Printable Version of Topic

180

Click here to view this topic in its original format

BlackSDA _ 3ABN _ Linda's employment post 3ABN

Posted by: BrotherBill Aug 12 2006, 02:57 PM

> **QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Aug 12 2006, 03:07 AM)**
>
> Also, your last point involved efforts to keep Linda from seeking employment (you did say seeking, but to clarify - do you mean seeking or gaining). Isn't she continuing with her musical ministry? Of course 3ABN claims they haven't stood in her way of pursuing her ministry or gaining employment. To date, what employment has she lost as a direct result of 3ABN stepping in the way and keeping her from seeking employment.
>
> - fallible

She has been kept from speaking in a great number of Churches. In my own, our Pastor was told by the Conference that she could not speak. I don't know the specifics in the others as to why she was told she could not speak. The same is true for camp meetings.

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Aug 12 2006, 03:18 PM

> **QUOTE(BrotherBill @ Aug 12 2006, 04:51 PM)**
>
> Linda was not permitted legal counsel if she wanted any kind of severence package. It was handled differently. The gag order is not over. As to Linda's willingness to sign documents, she did. Were there extenuating circumstances? Yes. Remember, she was also being divorced at the time.

...and if she wanted **any money to live on** she had to sign.

Posted by: Fstpicker Aug 12 2006, 03:20 PM

> **QUOTE(BrotherBill @ Aug 12 2006, 03:57 PM)**
>
> She has been kept from speaking in a great number of Churches. In my own, our Pastor was told by the Conference that she could not speak. I don't know the specifics in the others as to why she was told she could not speak. The same is true for camp meetings.

I don't fully understand why she is not allowed to speak. What are some possible reasons that would explain this? As an outsider who has no access to any "inside" information into their thinking in this, other than on this forum, here are some possible reasons that I can think of right now:

1) They are afraid of what she might say when she has an audience that could be negative about them or at least not exactly positive.

2) They don't want her to build an "audience" of supporters and/or her sphere of influence by any means, and therefore don't want to give her a platform in which she could do it.

3) They feel that she should not be allowed to speak because she is a sinner (an adulterous) and at fault here, and they (sinners) should have no voice or power in the church.

4) They feel that as a part of, or a side effect of her gag order, that she shouldn't be allowed to speak up front...that this was included (of which it was not if I understand the "gag" order correctly).

Can't think of any other reason right now. What do you guys think could be some possible reasons?

And thanks for the welcome! I've been reading posts and posts and posts for almost 2 weeks now, trying to absorb all of it and make sense of it all. Some things have become clearer to me, but others are still in the process.

Fstpicker

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Aug 12 2006, 03:29 PM

> **QUOTE(Fstpicker @ Aug 12 2006, 05:20 PM)**
>
> I don't fully understand why she is not allowed to speak. What are some possible reasons that would explain this? As an outsider who has no access to any "inside" information into their thinking in this, other than on this forum, here are some possible reasons that I can think of right now:
>
> 1) They are afraid of what she might say when she has an audience that could be negative about them or at least not exactly positive.
>
> 2) They don't want her to build an "audience" of supporters and/or her sphere of influence by any means, and therefore don't want to give her a platform in which she could do it.
>
> 3) They feel that she should not be allowed to speak because she is a sinner (an adulterous) and at fault here, and they (sinners) should have no voice or power in the church.
>
> 4) They feel that as a part of, or a side effect of her gag order, that she shouldn't be allowed to speak up front...that this was included (of which it was not if I understand the "gag" order correctly).
>
> Can't think of any other reason right now. What do you guys think could be some possible reasons?
>
> **And thanks for the welcome!** I've been reading posts and posts and posts for almost 2 weeks now, trying to absorb all of it and make sense of it all. Some things have become clearer to me, but others are still in the process.
>
> Jeff

Excellent points - and again...that's all we want here - we want people to **honestly read everything** before formulating an opinion either here or there...then be able to discuss both sides.

You keep on a readin'...and any questions you ask will be answered - as long as you don't have a problem with others asking you questions too ...... We like to use a quote here...."This ain't Sabbath

School - we listen here!" - and it is true. **We** (the collective of BSDA) do listen and enjoy dialogue, asking questions, and answering questions.

welc

Posted by: Panama_Pete Aug 12 2006, 03:31 PM

> **QUOTE(BrotherBill @ Aug 12 2006, 03:57 PM)**
>
> She has been kept from speaking in a great number of Churches. In my own, our Pastor was told by the Conference that she could not speak. I don't know the specifics in the others as to why she was told she could not speak. The same is true for camp meetings.

One can imagine what the Seventh-day Adventist conferences must have been told about Linda Shelton for them to respond that way.

To me, that sort of sounds like that "P" word that's been floating around here.

What was it? **Persecution?**

Posted by: lurker Aug 12 2006, 05:57 PM

> **QUOTE(Fstpicker @ Aug 12 2006, 04:20 PM)**
>
> I don't fully understand why she is not allowed to speak. What are some possible reasons that would explain this? As an outsider who has no access to any "inside" information into their thinking in this, other than on this forum, here are some possible reasons that I can think of right now:
>
> 1) They are afraid of what she might say when she has an audience that could be negative about them or at least not exactly positive.
>
> 2) They don't want her to build an "audience" of supporters and/or her sphere of influence by any means, and therefore don't want to give her a platform in which she could do it.
>
> 3) They feel that she should not be allowed to speak because she is a sinner (an adulterous) and at fault here, and they (sinners) should have no voice or power in the church.
>
> 4) They feel that as a part of, or a side effect of her gag order, that she shouldn't be allowed to speak up front...that this was included (of which it was not if I understand the "gag" order correctly).
>
> Can't think of any other reason right now. What do you guys think could be some possible reasons?
>
> **And thanks for the welcome!** I've been reading posts and posts and posts for almost 2 weeks now, trying to absorb all of it and make sense of it all. Some things have become clearer to me,

> but others are still in the process.
>
> Jeff

;ure I can think of a reason. If Linda is in a visible place of service in the church, it will become ıpparent that she is not "shacking up somewhere with the doctor" but is living a chaste christian life.

Posted by: calvin Aug 12 2006, 06:30 PM

> **QUOTE(Fstpicker @ Aug 12 2006, 04:20 PM)**
>
> I don't fully understand why she is not allowed to speak. What are some possible reasons that would explain this? As an outsider who has no access to any "inside" information into their thinking in this, other than on this forum, here are some possible reasons that I can think of right now:
>
> 1) They are afraid of what she might say when she has an audience that could be negative about them or at least not exactly positive.
>
> 2) They don't want her to build an "audience" of supporters and/or her sphere of influence by any means, and therefore don't want to give her a platform in which she could do it.
>
> 3) They feel that she should not be allowed to speak because she is a sinner (an adulterous) and at fault here, and they (sinners) should have no voice or power in the church.
>
> 4) They feel that as a part of, or a side effect of her gag order, that she shouldn't be allowed to speak up front...that this was included (of which it was not if I understand the "gag" order correctly).
>
> Can't think of any other reason right now. What do you guys think could be some possible reasons?
>
> **And thanks for the welcome!** I've been reading posts and posts and posts for almost 2 weeks now, trying to absorb all of it and make sense of it all. Some things have become clearer to me, but others are still in the process.
>
> Jeff

\nother reason is that this is a **routine** business practice corporations require as a condition for a ;everance package with executives that are dismissed for cause or without cause. Corporations don't vant the distraction of dealing with a possible disgruntled ex-employee that could have damaging or ɜmbarrassing truthful information but also out of vengeance can spread untruths. 3ABN is just using vhat leverage it has to protect its name and business interest, nothing unethical in that, I would ɜxpect any business to do the same.

