: Linda was replaced by a Reverend dismissed by another denomination. His name is **Tommy Shelton**, but I suppose just calling him "her replacement" sounds better? You have your marching orders to focus everyone's attention on demonizing Linda - and away from all other core issues? That's what you're getting paid to do as part of your "mending broken people" agenda? Just asking.

3. As for any trip to Norway, the Norwegian doctor, Arild Abrahamsen, has already written and distributed his account.

4. **Linda lost her health insurance** when she was summarily fired by her ex-husband. **You know that.** The Norwegian doctor, aware of what had happened, gave Linda access to his medical clinic after the loss of the insurance. Why keep trying to make that something it is not. Even you, yourself, say Linda Shelton was already divorced at that time.

5. I was in Thompsonville shortly after Danny asked for a divorce. I saw no such fawning as you describe. When Linda started the radio network on December 31, 1999, Danny went on the air shortly thereafter and said several times, "I have no vision for radio," **with Linda Shelton sitting right next to him on the air.** This certainly didn't look like bragging over Linda to me. It came across to me as a message to viewers saying, "Radio is not part of the Great Danny Shelton Vision, so please take note, everyone." But Linda's radio network succeeded anyway, despite Danny's admonition to his viewers. And things were never the same after that.

Linda held a 3ABN Radio School beginning on Monday, March 8, 2004. It was a sold-out event. The Radio Network was succeeding. Danny could see that and he was not happy. If Danny was going to get rid of Linda, he'd have to do it before she added a dozen more radio stations.

Danny demanded his divorce, the night before the radio school started, on Sunday, March 7, 2004. Danny just couldn't handle Linda's success and he was determined to put a stop to it. Linda, not being streetwise, could not suspect what was going on or how her demise was linked to her own success in radio.

Mollie Steenson had gone to India, and I believe she was not in Thompsonville, on Sunday evening, March 7, 2004, when Danny demanded his divorce and put his plan into action. Mollie came back to Thompsonville and was in her office by midweek, but everything was already in motion. My opinion is that Mollie Steenson either couldn't be trusted to help destroy Linda Shelton, or Mollie wanted to distance herself from the planned event, so it was done while she, Mollie, was out of the country - in India, no less. Was that trip to India planned in advance by someone for such a reason? I've decided in my own mind that it was.

6. I don't see that "programming improved" with the Reverend Tommy Shelton sitting in Linda's old office. But that's in the eye of the beholder. Maybe an endless array of scolding, talking heads at 3ABN pleases you. There's nothing special about Shelley Quinn with her veiled excoriation using "John the Baptist" or John Lomacang's version of the same using his "Moses - Touch Not the Lord's Anointed" blatherments. The expoundings of these two strike me as nothing but desperate and weird.

6. Bystander, you keep regurgitating the same old garbage over and over trying so hard to re-write history. It is not working, so give it up. The reason you skip responding to Watchbird is that she knows the timeline, and you cannot deal with that; Your job is to deliver your mudballs to people who **you think** cannot tell the difference.

7. The entire 3ABN defense from the very beginning has been, "Nobody will be able to criticize us, because they are all stupid and will never be able to figure out what we did for sure," *id est*, "Nobody knows me and Linda" *ad infinitum*. Your only purpose on this forum, Bystander, is to muddy the waters with your little mudballs and to make sure it all stays muddy. Everybody can see that, **so this must be about your personal paycheck.** It certainly cannot be about truth or justice. Not knowing who you are, this is all about your own personal bank account, right? Are you willing to do anything to keep those paychecks coming, no matter what? Am I close? I think I am right on target. I think it is all about money, your money, Bystander, and nothing else. I think everything and everyone comes a distant second with you.

'ou make some great points Pete. [don't let BS get to you 

Posted by: seraph|m Mar 22 2007, 09:49 PM

QUOTE(mozart @ Mar 22 2007, 10:41 PM)

You make some great points Pete. [**don't let BS get to you**]

Thanks for the chuckle. edited content.....

