

## Printable Version of Topic

153

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

---

### BlackSDA \_ 3ABN \_ Dr. Bacchiocchi's Thoughts

---

**Posted by: beartrap Sep 14 2006, 10:02 AM**

#### DANNY AND LINDA SHELTON'S DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

The 3ABN saga of Danny and Linda Shelton's divorce and remarriage has attracted considerable attention. Many subscribers to our newsletters have emailed me all sorts of gossip information. Both Danny and Linda also have exchanged several messages with me. Danny claims to be totally innocent, because it was Linda who had an affair with a Norwegian doctor, Arild Abrahamsen, and left him to be with her lover.

Linda denies all the allegations, as you can read for yourself at her website: <http://www.lindashelton.org/> She claims that she never had an affair with Arild, she left Danny because of his abusive behavior, and she never wanted a divorce.

At this point only God knows who is telling the truth. The only thing that we know for sure is that Danny remarried a 20 years younger, twice divorced woman, while Linda is still single.

In response to the many enquiries I decided to put together the following information:

- 1) The two sides of the Linda/Danny Shelton story as posted at the BLACK SDA WEBSITE: <http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?>
- 2) My understanding of the Biblical teaching on Divorce and Remarriage and its application especially to *Danny's remarriage of a divorced woman*.

The focus of my study is on the biblical teaching on divorce and remarriage. Danny and Linda Shelton are briefly mentioned only as a case study of the Biblical teaching.

#### THE BLACK ADVENTIST ONLINE COMMUNITY

<http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?>

The Accused Other Man Evidence: Dr. Arild Abrahamsen

06/20/2006

Greetings from Norway;

My name is Dr. Arild Abrahamsen. I live in Svindal, Norway. I have been a medical doctor for more than 35 years. I am a member of the Moss SDA Church. I've been the Sabbath School Superintendent for 14 years and the head elder for 4 years, which position I am presently serving. I am the Norwegian doctor who has been slandered by Dr. Walt Thompson, chairman of the board of 3ABN, Danny Shelton, John Lomacang and others.

Since I have observed the situation and the slander only getting worse, I feel it best to share my experience. I share my personal experience, what I have seen and heard. Much of this information has been verified by other sources, which include emails, letters and the personal experiences of others. I share my experience not to attack any individual or organization, but to bring the truth of this situation to the surface.

I have been shocked to observe the events of the last two years. I have made no public statement until now. I had hoped things would resolve themselves.

I visited Johann and Irmgard Thorvaldsson at 3ABN the last week of 2003. The purpose of the trip was to see them and visit the ministry, which I personally had been supporting for some time. I had never been to 3ABN previously, nor had I met the Shelton's. During this visit I discovered from the Thorvaldsson's that Linda Shelton's son, Nathan, was in a dangerous state of health because of an addiction to drugs and working in coalmines. I offered to see him. This visit resulted in an invitation for Nathan to come to Norway for treatments. Nathan came to Norway around January 20, 2004 along with his friend, Dava Vice. Linda came for a 3-? day visit to support her son, the first week of February together with Brenda Walsh. This was the last time I saw Linda until the weekend she was fired.

I had a chance to visit with Nathan regularly. I learned from my conversations with Nathan that the roots of his drug problems were the relationships with his father and stepfather. Specifically he told me that Danny had turned his back on him. I shared this information with his mother on the phone. She told me that Danny said he had no responsibility towards Nathan since he was a product of her first marriage, so she felt she had to do what she could to help her son. There was nothing unusual in the occasional phone reports I gave Nathan's mother while he was in Norway. After Nathan returned home, I asked Linda to keep me updated on Nathan's progress.

I was shocked to discover in early March of 2004 that Danny was threatening to get Linda fired from 3ABN because of some conversations on the phone. In fact, she was threatened immediately with divorce. By this time Nathan had started with drugs again and Linda was seeking advice. I was also shocked to discover that Brenda had started circulating untrue statements as well. (Was it because Danny had admitted to some emotional involvement with Brenda?) I talked to Danny one time on the phone and found him to be unreasonable, unbalanced and very difficult to communicate with. Johann Thorvaldsson, a retired pastor of the SDA Church of 50 years, also was in communication with Danny, both by phone and email. We talked together and shared the same opinion that Danny was acting completely irrational and unreasonable towards his wife. It appeared he was attempting to leave an email trail filled with untruths to verify a position at a later time. The decision was made to stop the communication by phone with Linda.

Some weeks went by. Johann and Irmgard were getting treatments at my clinic and staying in my home during the Easter week in April, so I discovered from them that the situation was not improving for Linda. She was being harassed, threatened, and unreasonable demands by her husband were repeatedly being made to confess things she had not done. By this time, she was also suspended from her job at 3ABN, an order that was issued and enforced by her husband with no Board action. Things were so bad in the home that she found it necessary to go to her daughter's home in Springfield, Illinois for safety and rest on several occasions. Derrell Mundall, who was traveling often for 3ABN, reports rumors of Linda's so-called "affair" were in SDA churches in April 2004, when Linda was still living with Danny. When he inquired about the source of the rumors, people always pointed to Danny Shelton.

I could see from my 35 years of experience as a physician that Danny was a psychopath. accusations were directed at me that I had done "mind control" over Linda. (Walt Thompson made the same accusations in his letters.) Linda was accused of sending "secret messages" to me over the television. Danny's emails and communications with Johann were completely crazy, and his reasoning often conflicted with his previous emails. Danny targeted Linda's few inner circle confidants and slandered her to the point that even they backed away from her at this critical time. (Linda's "friends" did not want to lose their television privileges.) Johann and I concluded this was a man who was determined to get rid of his wife. We also concluded that Linda was in danger.

Things eventually progressed from emotional and mental abuse to physical abuse. In the midst of all this harassment Linda asked Danny, 'Why are you treating me like this?' He answered, 'Because I want you to get out.'

Considering the urgency of the situation I allowed the conversations to resume. Linda knew, with her high profile status, that confiding with local people regarding these issues would be very bad for the ministry. I had given counsel to people in difficulty in the past and felt I could be helpful

from a distance in this situation. I encouraged Linda to fight for her marriage and ministry many times. This she really did, but she often had to leave her home to find refuge at her daughter's apartment in Springfield, even in the middle of the night because of Danny's behavior. At times like these she was afraid of him. She always returned to her home after a couple of days seeking to try to mend the marriage, but Danny would not allow this.

During the spring of 2004 Danny called my pastor in Norway. Danny tried to get me kicked out as an elder and as a member of the church. My pastor told me about the conversation and he said, "He is mentally sick, he needs professional help."

I find it very disturbing that Walt Thompson defended and continues to defend Danny although he was a witness repeatedly to the emotional and mental abuse that was taking place. At one point he witnessed Danny "trashing" his wife for five hours. I also find it disturbing that John Lomacang, Linda's former pastor, claims to have counseled extensively with Danny and Linda when this was far from the truth. During the months of April and May of 2004, when most of the activity was occurring in this situation, Linda NEVER saw John, who was supposed to be her pastor.

Coincidentally the handful of people supporting Danny and defending his actions has gained either power, position, airtime, homes, public endorsement or all of the above.

At one point I had a conversation with Walt Thompson, Chairman of the Board of 3ABN. He asked me to stop all communication with Linda. This had also been communicated to Johann and Irmgard Thorvaldsson and others. I told him that it was obviously Danny's plan to isolate Linda from everyone at a time when she needed help. To me it was the Christian thing to answer her phone calls and the only humane thing to do for someone who was in crisis.

Others did not come to Linda's aid because they did not want to lose whatever benefit they gained from 3ABN, whether it be a job, programming, promotions, etc. Walt was also the one who phoned Linda when she was suspended from the ministry by her husband. He instructed her that she must not come to the ministry (which she co-founded) without calling ahead of time because she must be supervised when at 3ABN. Danny broke into a locked bathroom to forcefully take her keys to 3ABN from her. Her hard drive of her computer was confiscated, her contact information taken and even her filing cabinets ravaged, all without any kind of Board action.

Linda was living in an impossible situation. Danny was "in her face" on a regular basis. At times he would say, "If you don't say you're a pathological liar, the marriage and 3ABN is over. If you don't say you're an adulterous woman the marriage and 3ABN is over for you. If you don't say you've given your heart to another man and that he is a demon the marriage and 3ABN is over..... etc." It even reached the point when he demanded her to say "Repeat after me." Johann and I received a couple emails, which said they were from Linda, but they were written by Danny. Linda saw her ministry being destroyed one day at a time. All of this was dehumanizing and terrifying to Linda, who was trying to hold things together. She very much realized what was at stake.

An "investigative committee" was put together by Walt Thompson to look into this situation. They were Walt Thompson, Bill Hulsey, Nick Miller and Kay Kuzma. Danny talked privately at length with each of these people. Linda did not. The committee as a whole never met with Linda at all. In one brief phone conversation with Kay Kuzma she told Linda, "The Board is not interested in you and Danny's personal problems. It is only interested in the fact that the President no longer wants his Vice-President." Johann Thorvaldsson testifies that he spoke with Kay the following day. She told him she was instructed to get Linda used to the idea of not being at 3ABN anymore and to try to get her involved in another ministry.

It's interesting that at the time Danny accused Linda for speaking on the phone to me, that he was in the practice of speaking regularly with Brenda, Linda's "friend." He also visited often with her in her 3ABN apartment in the night. A worker at 3ABN states that Brenda even went golfing with Danny behind Linda's back while she was working. As soon as Brenda saw where the tide was turning, she was no longer Linda's friend. She became an accuser as well.

About May 1, 2004 instructions were given to the production staff to wipe Linda's face off of the network by June 1, again with no Board action.

All CD's, videos, literature and photos of Linda were stripped out of the Call Center. She was sent a document a few days later specifying that she was advised to get 30 days of counseling by counselors of "their" choice. If she did not agree to this in writing within 24 hours, her employment could be gone. She requested time for an attorney to look at the document. This was refused. Mail was flooding into the network with Linda's name on it. They were all returned to sender. Her scheduled speaking appointments for women's ministries were sabotaged by those in leadership at 3ABN. Danny told those who worked for Linda that she was a pathological liar and to stay away from her. (He did not want them to hear the other side of the story.) At one point Linda told Walt that Dan was purposefully ruining her reputation and that she was not willing to be a martyr for 3ABN. Walt's response was "How else are we going to save the ministry?"

Rumors of Linda's so-called "affair" were flying throughout the churches and the General Conference in May of 2004, rumors which were begun by her husband. It was communicated to me that Linda was going to be fired at the Board meeting, which would occur in May, following the 3ABN camp meeting. Johann and I decided to go to the camp meeting and talk to the Board members and tell them the truth about the situation. When we walked into the 3ABN building we were surrounded by about 10 people. One person stood directly behind me for the entire service. Walt Thompson and Nick Miller (3ABN's attorney) asked us to leave. We stayed until nearly the end of the service. (At this camp meeting an announcement was made regarding Linda. There were tearful appeals by Danny, which raised a record-breaking amount of money for 3ABN. Danny also claims that an additional two million dollars was raised the year of their divorce.) When Johann and I went to the door, once again we were followed by a small crowd of people. I spoke to Mark Finley about the situation at length in the parking lot. John Lomacang tried to stop the conversation. He said 'It is not good for you to talk to him alone.' What was he afraid of? He was standing with me when Danny drove up and said that if I returned to camp meeting I would be arrested and thrown in jail. He had already talked to the Sheriff. I decided to not return, as it was Mark Finley's suggestion to avoid the possibility of disrupting the camp meeting for all of the people attending. Linda was staying in her daughter's apartment in Springfield, so we drove there on Saturday to stay in a hotel for the weekend. During this weekend we were followed by three private investigators all the time. What kind of actions was that, for a man that REALLY wanted to save his marriage?

It is my understanding that a one-sided conversation was illegally taped by Danny towards the end of May. With a mind set on framing his wife, her words have been misconstrued into saying what he wants people to think. She mentions a trip to Las Vegas. He explains to all that she is planning a rendezvous with "the doctor." In reality for weeks he has offered Linda larger and larger sums of money for her to go to Las Vegas and stay with her mother for six weeks to acquire residency, a requirement for couples that want a quick divorce. For weeks she refused. SHE NEVER WANTED A DIVORCE.

The events of the previous months eventually bring her to the place where she thinks this is maybe what she should do. She knew a separation was necessary. Danny takes her words from the phone call and adds his insinuations. He makes photo copies of her one sided conversation and distributes it. This is his main source of "proof" for his actions and re-marriage. They call it circumstantial evidence." To further cover their tracks Linda's accusers say that for her sake they don't want to tell "all she has done." They say this so people will accept their statements and imagine the worst. This is slander of the worst kind all coming from professed Christians.

Johann says he was fired from 3ABN for refusing to attest to something false Danny wanted him to put in writing about Linda. Derrell Mundall, Danny's ex-son-in-law, says he was given the option to resign or be fired because of his actions defending Linda. Others quit their jobs because they could not support the actions of the leaders. There is one thing many of these people have in common. Anyone who disagrees with Danny is slandered and discredited.

It's interesting that Danny's daughter recently was found to be pregnant out of wedlock. A quick wedding followed when Derrell, (her ex-husband & father of their four children), claims she had

no grounds for re-marriage. It's also interesting that nobody asked Derrell about the issue of grounds at all when he was still a resident in Thompsonville. Also another married Shelton family member had a romantic encounter recently with a married employee of 3ABN. They were instructed to keep it quiet. They did. They all still work at 3ABN, and Melody is featured on the network. Is 3ABN all about standing for principle and values, or standing for those who happen to be in good graces with the President and the Shelton family ?