.inda did not have to take the money. If she felt if was more important to talk, then she could have ione what the rest of have to do when we loose a job. Go and get another one. Don't mean to make ight of the situation. It is unfortunate for anyone to loose there job especially a business that you ıelped create. But that is business and those are always the risk. Can't feel too too sorry for ;omebody that walks away with two years of salary as severance payment.

don't buy the story that Linda was prohibited to have an independent legal counsel. This is a free :ountry, you can talk to anybody.

\s I have said before about 1,000 post ago; Linda severance/gag order and the jet plane make for veak petty arguments against 3abn.

Posted by: Uncle Sam Aug 12 2006, 07:03 PM

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 12 2006, 05:30 PM)**
>
> Another reason is that this is a **routine** business practice corporations require as a condition for a severance package with executives that are dismissed for cause or without cause. Corporations don't want the distraction of dealing with a possible disgruntled ex-employee that could have damaging or embarrassing truthful information but also out of vengeance can spread untruths. 3ABN is just using what leverage it has to protect its name and business interest, nothing unethical in that, I would expect any business to do the same.
>
> Linda did not have to take the money. If she felt if was more important to talk, then she could have done what the rest of have to do when we loose a job. Go and get another one. Don't mean to make light of the situation. It is unfortunate for anyone to loose there job especially a business that you helped create. But that is business and those are always the risk. Can't feel too too sorry for somebody that walks away with two years of salary as severance payment.
>
> I don't buy the story that Linda was prohibited to have an independent legal counsel. This is a free country, you can talk to anybody.
>
> As I have said before about 1,000 post ago; Linda severance/gag order and the jet plane make for weak petty arguments against 3abn.

I don't understand why everybody is so against 3ABN and Danny's lifestyle and pro Linda. Did she not have the same perks that Danny has/had? Did she not have the jet, house, etc? I have issues with how things were handled with Linda and the divorce. Now that Danny is taking a some time off to "soul search" does that make a difference to anyone? What if anything can he do to make things right?

Posted by: sister Aug 12 2006, 07:22 PM

> **QUOTE(lurker @ Aug 12 2006, 06:57 PM)**
>
> # Sure I can think of a reason. If Linda is in a visible place of service in the church, it will become apparent that

she is not "shacking up somewhere with the doctor" but is living a chaste christian life.

Good point Lurker! As recently as the last few months rumors have been circulated that Linda is wearing a large diamond ring given to her by "the Doctor". Of course this is easy to verify and has no shred of truth in it. Interesting, when the rumor mill is traced to it's original source, it is none other than Danny Shelton. As long as there is a gag order silencing Linda and she is kept from public ministry, the desired effect is for people to believe that every accusation Danny has made against Linda is true and that is why she is banned from speaking appointments within the SDA chruch. That of course is false reasoning, based upon the fact that both the accusations and the mandate to remove Linda from ministry in the SDA church comes from the same source: Danny Shelton.

A little background for this situation: When Linda moved to Springfield Illinois the man filling in as interim pastor was Lee Grady, a retired SDA pastor in good standing. Lee Grady had also worked at 3ABN in the pastoral department and was a member of the Thompsonville church. The reason Pastor Grady originally came to 3ABN was to support the ministry where his son, Scott, worked as a director. (Since leaving 3ABN Scott and his family are working in ministry with David Gates in South America, having grown up as the child of missionary parents, Scott is fluent in Spanish.) Pastor Grady took a stance against Danny Shelton on a certain issue and for refusing to acquiesce to Danny, that was the end of his service in the Pastoral Department. Sooner or later every SDA pastor with a conscience grounded in the Word of God has a similar experience with Danny.

When Linda arrived in Springfield Pastor Grady, a man of experience with both 3ABN and the SDA church, had no difficulty with Linda's involvement in the ministry of the church. Of course one can only imagine the result this had on Danny. This resulted in the associate pastor, John Stanton, from the Thompsonville church (Danny's 3ABN church) and also an on air personality, quickly being dispatched to replace Pastor Grady in Springfield. One of Stanton's first duties was to remove Linda Shelton from functioning in any position in the Springfield SDA church other than pew warming. He claimed the authority to do so came directly from Ken Denslow, the Illinois Conference President.

This is where the story become interesting: what possible reason would Ken Denslow have for this action? Linda was neither under church discipline or disfellowshiped from the church where her membership was held. She had caused no problems in the Springfield church and was accepted by the local congregation and the pastor where she now resided. Well, lets look a little closer at Ken Denslow's relationship with 3ABN: he is a member of their board, his parents are full-time volunteers who spend their time traveling around the country promoting 3ABN (recently Danny has given them a beautiful brand new RV for their travels. This does not exactly make him an independent observer in this situation.

I am sure, if contacted, Pastor Grady would be willing to confirm the situation in Springfield. And could give addtional first person tsetimony in regard to 3ABN.

Lurker you've hit the nail on the head. Considering this background, your explanation is by far the most plausible.

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 12 2006, 07:33 PM

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 12 2006, 05:30 PM)**
>
> Another reason is that this is a **routine** business practice corporations require as a condition for a severance package with executives that are dismissed for cause or without cause. Corporations don't want the distraction of dealing with a possible disgruntled ex-employee that could have damaging or embarrassing truthful information but also out of vengeance can spread untruths. 3ABN is just using what leverage it has to protect its name and business interest, nothing unethical in that, I would expect any business to do the same.
>
> Linda did not have to take the money. If she felt if was more important to talk, then she could have done what the rest of have to do when we loose a job. Go and get another one. Don't mean to make light of the situation. It is unfortunate for anyone to loose there job especially a business that you helped create. But that is business and those are always the risk. Can't feel too too sorry for somebody that walks away with two years of salary as severance payment.
>
> I don't b'uy the story that Linda was prohibited to have an independent legal counsel. This is a free country, you can talk to anybody.
>
> As I have said before about 1,000 post ago; Linda severance/gag order and the jet plane make for weak petty arguments against 3abn.

I long for the day Calvin, when you can know the why's of why things were done the way they were. I can tell you that you can't think in "normal" terms with regard to this situation. I know that if it were known, it would no longer be seen as "petty arguments".

I know, it's just my words, but, it's just isn't as simple as you state. Now, hind sight?? I'm sure she would go back and redo things - but then again, if you understand emotional abuse, pressure and more pressure and MORE PRESSURE, along with fear, control and more of same, you can see why a person would not think "normal" in an "abnormal" situation. Things happened VERY fast, and in a shocking manner. It's called "railroaded". When it's all happening, you are in shock as well as everything coming at you - shutting you out and closing you in all at once.

