

94

## Printable Version of Topic

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

### BlackSDA \_ 3ABN \_ More Questions For 3-abn

**Posted by: Observer Jan 31 2007, 04:54 AM**

Mr. Joy has recently sent "Nick" the following questions:

"Hi Nick.

Here's some questions:

In 2003, 3ABN paid \$600,000 for WDQN FM when it shouldn't have cost more than \$250,000 at the most, and no real estate was acquired in the deal. Why was it never approved by the board?

Why would Danny have paid that much for it? What benefit could Danny have gotten out of it? Kickbacks?

What benefit would it be for Danny to have on the 2003 application for license transfer for WDQN to say that 3ABN is a for-profit corporation? And why would the license renewal in 2004 say that the facility is commercial? (The FCC's failure to grant the license renewal after 2 1/2 years raises some questions.)

Why are we having such a hard time finding that purchase/asset on the 2003 Form 990?

3ABN is a non-profit taking depreciation of about 2 million a year. Is that masking the inappropriate use of cash assets?

Did you know that Danny was taking advances on the trust funds?

Did you get your hands on any proof regarding 3ABN's payments to Cherie Peters for Brandi's income?

Did you get any follow-up for your formal request to the CA EEOC?

Were you aware of the illegal process of acquiring low power FM stations through surrogates for 3ABN's exclusive use?"

I assume, but do not know that "Nick" is Mr. Miller, a 3-ABN attorney.

I find the above questions of interest, but I have no assumption as to what the answer might be. I will suggest to you that no specific answer may be assumed. Those questions are not anything more than questions, for which there may be an appropriate answer.

But, I will suggest that the above questions illustrate a point that I have made. With the failure of any denominationally related organization to resolve the questions that keep coming, we can expect more and more. I do not think that these issues and questions will get any better.

In any case, I will be glad to post here any response that 3-ABN makes to these questions.

**Posted by: watchbird Jan 31 2007, 05:43 AM**

**QUOTE(Observer @ Jan 31 2007, 05:54 AM) □**

Mr. Joy has recently sent "Nick" the following questions:

"Hi Nick.

Here's some questions:

In 2003, 3ABN paid \$600,000 for WDQN FM when it shouldn't have cost more than \$250,000 at the most, and no real estate was acquired in the deal. Why was it never approved by the board?

Why would Danny have paid that much for it? What benefit could Danny have gotten out of it? Kickbacks?

What benefit would it be for Danny to have on the 2003 application for license transfer for WDQN to say that 3ABN is a for-profit corporation? And why would the license renewal in 2004 say that the facility is commercial? (The FCC's failure to grant the license renewal after 2 1/2 years raises some questions.)

Why are we having such a hard time finding that purchase/asset on the 2003 Form 990?

3ABN is a non-profit taking depreciation of about 2 million a year. Is that masking the inappropriate use of cash assets?

Did you know that Danny was taking advances on the trust funds?

Did you get your hands on any proof regarding 3ABN's payments to Cherie Peters for Brandi's income?

Did you get any follow-up for your formal request to the CA EEOC?

Were you aware of the illegal process of acquiring low power FM stations through surrogates for 3ABN's exclusive use?"

**I assume, but do not know that "Nick" is Mr. Miller, a 3-ABN attorney.**

I find the above questions of interest, but I have no assumption as to what the answer might be. I will suggest to you that no specific answer may be assumed. Those questions are not anything more than questions, for which there may be an appropriate answer.

But, I will suggest that the above questions illustrate a point that I have made. With the failure of any denominationally related organization to resolve the questions that keep coming, we can expect more and more. I do not think that these issues and questions will get any better.

In any case, I will be glad to post here any response that 3-ABN makes to these questions.

In regard to the sentence I have highlighted above...

Please make it plain that Nick Miller is not CURRENTLY "a 3-ABN attorney. He still may be the person the letter is being sent to, since he was in 3abn employ, and was even a 3abn board member, for a relatively short period of time which may well have included the time frame of Mr. Joy's questions. I do not know at what point he began his employment, nor whether it was such that he should be considered their "attorney" or if they only had a "contract" arrangement... nor do I understand the distinction between the two, I only know such a distinction was made by a representative of 3abn when queried about him.