Another question that seems to be in the minds of many is "Why was Linda given \$240,000 when all claim she was fired for a wrongdoing?" The only reason Linda signed this 3ABN contract was because she needed money to escape from a very irregular, abusive and impossible situation. Danny forced her to sign not only this contract, but another contract which sold him her half of their joint-owned home the same day.

Linda has suffered much emotional trauma and humiliation from all of this. She still has nightmares about these events. She did not feel ready to face the people of the SDA church for six months after all of this occurred. I encouraged her to begin again. She went for the first time around the end of November of 2004 in Springfield. The people welcomed her. She requested her membership to be transferred out of the Thompsonville church into the Springfield church in December of 2004. The Springfield pastor had previously worked at 3ABN and knew Linda. He did not believe the rumors and encouraged the church to put her to work. It was a healing time for her to teach Sabbath School and occasionally preach.

In June of 2005 things changed. Pastor Grady was transferred out of the Springfield church, though he wanted to stay, and a pastor from 3ABN was moved into the church. Within two weeks John Stanton met with Linda and told her she would be doing nothing on the platform. She told him that the church really needed the help and she hoped that if she was asked once in two months to teach a Sabbath School class that she would be able to do this. He told her that the orders had come from the conference level. (The Illinois conference President sits on 3ABN's Board and his parents work for 3ABN.) During our visit to the General Conference Session Johann and I visited with this pastor. He told us he thought Linda was a liar. I TOLD HIM THAT LINDA HAD NEVER BEEN UNFAITHFUL TO HER HUSBAND and that all the rumors from her husband were lies. But this man had TV interests to pursue and he was in close connection with Danny and John Lomacang.

The last week of October 2005, a letter came to Linda from John Lomacang, the pastor of the Thompsonville (3ABN) church. It stated that the church board had voted "to call a church business session to recommend to the church that you be placed under censure." Linda called John to ask him why. He said it was because she had abandoned her marriage and ministry, which led to her divorce. (This is what Danny refers to as "grounds" to re-marry.) Linda planned to address the church business meeting. She wrote to Danny requesting a release from the restrictions of the contract she signed so she could openly share her side of the story. Danny denied this request. Because of this she felt forced to drop her membership there and then join another SDA church. This decision was made after much counsel with several SDA's. It's interesting that this recommendation for censure came almost 18 months after the fact. (Which kind of practice is this? Special for USA?) It's also interesting that all of this occurred while Danny was trying to gather evidence against Linda so he could re-marry.

Danny Shelton and the leadership of 3ABN are responsible for using the ministry of 3ABN to bring character assassination to Linda and others. In Linda's case, television and radio announcements were made denouncing her character. There was an announcement on the front page of 3ABN's website for many months. About 180,000 letters about Linda were sent to the mailing list at 3ABN. Videos about her were made and distributed. Magazine articles were written and submitted. Mailings were made to church officials. Many calls were taken at 3ABN where slanderous remarks about Linda were given over the phone. Many letters containing completely false statements were sent to many individuals. Danny even made his personal email address available over 3ABN so people could write to him and obtain his side of the story. They did a thorough job of character assassination.

Now two years later the "trashing" continues. It is inexcusable, especially for a proclaimed

Christian ministry.

In conclusion I want to clearly state that I have not committed adultery (emotional, physical, "spiritual"), and neither has Linda. The conversations we had were not unusual or inappropriate. Linda is the victim of domestic violence, only this has resulted in worldwide effects for our Church.

Linda has sought for help at the General Conference level. She has sought the aid of pastors. No one has an answer. She has tried repeatedly to meet with a committee from the Board of 3ABN. This request has not been granted. Still the bulk emails and letters flow from 3ABN slandering the innocent. This has been the most ungodly situation I have observed in my entire life. Any who find themselves not in good graces with Danny Shelton will find that their name is discredited and slandered in an attempt to destroy their influence. Linda has suffered the most with the loss of her job, her influence and reputation. But many others, including myself, have felt the heat coming from what is supposed to be a ministry representing Jesus Christ. This is an outrage. This is unacceptable. Accountability of leaders is a must. (Can bad fruits come from good trees?) As Christians, it is our duty to demand accountability and a high standard from leaders. I hope this testimony will fulfill the mission intended.

Respectfully,

Dr. Arild Abrahamsen

From Walter Thompson  
Chairman, 3ABN board of Directors  
Regarding Danny's marriage

Dear Family and Friends of 3ABN,

Two years ago 3ABN was challenged by the most difficult battle the ministry has ever faced. It was a battle that threatened the very existence of the ministry and the work of preaching the end time message of the Three Angel's to the world. It is only because of the grace and power of God Almighty, and the faithful support of you, the 3ABN family, that the ministry has survived to preach another day. Today, the ministry is stronger than it has ever been and its reach into the world even broader and more powerful for the cause of truth.

As is always the case when in the public eye, questions arise, stories abound, and rumors spread. We thank God that you have trusted the leadership and board of 3ABN during this time and have stayed with us in ministry. More recently some of you have heard that Danny has found one to comfort him in his loneliness and sorrow. You may have also heard rumors about an allegedly illegal divorce occurring without Biblical grounds. This letter is an attempt to fill you in with the facts.

As chairman of the board I have been in the midst of this long and drawn out ordeal from the beginning. I was there when we counseled with Linda over and over again. I was present during the pleas and prayers, seeking to get her to give up her relationship with the doctor. I have seen and heard the evidence upon which the board has taken the action that it has taken. I have been one that has plead with Linda to keep her marriage and her ministry and offered to provide counseling for them. I have known Danny and Linda almost from the beginning of the ministry and have been in their home many times. They had a good marriage. It was not until this third party got in the middle did things begin to fall apart. It is also true that Danny really did want to get back together again, but when it became obvious that couldn't happen, he correctly had to close the door on that part of his history lest it destroy him and the ministry.

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

Guam, checked it out and found it to be legal, and decided to go that route. Though I believe Guam has now stopped the program, the legality of a Guam divorce had previously been taken to the U.S. Supreme Court where it was ruled legitimate. As chairman of the board, I did not try to influence the decision, but I will say that had they not obtained a quick divorce, the ministry would have been placed at much greater risk since the situation was causing so much dysfunction with leadership and staff. I believe time has verified the correctness of what was done then, both by Danny and by the board for the ministry.

Linda's web site recently stated that she and Danny were not divorced. She wrote this after the judge made the decision in Danny's favor. She claims she did not know this when she wrote it. Her web site referred to an e mail I sent to Johann Thorvaldson a year earlier saying that I had never accused her of adultery. I believe that exchange with him was in response to an accusation by him that we had fired her because of adultery. I was merely saying that she was not fired for adultery, but because she had defied the board in not discontinuing a relationship that was threatening to destroy the ministry. (I might add that the doctor also told me he would not break off the relationship, even though I pled with him to do so.) That letter to Johann was correct, and it is true that I have never directly accused her of adultery. That does not mean that I believe Linda is innocent. If by adultery one must be caught in bed with another person, I cannot prove Linda has committed adultery. If, on the other hand, hard evidence indicates that Linda was involved in an unacceptable relationship with another man qualifies for adultery, then there is no question about Danny's moral right to marry again.

As a board, we have chosen not to make the details of the evidence available to the public. I believe Satan is the accuser of the brethren. We have chosen to take the "high road" in this whole situation and say nothing more than we have been forced to say to try to quell rumors. We care about Linda and have tried not to do anything to hurt her more than she has already been hurt. I can tell you that I personally spent a great deal of time at 3ABN during those months when this was all happening. I spoke with Linda and Danny on numerous occasions. A sub committee of the board met and prayed with Danny and Linda and pled with Linda to call off the relationship. Danny and Linda spent an 8 hour session with a pair of Christian counselors (non-Adventist in an attempt to avoid bias) who had no doubts about the nature of Linda's conduct. We offered to provide Linda with the opportunity to go away for counseling with a counselor agreeable to both she and us. She did not respond to that offer or request.

Finally, the full board met, reviewed Linda's letter of explanation, and voted unanimously to remove her from the ministry and her seat on the board. Other church leaders who have been privy to some of the evidence we have are in full agreement with our decision.

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

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

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

The things I have stated here are accurate and correct. As far as the lady Danny has married is concerned, I can only say I believe his new wife is a very good person and will be a real asset to him as he carries on his heavy responsibilities. Just to clarify any rumor you may have heard, this

relationship began long after the divorce. I was at 3ABN when this lady came from Florida looking for work. There was nothing going on before that time, and Danny definitely was not trying to "dump" Linda. I was with him during much of the time he agonized and mourned her loss. It is one thing to lose a loved one in death. It is much different to lose one to another lover - like cutting a dog's tail off one inch at a time! As to the matter of age difference, I will say that I do not believe that is any of my business. I find nothing in the Bible, and I don't remember any thing in the SOP indicating age differences for married couples. If it is legal, and morally correct, and if entered into with honesty, sincerity and earnest prayer for God's guidance, as I know happened here, it is not for me to criticize. In my own musings about this, I have concluded that it was no accident that brought Brandy to 3ABN. Either the devil was behind it, or God was. There is no question in my mind which one it was.

(Archo Dart was for many years a family and marriage counselor in the Adventist church. When in his 80's, he married one of my patients, who was then in her 50's. She loved and admired him till death many years later.)

I have had an interesting thought this week that I will share with you. It is this. God lost one of his closest companions when Lucifer went astray. More than that, myriads more angels left with him when he left heaven. Talk about grief or emotional pain. Experiences such as this with Linda, I think, help us to understand the pain of loss, and the reality of the war between God and Satan. Some have claimed it takes two to divorce. I don't think that is categorically true! This has been a terrible injury that has hit 3abn and Danny, and yes, Linda too, but it is one that I believe God understands - and He continues to bless his servants.

We recognize that we live in a world at war, and are working with a ministry that the devil would like to see destroyed. The war is real, and as in any other war there are real casualties. War is never pleasant, and spiritual battles may be some of the worst. Our hearts still ache for those who have been wounded. Our prayers continue to ascend on their behalf. Should acknowledgement of wrongdoing and penitence ever occur, we would be the first to forgive and forget. Unfortunately, that has not happened, and we must move on.

Some who have been aware of the growing relationship and the possibility of marriage have thought they should wait for a longer period of time before marrying. In discussions before the event, the 3ABN board reviewed the events of the past couple years and have agreed that there was no moral or legal reason precluding marriage. Realizing the heavy burdens resting on Danny and of his need for companionship, we, the board did not see any reason not to give our blessing to their union. We hope you, our 3ABN family, will agree too, and with us, welcome Brandy with open arms.

Should you have any questions that I might answer, please feel free to send them to me at 3ABN and I will do my best to try to answer them.

Sincerely in the precious name of Jesus,  
Walter Thompson  
Chairman, 3ABN Board of Directors  
Walter Thompson MD

REFLECTIONS ON THE BIBLICAL TEACHINGS ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE  
AS THEY RELATE TO DANNY AND LINDA SHELTON'S SITUATION  
Samuele Bacchiocchi, Ph. D.  
Retired Professor of Theology,  
Andrews University



Much of the discussion about Danny and Linda Shelton's divorce and consequent remarriage of Danny, revolves on the legitimate grounds for them to divorce and for Danny to remarry. It appears to me that from a biblical standpoint, the issue is not, "Did Danny have a legitimate ground to divorce Linda, but should a Christian couple experiencing marital problems consider divorce as a solution to their problems in the first place?"

The teaching of Jesus on divorce and remarriage is abundantly clear. Both Luke and Mark affirm the same teaching. "Every one who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery" (Luke 16:18). "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another, commits adultery against her; and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery" (Mark 10:11-12).

When Paul applied Jesus' teaching to the concrete marital problems that existed in the Church of Corinth, he clearly claims to give Christ's command by enjoining the wife not to separate from her husband, and the husband not to divorce his wife: "The wife should not separate from her husband, but if she does, let her remain single or else be reconciled to her husband- and that the husband should not divorce his wife" (1 Cor 7:10-11). The total prohibition of divorce by Paul reflects the teaching of Jesus found in the Gospels.

In my book THE MARRIAGE COVENANT I explain at great length that the exceptive clause of Matt 19:9 which admits divorce on the ground of porneia, can be best explained in the light of the Judeo-Christian readership of Matthew. While Mark and Luke write to Gentiles, Matthew write to Judeo-Christians. Jews were tribally related and it was easy for them to marry a close blood relative. Such marriages were condemned by the Mosaic law (Lev 18:6-18) and were called porneia.

Thus, Jesus allows for divorce only where a marriage should not have taken place in the first place, namely, within the degrees of prohibited relationships. Consequently, in Matthew, Jesus does not envisage any exception to the absolute ban on divorce but only allows for the dissolution of a marriage which was validly contracted according to Greco-Roman laws, but which was in conflict with the Mosaic law of prohibited relationships.

Danny is advancing all sorts of argument to prove that he is innocent and Linda is guilty. In the light of his allegations I asked Linda to respond to a dozen of specific questions. She denies all your allegations. She claims she left Danny because of his abusive behavior, she did not want a divorce, and she never had intimate relationship with the Arield, the Norwegian doctor, and she never married the man. It appears to me that had Linda been involved in an adulterous relationship, by now they would be married, especially since he is widow and she is divorced.