And Uncle Sam,
What people are against is the misleading way that things are "alluded" too from the 3abn menagerie. Though I am not God, and thank goodness for that, I have my SERIOUS doubts that Danny is doing soul searching. It's called, lay low, regroup, not show the stress to the whole world that your world is coming in on you and some serious change is about to occur. I'm sure he thinks, and probably got it on good "advice" that if you are out of the immediate picture, people will somehow stop thinking about you and your true deeds coming out. Out of sight, out of mind thinking. As if there are people that actually are minipulated this way (who'd of thought??!!).

> **QUOTE(sister @ Aug 12 2006, 06:22 PM)**
>
> Good point Lurker! As recently as the last few months rumors have been circulated that Linda is wearing a large diamond ring given to her by "the Doctor". Of course this is easy to verify and has no shred of truth in it. Interesting, when the rumor mill is traced to it's original source, it is none other than Danny Shelton. As long as there is a gag order silencing Linda and she is kept from public ministry, the desired effect is for people to believe that every accusation Danny has made against Linda is true and that is why she is banned from speaking appointments within the SDA chruch. That of course is false reasoning, based upon the fact that both the accusations and the

mandate to remove Linda from ministry in the SDA church comes from the same source: Danny Shelton.

A little background for this situation: When Linda moved to Springfield Illinois the man filling in as interim pastor was Lee Grady, a retired SDA pastor in good standing. Lee Grady had also worked at 3ABN in the pastoral department and was a member of the Thompsonville church. The reason Pastor Grady originally came to 3ABN was to support the ministry where his son, Scott, worked as a director. (Since leaving 3ABN Scott and his family are working in ministry with David Gates in South America, having grown up as the child of missionary parents, Scott is fluent in Spanish.) Pastor Grady took a stance against Danny Shelton on a certain issue and for refusing to acquiesce to Danny, that was the end of his service in the Pastoral Department. Sooner or later every SDA pastor with a conscience grounded in the Word of God has a similar experience with Danny.

When Linda arrived in Springfield Pastor Grady, a man of experience with both 3ABN and the SDA church, had no difficulty with Linda's involvement in the ministry of the church. Of course one can only imagine the result this had on Danny. This resulted in the associate pastor, John Stanton, from the Thompsonville church (Danny's 3ABN church) and also an on air personality, quickly being dispatched to replace Pastor Grady in Springfield. One of Stanton's first duties was to remove Linda Shelton from functioning in any position in the Springfield SDA church other than pew warming. He claimed the authority to do so came directly from Ken Denslow, the Illinois Conference President.

This is where the story become interesting: what possible reason would Ken Denslow have for this action? Linda was neither under church discipline or disfellowshiped from the church where her membership was held. She had caused no problems in the Springfield church and was accepted by the local congregation and the pastor where she now resided. Well, lets look a little closer at Ken Denslow's relationship with 3ABN: he is a member of their board, his parents are full-time volunteers who spend their time traveling around the country promoting 3ABN (recently Danny has given them a beautiful brand new RV for their travels. This does not exactly make him an independent observer in this situation.

I am sure, if contacted, Pastor Grady would be willing to confirm the situation in Springfield. And could give addtional first person tsetimony in regard to 3ABN.

Lurker you've hit the nail on the head. Considering this background, your explanation is by far the most plausible.

Now, where is fallible human being when you need him-slash-her??

Posted by: BrotherBill Aug 12 2006, 07:55 PM

QUOTE(Fstpicker @ Aug 12 2006, 05:20 PM)

I don't fully understand why she is not allowed to speak. What are some possible reasons that would explain this? As an outsider who has no access to any "inside" information into their thinking in this, other than on this forum, here are some possible reasons that I can think of right now:

1) They are afraid of what she might say when she has an audience that could be negative about them or at least not exactly positive.

2) They don't want her to build an "audience" of supporters and/or her sphere of influence by any means, and therefore don't want to give her a platform in which she could do it.

> 3) They feel that she should not be allowed to speak because she is a sinner (an adulterous) and at fault here, and they (sinners) should have no voice or power in the church.
>
> 4) *They feel that as a part of, or a side effect of her gag order, that she shouldn't be allowed to* speak up front...that this was included (of which it was not if I understand the "gag" order correctly).
>
> Can't think of any other reason right now. What do you guys think could be some possible reasons?
>
> **And thanks for the welcome!** I've been reading posts and posts and posts for almost 2 weeks now, trying to absorb all of it and make sense of it all. Some things have become clearer to me, but others are still in the process.
>
> Jeff

3 ABN has been, and continues to minimize Linda because Danny has clearly defined the sides. You are either with him, or against him. The moment he decided he was done with Linda, she was the enemy and did not deserve to have a job. If Linda were able to speak, the truth might would come out while she still had the following she did. Now, the truth is coming out, but her supporters have been bombarded for 2 + years with one side of the story.

Her gag order did not prohibit Linda from speaking at any meeting, convention, or other function. She just was not allowed to speak negatively about 3ABN. However, she has been prohibited from speaking just the same, presumably because of the assumption of what she would say.

> **QUOTE(Panama_Pete @ Aug 12 2006, 05:31 PM)**
>
> One can imagine what the Seventh-day Adventist conferences must have been told about Linda Shelton for them to respond that way.
>
> To me, that sort of sounds like that "P" word that's been floating around here.
>
> What was it? **Persecution?**

Frankly, *I have not seen the documentation from the* Conferences, but all *of the* Pastors in my conference got one that suggested she was too controversial to have speak at the Churches. Of course, probably more consequential is the number of average SDA's who get 3ABN, watch it all the time, and assume she is guilty of adultery. They just don't know any better, and they will not let her come to the Church either.

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 12 2006, 07:58 PM

> **QUOTE(BrotherBill @ Aug 12 2006, 06:50 PM)**
>
> 3 ABN has been, and continues to minimize Linda because Danny has clearly defined the sides. You are either with him, or against him. The moment he decided he was done with Linda, she was the enemy and did not deserve to have a job. If Linda were able to speak, the truth might would come out while she still had the following she did. Now, the truth is coming out, but her supporters have been bombarded for 2 + years with one side of the story.
>
> Her gag order did not prohibit Linda from speaking at any meeting, convention, or other function. She just was not allowed to speak negatively about 3ABN. However, she has been prohibited from speaking just the same, presumably because of the assumption of what she would say.

Not just because she might say something, but because she would be active. It's easier to keep a person under your thumb and out of sight and then carry on looking like the "good guy" in the situation. This has evolved as desperation grew - this is why the letters and attempts have gotten worse and worse against her. If you make a person feel helpless, and then they realize they are not helpless, because they are trusting God to make sense of it all and vindicate you, you continue to do what you love, or try to, in spite of the threats. This is where Dan has come ahead of her and made the calls to threaten people not to take her. There are many stories.

Also, Dan talks out of both sides of his mouth. He will tell one person "i love linda and want her back" and then tell another one the same day "she's this and this and such and such and I never want her in my life again". Tell me, what kind of SANE person would behave this way? A NON-sane one, that's who.