Posted by: mozart Mar 22 2007, 10:23 PM

hope you don't mind me posting inside your post.

QUOTE(watchbird @ Feb 28 2007, 04:34 PM)

It is doubtful if 3abn will ever officialy admit anything about anything. But the reason Linda was dismissed is very plain.... She was dismissed because Danny didn't want her around any more.

Isn't this pretty much what Walt Thompson said to her, when he wrote something to the effect that he didn't care about their personal problems all he knew was the president didn't want the vice-president anymore. (now that's cold)

Now as to why he didn't want her around..... there is probably no single answer to that. And since speculating about motives is not a good thing to do, we shall probably have to be content to notice what things he has changed since he got rid of her. The most obvious, of course, is that he has a new wife..... one that is much younger.

I'm not so sure we should concentrate on "younger woman" so much. nowadays lots of women look better at 40 than they did at 20 plus they got the smarts. sad to say some guys are afraid of smarts. (i'm not one of them. the smarter my wife is the easier it is on me. rofl) seriously tho', i think that's what is probably more accurate. why else would he be in such a panic to discredit her. he's terrified of what she knows. can anyone say the word: "gag"? what he seems to have forgotten or maybe never appreciated, however, is that she has class.

But there may be other changes also that are significant in other areas.... types of programming.... doctrinal emphases..... the way workers are treated..... perhaps others more familiar with things both before and after Linda left may have noticed changes that may be significant.

Of course, we do not know that spring 2004 was actually the watershed. It could be that Danny was already making changes.... at least some of which caused added friction between the two. Some have seen their going for a private jet plane as a significant watershed. Some have seen the court case over the property tax exemption as significant. It would be interesting to hear what others observed in the way of significant changes over the last 5 years or so.

seems to me, power and control got the best of DS

QUOTE(Nuggie @ Mar 1 2007, 05:53 AM)

OK, let me see if I've got this straight...you want us to believe that Linda had so much power at 3ABN that she controlled programming, employee morale and workers' salary? You want us to believe that Danny was impotent and powerless to do anything to break Linda's control. You want us to believe that Danny, the founder and person to whom God gave this wonderful "vision" let

Linda get all the power and control everything he felt that the Lord specifically gave to him. Yet with all this power that she supposedly had the 3ABN board was quick to summarily dismiss her and bind her up with a gag order. Yeah...OK...and Bill Gates is just a front for Microsoft...I'm really the President...

Oh kew!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Can i borrow a few bucks?

Posted by: mozart Mar 22 2007, 10:44 PM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Mar 4 2007, 02:41 AM)

Duane, a post was written to you some time ago. I don't know if you didn't want to answer (which is your prerogative) or if you just missed it, so I will ask again.

Did you write a reply to TS's letter you say was sent to you. If so why was it not published also? My other question. You say all you are seeking is an apology, if so, wasn't that what the letter was about? Please don't say that there are others he needs to apologize to. If so, that is between him, them and God. You are only responsible for you and him alone. If that is his letter, he apologized a long time ago, so why are you here if that is all you wanted?

AN APOLOGY??? FOR CRYING OUT LOUD!!! TS should buy him a "beamer" and praise the Lord he's not behind bars. Apology indeed!!!

QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Mar 5 2007, 12:23 AM)

He will. I will pray for him.

me too! PB Let's take a moment from this disheartening fiasco and pray for PB and her husband.

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 27 2007, 06:41 PM

QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Feb 28 2007, 06:56 PM)

1. Linda Shelton has already responded to this. She says she had no power over how much employees were paid. Linda said she wanted to give Sandra Juarez a raise, but was overruled by her ex-husband, Danny Shelton. **Danny does all hiring and firing. Period. Everybody knows that. You know it. I know it. So just stop with this nonsense.**

2. Her Replacement = Tommy Shelton. We already know who "her replacement" was, so you might as well spell it out: Linda was replaced by a Reverend dismissed by another denomination. His name is **Tommy Shelton**, but I suppose just calling him "her replacement" sounds better? You have your marching orders to focus everyone's attention on demonizing Linda - and away from all other core issues? That's what you're getting paid to do as part of your "mending broken people" agenda? Just asking.