I do know that his period of active service included the months immediately preceding and following Linda's removal from 3abn and her and Danny's divorce, and I do know the approximate date (Sep-Oct 2005) at which he ceased working for them and removed himself from their board.

Thus he has not been a board member nor done any work for them for over a year.

---

**Posted by: Pickle Jan 31 2007, 06:08 AM**

My understanding is that he was trying to clean up some of the corruption he saw, and that is why he is no longer a board member.

Can anyone confirm?

---

**Posted by: Observer Jan 31 2007, 06:23 AM**

**QUOTE(watchbird @ Jan 31 2007, 04:43 AM) □**

In regard to the sentence I have highlighted above...

Please make it plain that Nick Miller is not CURRENTLY "a 3-ABN attorney. He still may be the person the letter is being sent to, since he was in 3abn employ, and was even a 3abn board member, for a relatively short period of time which may well have included the time frame of Mr. Joy's questions. I do not know at what point he began his employment, nor whether it was such that he should be considered their "attorney" or if they only had a "contract" arrangement... nor do I understand the distinction between the two, I only know such a distinction was made by a representative of 3abn when queried about him.

I do know that his period of active service included the months immediately preceding and following Linda's removal from 3abn and her and Danny's divorce, and I do know the approximate date (Sep-Oct 2005) at which he ceased working for them and removed himself from their board.

Thus he has not been a board member nor done any work for them for over a year.

Thank you for that clarification. You are correct, Mr. Miller is not a 3-ABN attorney. I was in error, and I gladly post this correction.

---

**Posted by: Johann Jan 31 2007, 09:55 AM**

**QUOTE(Observer @ Jan 31 2007, 12:54 PM) □**

Mr. Joy has recently sent "Nick" the following questions:

---

I assume, but do not know that "Nick" is Mr. Miller, a 3-ABN attorney.

---

If this is Nick Miller he was, but is no longer an attorney for 3ABN. I understand he had to withdraw. .

**QUOTE(Pickle @ Jan 31 2007, 02:08 PM) □**

My understanding is that he was trying to clean up some of the corruption he saw, and that is why he is no longer a board member.

Can anyone confirm?

I inerstand that Nick had to withdraw as a board member in order to retain his credibility. I know that he tried to be an honest man, but that was not easy when working for 3ABN.

---

**Posted by: Daryl Fawcett Feb 1 2007, 08:09 AM**

It would be nice if this Nick Miller would be willing to come forward regarding what he experienced at 3ABN while he was there, etc.

---

**Posted by: watchbird Feb 1 2007, 09:45 AM**

---

**QUOTE(Daryl Fawcett @ Feb 1 2007, 09:09 AM)**

It would be nice if this Nick Miller would be willing to come forward regarding what he experienced at 3ABN while he was there, etc.

Nick Miller is an attorney, and an ethical one. He cannot "come forward" regarding anything having to do with a former client unless he were to be subpoenaed by a civil court. We are not a court. We should not expect, invite, entice, or imply that someone who experienced something at 3abn should come here and satisfy our curiosity. Those who do come to share their experiences are certainly welcome... but our welcome of them should not contain any hint of pressure on, or criticism of, those who choose to remain silent.

---

**Posted by: Fran Feb 1 2007, 04:56 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Observer @ Jan 31 2007, 04:54 AM)**

Mr. Joy has recently sent "Nick" the following questions:

"Hi Nick.

Here's some questions:

In 2003, 3ABN paid \$600,000 for WDQN FM when it shouldn't have cost more than \$250,000 at the most, and no real estate was acquired in the deal. Why was it never approved by the board?

Why would Danny have paid that much for it? What benefit could Danny have gotten out of it? Kickbacks?