Posted by: Clay Aug 12 2006, 08:05 PM

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 12 2006, 06:30 PM)**
>
> Another reason is that this is a **routine** business practice corporations require as a condition for a severance package with executives that are dismissed for cause or without cause. Corporations don't want the distraction of dealing with a possible disgruntled ex-employee that could have damaging or embarrassing truthful information but also out of vengeance can spread untruths. 3ABN is just using what leverage it has to protect its name and business interest, nothing unethical in that, I would expect any business to do the same.
>
> *Linda did not have to take the money. If she felt if was more important to talk, then she could have* done what the rest of have to do when we loose a job. Go and get another one. Don't mean to make light of the situation. It is unfortunate for anyone to loose there job especially a business that you helped create. But that is business and those are always the risk. Can't feel too too sorry for somebody that walks away with two years of salary as severance payment.
>
> I don't buy the story that Linda was prohibited to have an independent legal counsel. This is a free country, you can talk to anybody.
>
> As I have said before about 1,000 post ago; Linda severance/gag order and the jet plane make for weak petty arguments against 3abn.

and thats just it Calvin... it should NOT have been business as usual... how are you going to use shaky grounds to get a questionable divorce and then cut off all means, for the woman you said you loved and had been married to for over 20 yrs, for her to make a living... did she have access to the money or the bank accounts or was she given an allowance? Did he control the money and if so then what recourse did she have save sign an agreement that would give her some money until she could get on her feet....

3ABN is not the issue to me, he did not treat her as a christian should..... that is my issue....

Posted by: Panama_Pete Aug 12 2006, 08:08 PM

> **QUOTE(BrotherBill @ Aug 12 2006, 07:55 PM)**
>
> Frankly, I have not seen the documentation from the Conferences, but all of the Pastors in my conference got one that suggested she was too controversial to have speak at the Churches. Of course, probably more consequential is the number of average SDA's who get 3ABN, watch it all the time, and assume she is guilty of adultery.

It would be good to see a copy of that memo or document. Maybe some pastor in the Conference could supply a copy.

Posted by: BrotherBill Aug 12 2006, 08:19 PM

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 12 2006, 08:30 PM)**
>
> Another reason is that this is a **routine** business practice corporations require as a condition for a severance package with executives that are dismissed for cause or without cause. Corporations don't want the distraction of dealing with a possible disgruntled ex-employee that could have damaging or embarrassing truthful information but also out of vengeance can spread untruths. 3ABN is just using what leverage it has to protect its name and business interest, nothing unethical *in that, I would expect any business to do the same.*
>
> I agree completely. In my work we issue non-disclosures and non-competes. That is standard business practice. However, if I were to seek to prohibit that person from gaining employment, that is a competely different story. That is the problem I have.
>
> Linda did not have to take the money. If she felt if was more important to talk, then she could have done what the rest of have to do when we loose a job. Go and get another one. Don't mean to make light of the situation. It is unfortunate for anyone to loose there job especially a business that you helped create. But that is business and those are always the risk. Can't feel too too sorry for somebody that walks away with two years of salary as severance payment.
>
> Linda had VERY LIMITED CHOICES. This was a complicated time. She was accused of adultery, betrayed by some of her closest friends, dismissed by her husband, and dismissed by a ministry which she helped to create. She had very limited time to make major decisions, some of which were tied to other major decisions she had to make. It was not just the separation from 3ABN, it was also the separation from her husband. It is easy to second guess her now. I did then, and I sometimes still do now. But none of us will know what she really went through during this embarrassing, hurried, frustrating time.
>
> I don't buy the story that Linda was prohibited to have an independent legal counsel. This is a free country, you can talk to anybody.
>
> As in the case of my business and yours, any "deal" you strike is negotiable. If 3ABN made their deal contingent upon not seeking legal counsel, or at least not having a lawyer negotiate the deal, then in order to accept the deal, she could not have legal cousel. That, in fact, is what happened. Now people can judge whether that was a good deal or a bad one, but it IS what happened during this troubling time.
>
> As I have said before about 1,000 post ago; Linda severance/gag order and the jet plane make for weak petty arguments against 3abn.

> **QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Aug 12 2006, 09:33 PM)**
>
> I long for the day Calvin, when you can know the why's of why things were done the way they were. I can tell you that you can't think in "normal" terms with regard to this situation. I know that if it were known, it would no longer be seen as "petty arguments".
>
> *I know, it's just my words, but, it's just isn't as simple as you state. Now, hind sight?? I'm sure she* would go back and redo things - but then again, if you understand emotional abuse, pressure and more pressure and MORE PRESSURE, along with fear, control and more of same, you can see why a person would not think "normal" in an "abnormal" situation. Things happened VERY fast, and in a shocking manner. It's called "railroaded". When it's all happening, you are in shock as well as everything coming at you - shutting you out and closing you in all at once.

You hit it on the head. b PRESSURE, MORE PRESSURE, MORE PRESSURE. Like none of us will know. That is the best word to describe that time

---

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 12 2006, 08:23 PM

> **QUOTE(BrotherBill @ Aug 12 2006, 07:19 PM)**
>
> You hit it on the head. b PRESSURE, MORE PRESSURE, MORE PRESSURE. Like none of us will know. That is the best word to describe that time

add to this the words "you sign it today, because tomorrow it won't be here". Just a bit more pressure...

Posted by: BrotherBill Aug 12 2006, 08:51 PM

> **QUOTE(Clay @ Aug 12 2006, 10:05 PM)**
>
> 3ABN is not the issue to me, he did not treat her as a christian should..... that is my issue....

What 3 ABN did to her is a problem for me. But I agree with you completely; how Danny treated his

WIFE was a HUGE problem for me.

> **QUOTE(Clay @ Aug 12 2006, 10:05 PM)**
>
> and thats just it Calvin... is should NOT have been business as usual... how are you going to use shaky grounds to get a questionable divorce and then cut off all means, for the woman you said you loved and had been married to for over 20 yrs, for her to make a living... did she have access to the money or the bank accounts or was she given an allowance? Did he control the money and if so then what recourse did she have save sign an agreement that would give her some money until she could get on her feet....
>
> 3ABN is not the issue to me, he did not treat her as a christian should..... that is my issue....

I will try to get a copy.

> **QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Aug 12 2006, 10:23 PM)**
>
> add to this the words "you sign it today, because tomorrow it won't be here". Just a bit more pressure...

You must have been there, because that is just what happened. Again, not to be redundant, but most of us just can't know the pressure she was under.

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Aug 12 2006, 09:09 PM

> **QUOTE(lurker @ Aug 12 2006, 07:57 PM)**
>
> Sure I can think of a reason. If Linda is in a visible place of service in the church, it will become apparent that she is not "shacking up somewhere with the doctor" but is living a chaste christian life.

Boomp/Mercilations/My LERD! (To the novices this means - *ahem* "Goodness gracious you are so correct!"

> **QUOTE(Clay @ Aug 12 2006, 10:05 PM)**
>
> ....3ABN is not the issue to me, he did not treat her as a christian should..... that is my issue....

Once again - this is the epitome of the problem.

Pernt blank!

Posted by: calvin Aug 12 2006, 09:17 PM

> **QUOTE(Clay @ Aug 12 2006, 09:05 PM)**
>
> and thats just it Calvin... is should NOT have been business as usual... how are you going to use shaky grounds to get a questionable divorce and then cut off all means, for the woman you said you loved and had been married to for over 20 yrs, for her to make a living... did she have access to the money or the bank accounts or was she given an allowance? Did he control the money and if so then what recourse did she have save sign an agreement that would give her some money until she could get on her feet....
>
> 3ABN is not the issue to me, he did not treat her as a christian should..... that is my issue....