The fact is that she is still single and does not intend to remarry, makes it very difficult to believe Danny's allegations. By contrast, Danny has remarried a twice divorced woman who is 20 years younger. The facts speak for themselves. In the light of this situation, the only honorable thing for Danny to do is to resign from his present position as Director of 3ABN and let someone with a clean record serve as the leader of a station committed to preach the true Gospel of Jesus Christ. He can still work at 3ABN but in a less conspicuous position.

The longer he holds on to his position, the more people will become disenchanted with him and 3ABN. In an age of instant communication, one cannot cover up past mistakes for very long.

My advice to Danny is largely based on Paul's teaching on Divorce and remarriage that we want to consider at this point.

#### THE TEACHING OF PAUL ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

Paul's teachings on divorce and remarriage are found in 1 Corinthians 7, where the apostle discusses three different types of marital problems. In 1 Corinthians 7:10-11 Paul speaks to married believers who might consider divorce as a means to resolve their marital conflicts. His admonition given with Christ's authority is clear. Christian couples should not seek divorce, and if they separate they should remain single to leave the door open for reconciliation.

Since I have examined this passage in my book THE MARRIAGE COVENANT, I will quote a few paragraphs relevant to Danny and Linda's situation. Personally I feel that it is far more important to understand what the Bible teaches us on this important area of marital relationship, than to gossip about who is to be blamed.

In marital conflicts the blame seldom falls only on one partner. To a greater or lesser degree both partners have contributed to the problem and both need to seek a biblical solution to their problem. In seeking for a solution, it is important to remember that in the Bible marriage is not a social or civil contract that can be dissolved through the legal process, but it is a sacred, lifelong covenant witnessed and guaranteed by God Himself.

#### The Teaching of Paul in 1 Corinthians 7:10-16

Paul's treatment of the divorce question in 1 Corinthians 7:10-16 is most significant because it reveals how the teaching of Jesus on divorce was understood and applied to certain concrete marital situations in the apostolic church. He begins the chapter by setting forth some general principles about marriage. To avoid the temptation to sexual immorality, "each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband" (1 Cor 7:2). Both husband and wife should fulfill their respective conjugal rights (1 Cor 7:3-5). The unmarried and the widows who have the gift of celibacy should remain single as himself (1 Cor 7:7-8).

Next Paul discusses three different divorce situations: (1) the divorce of two believers (vv. 10-11), (2) the divorce of a believer and an unbeliever where the unbeliever does not want to divorce, and (3) the divorce of a believer and an unbeliever where the unbeliever wants to divorce. Since only the first situation is relevant to the case of Danny and Linda, I will quote from the book what I have written about it.

**Divorce of Two Believers.** Paul first speaks to married believers who might consider divorce as a means to resolve their marital conflicts: "To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord, that the wife should not separate from her husband (but if she does, let her remain single or else be reconciled to her husband)-and that the husband should not divorce his wife" (1 Cor 7:10-11).

Appealing to the teaching of Christ (cf. Mark 10:9, 11, 12; Luke 16:18; Matt 19:3-9), Paul declares in absolute terms that a Christian couple should not seek divorce. Twice he affirms the no-divorce principle: ". . . the wife should not separate from her husband . . . and the husband should not divorce his wife" (1 Cor 7:10-11). The basis of Paul's prohibition is Christ's teaching that husband and wife are one flesh and what God has joined together no man should put asunder.

Paul recognizes, however, that human nature is perverse and that even a Christian husband or wife can make marriage intolerable for the other partner. A spouse who is out of fellowship with God can become intolerant, abusive, unfaithful, domineering, inconsiderate. Undoubtedly, Paul had run into situations of this kind and recognizes that sometimes separation may be inevitable. However, if separation becomes a necessity, Paul leaves Christian partners with two options: (1) to remain permanently unmarried, or (2) to be reconciled to one's partner.

It is important to note that Paul appeals to the teaching of Jesus ("not I but the Lord") in ruling against the possibility of divorce for a Christian couple. On this regard, New Testament scholar F. F. Bruce comments: "For a Christian husband or wife, divorce is excluded by the law of Christ: here Paul has no need to express a judgment of his own, for the Lord's ruling on this matter was explicit."

To appreciate the revolutionary nature of such teaching, it is important to remember that divorce and remarriage was allowed in both the Jewish and Roman society. Yet Paul affirms the no-divorce principle for Christians as a word of the Lord which will be accepted without challenge. This goes to show that within twenty-five years of the crucifixion itself, the Apostolic Church believed and taught that Christ had proclaimed the permanence of the marriage union. This belief played an important role in the Christian mission to revolutionize the values of the existing

society.

In Paul's day, there was no provision for a wife to be legally separated from her husband without being divorced. Fortunately today, the law provides for legal separation as an alternative to divorce. Legal separation offers to a Christian the protection of the law while leaving the door open for reconciliation. Such a door must be left open because Christians believe that no marital conflict is impossible for God to solve.

Since there was no legal separation in Paul's day, the apostle recommends a legal separation-type of divorce. This is indicated by his use of the verb *koridzo* ("to separate") rather than the normal verb for divorce *apoluo* used by Jesus. By recommending a legal separation-type of divorce, Paul respects the spirit of Christ's teaching while at the same time providing protection for the believing wife until a reconciliation with her husband can be realized.

Paul's teachings on the question of divorce in 1 Corinthians 7:12-16 not only closely reflects Jesus' teachings concerning the permanence of marriage, but also reveals its full depths. It does this by showing how the Christian faith causes the marriage covenant to become a sacred and lifelong relationship. There is for Paul an intimate connection between the permanence of the marriage bond and the Christian faith.

A Christian couple who marries "in the Lord" accepts the responsibility to honor by divine grace their covenant commitment both to God and to one another. It is the sacred and permanent nature of the Christian covenant commitment to God that makes a Christian marriage sacred and permanent. On account of this fact, a Christian couple experiencing marital problems may separate with the hope of reconciliation but may not divorce and remarry. This condition does not apply to a mixed marriage where the unbelieving partner deserts his believing spouse, because by the very act of desertion the unbeliever rejects the Christian view of marriage as a sacred and permanent union.

Summing up, like Jesus the apostle Paul affirms the principle that Christian marriage is a union binding and permanent for life. If a separation should occur, Paul presents only two alternatives to believing partners: be reconciled to one another or remain single.

#### The Teaching of Paul on Divorce for Church Leaders

Paul's view of Christian marriage as a lifelong union which admits no divorce and remarriage, is indirectly supported by the marriage qualifications he sets forth for church leaders: "Now a bishop must be above reproach, the husband of one wife" (1 Tim 3:2; cf. Titus 1:6). "Let deacons be the husband of one wife, and let them manage their children and their households well" (1 Tim 3:12).

The basic qualifications given by Paul for the church office of elder (or overseer) and deacon were designed to enable Timothy in Ephesus and Titus on Crete to appoint church leaders qualified to serve in such offices. The first qualification for the office of elder is that the man must be "above reproach." His blameless lifestyle is to serve as a role model to the congregation and is to offer no reason for criticism in the community. The first important aspect of his role modeling is his marital status, which Paul defines as "husband of one wife" (1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:6). This qualification occurs both in 1 Timothy and Titus immediately after the demand for blamelessness thus indicating the prominence Paul gives to the marital status of a church leader.

The Greek words translated "husband of one wife" can be rendered literally as "one-wife-man." This short phrase has been the subject of considerable investigation. Did Paul mean that a church leader should be married only to one woman at a time or only once during his lifetime? Did Paul intend to exclude from church leadership polygamists, that is, men married to several wives or digamists, that is, men married twice or more legally?

Exclusion of Polygamists. Some have understood the phrase "husband of one wife" to exclude polygamists from church leadership. This interpretation is discredited by two main considerations. First, there was no need for this qualification since no Christian, whether church leader or not, was allowed to practice polygamy. Second, in New Testament times polygamy was generally

outlawed in the empire and thus it hardly needed insistence by Paul.

**Exclusion of Digamists.** The most plausible meaning of the phrase "husband of one wife" appears to be "married only once." This is in fact the rendering of the New Revised Standard Version. According to this view, divorce and remarriage would disqualify a man from the office of elder and deacon. Paul would be stressing the importance of appointing to church leadership only men whose marital status was beyond suspect by having been married only once. Several considerations favor this interpretation.

The priests in the Old Testament were enjoined to uphold a higher marriage standard by marrying only a virgin, and not "a widow, or one divorced, or a woman who has been defiled, or a harlot" (Lev 21:14; cf. 21:7). This Old Testament precedent supports the New Testament higher marriage standards for elders and deacons. Elsewhere I have shown that even the requirement for church leaders to be "abstinent" (1 Tim 3:2) finds its precedent in the Old Testament strict prohibition against the use of alcoholic beverages by the priests (Lev 10:9).

The construction of the phrase without article "mias gunaikos andra-one-wife-man" emphasizes the moral character of the individual as being totally committed to one woman. Such a total commitment is best exemplified by faithfulness to one's spouse "till death doeth us part." In an age when the marriage bond was lightly regarded and commonly dishonored, Paul emphasizes that a church leader must be an example of marital fidelity. Such a fidelity would exclude the possibility of divorce and remarriage.

This may be inferred also from the requirement that a woman enrolled in the official order of widows was to have been "the wife of one husband" (1 Tim 5:9). In Greek, the phrase corresponds to "the husband of one wife." Since the widows enrolled in the ministry of the church were to have been married only once, it seems safe to assume that the same qualification applied to the office of elder. The linguistic similarity between the two phrases ("husband of one wife" and "wife of one husband") strongly suggest that in both instances the person was to have been married only once.

In summary, both the Old and New Testaments uphold the principle of high marriage standards for church leaders (Lev 21:7, 14-15; 1 Tim 3:2, 12; Titus 1:6). In the New Testament church the elders and deacons must stand before the congregation as role models of blameless lifestyle, especially by being the "husband of one wife," that is to say, married only once and totally devoted to one's wife. This excludes the possibility for church leaders to divorce, remarry or to lust after other women.

The standard is admittedly high, but God could hardly allow a lesser standard from those who have been called to give spiritual leadership to His church. To allow a man who has been divorced and remarried to serve as the spiritual leader of a congregation means to tempt its members to follow his bad example by divorcing their spouses and remarrying, if the occasion arises.

The foregoing discussion of the marriage qualifications for church leaders has served to corroborate the principle that Christian marriage is a permanent, lifelong union, which admits no divorce and remarriage. This principle is to be upheld especially by church leaders because their lifestyle and teaching serve as role model for many to follow.

#### CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have found that both the Old and New Testaments clearly and consistently condemn divorce as a violation of God's original plan for marriage as a lifelong union that enables a man and a woman to become "one flesh." Respect for this fundamental principle demands that a Christian couple experiencing marital conflicts should not seek to resolve them through divorce. If a marriage relationship becomes intolerable, a Christian couple can consider a legal separation. The purpose of the separation should be to provide an opportunity for the couple to work toward a possible reconciliation.

#### APPLICATION OF PAUL'S TEACHING TO DANNY AND LINDA SHELTON'S CASE

According to Paul's teachings, the solution to Danny and Linda's marital conflicts, should have been, not the filing for a hasty divorce in Guam, but the filing of a legal separation which would have left the door open for a possible reconciliation.

Christians who believe that marriage is a sacred covenant witnessed and guaranteed by God Himself, must also believe that God is willing to move heaven and earth to save their marriage. Legal separation leaves the door open for the Holy Spirit to work in the hearts of both partners who have been estranged.

It is important to note that a key qualification for church leadership spelled out by Paul, is the marital status. A church leaders is expected to be a "one-wife-man," that is, a man married only once, fully committed to his wife and a spiritual leader who "manages well his own home . . . for if a man does not know how to manage his own household, how can he care for God's church? (1 Tim 3:5).

Particular emphasis is placed upon the Christian character of a church leader, exemplified by his temperate life-style, loyalty to his wife, and spiritual leadership in the home. The reason is that a pastor or a TV evangelist serve as role models to the congregation or viewing audience entrusted to them. A man divorced and remarried several times, can hardly serve as a role model to his congregation or viewing audience. Thus, fidelity to the biblical teachings demands that spiritual leadership is to be entrusted to men who have proven to be faithful to their wives and to be moral and spiritual leaders in the home.

--

Christian regards

Samuele Bacchiocchi, Ph. D.,  
Retired Professor of Theology and Church History, Andrews University  
4990 Appian Way  
Berrien Springs, MI 49103

Phone (269) 471-2915 Fax (269) 978-6898

E-mail [sbacchiocchi@biblicalperspectives.com](mailto:sbacchiocchi@biblicalperspectives.com)

WWW HOMEPAGE: <http://www.biblicalperspectives.com>


---

**Posted by: September Sep 14 2006, 10:25 AM**

Excellent study! I pray more leaders like him speak out.


---

**Posted by: Lucyladye Sep 14 2006, 10:37 AM**

In one way or another, most of us have posted the same thoughts, although not as detailed, for which I thank you Dr. Bacchiocchi. 