3. As for any trip to Norway, the Norwegian doctor, Arild Abrahamsen, has already written and distributed his account.

4. **Linda lost her health insurance** when she was summarily fired by her ex-husband. **You know**

that. The Norwegian doctor, aware of what had happened, gave Linda access to his medical clinic after the loss of the insurance. Why keep trying to make that something it is not. Even you, yourself, say Linda Shelton was already divorced at that time.

5. I was in Thompsonville shortly after Danny asked for a divorce. I saw no such fawning as you describe. When Linda started the radio network on December 31, 1999, Danny went on the air shortly thereafter and said several times, "I have no vision for radio," **with Linda Shelton sitting right next to him on the air.** This certainly didn't look like bragging over Linda to me. It came across to me as a message to viewers saying, "Radio is not part of the Great Danny Shelton Vision, so please take note, everyone." But Linda's radio network succeeded anyway, despite Danny's admonition to his viewers. And things were never the same after that.

Linda held a 3ABN Radio School beginning on Monday, March 8, 2004. It was a sold-out event. The Radio Network was succeeding. Danny could see that and he was not happy. If Danny was going to get rid of Linda, he'd have to do it before she added a dozen more radio stations.

Danny demanded his divorce, the night before the radio school started, on Sunday, March 7, 2004. Danny just couldn't handle Linda's success and he was determined to put a stop to it. Linda, not being streetwise, could not suspect what was going on or how her demise was linked to her own success in radio.

Mollie Steenson had gone to India, and I believe she was not in Thompsonville, on Sunday evening, March 7, 2004, when Danny demanded his divorce and put his plan into action. Mollie came back to Thompsonville and was in her office by midweek, but everything was already in motion. My opinion is that Mollie Steenson either couldn't be trusted to help destroy Linda Shelton, or Mollie wanted to distance herself from the planned event, so it was done while she, Mollie, was out of the country - in India, no less. Was that trip to India planned in advance by someone for such a reason? I've decided in my own mind that it was.

6. I don't see that "programming improved" with the Reverend Tommy Shelton sitting in Linda's old office. But that's in the eye of the beholder. Maybe an endless array of scolding, talking heads at 3ABN pleases you. There's nothing special about Shelley Quinn with her veiled excoriation using "John the Baptist" or John Lomacang's version of the same using his "Moses - Touch Not the Lord's Anointed" blatherments. The expoundings of these two strike me as nothing but desperate and weird.

6. Bystander, you keep regurgitating the same old garbage over and over trying so hard to re-write history. It is not working, so give it up. The reason you skip responding to Watchbird is that she knows the timeline, and you cannot deal with that; Your job is to deliver your mudballs to people who **you think** cannot tell the difference.

7. The entire 3ABN defense from the very beginning has been, "Nobody will be able to criticize us, because they are all stupid and will never be able to figure out what we did for sure," *id est*, "Nobody knows me and Linda" *ad infinitum*. Your only purpose on this forum, Bystander, is to muddy the waters with your little mudballs and to make sure it all stays muddy. Everybody can see that, **so this must be about your personal paycheck.** It certainly cannot be about truth or justice. Not knowing who you are, this is all about your own personal bank account, right? Are you willing to do anything to keep those paychecks coming, no matter what? Am I close? I think I am right on target. I think it is all about money, your money, Bystander, and nothing else. I think everything and everyone comes a distant second with you.

ete, this was very well stated. Thank you! Kudos! 

© Invision Power Services (<http://www.invisionpower.com>)