That is just it, 3abn is a business. 3abn did not owe Linda any severance nor was she entitled to one. All an employer owes you is a honest days pay for a honest days work. Most states in the US operation under the doctrine of "employment at will" meaning just like you can quit a job anytime an employer terminate your employment for most any reason they want to. It's business.

Posted by: watchbird Aug 12 2006, 09:29 PM

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 12 2006, 09:17 PM)**
>
> That is just it, 3abn is a business. 3abn did not owe Linda any severance nor was she entitled to one. All an employer owes you is a honest days pay for a honest days work. Most states in the US operation under the doctrine of "employment at will" meaning just like you can quit a job anytime an employer terminate your employment for most any reason they want to. It's business.

Are you maybe forgetting that supposedly she was joint owner of the business? And that there are laws that make it very difficult for an employer to terminate and employee without just reason? And I suspect that firing because a husband wanted to get rid of his wife would come under some gender discrimination categories that could make things rather sticky if the woman complained to the right agencies.

Posted by: BrotherBill Aug 12 2006, 09:34 PM

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 12 2006, 10:17 PM)**
>
> That is just it, 3abn is a business. 3abn did not owe Linda any severance nor was she entitled to one. All an employer owes you is a honest days pay for a honest days work. Most states in the US operation under the doctrine of "employment at will" meaning just like you can quit a job anytime an employer terminate your employment for most any reason they want to. It's business.

Everything you said above is absolutely correct. Just as I posted to your former message, your business analogy is spot on. However, after the employer terminates someone, the relationship should be over, subject to any binding agreements, which Linda clearly has. However 3ABN has no right to further limit her ability to work in her field by spreading gossip, half-truths, and down right lies. In this case, 3ABN has no right to, once they hear of a speaking engagement Linda has, pick up the phone and arrange for it to be cancelled.

Someone said earlier that Linda could work elsewhere. That is probably true. But if Linda wants to work in Christian Service in this Church, in Broadcast Network Management, it's just not possible for her given the environment created by 3ABN.

Posted by: calvin Aug 12 2006, 09:52 PM

> **QUOTE(BrotherBill @ Aug 12 2006, 09:34 PM)**
>
> Everything you said above is absolutely correct. Just as I posted to your former message, your business analogy is spot on. However, after the employer terminates someone, the relationship should be over, subject to any binding agreements, which Linda clearly has. However 3ABN has no right to further limit her ability to work in her field by spreading gossip, half-truths, and down right lies. In this case, 3ABN has no right to, once they hear of a speaking engagement Linda has, pick up the phone and arrange for it to be cancelled.
>
> Someone said earlier that Linda could work elsewhere. That is probably true. But if Linda wants to work in Christian Service in this Church, in Broadcast Network Management, it's just not possible for her given the environment created by 3ABN.

BrotherBill, if what is said about 3abn using it's influence to prevent Linda from earning a living, I agree, they are wrong.

Posted by: watchbird Aug 12 2006, 10:15 PM

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 12 2006, 09:52 PM)**
>
> BrotherBill, if what is said about 3abn using it's influence to prevent Linda from earning a living, I agree, they are wrong.

And the beat goes on....... b .... and the brick walls are renewed regularly ....

You probably recall the posts in another thread having to do with Linda doing a weekend in Oregon in connection with Polly's Place. Why don't you contact Mabel Dunbar, who is both president of Polly's Place Ministries and Women's Ministries Director for the Upper Columbia Conference, and ask her how *much flack she has gotten for her association with and support of Linda? Be specific. Ask her if she* has received any threats of loss of funding if she continued to support Linda.

You could also ask Max Torkelson, the President of Upper Columbia Conference, what kinds of reactions he has gotten in regard to Mabel's support and utilization of Linda.

And bring us word.

Posted by: inga Aug 12 2006, 10:24 PM

> **QUOTE(sister @ Aug 12 2006, 08:22 PM)**
>
> When Linda arrived in Springfield Pastor Grady, a man of experience with both 3ABN and the SDA church, had no difficulty with Linda's involvement in the ministry of the church. Of course one can

> only imagine the result this had on Danny. This resulted in the associate pastor, John Stanton, from the Thompsonville church (Danny's 3ABN church) and also an on air personality, quickly being dispatched to replace Pastor Grady in Springfield. One of Stanton's first duties was to remove Linda Shelton from functioning in any position in the Springfield SDA church other than pew warming. He claimed the authority to do so came directly from Ken Denslow, the Illinois Conference President.

have a problem with this kind of thing whenever I hear of it. The members of the Springfield

;DA Church are actually at fault for not knowing how the Adventist church is supposed to function -- he **the local congregation in business session is the highest authority in the local church.** It s not the pastor's business to dictate who can and cannot take part in local church services!

Jnfortunately too many folks follow any pastor like sheep, without thinking for themselves and without ıcquainting themselves with such sources of information as the Church Manual.

f the Springfield church members had been aware of how their rights and responsibilities, they could ıave/should have overruled the new pastor hastily brought in. Local congregations must understand hat if they allow mistreatment of any one person, any other person may be similarly mistreated.

Neither is the the conference president's business to dictate to the local church who shall hold offices. There is, of course, the possibility of an extreme situation in which the conference **in business session** (i.e. with delegates from the conference field) may actually disfellowship a whole church from he sisterhood of churches. But they normally have **no say over functions of the local church.** They may advise, they may counsel, but if they stay true to their mandate, they may not threaten, ınd they cannot force the church to do their bidding. Since the pastor is the liaison between the local :hurch and the conference, he may advise and counsel, but he may not threaten or force the :ongregation to do what they don't wish to do.

f we would all learn to grasp this principle, we would, of course, have to take responsibility for our ıwn decisions and quit belly-aching over what "the church" does. That would spoil many a whining ;ession.

There, I've finally got that one off my chest ... been meaning to say it ever since I read of this action.

\nd, yes, I've sat on many a church board. And, yes, I'm not every pastor's favorite board member nor is my DH, I may add). I've opposed a few arbitrary decrees from pastors, to the consternation of he "old faithful" yea-sayers. But the pastors backed down hastily and acknowledged that my point vas correct. (Yeah ... maybe I've been lucky, or ...) All in all, though, I think pastors have and do 'espect us, and the church functions much better when pastors act as team members, rather than lictators. Most don't want the dictator job anyway, but have often fallen into the role because of the ack of involvement of church members.

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Aug 12 2006, 11:42 PM

snε

Go head Inga!

snε

Posted by: Clay Aug 13 2006, 01:14 AM

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 12 2006, 09:17 PM)**
>
> That is just it, 3abn is a business. 3abn did not owe Linda any severance nor was she entitled to one. All an employer owes you is a honest days pay for a honest days work. Most states in the US operation under the doctrine of "employment at will" meaning just like you can quit a job anytime an employer terminate your employment for most any reason they want to. It's business.

she was his wife.... there is no excuse.... and IF he had wanted her silence then he should have treated her more than fair... you don't hear Trump's ex's bashing him, and they didnt sign a gag order... you don't hear Will Smith's 1st wife bash him, and there was no gag order, why? Because they made sure they treated them more than fair.... I am not buying that it was a business... if anything it was "their" business, and he shafted her.... and as a christian he should have done better...