---

**Posted by: sonshineonme Sep 14 2006, 11:10 AM**

In light of information from Dr. Bacchiocchi and possibly some others, it may make for an interesting night to watch 3ABN Live, and the FIRST live showing of course, as often the replays are edited. It can be watched online too if you don't have the satellite. 

p.s. I will be happy when spell check comes back from vacation. Ü

**Posted by: Chez Sep 14 2006, 11:38 AM**

**QUOTE(beartrap @ Sep 14 2006, 11:02 AM) □**

#### DANNY AND LINDA SHELTON'S DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

The 3ABN saga of Danny and Linda Shelton's divorce and remarriage has attracted considerable attention. Many subscribers to our newsletters have emailed me all sorts of gossip information. Both Danny and Linda also have exchanged several messages with me. Danny claims to be totally innocent, because it was Linda who had an affair with a Norwegian doctor, Arild Abrahamsen, and left him to be with her lover.

Linda denies all the allegations, as you can read for yourself at her website:  
<http://www.lindashelton.org/> She claims that she never had an affair with Arild, she left Danny because of his abusive behavior, and she never wanted a divorce.

At this point only God knows who is telling the truth. The only thing that we know for sure is that Danny remarried a 20 years younger, twice divorced woman, while Linda is still single.

In response to the many enquiries I decided to put together the following information:

1) The two sides of the Linda/Danny Shelton story as posted at the BLACK SDA WEBSITE:  
<http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?>

2) My understanding of the Biblical teaching on Divorce and Remarriage and its application especially to Danny's remarriage of a divorced woman.

The focus of my study is on the biblical teaching on divorce and remarriage. Danny and Linda Shelton are briefly mentioned only as a case study of the Biblical teaching.

#### THE BLACK ADVENTIST ONLINE COMMUNITY

<http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?>

The Accused Other Man Evidence: Dr. Arild Abrahamsen

06/20/2006

Greetings from Norway;

My name is Dr. Arild Abrahamsen. I live in Svindal, Norway. I have been a medical doctor for more than 35 years. I am a member of the Moss SDA Church. I've been the Sabbath School Superintendent for 14 years and the head elder for 4 years, which position I am presently serving. I am the Norwegian doctor who has been slandered by Dr. Walt Thompson, chairman of the board of 3ABN, Danny Shelton, John Lomacang and others.

Since I have observed the situation and the slander only getting worse, I feel it best to share my experience. I share my personal experience, what I have seen and heard. Much of this information has been verified by other sources, which include emails, letters and the personal experiences of others. I share my experience not to attack any individual or organization, but to bring the truth of this situation to the surface.

I have been shocked to observe the events of the last two years. I have made no public statement until now. I had hoped things would resolve themselves.

I visited Johann and Irmgard Thorvaldsson at 3ABN the last week of 2003. The purpose of the trip was to see them and visit the ministry, which I personally had been supporting for some time. I had never been to 3ABN previously, nor had I met the Shelton's. During this visit I discovered from the Thorvaldsson's that Linda Shelton's son, Nathan, was in a dangerous state of health because of an addiction to drugs and working in coalmines. I offered to see him. This visit resulted in an invitation for Nathan to come to Norway for treatments. Nathan came to Norway around January 20, 2004 along with his friend, Dava Vice. Linda came for a 3-? day visit to support her son, the first week of February together with Brenda Walsh. This was the last time I saw Linda until the weekend she was fired.

I had a chance to visit with Nathan regularly. I learned from my conversations with Nathan that the roots of his drug problems were the relationships with his father and stepfather. Specifically he told me that Danny had turned his back on him. I shared this information with his mother on the phone. She told me that Danny said he had no responsibility towards Nathan since he was a product of her first marriage, so she felt she had to do what she could to help her son. There was nothing unusual in the occasional phone reports I gave Nathan's mother while he was in Norway. After Nathan returned home, I asked Linda to keep me updated on Nathan's progress.

I was shocked to discover in early March of 2004 that Danny was threatening to get Linda fired from 3ABN because of some conversations on the phone. In fact, she was threatened immediately with divorce. By this time Nathan had started with drugs again and Linda was seeking advice. I was also shocked to discover that Brenda had started circulating untrue statements as well. (Was it because Danny had admitted to some emotional involvement with Brenda?) I talked to Danny one time on the phone and found him to be unreasonable, unbalanced and very difficult to communicate with. Johann Thorvaldsson, a retired pastor of the SDA Church of 50 years, also was in communication with Danny, both by phone and email. We talked together and shared the same opinion that Danny was acting completely irrational and unreasonable towards his wife. It appeared he was attempting to leave an email trail filled with untruths to verify a position at a later time. The decision was made to stop the communication by phone with Linda.

Some weeks went by. Johann and Irmgard were getting treatments at my clinic and staying in my home during the Easter week in April, so I discovered from them that the situation was not improving for Linda. She was being harassed, threatened, and unreasonable demands by her husband were repeatedly being made to confess things she had not done. By this time, she was also suspended from her job at 3ABN, an order that was issued and enforced by her husband with no Board action. Things were so bad in the home that she found it necessary to go to her daughter's home in Springfield, Illinois for safety and rest on several occasions. Derrell Mundall, who was traveling often for 3ABN, reports rumors of Linda's so-called "affair" were in SDA churches in April 2004, when Linda was still living with Danny. When he inquired about the source of the rumors, people always pointed to Danny Shelton.

I could see from my 35 years of experience as a physician that Danny was a psychopath. accusations were directed at me that I had done "mind control" over Linda. (Walt Thompson made the same accusations in his letters.) Linda was accused of sending "secret messages" to me over the television. Danny's emails and communications with Johann were completely crazy, and his reasoning often conflicted with his previous emails. Danny targeted Linda's few inner circle confidants and slandered her to the point that even they backed away from her at this critical time. (Linda's "friends" did not want to lose their television privileges.) Johann and I concluded this was a man who was determined to get rid of his wife. We also concluded that Linda was in danger.

Things eventually progressed from emotional and mental abuse to physical abuse. In the midst of all this harassment Linda asked Danny, 'Why are you treating me like this?' He answered, 'Because I want you to get out.'

Considering the urgency of the situation I allowed the conversations to resume. Linda knew, with

her high profile status, that confiding with local people regarding these issues would be very bad for the ministry. I had given counsel to people in difficulty in the past and felt I could be helpful from a distance in this situation. I encouraged Linda to fight for her marriage and ministry many times. This she really did, but she often had to leave her home to find refuge at her daughter's apartment in Springfield, even in the middle of the night because of Danny's behavior. At times like these she was afraid of him. She always returned to her home after a couple of days seeking to try to mend the marriage, but Danny would not allow this.

During the spring of 2004 Danny called my pastor in Norway. Danny tried to get me kicked out as an elder and as a member of the church. My pastor told me about the conversation and he said, "He is mentally sick, he needs professional help."

I find it very disturbing that Walt Thompson defended and continues to defend Danny although he was a witness repeatedly to the emotional and mental abuse that was taking place. At one point he witnessed Danny "trashing" his wife for five hours. I also find it disturbing that John Lomacang, Linda's former pastor, claims to have counseled extensively with Danny and Linda when this was far from the truth. During the months of April and May of 2004, when most of the activity was occurring in this situation, Linda NEVER saw John, who was supposed to be her pastor.

Coincidentally the handful of people supporting Danny and defending his actions has gained either power, position, airtime, homes, public endorsement or all of the above.

At one point I had a conversation with Walt Thompson, Chairman of the Board of 3ABN. He asked me to stop all communication with Linda. This had also been communicated to Johann and Irmgard Thorvaldsson and others. I told him that it was obviously Danny's plan to isolate Linda from everyone at a time when she needed help. To me it was the Christian thing to answer her phone calls and the only humane thing to do for someone who was in crisis.

Others did not come to Linda's aid because they did not want to lose whatever benefit they gained from 3ABN, whether it be a job, programming, promotions, etc. Walt was also the one who phoned Linda when she was suspended from the ministry by her husband. He instructed her that she must not come to the ministry (which she co-founded) without calling ahead of time because she must be supervised when at 3ABN. Danny broke into a locked bathroom to forcefully take her keys to 3ABN from her. Her hard drive of her computer was confiscated, her contact information taken and even her filing cabinets ravaged, all without any kind of Board action.

Linda was living in an impossible situation. Danny was "in her face" on a regular basis. At times he would say, "If you don't say you're a pathological liar, the marriage and 3ABN is over. If you don't say you're an adulterous woman the marriage and 3ABN is over for you. If you don't say you've given your heart to another man and that he is a demon the marriage and 3ABN is over..... etc." It even reached the point when he demanded her to say "Repeat after me." Johann and I received a couple emails, which said they were from Linda, but they were written by Danny. Linda saw her ministry being destroyed one day at a time. All of this was dehumanizing and terrifying to Linda, who was trying to hold things together. She very much realized what was at stake.

An "investigative committee" was put together by Walt Thompson to look into this situation. They were Walt Thompson, Bill Hulsey, Nick Miller and Kay Kuzma. Danny talked privately at length with each of these people. Linda did not. The committee as a whole never met with Linda at all. In one brief phone conversation with Kay Kuzma she told Linda, "The Board is not interested in you and Danny's personal problems. It is only interested in the fact that the President no longer wants his Vice-President." Johann Thorvaldsson testifies that he spoke with Kay the following day. She told him she was instructed to get Linda used to the idea of not being at 3ABN anymore and to try to get her involved in another ministry.

It's interesting that at the time Danny accused Linda for speaking on the phone to me, that he was in the practice of speaking regularly with Brenda, Linda's "friend." He also visited often with her in her 3ABN apartment in the night. A worker at 3ABN states that Brenda even went golfing with Danny behind Linda's back while she was working. As soon as Brenda saw where the tide was turning, she was no longer Linda's friend. She became an accuser as well.



About May 1, 2004 instructions were given to the production staff to wipe Linda's face off of the network by June 1, again with no Board action.

All CD's, videos, literature and photos of Linda were stripped out of the Call Center. She was sent a document a few days later specifying that she was advised to get 30 days of counseling by counselors of "their" choice. If she did not agree to this in writing within 24 hours, her employment could be gone. She requested time for an attorney to look at the document. This was refused. Mail was flooding into the network with Linda's name on it. They were all returned to sender. Her scheduled speaking appointments for women's ministries were sabotaged by those in leadership at 3ABN. Danny told those who worked for Linda that she was a pathological liar and to stay away from her. (He did not want them to hear the other side of the story.) At one point Linda told Walt that Dan was purposefully ruining her reputation and that she was not willing to be a martyr for 3ABN. Walt's response was "How else are we going to save the ministry?"

Rumors of Linda's so-called "affair" were flying throughout the churches and the General Conference in May of 2004, rumors which were begun by her husband. It was communicated to me that Linda was going to be fired at the Board meeting, which would occur in May, following the 3ABN camp meeting. Johann and I decided to go to the camp meeting and talk to the Board members and tell them the truth about the situation. When we walked into the 3ABN building we were surrounded by about 10 people. One person stood directly behind me for the entire service. Walt Thompson and Nick Miller (3ABN's attorney) asked us to leave. We stayed until nearly the end of the service. (At this camp meeting an announcement was made regarding Linda. There were tearful appeals by Danny, which raised a record-breaking amount of money for 3ABN. Danny also claims that an additional two million dollars was raised the year of their divorce.) When Johann and I went to the door, once again we were followed by a small crowd of people. I spoke to Mark Finley about the situation at length in the parking lot. John Lomacang tried to stop the conversation. He said 'It is not good for you to talk to him alone.' What was he afraid of? He was standing with me when Danny drove up and said that if I returned to camp meeting I would be arrested and thrown in jail. He had already talked to the Sheriff. I decided to not return, as it was Mark Finley's suggestion to avoid the possibility of disrupting the camp meeting for all of the people attending. Linda was staying in her daughter's apartment in Springfield, so we drove there on Saturday to stay in a hotel for the weekend. During this weekend we were followed by three private investigators all the time. What kind of actions was that, for a man that REALLY wanted to save his marriage?

It is my understanding that a one-sided conversation was illegally taped by Danny towards the end of May. With a mind set on framing his wife, her words have been misconstrued into saying what he wants people to think. She mentions a trip to Las Vegas. He explains to all that she is planning a rendezvous with "the doctor." In reality for weeks he has offered Linda larger and larger sums of money for her to go to Las Vegas and stay with her mother for six weeks to acquire residency, a requirement for couples that want a quick divorce. For weeks she refused. SHE NEVER WANTED A DIVORCE.

The events of the previous months eventually bring her to the place where she thinks this is maybe what she should do. She knew a separation was necessary. Danny takes her words from the phone call and adds his insinuations. He makes photo copies of her one sided conversation and distributes it. This is his main source of "proof" for his actions and re-marriage. They call it circumstantial evidence." To further cover their tracks Linda's accusers say that for her sake they don't want to tell "all she has done." They say this so people will accept their statements and imagine the worst. This is slander of the worst kind all coming from professed Christians.

Johann says he was fired from 3ABN for refusing to attest to something false Danny wanted him to put in writing about Linda. Derrell Mundall, Danny's ex-son-in-law, says he was given the option to resign or be fired because of his actions defending Linda. Others quit their jobs because they could not support the actions of the leaders. There is one thing many of these people have in common. Anyone who disagrees with Danny is slandered and discredited.

It's interesting that Danny's daughter recently was found to be pregnant out of wedlock. A quick wedding followed when Derrell, (her ex-husband & father of their four children), claims she had no

grounds for re-marriage. It's also interesting that nobody asked Derrell about the issue of grounds at all when he was still a resident in Thompsonville. Also another married Shelton family member had a romantic encounter recently with a married employee of 3ABN. They were instructed to keep it quiet. They did. They all still work at 3ABN, and Melody is featured on the network. Is 3ABN all about standing for principle and values, or standing for those who happen to be in good graces with the President and the Shelton family ?

