

## Re: Danny Shelton replies to CA posts Again

Re: Danny Shelton replies to CA posts Again - 11/03/04 01:18 AM

Posted by: [Inga](#)

Quote:

---

Inga:

Based on the letters from Danny that you and NormF have posted online, Linda has been doing something much worse than "spiritual adultery" that would justify him for divorcing Linda.

---

Yes, that is Danny's claim. (He used the word "spiritual adultery" in private when speaking to several different individuals, one of them being Johann Thorvaldsson. Apparently Danny hadn't come up with something "much worse" at the time of the divorce. That took more time.)

Quote:

---

If the above quote is correct, Danny has good moral and ethical justification to have divorced Linda. Honestly, I cannot use Jesus' or Paul's teaching to condemn him.

---

**If ...**

That is what this whole discussion has been about -- whether or not the insinuations about Linda by Danny and the board are reflecting the actual truth of the matter.

**If** is such a little word. ... with so much import ...

It seems to me that you have always assumed that Danny and the board were more or less telling the truth, and you have used "deductive thinking" from there. But by **assuming the conclusion** before beginning your deductive thinking, you are engaging in what is recognized as "circular reasoning." Circular reasoning doesn't get you anywhere but back to where you started ...

When "the board" made statements, you assumed that these were individuals separate and distinct from Danny Shelton, and that they saw matters in very much the same light as Danny Shelton. (For their conclusions to be valid, board members would have to have some way of verifying the evidence apart from Danny.)

What **if** the only source of "information" was Danny himself, one party in the dispute. What if

no one else was allowed to testify or give information? What if that board consisted of individuals who had been used to rubber-stamping all of Danny's input for many years and this was only another rubber stamp?

To help our deductive reasoning, let's try a little visualization: Danny is the president of the company. He sits on the board, and the other board members look to him for accurate information because they are not personally involved in the operation of the company. Nominally someone else is the "chairman of the board," but who has the real power and influence? Can such a "board" make an unbiased judgment about the president of the company?

Of course, there's the other side of the coin too: If you assume that Danny and the "board" are telling the truth, you must necessarily assume that Linda and a respected Adventist pastor and administrator, namely Johann Thorvaldsson, are lying. It isn't too hard to line up quite a number of contradictory statements ...

I invite you to do some deductive reasoning to consider who has more reasons to manipulate the truth -- Danny himself or someone who has nothing to gain by contradicting Danny?

I invite you further to check into the reputation these two men have for truth-telling. Elder Thorvaldsson has been around long enough to be known by quite a few other Adventist administrators, so you should be able to find out something. Danny is fairly well known by folks in his home town, and you could probably find out something there.

Here's just a little snippet from a recent letter to a third party which Elder Thorvaldsson is allowing me to share:

"How can a board make an accurate decision in a complicated case, like what happened between Danny and Linda Shelton, when merely one side of the story is heard? When the other party is denied access to the board? (She was permitted to submit a letter. I was with Linda most of the night before that meeting to help her with computer software problems to get that letter finished, but we were three together. The Private Investigators reported to Danny that she'd had a male visit during the night. That was strong ammunition he could use before the board.) I was there and could testify to what happened. Danny Shelton dismissed me from 3ABN because I insisted Irmgard and I had spent several days together with the Doctor in Norway at the time when Danny Shelton and Nick Miller contended the the doctor had been together with Linda in Florida."



So you see, if we believe both accounts, the doctor was in two places at once -- in Norway with Johann and Irmgard Thorvaldsson and in Florida "vacationing" with Linda. You may believe that if you like.



And the fact that Linda was with a "male visitor" the night before the hearing was evidence against her. Accept that if you like.

That's just a sample.

What if the rest of Danny's tales are of similar substance? What if he feels he "has to" make up these stories "to protect 3ABN"? (Those of us listening to Danny now and then see that he finds it difficult to distinguish between himself and 3ABN -- not only in reputation, but in other matters as well.)

The board, of course, got an inside view of the situation between Danny and Linda. After all, they had an "insider" right on their board, and they were used to getting their insider information

from him. That was, of course, much better and more objective than a mere letter from the accused. Accept that as a fair decision-making process, if you like.

And I invite you to use some deductive reasoning to conclude with what kind of people Danny has surrounded himself when he fires a valuable volunteer as Director of European Development just because that person, respected in the European church, can testify that he was personally with the doctor in Europe when it would suit Danny's tale better to have the doctor in Florida with Linda at that time? (Evidently, someone missed a cue when coming up with that tale.) You may consider the opinions of people with which Danny has surrounded himself as "independent verification," if you like.

Such a big import in that little word, **if ...**

Blessings,  
Inge Anderson