Posted by: Nuggie Aug 13 2006, 05:33 AM

> **QUOTE(inga @ Aug 12 2006, 11:24 PM)**
>
> I have a problem with this kind of thing whenever I hear of it. The members of the Springfield SDA Church are actually at fault for not knowing how the Adventist church is supposed to function -- the **the local congregation in business session is the highest authority in the local church.** It is not the pastor's business to dictate who can and cannot take part in local church services!
>
> Unfortunately too many folks follow any pastor like sheep, without thinking for themselves and without acquainting themselves with such sources of information as the Church Manual.
>
> If the Springfield church members had been aware of how their rights and responsibilities, they could have/should have overruled the new pastor hastily brought in. Local congregations must understand that if they allow mistreatment of any one person, any other person may be similarly mistreated.
>
> Neither is the the conference president's business to dictate to the local church who shall hold offices. There is, of course, the possibility of an extreme situation in which the conference **in business session** (i.e. with delegates from the conference field) may actually disfellowship a whole church from the sisterhood of churches. But they normally have **no say over functions of the local church.** They may advise, they may counsel, but if they stay true to their mandate, they may not threaten, and they cannot force the church to do their bidding. Since the pastor is the liaison between the local church and the conference, he may advise and counsel, but he may not threaten or force the congregation to do what they don't wish to do.
>
> If we would all learn to grasp this principle, we would, of course, have to take responsibility for our own decisions and quit belly-aching over what "the church" does. That would spoil many a whining session.
>
> There, I've finally got that one off my chest ... been meaning to say it ever since I read of this action.

> And, yes, I've sat on many a church board. And, yes, I'm not every pastor's favorite board member (nor is my DH, I may add). I've opposed a few arbitrary decrees from pastors, to the consternation of the "old faithful" yea-sayers. But the pastors backed down hastily and acknowledged that my point was correct. (Yeah ... maybe I've been lucky, or ...) *All in all, though, I think pastors have and* do respect us, and the church functions much better when pastors act as team members, rather than dictators. Most don't want the dictator job anyway, but have often fallen into the role because of the lack of involvement of church members.

Well said and right on point!

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Aug 13 2006, 09:41 AM

> **QUOTE(Clay @ Aug 13 2006, 03:14 AM)**
>
> she was his wife.... there is no excuse.... and IF he had wanted her silence then he should have treated her more than fair... you don't hear Trump's ex's bashing him, and they didnt sign a gag order... you don't hear Will Smith's 1st wife bash him, and there was no gag order, why? Because they made sure they treated them more than fair.... I am not buying that it was a business... if anything it was "their" business, and he shafted her.... and as a christian he should have done better...

Dead on!

and EXCELLENT EXAMPLES I must add!

sn

Posted by: msraccoon Aug 13 2006, 12:39 PM

Me thinks this "infallible humanbeing" is getting way too much press. Look at the stats: He/she joined 2 days ago and has submitted 30 posts designed to stir up those who are concerned about 3ABN's leadership. Then we give this individual over 1,000 views/reads. Isn't this just what infallible wants?

msraccoon

Posted by: sonshineonme Aug 13 2006, 12:41 PM

> **QUOTE(msraccoon @ Aug 13 2006, 11:39 AM)**
>
> Me thinks this "infallible humanbeing" is getting way too much press. Look at the stats: He/she joined 2 days ago and has submitted 30 posts designed to stir up those who are concerned about 3ABN's leadership. Then we give this individual over 1,000 views/reads. Isn't this just what infallible wants?
>
> msraccoon

in a word Y E S

Posted by: watchbird Aug 13 2006, 01:29 PM

> **QUOTE(msraccoon @ Aug 13 2006, 12:39 PM)**
>
> Me thinks this "infallible humanbeing" is getting way too much press. Look at the stats: He/she joined 2 days ago and has submitted 30 posts designed to stir up those who are concerned about 3ABN's leadership. Then we give this individual over 1,000 views/reads. Isn't this just what infallible wants?
>
> msraccoon

> **QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Aug 13 2006, 12:41 PM)**
>
> in a word Y E S

I don't think people are coming here to read what fallable had to say. I think they are coming to read because since post #105, we have had important information posted here.

I think it is time for this thread to be split, and let fallable's stuff sink into the oblivion they deserve.

Clay....... Calvin........ Somebody....... where are you? We need a "splitter" here!

Posted by: watchbird Aug 13 2006, 04:28 PM

> **QUOTE(watchbird @ Aug 13 2006, 01:29 PM)**
>
> Clay....... Calvin........ Somebody....... where are you? We need a "splitter" here!

wow.gif .... It's done already. Looky everbody..... we have a nice new room ....

sig ......

Let the conversations resume......... tableta ....

Posted by: PaperTigers Aug 13 2006, 04:44 PM

wooohooo it's clean again

Posted by: Chez Aug 14 2006, 12:06 AM

> **QUOTE(BrotherBill @ Aug 12 2006, 08:55 PM)**
>
> 3 ABN has been, and continues to minimize Linda because Danny has clearly defined the sides. You are either with him, or against him. The moment he decided he was done with Linda, she was the enemy and did not deserve to have a job. If Linda were able to speak, the truth might would come out while she still had the following she did. Now, the truth is coming out, but her supporters have been bombarded for 2 + years with one side of the story.
>
> Her gag order did not prohibit Linda from speaking at any meeting, convention, or other function. She just was not allowed to speak negatively about 3ABN. However, she has been prohibited from speaking just the same, presumably because of the assumption of what she would say.
> Frankly, I have not seen the documentation from the Conferences, but all of the Pastors in my conference got one that suggested she was too controversial to have speak at the Churches. Of course, probably more consequential is the number of average SDA's who get 3ABN, watch it all the time, and assume she is guilty of adultery. They just don't know any better, and they will not let her come to the Church either.

I am tired of pastors not knowing any better. What happened to the Holy Spirit who will lead us into all truth? What happened to the discernment that the Holy Spirit gives us? Are you telling me that our pastors are not praying and receiving guidance from God or are they just not listening and acting on what the Holy Spirit says? By prohibiting Linda from sharing the Word in a public forum, they unwittingly agree with Danny and his cronies along with his marriage to Brandy. Or do they not know any better?

Who are these people who have the nerve to prohibit a child of God from attending his Church or going to his house? This is dangerous. When God says enough, ... have mercy.

Posted by: Clay Aug 14 2006, 12:36 AM

> **QUOTE(Chez @ Aug 14 2006, 01:06 AM)**
>
> I am tired of pastors not knowing any better. What happened to the Holy Spirit who will lead us into all truth? What happened to the discernment that the Holy Spirit gives us? Are you telling me that our pastors are not praying and receiving guidance from God or are they just not listening and acting on what the Holy Spirit says? By prohibiting Linda from sharing the Word in a public forum, they unwittingly agree with Danny and his cronies along with his marriage to Brandy. Or do they not know any better?
>
> Who are these people who have the nerve to prohibit a child of God from attending his Church or going to his house? This is dangerous. When God says enough, ... have mercy.

the Holy Spirit will indeed lead and guide... the question is are they seeking his guidance... from the looks of things.... no they are not....