Another question that seems to be in the minds of many is "Why was Linda given \$240,000 when all claim she was fired for a wrongdoing?" The only reason Linda signed this 3ABN contract was because she needed money to escape from a very irregular, abusive and impossible situation. Danny forced her to sign not only this contract, but another contract which sold him her half of their joint-owned home the same day.

Linda has suffered much emotional trauma and humiliation from all of this. She still has nightmares about these events. She did not feel ready to face the people of the SDA church for six months after all of this occurred. I encouraged her to begin again. She went for the first time around the end of November of 2004 in Springfield. The people welcomed her. She requested her membership to be transferred out of the Thompsonville church into the Springfield church in December of 2004. The Springfield pastor had previously worked at 3ABN and knew Linda. He did not believe the rumors and encouraged the church to put her to work. It was a healing time for her to teach Sabbath School and occasionally preach.

In June of 2005 things changed. Pastor Grady was transferred out of the Springfield church, though he wanted to stay, and a pastor from 3ABN was moved into the church. Within two weeks John Stanton met with Linda and told her she would be doing nothing on the platform. She told him that the church really needed the help and she hoped that if she was asked once in two months to teach a Sabbath School class that she would be able to do this. He told her that the orders had come from the conference level. (The Illinois conference President sits on 3ABN's Board and his parents work for 3ABN.) During our visit to the General Conference Session Johann and I visited with this pastor. He told us he thought Linda was a liar. I TOLD HIM THAT LINDA HAD NEVER BEEN UNFAITHFUL TO HER HUSBAND and that all the rumors from her husband were lies. But this man had TV interests to pursue and he was in close connection with Danny and John Lomacang.

The last week of October 2005, a letter came to Linda from John Lomacang, the pastor of the Thompsonville (3ABN) church. It stated that the church board had voted "to call a church business session to recommend to the church that you be placed under censure." Linda called John to ask him why. He said it was because she had abandoned her marriage and ministry, which led to her divorce. (This is what Danny refers to as "grounds" to re-marry.) Linda planned to address the church business meeting. She wrote to Danny requesting a release from the restrictions of the contract she signed so she could openly share her side of the story. Danny denied this request. Because of this she felt forced to drop her membership there and then join another SDA church. This decision was made after much counsel with several SDA's. It's interesting that this recommendation for censure came almost 18 months after the fact. (Which kind of practice is this? Special for USA?) It's also interesting that all of this occurred while Danny was trying to gather evidence against Linda so he could re-marry.

Danny Shelton and the leadership of 3ABN are responsible for using the ministry of 3ABN to bring character assassination to Linda and others. In Linda's case, television and radio announcements were made denouncing her character. There was an announcement on the front page of 3ABN's website for many months. About 180,000 letters about Linda were sent to the mailing list at 3ABN. Videos about her were made and distributed. Magazine articles were written and submitted. Mailings were made to church officials. Many calls were taken at 3ABN where slanderous remarks about Linda were given over the phone. Many letters containing completely false statements were sent to many individuals. Danny even made his personal email address available over 3ABN so people could write to him and obtain his side of the story. They did a thorough job of character assassination.

Now two years later the "trashing" continues. It is inexcusable, especially for a proclaimed Christian ministry.

In conclusion I want to clearly state that I have not committed adultery (emotional, physical, "spiritual"), and neither has Linda. The conversations we had were not unusual or inappropriate. Linda is the victim of domestic violence, only this has resulted in worldwide effects for our Church.

Linda has sought for help at the General Conference level. She has sought the aid of pastors. No one has an answer. She has tried repeatedly to meet with a committee from the Board of 3ABN. This request has not been granted. Still the bulk emails and letters flow from 3ABN slandering the innocent. This has been the most ungodly situation I have observed in my entire life. Any who find themselves not in good graces with Danny Shelton will find that their name is discredited and slandered in an attempt to destroy their influence. Linda has suffered the most with the loss of her job, her influence and reputation. But many others, including myself, have felt the heat coming from what is supposed to be a ministry representing Jesus Christ. This is an outrage. This is unacceptable. Accountability of leaders is a must. (Can bad fruits come from good trees?) As Christians, it is our duty to demand accountability and a high standard from leaders. I hope this testimony will fulfill the mission intended.

Respectfully,

Dr. Arild Abrahamsen  
From Walter Thompson  
Chairman, 3ABN board of Directors  
Regarding Danny's marriage

Dear Family and Friends of 3ABN,

Two years ago 3ABN was challenged by the most difficult battle the ministry has ever faced. It was a battle that threatened the very existence of the ministry and the work of preaching the end time message of the Three Angel's to the world. It is only because of the grace and power of God Almighty, and the faithful support of you, the 3ABN family, that the ministry has survived to preach another day. Today, the ministry is stronger than it has ever been and its reach into the world even broader and more powerful for the cause of truth.

As is always the case when in the public eye, questions arise, stories abound, and rumors spread. We thank God that you have trusted the leadership and board of 3ABN during this time and have stayed with us in ministry. More recently some of you have heard that Danny has found one to comfort him in his loneliness and sorrow. You may have also heard rumors about an allegedly illegal divorce occurring without Biblical grounds. This letter is an attempt to fill you in with the facts.

As chairman of the board I have been in the midst of this long and drawn out ordeal from the beginning. I was there when we counseled with Linda over and over again. I was present during the pleas and prayers, seeking to get her to give up her relationship with the doctor. I have seen and heard the evidence upon which the board has taken the action that it has taken. I have been one that has plead with Linda to keep her marriage and her ministry and offered to provide counseling for them. I have known Danny and Linda almost from the beginning of the ministry and have been in their home many times. They had a good marriage. It was not until this third party got in the middle did things begin to fall apart. It is also true that Danny really did want to get back together again, but when it became obvious that couldn't happen, he correctly had to close the door on that part of his history lest it destroy him and the ministry.

The divorce was a mutually agreed thing, even the choice to get it from Guam where there would be no long wait. Linda had originally planned to move to Las Vegas long enough to become a resident there so as to get a divorce there. They then discovered the possibility of a divorce from Guam, checked it out and found it to be legal, and decided to go that route. Though I believe Guam has now stopped the program, the legality of a Guam divorce had previously been taken to the U.S. Supreme Court where it was ruled legitimate. As chairman of the board, I did not try to influence the decision, but I will say that had they not obtained a quick divorce, the ministry would have been placed at much greater risk since the situation was causing so much dysfunction with leadership and staff. I believe time has verified the correctness of what was done then, both by Danny and by the

board for the ministry.

Linda's web site recently stated that she and Danny were not divorced. She wrote this after the judge made the decision in Danny's favor. She claims she did not know this when she wrote it. Her web site referred to an e mail I sent to Johann Thorvaldson a year earlier saying that I had never accused her of adultery. I believe that exchange with him was in response to an accusation by him that we had fired her because of adultery. I was merely saying that she was not fired for adultery, but because she had defied the board in not discontinuing a relationship that was threatening to destroy the ministry. (I might add that the doctor also told me he would not break off the relationship, even though I pled with him to do so.) That letter to Johann was correct, and it is true that I have never directly accused her of adultery. That does not mean that I believe Linda is innocent. If by adultery one must be caught in bed with another person, I cannot prove Linda has committed adultery. If, on the other hand, hard evidence indicates that Linda was involved in an unacceptable relationship with another man qualifies for adultery, then there is no question about Danny's moral right to marry again.

As a board, we have chosen not to make the details of the evidence available to the public. I believe Satan is the accuser of the brethren. We have chosen to take the "high road" in this whole situation and say nothing more than we have been forced to say to try to quell rumors. We care about Linda and have tried not to do anything to hurt her more than she has already been hurt. I can tell you that I personally spent a great deal of time at 3ABN during those months when this was all happening. I spoke with Linda and Danny on numerous occasions. A sub committee of the board met and prayed with Danny and Linda and pled with Linda to call off the relationship. Danny and Linda spent an 8 hour session with a pair of Christian counselors (non-Adventist in an attempt to avoid bias) who had no doubts about the nature of Linda's conduct. We offered to provide Linda with the opportunity to go away for counseling with a counselor agreeable to both she and us. She did not respond to that offer or request.

Finally, the full board met, reviewed Linda's letter of explanation, and voted unanimously to remove her from the ministry and her seat on the board. Other church leaders who have been privy to some of the evidence we have are in full agreement with our decision.

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

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

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

The things I have stated here are accurate and correct. As far as the lady Danny has married is concerned, I can only say I believe his new wife is a very good person and will be a real asset to him as he carries on his heavy responsibilities. Just to clarify any rumor you may have heard, this relationship began long after the divorce. I was at 3ABN when this lady came from Florida looking for work. There was nothing going on before that time, and Danny definitely was not trying to "dump" Linda. I was with him during much of the time he agonized and mourned her loss. It is one thing to lose a loved one in death. It is much different to lose one to another lover - like cutting a dog's tail off one inch at a time! As to the matter of age difference, I will say that I do not believe that is any of my business. I find nothing in the Bible, and I don't remember any thing in the SOP indicating age differences for married couples. If it is legal, and morally correct, and if entered into

with honesty, sincerity and earnest prayer for God's guidance, as I know happened here, it is not for me to criticize. In my own musings about this, I have concluded that it was no accident that brought Brandy to 3ABN. Either the devil was behind it, or God was. There is no question in my mind which one it was.

(Archo Dart was for many years a family and marriage counselor in the Adventist church. When in his 80's, he married one of my patients, who was then in her 50's. She loved and admired him till death many years later.)

I have had an interesting thought this week that I will share with you. It is this. God lost one of his closest companions when Lucifer went astray. More than that, myriads more angels left with him when he left heaven. Talk about grief or emotional pain. Experiences such as this with Linda, I think, help us to understand the pain of loss, and the reality of the war between God and Satan. Some have claimed it takes two to divorce. I don't think that is categorically true! This has been a terrible injury that has hit 3abn and Danny, and yes, Linda too, but it is one that I believe God understands - and He continues to bless his servants.

We recognize that we live in a world at war, and are working with a ministry that the devil would like to see destroyed. The war is real, and as in any other war there are real casualties. War is never pleasant, and spiritual battles may be some of the worst. Our hearts still ache for those who have been wounded. Our prayers continue to ascend on their behalf. Should acknowledgement of wrongdoing and penitence ever occur, we would be the first to forgive and forget. Unfortunately, that has not happened, and we must move on.

Some who have been aware of the growing relationship and the possibility of marriage have thought they should wait for a longer period of time before marrying. In discussions before the event, the 3ABN board reviewed the events of the past couple years and have agreed that there was no moral or legal reason precluding marriage. Realizing the heavy burdens resting on Danny and of his need for companionship, we, the board did not see any reason not to give our blessing to their union. We hope you, our 3ABN family, will agree too, and with us, welcome Brandy with open arms.

Should you have any questions that I might answer, please feel free to send them to me at 3ABN and I will do my best to try to answer them.

Sincerely in the precious name of Jesus,  
Walter Thompson  
Chairman, 3ABN Board of Directors  
Walter Thompson MD

**REFLECTIONS ON THE BIBLICAL TEACHINGS ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE  
AS THEY RELATE TO DANNY AND LINDA SHELTON'S SITUATION**

Samuele Bacchiocchi, Ph. D.  
Retired Professor of Theology,  
Andrews University

Much of the discussion about Danny and Linda Shelton's divorce and consequent remarriage of Danny, revolves on the legitimate grounds for them to divorce and for Danny to remarry. It appears to me that from a biblical standpoint, the issue is not, "Did Danny have a legitimate ground to divorce Linda, but should a Christian couple experiencing marital problems consider divorce as a solution to their problems in the first place?"

The teaching of Jesus on divorce and remarriage is abundantly clear. Both Luke and Mark affirm the same teaching. "Every one who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery" (Luke 16:18). "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another, commits adultery against her; and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery" (Mark 10:11-12).

When Paul applied Jesus' teaching to the concrete marital problems that existed in the Church of Corinth, he clearly claims to give Christ's command by enjoining the wife not to separate from her husband, and the husband not to divorce his wife: "The wife should not separate from her husband, but if she does, let her remain single or else be reconciled to her husband- and that the husband

should not divorce his wife" (1 Cor 7:10-11). The total prohibition of divorce by Paul reflects the teaching of Jesus found in the Gospels.

In my book THE MARRIAGE COVENANT I explain at great length that the exceptive clause of Matt 19:9 which admits divorce on the ground of porneia, can be best explained in the light of the Judeo-Christian readership of Matthew. While Mark and Luke write to Gentiles, Matthew write to Judeo-Christians. Jews were tribally related and it was easy for them to marry a close blood relative. Such marriages were condemned by the Mosaic law (Lev 18:6-18) and were called porneia.

Thus, Jesus allows for divorce only where a marriage should not have taken place in the first place, namely, within the degrees of prohibited relationships. Consequently, in Matthew, Jesus does not envisage any exception to the absolute ban on divorce but only allows for the dissolution of a marriage which was validly contracted according to Greco-Roman laws, but which was in conflict with the Mosaic law of prohibited relationships.

Danny is advancing all sorts of argument to prove that he is innocent and Linda is guilty. In the light of his allegations I asked Linda to respond to a dozen of specific questions. She denies all your allegations. She claims she left Danny because of his abusive behavior, she did not want a divorce, and she never had intimate relationship with the Arield, the Norwegian doctor, and she never married the man. It appears to me that had Linda been involved in an adulterous relationship, by now they would be married, especially since he is widow and she is divorced.