What benefit would it be for Danny to have on the 2003 application for license transfer for WDQN to say that 3ABN is a for-profit corporation? And why would the license renewal in 2004 say that the facility is commercial? (The FCC's failure to grant the license renewal after 2 1/2 years raises some questions.)

Why are we having such a hard time finding that purchase/asset on the 2003 Form 990?

3ABN is a non-profit taking depreciation of about 2 million a year. Is that masking the inappropriate use of cash assets?

Did you know that Danny was taking advances on the trust funds?

Did you get your hands on any proof regarding 3ABN's payments to Cherie Peters for Brandi's income?

Did you get any follow-up for your formal request to the CA EEOC?

Were you aware of the illegal process of acquiring low power FM stations through surrogates for 3ABN's exclusive use?"

I assume, but do not know that "Nick" is Mr. Miller, a 3-ABN attorney.

I find the above questions of interest, but I have no assumption as to what the answer might be. I will suggest to you that no specific answer may be assumed. Those questions are not anything more than questions, for which there may be an appropriate answer.

But, I will suggest that the above questions illustrate a point that I have made. With the failure of any denominationally related organization to resolve the questions that keep coming, we can expect more and more. I do not think that this these issues and questions will get any better.

In any case, I will be glad to post here any resposne that 3-ABN makes to to these questions.

Now your talking my language! It is about time for questions AND answers.

---

**Posted by: Bystander Feb 2 2007, 12:16 AM**

---

**QUOTE(Fran @ Feb 1 2007, 04:56 PM)**

Now your talking my language! It is about time for questions AND answers.

Fran, I hope no one here is talking your language no matter what side they are on. There are several, myself included that are apalled at your statement for Tommy S to come to texas after the death penalty is invoked. What a terrible thing for a christian to say. You have lost what little bit of credibility you had.

---

**Posted by: Fran Feb 2 2007, 12:19 AM**

Bystander!

I thought you were banned! I never touted that I had any credibility at all. That isn't important. I have never been power hungry. I just squeak very loudly until the credible people stand up and take notice. I have no importance, and can, in fact, be a pain in the neck.

What is important is the fact that those with credibility will judge Danny. However, if the documents and forms are junk, you have nothing to worry about, so what is your gripe?

As for Tommy, Danny should be the one ashamed. First hand witnesses have documented their experiences with Tommy. Danny says he is a Seventh-day Adventist. Yet he cares not about the children!

It has become clear that Tommy has no shame. Danny is really proud of him for his adultery with the opposite sex, and yes with under aged boys. Both have not shown the least bit of sorrow, but only of this being OK.

Tommy has committed a crime many times. Why will you not acknowledge that molesting children is a crime? This reveals something vital about Danny's character, or lack thereof.

I do not wish anyone death. I want people to know that molestation is a "serious" crime and some states are fed up with this deviant behavior that your crowd feels is so normal. It appears that they feel they are entitled to this sexually deviant behavior because both of the boys do not think it is sin. They do it because they want to, and they feel they are entitled to take what they want.

Good news folks! Molestation/Pedophilia of any kind it is a crime. I am going to vote for the Texas bill. Maybe then the molesters will think twice before they act on their addictions. That would include Danny too, since there are allegations against him also.

Why will you not answer the financial questions asked by Observer? Sticky, huh?

Thank you for coming "out" in this thread. It is vital that this thread not die. People need to know what has been going on for many years. I hear that the gravy train is getting put out of business.

Is the increase in 3ABN's income due to the fact that all that money that was leaving before is now getting posted?

When will Tommy and Danny apologize to all of Tommy and Danny's victims? Sometimes people sin for so long, they no longer see sin as sin. God sometimes has to wake people up to truth all over again.

Please tell Danny that I do not believe Linda committed adultery. Danny has said publicly that there was no adultery. I really don't care if she did because she is no longer in a position for it to matter. However, Danny on the other hand is. I care about what Danny did. Bystander, what are the facts about Danny.

Remember, you must STOP trashing Linda. She is not trash. She is a Godly Christian. She is no longer involved in the 3ABN issues. Sorry, but it is true. For many reasons I believe in Linda's honesty. I do not think she is perfect by any means. Proof, to me, would be that she married and stayed with Danny for 20 years. Now, that is a rough row to hoe.