Posted by: summertime Aug 14 2006, 07:35 AM

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 12 2006, 09:17 PM)**
>
> That is just it, 3abn is a business. 3abn did not owe Linda any severance nor was she entitled to one. All an employer owes you is a honest days pay for a honest days work. Most states in the US operation under the doctrine of "employment at will" meaning just like you can quit a job anytime an employer terminate your employment for most any reason they want to. It's business.

The thing that bothers me is that 3ABN is called a business. If what Danny has consistently said about the God above calling him to spread the message throughout the world is accurate, then would one say that God had called him to start a business?. Any man/woman can start a business. Is telling the world about the soon coming Saviour a business? Or is it a challange to do the work of the Lord?. Is the work of the General Conference a business? Or is it a God directed entity whose job it is to prepare the world with the 3 angels message? Was Sister White called by God to start a business, or was she called to further the work of God by sharing and writing the things that God revealed to her? I am deeply troubled by the fact that apparently the Illinois judge has called 3ABN a private Shelton family business (*if I read it correctly). and our denomination still stands by the fact that Danny is the* 'face of Adventism'

If Danny wants to run a business let him go out and build a profitable organization which will enable him to have all the amenities of a wealthy man. Maybe I am wrong. Of course any Godlike organization has to have structure and bylaws but can we really call it a business? I had always considered 3ABN as God's Network, perhaps founded by Danny and Linda Shelton, but the purpose was not to move, shove or get out of the way. The purpose of the Network was to let the world know that Jesus is coming. How much Gospel was spread by the things that were said these past few days by J. Lomacang and Shelly Quinn?. How many dollars have been spent--dollars which were donated by people who thought they were doing the Lord's work by sacrificing worldly pleasures to tell the *world about Jesus? If by any chance new listeners were hearing recent discussions(?)* by Lomacang and Quinn--how many of them heard the story of the 3angels message? If I turned that stuff on for the first time I would turn the channel quickly. Maybe they have been thrown off Sky Angel for a purpose at this time.

If 3ABN is a private family business, then it would seem to me that all the assets of the business (?) would have been split properly and Danny and Linda would have each gotten half of whatever the business (?) was worth. How much is this business (?) worth? If I had thought that my donations were being put into the family business I would have never sent them a dime.

Linda was not an employee of 3ABN. She was the co-founder of 3ABN. Do they call Shilling an employee of Enron? I think not. Otherwise he would not be heading for jail.

Posted by: justme Aug 14 2006, 08:58 AM

> **QUOTE(summertime @ Aug 14 2006, 08:35 AM)**
>
> The thing that bothers me is that 3ABN is called a business. If what Danny has consistently said about the God above calling him to spread the message throughout the world is accurate, then *would one say that God had called him to start a business?. Any man/woman can start a business.*

> Is telling the world about the soon coming Saviour a business? Or is it a challange to do the work of the Lord?. Is the work of the General Conference a business? Or is it a God directed entity whose job it is to prepare the world with the 3 angels message? Was Sister White called by God to start a business, or was she called to further the work of God by sharing and writing the things that God revealed to her? I am deeply troubled by the fact that apparently the Illinois judge has called 3ABN a private Shelton family business (if I read it correctly). and our denomination still stands by the fact that Danny is the 'face of Adventism'
>
> If Danny wants to run a business let him go out and build a profitable organization which will enable him to have all the amenities of a wealthy man. Maybe I am wrong. Of course any Godlike organization has to have structure and bylaws but can we really call it a business? I had always considered 3ABN as God's Network, perhaps founded by Danny and Linda Shelton, but the purpose was not to move, shove or get out of the way. The purpose of the Network was to let the world know that Jesus is coming. How much Gospel was spread by the things that were said these past few days by J. Lomacang and Shelly Quinn?. How many dollars have been spent--dollars which were donated by people who thought they were doing the Lord's work by sacrificing worldly pleasures to tell the world about Jesus? If by any chance new listeners were hearing recent discussions(?) by Lomacang and Quinn--how many of them heard the story of the 3angels message? If I turned that stuff on for the first time I would turn the channel quickly. Maybe they have been thrown off Sky Angel for a purpose at this time.
>
> If 3ABN is a private family business, then it would seem to me that all the assets of the business (?) would have been split properly and Danny and Linda would have each gotten half of whatever the business (?) was worth. How much is this business (?) worth? If I had thought that my donations were being put into the family business I would have never sent them a dime.
>
> Linda was not an employee of 3ABN. She was the co-founder of 3ABN. Do they call Shilling an emoloyee of Enron? I think not. Otherwise he would not be heading for jail.

---

lere's an interesting revelation, at least it was to me. A while back I saw an appeal from Kay Kuzma eferring to "those of us who are 3ABN SHAREHOLDERS". It set me to wondering how many SHAREHOLDERS" there are. And how does one get to become a "SHAREHOLDER"? Did these SHAREHOLDERS" perhaps "buy" each one, a "Position" at 3ABN? Perhaps they should be called CHAIR-HOLDERS" since so many of them sit on a chair in on an advisory board.

Nhat would happen happen to these "CHAIR-HOLDERS" if their investments in 3ABN were to become hreatened by "cleaning house". ow many of the BIG WIGS there have "bought" their way into a job of ligh influence?

Posted by: tall73 Aug 14 2006, 12:06 PM

> **QUOTE(summertime @ Aug 14 2006, 08:35 AM)**
>
> How much is this business (?) worth? If I had thought that my donations were being put into the family business I would have never sent them a dime.

'his is the key to me. First of all, what is it worth? It seems according to the document in 2000-2001 t was worth around 3.5 mil. How much of that was later used for re-investment in the business, etc. s unclear. Moreover, the designation of a business was partly a result of the particular laws of that state. But all the same, the bigger question is still valid. How many people thought their donation was going to "business-like" use?

How many people anticipated paying for Linda's settlement for instance? If she did commit adultery, why should ministry money go to her? And if not, why would she need a settlement or dismissal?

The other thing that bothers me (and I don't think it is a legal issue), is that they were charging around 600k a year for ministries to buy air time, while making around double that amount in profit. If they want to spread the message, why not cut Amazing Facts, etc. a break? Part of it could be saving for a rainy day, but overall it does look more like a business. That may not be scandal worthy in itself ,but it does bother me. And how many donors know they are doing that?

Posted by: summertime Aug 16 2006, 09:57 AM

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 12 2006, 09:17 PM)**
>
> That is just it, 3abn is a business. 3abn did not owe Linda any severance nor was she entitled to one. All an employer owes you is a honest days pay for a honest days work. Most states in the US operation under the doctrine of "employment at will" meaning just like you can quit a job anytime an employer terminate your employment for most any reason they want to. It's business.

Again I say, so 3ABN is a business? Does a man have a right to come before millions of people and tell them that he was ordered by God for him to start a "business"? I thought that he has claimed that he was told to build a christian network that would spread an undiluted 3Angels Message to the world. Now, did God instruct him to build a business that would make himself and others rich or was he to spend donations from millions of people to spred the word of God?. Is that a 'business' or is that a 'ministry?" I know that the state of Illinois said that 3ABN is a SHelton family personal business. Then why aren't they paying income taxes to the government just like the rest of us?