The fact is that she is still single and does not intend to remarry, makes it very difficult to believe Danny's allegations. By contrast, Danny has remarried a twice divorced woman who is 20 years younger. The facts speak for themselves. In the light of this situation, the only honorable thing for Danny to do is to resign from his present position as Director of 3ABN and let someone with a clean record serve as the leader of a station committed to preach the true Gospel of Jesus Christ. He can still work at 3ABN but in a less conspicuous position.

The longer he holds on to his position, the more people will become disenchanted with him and 3ABN. In an age of instant communication, one cannot cover up past mistakes for very long.

My advice to Danny is largely based on Paul's teaching on Divorce and remarriage that we want to consider at this point.

#### THE TEACHING OF PAUL ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

Paul's teachings on divorce and remarriage are found in 1 Corinthians 7, where the apostle discusses three different types of marital problems. In 1 Corinthians 7:10-11 Paul speaks to married believers who might consider divorce as a means to resolve their marital conflicts. His admonition given with Christ's authority is clear. Christian couples should not seek divorce, and if they separate they should remain single to leave the door open for reconciliation.

Since I have examined this passage in my book THE MARRIAGE COVENANT, I will quote a few paragraph relevant to Danny and Linda's situation. Personally I feel that it is far more important to understand what the Bible teaches us on this important area of marital relationship, than to gossip about who is to be blamed.

In marital conflicts the blame seldom falls only on one partner. To a greater or lesser degree both partners have contributed to the problem and both need to seek a biblical solution to their problem. In seeking for a solution, it is important to remember that in the Bible marriage is not a social or civil contract that can be dissolved through the legal process, but it is a sacred, lifelong covenant witnessed and guaranteed by God Himself.

#### The Teaching of Paul in 1 Corinthians 7:10-16

Paul's treatment of the divorce question in 1 Corinthians 7:10-16 is most significant because it reveals how the teaching of Jesus on divorce was understood and applied to certain concrete marital situations in the apostolic church. He begins the chapter by setting forth some general principles

about marriage. To avoid the temptation to sexual immorality, "each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband" (1 Cor 7:2). Both husband and wife should fulfill their respective conjugal rights (1 Cor 7:3-5). The unmarried and the widows who have the gift of celibacy should remain single as himself (1 Cor 7:7-8).

Next Paul discusses three different divorce situations: (1) the divorce of two believers (vv. 10-11), (2) the divorce of a believer and an unbeliever where the unbeliever does not want to divorce, and (3) the divorce of a believer and an unbeliever where the unbeliever wants to divorce. Since only the first situation is relevant to the case of Danny and Linda, I will quote from the book what I have written about it.

**Divorce of Two Believers.** Paul first speaks to married believers who might consider divorce as a means to resolve their marital conflicts: "To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord, that the wife should not separate from her husband (but if she does, let her remain single or else be reconciled to her husband)-and that the husband should not divorce his wife" (1 Cor 7:10-11).

Appealing to the teaching of Christ (cf. Mark 10:9, 11, 12; Luke 16:18; Matt 19:3-9), Paul declares in absolute terms that a Christian couple should not seek divorce. Twice he affirms the no-divorce principle: ". . . the wife should not separate from her husband . . . and the husband should not divorce his wife" (1 Cor 7:10-11). The basis of Paul's prohibition is Christ's teaching that husband and wife are one flesh and what God has joined together no man should put asunder.

Paul recognizes, however, that human nature is perverse and that even a Christian husband or wife can make marriage intolerable for the other partner. A spouse who is out of fellowship with God can become intolerant, abusive, unfaithful, domineering, inconsiderate. Undoubtedly, Paul had run into situations of this kind and recognizes that sometimes separation may be inevitable. However, if separation becomes a necessity, Paul leaves Christian partners with two options: (1) to remain permanently unmarried, or (2) to be reconciled to one's partner.

It is important to note that Paul appeals to the teaching of Jesus ("not I but the Lord") in ruling against the possibility of divorce for a Christian couple. On this regard, New Testament scholar F. F. Bruce comments: "For a Christian husband or wife, divorce is excluded by the law of Christ: here Paul has no need to express a judgment of his own, for the Lord's ruling on this matter was explicit."

To appreciate the revolutionary nature of such teaching, it is important to remember that divorce and remarriage was allowed in both the Jewish and Roman society. Yet Paul affirms the no-divorce principle for Christians as a word of the Lord which will be accepted without challenge. This goes to show that within twenty-five years of the crucifixion itself, the Apostolic Church believed and taught that Christ had proclaimed the permanence of the marriage union. This belief played an important role in the Christian mission to revolutionize the values of the existing society.

In Paul's day, there was no provision for a wife to be legally separated from her husband without being divorced. Fortunately today, the law provides for legal separation as an alternative to divorce. Legal separation offers to a Christian the protection of the law while leaving the door open for reconciliation. Such a door must be left open because Christians believe that no marital conflict is impossible for God to solve.

Since there was no legal separation in Paul's day, the apostle recommends a legal separation-type of divorce. This is indicated by his use of the verb *koridzo* ("to separate") rather than the normal verb for divorce *apouo* used by Jesus. By recommending a legal separation-type of divorce, Paul respects the spirit of Christ's teaching while at the same time providing protection for the believing wife until a reconciliation with her husband can be realized.

Paul's teachings on the question of divorce in 1 Corinthians 7:12-16 not only closely reflects Jesus' teachings concerning the permanence of marriage, but also reveals its full depths. It does this by showing how the Christian faith causes the marriage covenant to become a sacred and lifelong relationship. There is for Paul an intimate connection between the permanence of the marriage bond and the Christian faith.

A Christian couple who marries "in the Lord" accepts the responsibility to honor by divine grace their covenant commitment both to God and to one another. It is the sacred and permanent nature of the Christian covenant commitment to God that makes a Christian marriage sacred and permanent. On account of this fact, a Christian couple experiencing marital problems may separate with the hope of reconciliation but may not divorce and remarry. This condition does not apply to a mixed marriage where the unbelieving partner deserts his believing spouse, because by the very act of desertion the unbeliever rejects the Christian view of marriage as a sacred and permanent union.

Summing up, like Jesus the apostle Paul affirms the principle that Christian marriage is a union binding and permanent for life. If a separation should occur, Paul presents only two alternatives to believing partners: be reconciled to one another or remain single.

#### The Teaching of Paul on Divorce for Church Leaders

Paul's view of Christian marriage as a lifelong union which admits no divorce and remarriage, is indirectly supported by the marriage qualifications he sets forth for church leaders: "Now a bishop must be above reproach, the husband of one wife" (1 Tim 3:2; cf. Titus 1:6). "Let deacons be the husband of one wife, and let them manage their children and their households well" (1 Tim 3:12).

The basic qualifications given by Paul for the church office of elder (or overseer) and deacon were designed to enable Timothy in Ephesus and Titus on Crete to appoint church leaders qualified to serve in such offices. The first qualification for the office of elder is that the man must be "above reproach." His blameless lifestyle is to serve as a role model to the congregation and is to offer no reason for criticism in the community. The first important aspect of his role modeling is his marital status, which Paul defines as "husband of one wife" (1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:6). This qualification occurs both in 1 Timothy and Titus immediately after the demand for blamelessness thus indicating the prominence Paul gives to the marital status of a church leader.

The Greek words translated "husband of one wife" can be rendered literally as "one-wife-man." This short phrase has been the subject of considerable investigation. Did Paul mean that a church leader should be married only to one woman at a time or only once during his lifetime? Did Paul intend to exclude from church leadership polygamists, that is, men married to several wives or digamists, that is, men married twice or more legally?

**Exclusion of Polygamists.** Some have understood the phrase "husband of one wife" to exclude polygamists from church leadership. This interpretation is discredited by two main considerations. First, there was no need for this qualification since no Christian, whether church leader or not, was allowed to practice polygamy. Second, in New Testament times polygamy was generally outlawed in the empire and thus it hardly needed insistence by Paul.

**Exclusion of Digamists.** The most plausible meaning of the phrase "husband of one wife" appears to be "married only once." This is in fact the rendering of the New Revised Standard Version. According to this view, divorce and remarriage would disqualify a man from the office of elder and deacon. Paul would be stressing the importance of appointing to church leadership only men whose marital status was beyond suspect by having been married only once. Several considerations favor this interpretation.

The priests in the Old Testament were enjoined to uphold a higher marriage standard by marrying only a virgin, and not "a widow, or one divorced, or a woman who has been defiled, or a harlot" (Lev 21:14; cf. 21:7). This Old Testament precedent supports the New Testament higher marriage standards for elders and deacons. Elsewhere I have shown that even the requirement for church leaders to be "abstinent" (1 Tim 3:2) finds its precedent in the Old Testament strict prohibition against the use of alcoholic beverages by the priests (Lev 10:9).

The construction of the phrase without article "mias gunaikos andra-one-wife-man" emphasizes the moral character of the individual as being totally committed to one woman. Such a total commitment is best exemplified by faithfulness to one's spouse "till death doeth us part." In an age when the marriage bond was lightly regarded and commonly dishonored, Paul emphasizes that a



church leader must be an example of marital fidelity. Such a fidelity would exclude the possibility of divorce and remarriage.

This may be inferred also from the requirement that a woman enrolled in the official order of widows was to have been "the wife of one husband" (1 Tim 5:9). In Greek, the phrase corresponds to "the husband of one wife." Since the widows enrolled in the ministry of the church were to have been married only once, it seems safe to assume that the same qualification applied to the office of elder. The linguistic similarity between the two phrases ("husband of one wife" and "wife of one husband") strongly suggest that in both instances the person was to have been married only once.

In summary, both the Old and New Testaments uphold the principle of high marriage standards for church leaders (Lev 21:7, 14-15; 1 Tim 3:2, 12; Titus 1:6). In the New Testament church the elders and deacons must stand before the congregation as role models of blameless lifestyle, especially by being the "husband of one wife," that is to say, married only once and totally devoted to one's wife. This excludes the possibility for church leaders to divorce, remarry or to lust after other women.

The standard is admittedly high, but God could hardly allow a lesser standard from those who have been called to give spiritual leadership to His church. To allow a man who has been divorced and remarried to serve as the spiritual leader of a congregation means to tempt its members to follow his bad example by divorcing their spouses and remarrying, if the occasion arises.

The foregoing discussion of the marriage qualifications for church leaders has served to corroborate the principle that Christian marriage is a permanent, lifelong union, which admits no divorce and remarriage. This principle is to be upheld especially by church leaders because their lifestyle and teaching serve as role model for many to follow.

#### CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have found that both the Old and New Testaments clearly and consistently condemn divorce as a violation of God's original plan for marriage as a lifelong union that enables a man and a woman to become "one flesh." Respect for this fundamental principle demands that a Christian couple experiencing marital conflicts should not seek to resolve them through divorce. If a marriage relationship becomes intolerable, a Christian couple can consider a legal separation. The purpose of the separation should be to provide an opportunity for the couple to work toward a possible reconciliation.

#### APPLICATION OF PAUL'S TEACHING TO DANNY AND LINDA SHELTON'S CASE

According to Paul's teachings, the solution to Danny and Linda's marital conflicts, should have been, not the filing for a hasty divorce in Guam, but the filing of a legal separation which would have left the door open for a possible reconciliation.

Christians who believe that marriage is a sacred covenant witnessed and guaranteed by God Himself, must also believe that God is willing to move heaven and earth to save their marriage. Legal separation leaves the door open for the Holy Spirit to work in the hearts of both partners who have been estranged.

It is important to note that a key qualification for church leadership spelled out by Paul, is the marital status. A church leaders is expected to be a "one-wife-man," that is, a man married only once, fully committed to his wife and a spiritual leader who "manages well his own home . . . for if a man does not know how to manage his own household, how can he care for God's church? (1 Tim 3:5).

Particular emphasis is placed upon the Christian character of a church leader, exemplified by his temperate life-style, loyalty to his wife, and spiritual leadership in the home. The reason is that a pastor or a TV evangelist serve as role models to the congregation or viewing audience entrusted to them. A man divorced and remarried several times, can hardly serve as a role model to his congregation or viewing audience. Thus, fidelity to the biblical teachings demands that spiritual leadership is to be entrusted to men who have proven to be faithful to their wives and to be moral

and spiritual leaders in the home.

--

Christian regards

Samuele Bacchiocchi, Ph. D.,  
Retired Professor of Theology and Church History, Andrews University  
4990 Appian Way  
Berrien Springs, MI 49103

Phone (269) 471-2915 Fax (269) 978-6898

E-mail sbacchiocchi@biblicalperspectives.com

WWW HOMEPAGE: <http://www.biblicalperspectives.com>

EXCELLENT!!! Thank you.

---

**Posted by: caribbean sda Sep 14 2006, 12:00 PM**

---

**QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Sep 14 2006, 02:10 PM) □**

In light of information from Dr. Bacchiocchi and possibly some others, it may make for an interesting night to watch 3ABN Live, and the FIRST live showing of course, as often the replays are edited. It can be watched online too if you don't have the satellite. □  
p.s. I will be happy when spell check comes back from vacation. Ü

I don't know if Dr. B has ever been a guest on 3ABN...but I'm also certain that now he has rendered his perspective on the Danny/Linda situation, the welcome mat has been rolled up. The wagons are now circling in West Frankfort, and it would be interesting to see the spin the good folks at 3ABN would put on this new development.