---

**Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Feb 2 2007, 12:19 AM**

---

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 2 2007, 12:16 AM) □**

Fran, I hope no one here is talking your language no matter what side they are on. There are several, myself included that are appalled at your statement for Tommy S to come to Texas after the death penalty is invoked. What a terrible thing for a Christian to say. You have lost what little bit of credibility you had.

And you, sir, have NO credibility. You still refuse to answer my questions.

By the way, I thought you were banned?

---

**Posted by: inga Feb 2 2007, 01:41 AM**

**QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Feb 2 2007, 01:19 AM)**

And you, sir, have NO credibility. You still refuse to answer my questions.

By the way, I thought you were banned?

Yup, I got the same thoughts!!

---

**Posted by: Bystander Feb 2 2007, 11:32 PM**

**QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Feb 1 2007, 11:19 PM)**

And you, sir, have NO credibility. You still refuse to answer my questions.

By the way, I thought you were banned?

Surprise!!! you thought wrong.

---

**Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Feb 3 2007, 12:20 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 2 2007, 11:32 PM)**

Surprise!!! you thought wrong.

How childish.

Why haven't you answered my questions?

---

**Posted by: Pickle Feb 3 2007, 06:06 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 2 2007, 12:16 AM)**

Fran, I hope no one here is talking your language no matter what side they are on. There are several, myself included that are appalled at your statement for Tommy S to come to Texas after the death penalty is invoked. What a terrible thing for a Christian to say. You have lost what little bit of credibility you had.

Hmm. One of Tommy's alleged victims was in a bad accident and ended up in a special home in Texas. And Tommy would go to see him from time to time. That's what I am told.

Can you comment on that one, Duane?

**Posted by: Richard Sherwin Feb 3 2007, 08:16 AM**

Maybe his lawyers advised him not to talk to you. My guess would be that Bystander might have about 14 of them.

Richard

**QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Feb 3 2007, 01:20 AM)**

How childish.

Why haven't you answered my questions?

---

**Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Feb 3 2007, 09:23 AM**

**QUOTE(Richard Sherwin @ Feb 3 2007, 08:16 AM)**

Maybe his lawyers advised him not to talk to you. My guess would be that Bystander might have about 14 of them.

Richard

At any rate, there's no reason for anyone here to give any credibility to anything he says. He won't stand by his words.

Duane Clem

---

**Posted by: eye witness Feb 4 2007, 09:33 AM**

**QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Feb 2 2007, 12:19 AM)**

And you, sir, have NO credibility. You still refuse to answer my questions.

By the way, I thought you were banned?

I was wondering Duane, do you know anyone in a town not far from you, oh about 30-40 miles , who is a Public Accountant he does taxes for people and stuff? Just asking?

---

**Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Feb 4 2007, 09:41 AM**



**QUOTE(eye witness @ Feb 4 2007, 09:33 AM) □**

I was wondering Duane, do you know anyone in a town not far from you, oh about 30-40 miles , who is a Public Accountant he does taxes for people and stuff? Just asking?

There are accountants everywhere who do taxes. What's your point?

**Posted by: Grace Feb 4 2007, 10:20 AM**

**QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Feb 4 2007, 04:41 PM) □**

There are accountants everywhere who do taxes. What's your point?

Weird! I'm worried by these strange questions. □  
 Praying for wisdom and protection for you, Duane. That's just my mother's heart, I can't help it.

Blessings! □

**Posted by: Ralph Feb 4 2007, 10:20 AM**

**QUOTE(eye witness @ Feb 4 2007, 08:33 AM) □**

I was wondering Duane, do you know anyone in a town not far from you, oh about 30-40 miles , who is a Public Accountant he does taxes for people and stuff? Just asking?

**"Just asking"** -- Tell another one, eye witness. You know and I know why you are asking such questions and it is not appreciated.