---

**Posted by: watchbird Sep 14 2006, 12:12 PM**

---

**QUOTE(caribbean sda @ Sep 14 2006, 12:00 PM) □**

I don't know if Dr. B has ever been a guest on 3ABN...but I'm also certain that now he has rendered his perspective on the Danny/Linda situation, the welcome mat has been rolled up. The wagons are now circling in West Frankfort, and it would be interesting to see the spin the good folks at 3ABN would put on this new development.

Before we get too overawed by the Doc having his qualified "say" in the matter, it would be well to note that in the beginning ... within a very short time after Linda was ousted from 3abn, the doc listened to Johann and others, and essentially promised to write in her defense in one of his next newsletters. But not long after that he backed away, choosing to not "get involved". There are some

of us who, rather than being elated at this attention he is giving the topic, are rather in wonderment as to why, in all the time that has elapsed since then .... and with all that has been said here on BSDA .... he can still only quote the two contrasting letters of Thompson and Abrahamson from this site, and conclude that he doesn't have enough information to judge which is correct. Nor does he give even any passing casual "nod" to all of the other problems that have been revealed about the Shelton Dynasty. It is as if nothing existed other than Danny's divorce and remarriage.

So ... once more Linda has been dragged out like a "red herring" so as to divert attention from all of the other ills that exist on the 3ABN campus! Which is just the way Danny wants it. Strange, isn't it .... how he manages to "get his way" in that matter?

---

**Posted by: fallible humanbeing Sep 14 2006, 12:18 PM**

QUOTE(beartrap @ Sep 14 2006, 11:02 AM) □

REFLECTIONS ON THE BIBLICAL TEACHINGS ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE  
AS THEY RELATE TO DANNY AND LINDA SHELTON'S SITUATION  
Samuele Bacchiocchi, Ph. D.  
Retired Professor of Theology,  
Andrews University

Interesting read since I had the Dr. as a prof in university. I am curious what brought him to generate this document. Who solicited his thoughts on this subject and how did it make its way here?

---

**Posted by: Lucyladye Sep 14 2006, 12:30 PM**

Well Watchbird, I had come to the same conclusion after reading his Biblical Dissertation on marriage. Other concerns were not mentioned, and I wondered why he had not commented on them, but I am far too new to BSDA to have questioned why. Like I stated in my previous post, we all at one time or another have stated the same things only not as detailed....which was my way of saying without saying...much was left unsaid by him. I will leave it to all of you who have better insight than I do...to conclude as to the reasons why. □

---

**Posted by: watchbird Sep 14 2006, 12:37 PM**

QUOTE(Lucyladye @ Sep 14 2006, 12:30 PM) □

Well Watchbird, I had come to the same conclusion after reading his Biblical Dissertation on marriage. Other concerns were not mentioned, and I wondered why he had not commented on them, but I am far too new to BSDA to have questioned why. Like I stated in my previous post, we all at one time or another have stated the same things only not as detailed....which was my way of saying without saying...much was left unsaid by him. I will leave it to all of you who have better insight than I do...to conclude as to the reasons why. □

Being a long time follower of Bacchiocchi's newsletters, I think he gives the immediate answer to the question of "why" in his early paragraphs .... he had a bunch of requests from readers of his

newsletters .... and he had a book on the subject so he could use this as an excuse to promote that .... and he didn't have any other really bright ideas for subject matter (witness the fact that the majority of his several recent newsletters has been the reprinting of articles by other people, plus, of course, his own self-promotional material. (If I sound cynical when it comes to the dear "boc doc" (long history behind that nickname) it is only because I am... long history behind that also, but that would be WAY to far "off topic".)

---

**Posted by: Uncle Sam Sep 14 2006, 12:44 PM**

I am not sure how much people will listen to him. Seems like not too long ago he had some controversy and many have written him off too....

---

**Posted by: calvin Sep 14 2006, 12:49 PM**

Yes, it was an excellent Biblical based analysis. But please folks, you don't have to quote the whole post. We already read it.

---

**Posted by: simplysaved Sep 14 2006, 01:18 PM**

Dr. Bacchocci's reflect and approach is not only biblical but as equally importantly IMO addresses what is known for certain is factual and beyond speculation and hearsay, leaving both to their dignity as Christians.

It does, however raise some thoughts in another area.... Is he suggesting that even a person who is a widow/widower or a person who it is clearly known has grounds for divorce due to adultery should not be placed in leadership of the church if they re-marry?

---

**Posted by: awesumtenor Sep 14 2006, 01:33 PM**

---

**QUOTE(simplysaved @ Sep 14 2006, 03:18 PM)**

Dr. Bacchocci's reflect and approach is not only biblical but as equally importantly IMO addresses what is known for certain is factual and beyond speculation and hearsay, leaving both to their dignity as Christians.

It does, however raise some thoughts in another area.... Is he suggesting that even a person who is a widow/widower or a person who it is clearly known has grounds for divorce due to adultery should not be placed in leadership of the church if they re-marry?

Absent the man's stating otherwise, you should read it for what he stated it is... an assessment of that specific situation; any extrapolated tangents toward wide spread gneral application would be



off

for this thread in this forum.

You can always fish in another pond, however...

In His service,

Mr. J

---

**Posted by: simplysaved Sep 14 2006, 01:35 PM**

**QUOTE(simplysaved @ Sep 14 2006, 01:18 PM)**

Dr. Bacchocci's reflect and approach is not only biblical but as equally importantly IMO addresses what is known for certain is factual and beyond speculation and hearsay, leaving both to their dignity as Christians.

It does, however raise some thoughts in another area.... Is he suggesting that even a person who is a widow/widower or a person who it is clearly known has grounds for divorce due to adultery should not be placed in leadership of the church if they re-marry?

---

**Posted by: awesumtenor Sep 14 2006, 01:40 PM**

**QUOTE**

**QUOTE(simplysaved @ Sep 14 2006, 01:18 PM)**

Dr. Bacchocci's reflect and approach is not only biblical but as equally importantly IMO addresses what is known for certain is factual and beyond speculation and hearsay, leaving both to their dignity as Christians.

It does, however raise some thoughts in another area.... Is he suggesting that even a person who is a widow/widower or a person who it is clearly known has grounds for divorce due to adultery should not be placed in leadership of the church if they re-marry?

**QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Sep 14 2006, 02:33 PM)**

Absent the man's stating otherwise, you should read it for what he stated it is... an assessment of that specific situation; any extrapolated tangents toward wide spread gneral application would be



for this thread in this forum.

You can always fish in another pond, however...

In His service,  
Mr. J

Same answer still applies, sarah.

---

**Posted by: simplysaved Sep 14 2006, 01:43 PM**

And if you were the administration of BSDA or God it might be worth consideration...but since you are neither, and no rules have been violated, as a Moderator, all members are welcome to reply as it very much a part of this thread discussion.

Your thoughts have been noted.

---

**QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Sep 14 2006, 02:40 PM)**

Same answer still applies, sarah.

---

**Posted by: Expression Sep 14 2006, 01:54 PM**

I do not see everything the way Dr. Bacchiocchi does, but I really appreciate his thoughts. Making a statement and taking a stand has never been easy or popular--and yet it has always been needed. Church leaders have been all too quiet about the 3ABN situation and I hope others will come forward in the near future.

Thank you Dr. Bacchiocchi for sharing this with us.

---

**Posted by: Clay Sep 14 2006, 02:08 PM**

perhaps this thread that is dealing with divorce and remarriage be moved to the married forum....

---

**Posted by: simplysaved Sep 14 2006, 02:12 PM**

That is a very good idea....thanks for the suggestion. Can you please move it?

---

**QUOTE(Clay @ Sep 14 2006, 03:08 PM)**

perhaps this thread that is dealing with divorce and remarriage be moved to the married forum....

---

**Posted by: Clay Sep 14 2006, 02:16 PM**

---

**QUOTE(simplysaved @ Sep 14 2006, 03:12 PM)**

That is a very good idea....thanks for the suggestion. Can you please move it?

---

done.....

---

**Posted by: princessdi Sep 14 2006, 03:00 PM**

Scary as this is.....I have to agree with Sarah here. I know that everyone involved is more than ready for ALL of the issues to be resolved, but the good Dr. has really given what is needed, just enough to get Danny removed at 3ABN, or at least enough of a warning to get GC to distance themselves. They cannot in good conscious maintain a relationship with Danny when he is not living according to biblical principles, especially as a leader, one giving an Adventist face to the world. What the Dr. addressed is enough to get any other leader removed from office, it should be enough to warrant discipline for Danny. Also, it is the avenue that even the hardliners cannot ignore. It is the area which will more garner wide spread support.

The rest can also be dealt with in due time. It is not that there is not enough evidence, but it is definitely not as solid as the divorce/remarriage situation. Primarily because there is a solid biblical basis for it. We have hear several some here and say they lost interest when other matters came up with sketchy details. and It seemed like gossip at that point. Now, while it ia initially clear that these people did not take time to read carefully to get all the information on the other issues, it is also clear that they cannot over look the divorce/remarriage situation. IOW, it is a start. Begin with that, and the rest will come.

---

**QUOTE(simplicysaved @ Sep 14 2006, 12:18 PM)**

Dr. Bacchocci's reflect and approach is not only biblical but as equally importantly IMO addresses what is known for certain is factual and beyond speculation and hearsay, leaving both to their dignity as Christians.

---

**Posted by: västergötland Sep 14 2006, 04:04 PM**

I wonder if the people that watch 3abn are the same people who would write hate mail to Dr B for his articles on EllenW? In other words, one of the groups of SDA that would have benefited from reading this may have already stoped reading the endtime issue newsletters.

---

**Posted by: Panama\_Pete Sep 15 2006, 06:06 AM**

---


**QUOTE(watchbird @ Sep 14 2006, 01:12 PM)**

Before we get too overawed by the Doc having his qualified "say" in the matter, it would be well to note that in the beginning .... within a very short time after Linda was ousted from 3abn, the doc listened to Johann and others, and essentially promised to write in her defense in one of his next newsletters. But not long after that he backed away, choosing to not "get involved".

Watchbird. He did get involved in 2004.

I personally think 3ABN made Bacchiocchi offers in 2004 to "neutralized" him.

So many Adventists have no immunity to the insidious West Frankfort virus. Once that infected mosquito bites you, you're in trouble. We need to be grateful that he is recovering. Without

treatment, West Frankfort virus can remain in your system for years, causing you to compulsively seek out TV cameras. 

[http://www.biblicalpherspectives.com/endtimeissues/et\\_119.htm](http://www.biblicalpherspectives.com/endtimeissues/et_119.htm)

[http://www.biblicalpherspectives.com/endtimeissues/et\\_119.htm](http://www.biblicalpherspectives.com/endtimeissues/et_119.htm)

3ABN has invited Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi to be a guest on a live two-hour program in December on "The Passion of Christ," on their flagship program 3ABN Today. Plans are also in progress to produce future programs with him as well.

I wish to thank 3ABN for inviting me to participate in some of their live programs and for airing some of my popular messages. The aim is to broaden the outreach of 3ABN by attracting viewers who look for a more substantive presentation of biblical truths. I will be sure to inform you about the time of the airing of my messages.

[http://www.biblicalpherspectives.com/endtimeissues/et\\_122.pdf](http://www.biblicalpherspectives.com/endtimeissues/et_122.pdf)

[http://www.biblicalpherspectives.com/endtimeissues/et\\_122.pdf](http://www.biblicalpherspectives.com/endtimeissues/et_122.pdf)

APPEARANCE ON 3ABN ON DECEMBER 9, 2004

3ABN has extended me an official invitation to present the highlights of my forthcoming book THE PASSION OF CHRIST IN SCRIPTURE AND HISTORY on Thursday evening, December 9, 2004 during the two hours popular live program.

The program will be aired twice. The first time on Thursday evening December 9, at 8:00 p. m. Central Standard time and the second time on Friday, December 10, at 1:00 a. m Central Standard Time. In the next newsletters I should have the time for the overseas airing.

**Posted by: justme Sep 15 2006, 11:47 AM**

Dr. Bacchiocchi has given us his analysis as they do it at the seminary, in light of all the references they use up there. It is his personal view, just as this forum is a collection of personal views. His is no more or less authoritative because we each answer only to God in this regard.

Let us also remember that when one spouse commits adultery in the bed of another, it is called "adultery" as we all know. Jesus said that we also commit adultery if we so much as "lust" after another other than our spouse. Is that "grounds" as well? Is that a violation of the "Marriage bed"?

What if one spouse takes no interest in the sexual needs of the other spouse? Does that spouse then become the "victim" if the "starved spouse" accepts the love of another?

I also know of a couple who has an agreement. It is this. If either of us "wants it" and the other is not available, take whatever IS available, and we don't discuss it afterwards. Is that adultery if they each/both agree it is OK?

Where does "blame" and "culpability" begin or end?

Who is the "CAUSE" and who was the "EFFECT"?

Is "Self-righteousness" the absence of knowledge of "Cause and Effect".



What about a "PSYCHOPATH",and a "SOCIOPATH".

---

**Posted by: simplysaved Sep 15 2006, 01:51 PM**

I have asked that question in another 3ABN thread...will post when I locate it.

**QUOTE(justme @ Sep 15 2006, 12:47 PM)**

Dr. Bacchiocchi has given us his analysis as they do it at the seminary, in light of all the references they use up there. It is his personal view, just as this forum is a collection of personal views. His is no more or less authoritative because we each answer only to God in this regard.