I hope Duane completely ignores your insinuations. He does not need to give an answer to any of your insinuations.

**Posted by: calvin Feb 4 2007, 10:23 AM**

**QUOTE(Grace @ Feb 4 2007, 10:20 AM) □**

Weird! I'm worried by these strange questions. □  
 Praying for wisdom and protection for you, Duane. That's just my mother's heart, I can't help it.

Blessings!

Eye Witness won't be asking any more questions here.

---

**Posted by: watchbird Feb 4 2007, 10:33 AM**

**QUOTE(calvin @ Feb 4 2007, 11:23 AM)**

Eye Witness won't be asking any more questions here.

In a way, that is a great relief. In another way, though, I am sad to see him cut off... for we were learning SO much about his character and the way his mind runs.... and the fact that he was making such threats... even though veiled... to Duane Clem, will be evidence against him once his identity is unveiled and/or he claims to have not made any threats against him.

But the bottom line is another thank you for keeping a firm hand on the tiller.

---

**Posted by: Richard Sherwin Feb 4 2007, 10:37 AM**

Agreed, he/she has been telling us much about themselves in this line of questioning. I think in this case the person should have revealed who they are since they were going after Duane in such a public way. Cowardly is what they were.

Richard

**QUOTE(watchbird @ Feb 4 2007, 11:33 AM)**

In a way, that is a great relief. In another way, though, I am sad to see him cut off... for we were learning SO much about his character and the way his mind runs.... and the fact that he was making such threats... even though veiled... to Duane Clem, will be evidence against him once his identity is unveiled and/or he claims to have not made any threats against him.

But the bottom line is another thank you for keeping a firm hand on the tiller.

---

**Posted by: Grace Feb 4 2007, 10:51 AM**

**QUOTE(calvin @ Feb 4 2007, 05:23 PM)**

Eye Witness won't be asking any more questions here.

Thank you Calvin! It's good to know that this is a safe place for everybody!

God bless you!

---

**Posted by: Ralph Feb 4 2007, 11:55 AM**

---

**QUOTE(watchbird @ Feb 4 2007, 09:33 AM)**

In a way, that is a great relief. In another way, though, I am sad to see him cut off... for we were learning SO much about his character and the way his mind runs.... and the fact that he was making such threats... even though veiled... to Duane Clem, will be evidence against him once his identity is unveiled and/or he claims to have not made any threats against him.

But the bottom line is another thank you for keeping a firm hand on the tiller.

Don't worry. He/she/they will be back, only wearing a different garb.

---

**Posted by: Noahswife Feb 4 2007, 12:06 PM**

---

**QUOTE(watchbird @ Feb 4 2007, 11:33 AM)**

In a way, that is a great relief. In another way, though, I am sad to see him cut off... for we were learning SO much about his character and the way his mind runs.... and the fact that he was making such threats... even though veiled... to Duane Clem, will be evidence against him once his identity is unveiled and/or he claims to have not made any threats against him.

But the bottom line is another thank you for keeping a firm hand on the tiller.

I totally agree. I am not a trained therapist but those of you who are.....do you think we could have a narcissistic personality being demonstrated by EW?

nw

---

**Posted by: watchbird Feb 4 2007, 12:22 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Noahswife @ Feb 4 2007, 01:06 PM)**

I totally agree. I am not a trained therapist but those of you who are.....do you think we could have a narcissistic personality being demonstrated by EW?

nw

I'm not a "trained therapist" either.... but here is the dictionary definition of narcissism....

nar·cis·sism (när'sī-sīz'□m) Pronunciation Key

n.

Excessive love or admiration of oneself. See Synonyms at conceit.

A psychological condition characterized by self-preoccupation, lack of empathy, and unconscious deficits in self-esteem.

Erotic pleasure derived from contemplation or admiration of one's own body or self, especially as a fixation on or a regression to an infantile stage of development.

The attribute of the human psyche characterized by admiration of oneself but within normal limits.

There are two things... or maybe three... that I think would rule out this label...

One is the "with normal limits."