Les us also remember that when one spouse committs adultery in the bed of another, it is called "adultry" as we all know. Jesus said that we also committ adultery if we so much as "lust " after another other than our spouse. Is that "grounds" as well? Is that a violation of the "Marriage bed"? What if one spouse takes no interest in the sexual needs of the other spouse? Does that spouse then become the "victim" if the 'starved spouse" accepts the love of another?

I also know of a couple who has an agreement. It is this. If either of us "wants it" and the other is not available, take whatever IS available, and we don't discuss it afterwards. Is that adultery if they each/both agree it is OK?

Where does "blame" and "culpability" begin or end?

Who is the "CAUSE" and who was the 'EFFECT'?

Is "Self-righteousness" the absence of knowledge of "Cause and Effect".  
What about a "PSYCHOPATH",and a "SOCIOPATH".

<http://www.blackstda.com/forums/index.php?act=ST&f=48&t=10247>

Found it!

---

**Posted by: Tammy Sep 16 2006, 03:34 AM**

**QUOTE(watchbird @ Sep 14 2006, 12:37 PM)**

Being a long time follower of Bacchiocchi's newsletters, I think he gives the immediate answer to the question of "why" in his early paragraphs .... he had a bunch of requests from readers of his newsletters .... and he had a book on the subject so he could use this as an excuse to promote that .... and he didn't have any other really bright ideas for subject matter (witness the fact that the majority of his several recent newsletters has been the reprinting of articles by other people, plus, of course, his own self-promotional material. (If I sound cynical when it comes to the dear "boc doc" (long history behind that nickname) it is only because I am... long history behind that also, but that would be WAY to far "off topic".)

I think you "hit the nail on the head" as they say, Watchbird....I see the letter as a "marketing" tool for his book...

---

**Posted by: Tammy Sep 16 2006, 04:13 AM**

I agree with Watchbird....this letter was written as a "marketing tool".... I heard Bacchiocchi speak years ago, and it is ALL about "Dr. Bacchiocchi" this and "Dr. Bacchiocchi" that....sorry to be a pessimist...but he is far too "high on himself" for me to put any stock in what he has to say. Did you notice, there was not one Spirit of Prophecy quote in that letter he wrote? I believe it is because he is not in harmony with the Spirit of Prophecy on his understanding of divorce.

---

**Posted by: Tammy Sep 16 2006, 04:39 AM**

Please compare what the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy say, concerning divorce, to what Bacchiocchi says....he is NOT teaching Scripture...He is perverting Scripture! BEWARE!

**The Bible says:**

---

**QUOTE**

And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except [it be] for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. Matthew 19:9

But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery. Matthew 5:32

**The Spirit of Prophecy says:**

---

**QUOTE**

God gave only one cause why a wife should leave her husband, or the husband leave his wife, which was adultery. Let this ground be prayerfully considered. {AH 342.2}

-Your ideas in regard to the marriage relation have been erroneous. Nothing but the violation of the marriage bed can either break or annul the marriage vow. We are living in perilous times, when there is no assurance in anything save in firm, unwavering faith in Jesus Christ. There is no heart that may not be estranged from God through the devices of Satan, if one does not watch unto prayer. {AH 341.3}

**Bacchiocchi says:**

---

**QUOTE**

In my book THE MARRIAGE COVENANT I explain at great length that the exceptive clause of Matt 19:9 which admits divorce on the ground of porneia, can be best explained in the light of the Judeo-Christian readership of Matthew. While Mark and Luke write to Gentiles, Matthew write to Judeo-Christians. Jews were tribally related and it was easy for them to marry a close blood relative. Such marriages were condemned by the Mosaic law (Lev 18:6-18) and were called porneia.

**Thus, Jesus allows for divorce only where a marriage should not have taken place in the**

**first place**, namely, within the degrees of prohibited relationships. Consequently, in Matthew, Jesus does not envisage any exception to the absolute ban on divorce but only allows for the dissolution of a marriage which was validly contracted according to Greco-Roman laws, but which was in conflict with the Mosaic law of prohibited relationships.

---


**Posted by: västergötland Sep 16 2006, 05:09 AM**

Dr B using this partly as an opportunity to promote himself and/or his book? Probably.

Dr B lacking quotes from Ellen in his letter. Yes, So? I didnt miss them...  
There sure was no lack of scripture.

EllenW the only true interpreter of scripture? This might become interesting.

Time to get comfortable for the show..




---

**Posted by: Clay Sep 16 2006, 06:11 AM**

**QUOTE(Tammy @ Sep 16 2006, 04:13 AM)**

I agree with Watchbird....this letter was written as a "marketing tool".... I heard Bacchiocchi speak years ago, and it is ALL about "Dr. Bacchiocchi" this and "Dr. Bacchiocchi" that....sorry to be a pessimest...but he is far too "high on himself" for me to put any stock in what he has to say.....

that has been my observation also..... he is a good salesman..... or should I say he comes across like a good used car salesman.....

---

**Posted by: awesumtenor Sep 16 2006, 07:03 AM**

**QUOTE(Clay @ Sep 16 2006, 07:11 AM)**

that has been my observation also..... he is a good salesman..... or should I say he comes across like a good used car salesman.....

Regardless of Dr. B's perceived flaws... one doesn't rebut his arguments by attacking his person.

In His service,  
Mr. J

---

**Posted by: Clay Sep 16 2006, 07:09 AM**

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Sep 16 2006, 08:03 AM) □

Regardless of Dr. B's perceived flaws... one doesn't rebut his arguments by attacking his person.

In His service,  
Mr. J

not attempting to rebut this particular one..... now that one on wine...

Posted by: Tammy Sep 16 2006, 07:17 AM

The one on "wine"? What did I miss?

Posted by: Clay Sep 16 2006, 11:51 AM

QUOTE(Tammy @ Sep 16 2006, 07:17 AM) □

The one on "wine"? What did I miss?

another thread, another time..... don't need to highjack this thread, but if you search the archives you may be able to find the discussion we had on that subject....

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Sep 17 2006, 11:14 AM


QUOTE(västergötland @ Sep 16 2006, 06:09 AM) □

Dr B using this partly as an opportunity to promote himself and/or his book? Probably.

Dr B lacking quotes from Ellen in his letter. Yes, So? I didnt miss them...  
There sure was no lack of scripture.


EllenW the only true interpreter of scripture? This might become interesting.

Time to get comfortable for the show..



I'm having "meaty bits".....

"Lesser Spiritual" and all....



QUOTE(Clay @ Sep 16 2006, 08:09 AM) □

not attempting to rebut this particular one..... now that one on wine...

Get outta me head Clay - I was thinking the exact same thing!

**Posted by: simplysaved Sep 17 2006, 04:49 PM**

Thank you.

**QUOTE(Clay @ Sep 16 2006, 12:51 PM)**

another thread, another time..... don't need to highjack this thread, but if you search the archives you may be able to find the discussion we had on that subject....

**Posted by: calvin Sep 17 2006, 05:03 PM**

**QUOTE(Tammy @ Sep 16 2006, 05:13 AM)**

I agree with Watchbird....this letter was written as a "marketing tool".... I heard Bacchiocchi speak years ago, and it is ALL about "Dr. Bacchiocchi" this and "Dr. Bacchiocchi" that....sorry to be a pessimist...but he is far too "high on himself" for me to put any stock in what he has to say. Did you notice, there was not one Spirit of Prophecy quote in that letter he wrote? I believe it is because he is not in harmony with the Spirit of Prophecy on his understanding of divorce. .

Well, at least he gave BSDA it's props! We got a some free marketing out of it.  I'm cool with the man.

**Posted by: Brennen Sep 17 2006, 07:55 PM**

Great Dr. Sam. You are on target. You are certainly correct. Danny had no ground for remarriage and Linda is innocent. Danny should resign and do so very soon. The facts do speak for themselves. Great Dr. Sam, great points. I hope Danny Shelton reads this.

Quote by Dr. Samuel Bacc.:

"The fact is that she is still single and does not intend to remarry, makes it very difficult to believe Danny's allegations. By contrast, Danny has remarried a twice divorced woman who is 20 years younger. The facts speak for themselves. In the light of this situation, the only honorable thing for Danny to do is to resign from his present position as Director of 3ABN and let someone with a clean record serve as the leader of a station committed to preach the true Gospel of Jesus Christ. He can still work at 3ABN but in a less conspicuous position."

**Posted by: rwelchcrs Sep 17 2006, 09:07 PM**

Beartrap, I would like to find Bacchiocchi's Bible study on remarriage as it relates to D Shelton on the Endtime Issues Newsletter website, but I can't find it there. Am I looking in the wrong place? I would like to get this from it's source so I can forward it to friends who respect Bacchiocchi. Can

you provide a link directly to the study?

---

**Posted by: sister Sep 17 2006, 09:49 PM**

**QUOTE(Brennen @ Sep 17 2006, 08:55 PM)**

Great Dr. Sam. You are on target. You are certainly correct. Danny had no ground for remarriage and Linda is innocent. Danny should resign and do so very soon. The facts do speak for themselves. Great Dr. Sam, great points. I hope Danny Shelton reads this.

Quote by Dr. Samuel Bacc.:

"The fact is that she is still single and does not intend to remarry, makes it very difficult to believe Danny's allegations. By contrast, Danny has remarried a twice divorced woman who is 20 years younger. **The facts speak for themselves. In the light of this situation, the only honorable thing for Danny to do is to resign from his present position as Director of 3ABN and let someone with a clean record serve as the leader of a station committed to preach the true Gospel of Jesus Christ.** He can still work at 3ABN but in a less conspicuous position."

Brennen, of course Danny is reading this. He is reading BSDA everyday, watching and waiting, constantly checking which way the wind of Adventist opinion is blowing. How do I know this? I know Danny and one thing you can count on, he is predictable... He has certain established patterns of behavior from which he does not deviate. Once you realize how he plays the game, it is possible to stay a step ahead of him. Taking this into consideration, it would be completely out of character for Danny to do the honorable act of resigning his position at 3ABN. To quote a public statement he made previously, "3ABN is my baby and no one is going to take it away from me!" Is that the attitude of a man who would be willing to let someone with a clean record take his place at the helm of 3ABN? In defining "clean", I would not be suggesting any of the individuals currently in leadership positions at 3ABN. It is time to clean house...

There is one area of which I am in disagreement with Dr. Sam, in the above quote, that is in regard to Danny remaining at 3ABN in a less conspicuous position. First of all, I do not believe that would be possible, a demotion of that magnitude would be beyond what pride would allow. And secondly, Danny's influence would still control the ministry. But that is just my opinion...

---

**Posted by: JustTana Sep 18 2006, 08:44 AM**

**QUOTE(Clay @ Sep 16 2006, 07:11 AM)**

that has been my observation also..... he is a good salesman..... or should I say he comes across like a good used car salesman.....

That has always been my perception of the good Dr. Bacchocchi. I have long since stopped paying

attention to his self-promotional ramblings. Yes, he is right about Danny not having a right to remarry, and I'll give him that, but there is where I draw the line. His treatise on dress/makeup/jewelry is not to be believed and I refuse to be cowed into obeying what I see as Biblical twisting by the SDA establishment. Should we use the modesty in all things instruction, by all means, but to treat all of these items as sinful - NOT!!

OKAY, I'M CLIMBING DOWN OFF MY SOAPBOX NOW! (GOTTA GET THOSE EMOTICONS WORKING!

JT

**Posted by: Clay Sep 18 2006, 11:24 AM**

**QUOTE(JustTana @ Sep 18 2006, 08:44 AM) □**

That has always been my perception of the good Dr. Bacchocchi. I have long since stopped paying attention to his self-promotional ramblings. Yes, he is right about Danny not having a right to remarry, and I'll give him that, but there is where I draw the line. His treatise on dress/makeup/jewelry is not to be believed and I refuse to be cowed into obeying what I see as Biblical twisting by the SDA establishment. Should we use the modesty in all things instruction, by all means, but to treat all of these items as sinful - NOT!!

OKAY, I'M CLIMBING DOWN OFF MY SOAPBOX NOW! (GOTTA GET THOSE EMOTICONS WORKING!

JT

agreed.....

**Posted by: SoulEspresso Sep 19 2006, 09:58 AM**

Anyone who runs an independent ministry has to decide how, and how much, to "self-promote."

If you're on Dr. B's Endtime Issues mailing list, you know that every e-mail comes with a lot of advertising for his books and appearances.

Is this wrong?  I don't know. The advertising's not something I particularly like , but I stay on the mailing list because I like the content of the essays even if I disagree with him  at least 1/2 the time.


As noted by someone else above, a lot of people showed up here in the first place because he included a link to [blacksda](#) in his newsletter. I was one of those, and I owe him one for sending me over to y'all.

As for his thoughts ... I might not agree with his reasoning, but he came to the same conclusion many of us did, just in a different way--and his way may be more credible to The Establishment

tableta if they look for ways to distance themselves from him.

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Oct 14 2006, 02:09 PM**

SilentConqueror



Glad you came to join us here on this forum.

PeacefullyBewildered

---

**Posted by: husbandoftheyear Oct 17 2006, 08:50 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Panama\_Pete @ Sep 15 2006, 07:06 AM)**

Watchbird. He did get involved in 2004.

I personally think 3ABN made Bacchiocchi offers in 2004 to "neutralized" him.

---

There were discussions about having Dr. Bacchiocchi do a series on the 28 Fundamental Beliefs - but now I believe that program is going to James Rafferty and Ty Gibson...possibly...

---

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