And the other is that the preoccupation is not really with himself (themselves) so much as it is with others... particularly what are seen as the sins of others... especially those who are pointing out the sin in the camp of 3abn.

The broader and I think more accurate term is sociopath... which I think has already been described on BSDA, though I forget exactly where.

**Posted by: Bystander Feb 4 2007, 12:27 PM**

And the other is that the preoccupation is not really with himself (themselves) so much as it is with others... particularly what are seen as the sins of others... especially those who are pointing out the sin in the camp of 3abn.

[/quote]

Why is it that all of you can point out the "sin" in the 3abn camp, but we cannot point out the sin in your camp?

**Posted by: Observer Feb 4 2007, 12:29 PM**

**QUOTE(Noahswife @ Feb 4 2007, 11:06 AM) □**

I totally agree. I am not a trained therapist but those of you who are.....do you think we could have a narcissistic personality being demonstrated by EW?

nw

You-all are on weak territory to attempt to diagnose mental illness (or personality disorders) over the Internet.

In addition, the "gold standard" for such is the current Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, and not the dictionary.

**Posted by: Noahswife Feb 4 2007, 12:34 PM**

**QUOTE(Observer @ Feb 4 2007, 01:29 PM)**

You-all are on weak territory to attempt to diagnose mental illness (or personality disorders) over the Internet.

In addition, the "gold standard" for such is the current Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, and not the dictionary.

Actually, I was reading the DSM IV criteria when I made the post. I was not trying to diagnosis and that is why I stated at the beginning that I am not a trained therapist. I was merely responding to Watchbird's comment about how EW's mind worked and his character.

nw

**Posted by: Skyhook Feb 4 2007, 12:51 PM**

Here are some more characteristics of narcissism. People with narcissistic personalities want to be worshipped. They want adulation and admiration but no amount they get is ever enough. Everything about them has to be "Special." They might own fancy cars, or perhaps classic cars or antiques. They will have, or try to have the finest and best of everything, because, of course, they deserve it, because of who they are. Corporate jets, beautiful women, or men, etc. They go after what they think is impressive. However, they don't necessarily have highly refined taste. That would depend on their background. The important thing is looking good so others will admire and think highly of them. They are emotionally shallow, superficial and empty. They are not capable of true friendship, love, or intimacy. They can get terribly depressed and angry at loss of a relationship. They have a very hard time with rejection.

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 4 2007, 02:18 PM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Feb 4 2007, 02:27 PM)**

And the other is that the preoccupation is not really with himself (themselves) so much as it is with others... particularly what are seen as the sins of others... especially those who are pointing out the sin in the camp of 3abn.

Why is it that all of you can point out the "sin" in the 3abn camp, but we cannot point out the sin in your camp?

You can point out anything in **my life** you so choose to. **I DON'T CARE!!!**

I have sinned repeatedly **IN MY PAST**.... None of this is of any problem to me - because I have been forgiven of **my sins** and have been held accountable by my church and my LORD.

Now.

Can you put your mess on front street? Can you state that you have been held accountable for your sins? Have you been censored (EVEN ONCE) by your church? Have you had to ask/pray for

forgiveness for the wrong you have done?

Ah...therein lies the rub. Most of the folks that are advocating for 3ABN will not see the sins of one, but will see the sins of another. **I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH ANYONE TRYING TO REMOVE A TOOTHPICK FROM MY EYE.** It's all good to me. Show me the "err" of my ways if you see it..... then don't get indignant (or **ignorant**) **WHEN I SHOW YOU THE TELEPHONE POLE IN YOUR OWN EYE...**

K?

---

**Posted by: wwjd Feb 4 2007, 08:20 PM**

QUOTE(Pickle @ Feb 3 2007, 06:06 AM)

Hmm. One of Tommy's alleged victims was in a bad accident and ended up in a special home in Texas. And Tommy would go to see him from time to time. That's what I am told.

Can you comment on that one, Duane?

You need to quite listening to everything you're told. You should definitely not put it on this forum unless you have documentation of it and everything else you say.

---

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Feb 4 2007, 08:40 PM**

QUOTE(wwjd @ Feb 4 2007, 10:20 PM)

You need to quite listening to everything you're told. You should definitely not put it on this forum unless you have documentation of it and everything else you say.

How would you know if this is true or not unless you are Tommy?

Actually I don't care. I just know you are a bit....just a bit off. JMPO

---

**Posted by: husbandoftheyear Feb 5 2007, 01:12 AM**

QUOTE(wwjd @ Feb 4 2007, 09:20 PM)

You need to quite listening to everything you're told. You should definitely not put it on this forum unless you have documentation of it and everything else you say.

All I hear from you is that proof needs to be presented. That's fine, but what's good for the goose is good for the gander. I hear about Dan having receipts for the deck he built Linda, Tommy didn't molest children, Linda bought the pregnancy test, 3ABN has proof of the adultery, blah, blah, blah. It would seem that you know a great deal about things that would have only been known between Dan and Linda...and perhaps very close "friends."

I, for one, would absolutely love to see YOUR documentation for everything you've said. I'll be waiting...but I won't be holding my breath.

---

**Posted by: franklyamazed Feb 5 2007, 07:41 AM**

It would be extremely useful to have an organized presentation of all of the evidence against Linda, including a transcript of the illegal recordings. Maybe if Linda is ok with getting all the evidence out there so it can be challenged, she could be the source of the transcripts. It seems that as long as we have to trust someone who gets the information from someone who knows someone who ...

How about it "Lindas Team"?

---

**Posted by: watchbird Feb 5 2007, 08:25 AM**

**QUOTE(franklyamazed @ Feb 5 2007, 08:41 AM)**

It would be extremely useful to have an organized presentation of all of the evidence against Linda, including a transcript of the illegal recordings. Maybe if Linda is ok with getting all the evidence out there so it can be challenged, she could be the source of the transcripts. It seems that as long as we have to trust someone who gets the information from someone who knows someone who ...

How about it "Lindas Team"?

Linda cannot be the source of the "evidence" claimed by her opposition... for several reasons.... first of all they have never stated what their "evidence" really is, second there is little reason to think that they in fact have anything which would be considered "evidence" to bring forward. To say nothing of the fact that anything which came from Linda would be immediately discounted by anyone who did not already have a predisposition to believe her.

No... the "evidence" that has been claimed by her opposition will have to come straight from the same sources that have been claiming to have it but refusing to show it in order for it to have any credibility as being the "evidence" they has claimed to have had. There is good reason to doubt that it will actually be credible as real evidence of anything... especially in view of a statement I once saw where Danny noted that they had "evidence which could not be presented in a court of law".... whatever that meant.

---

**Posted by: Observer Feb 5 2007, 08:33 AM**

**QUOTE(franklyamazed @ Feb 5 2007, 06:41 AM)**

It would be extremely useful to have an organized presentation of all of the evidence against Linda, including a transcript of the illegal recordings. Maybe if Linda is ok with getting all the evidence out there so it can be challenged, she could be the source of the transcripts. It seems that as long as we have to trust someone who gets the information from someone who knows someone who ...

How about it "Lindas Team"?

I do not believe that either the so-called "Linda Team," or Linda herself, has the transcripts. Those so-called transcripts are claimed to have been seen by only a very few unnamed people, and are also claimed to only be a record of what Linda is supposed to have said, and do not include anything that the other party said.

However, Linda and Linda's Team would very much like to obtain them. You can be assured that if litigation occurs, those defending Linda will attempt to obtain them, as well as sworn testimony of the conditions under which they were obtained, and as to the names of people who have seen them. If this happens, we believe that attempts will be made to keep them secret, and away from Linda's Team.

We shall see what happens.

Re: ". . . Danny noted that they had "evidence which could not be presented in a court of law".... whatever that meant."

We who are on Linda's Team believe that we know what it meant, and that Danny spoke the truth, it could never be presented in a court of law. In addition, we believe that it is of such a nature that reasonable people should not accept it as evidence.

---

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