Now, how much money is Danny and Brandy going to spend while they are on a break for restoration and revival? Three months--less or more. Who is going to pay while they take 'time out'---the donors of 3ABN or will he use the money that he has accumulated over the years while he was buying houses, horses and jet planes? Somebody is going to pay for the 'vacation'. How many people's savings are going to be sent to Danny so he can revive and reform?

Linda was not an employee--she was a co-founder---she should have been treated like one. Is Danny an employee of 3ABN? Look on the inside of your next program schedule that is sent out. There is a picture of Danny and his title is founder---he was a co-founder-just like Linda.

Posted by: watchbird Aug 16 2006, 11:13 AM

> **QUOTE(summertime @ Aug 16 2006, 09:57 AM)**
>
> Again I say, so 3ABN is a business? Does a man have a right to come before millions of people and tell them that he was ordered by God for him to start a "business"? I thought that he has claimed that he was told to build a christian network that would spread an undiluted 3Angels Message to the world. Now, did God instruct him to build a business that would make himself and others rich or was he to spend donations from millions of people to spred the word of God?. Is that a 'business' or is that a 'ministry?" I know that the state of Illinois said that 3ABN is a SHelton family personal business. Then why aren't they paying income taxes to the government just like the rest of us?

> Now, how much money is Danny and Brandy going to spend while they are on a break for restoration and revival? Three months--less or more. Who is going to pay while they take 'time out'---the donors of 3ABN or will he use the money that he has accumulated over the years while he was buying houses, horses and jet planes? Somebody is going to pay for the 'vacation'. How many people's savings are going to be sent to Danny so he can revive and reform?
>
> Linda was not an employee--she was a co-founder---she should have been treated like one. Is Danny an employee of 3ABN? Look on the inside of your next program schedule that is sent out. There is a picture of Danny and his title is founder---he was a co-founder-just like Linda.

ɜood questions summertime ....

ɨere's another .... how comes no one is saying anything about restitution? The way I was taught, rue repentance brings forth fruit, not only "revival and reform" but restitution of what has been taken vrongly. It's real easy to say "I'm a sinner just like all sinners, and God washes away my sins when I repent and am baptized". But what is "repentence"? I think that is where the Zacchaeus story gives ɪs valuable insights. True repentence is not only confession of sins.... but **restitution** of what has ɔeen taken. And not merely dollar for dollar, but restoring "four-fold". And that not only goes for Ɔanny, but for all of the other "top eschelon" employees who have been paid premium wages and ɔerks for encouraging Danny in his errant ways.

Posted by: PaperTigers Aug 16 2006, 11:24 AM

> **QUOTE(watchbird @ Aug 16 2006, 01:13 PM)**
>
> Good questions summertime ....
>
> Here's another .... how comes no one is saying anything about restitution? The way I was taught, true repentance brings forth fruit, not only "revival and reform" but restitution of what has been taken wrongly. It's real easy to say "I'm a sinner just like all sinners, and God washes away my sins when I "repent and am baptized". But what is "repentence"? I think that is where the Zacchaeus story gives us valuable insights. True repentence is not only confession of sins.... but **restitution** of what has been taken. And not merely dollar for dollar, but restoring "four-fold". And that not only goes for Danny, but for all of the other "top eschelon" employees who have been paid premium wages and perks for encouraging Danny in his errant ways.

Ɔefinitions per Websters Dictionary

> **QUOTE**
>
> **Repent**
> 1 : to turn from sin and dedicate oneself to the *amendment* of one's life
>
> **Amendment**
> 1 : the act of amending : CORRECTION

ɗoesn't that mean making things right?

Posted by: sister Aug 16 2006, 11:56 AM

> **QUOTE(watchbird @ Aug 16 2006, 12:13 PM)**
>
> Good questions summertime ....
>
> Here's another .... how comes no one is saying anything about restitution? The way I was taught, true repentance brings forth fruit, not only "revival and reform" but restitution of what has been taken wrongly. It's real easy to say "I'm a sinner just like all sinners, and God washes away my sins when I "repent and am baptized". But what is "repentence"? I think that is where the Zacchaeus story gives us valuable insights. True repentence is not only confession of sins.... but **restitution** of what has been taken. And not merely dollar for dollar, but restoring "four-fold". And that not only goes for Danny, but for all of the other "top eschelon" employees who have been paid premium wages and perks for encouraging Danny in his errant ways.

Watchbird if you read the newest installment from Jorgen, he mentions restitution as well.

Posted by: calvin Aug 16 2006, 12:20 PM

> **QUOTE(summertime @ Aug 16 2006, 09:57 AM)**
>
> Again I say, so 3ABN is a business? Does a man have a right to come before millions of people and tell them that he was ordered by God for him to start a "business"? I thought that he has claimed that he was told to build a christian network that would spread an undiluted 3Angels Message to the world. Now, did God instruct him to build a business that would make himself and others rich or was he to spend donations from millions of people to spred the word of God?. Is that a 'business' or is that a 'ministry?" I know that the state of Illinois said that 3ABN is a SHelton family personal business. Then why aren't they paying income taxes to the government just like the rest of us?
>
> Now, how much money is Danny and Brandy going to spend while they are on a break for restoration and revival? Three months--less or more. Who is going to pay while they take 'time out'---the donors of 3ABN or will he use the money that he has accumulated over the years while he was buying houses, horses and jet planes? Somebody is going to pay for the 'vacation'. How many people's savings are going to be sent to Danny so he can revive and reform?
>
> Linda was not an employee--she was a co-founder---she should have been treated like one. Is Danny an employee of 3ABN? Look on the inside of your next program schedule that is sent out. There is a picture of Danny and his title is founder---he was a co-founder-just like Linda.

Any operations/organization that receives and disburse monies are businesses. That includes ministries, your local church, GC, etc. Don't get hung up on the type of business, be it a ministry (non-for-profit) or for-profit. 3ABN has employees and is required to withhold taxes, uses double entry accounting to record its transactions, pays bills, deposits funds, has a bank account, does sales and marketing, etc. These are all business functions.

Now if you want to debate and discuss whether 3ABN is a corrupt business then carry on.

Danny is an employee and so was Linda. He being the founder and owner has no bearing on his status as an employee. He receives a salary for service to 3ABN and gets a W2 every January as proof of his employment like all the other employees.

Posted by: Sapphire Aug 16 2006, 12:22 PM

> **QUOTE(watchbird @ Aug 16 2006, 01:13 PM)**
>
> Good questions summertime ....
>
> Here's another .... how comes no one is saying anything about restitution? The way I was taught, true repentance brings forth fruit, not only "revival and reform" but restitution of what has been taken wrongly. It's real easy to say "I'm a sinner just like all sinners, and God washes away my sins when I "repent and am baptized". But what is "repentence"? I think that is where the Zacchaeus story gives us valuable insights. True repentence is not only confession of sins.... but **restitution** of what has been taken. And not merely dollar for dollar, but restoring "four-fold". And that not only goes for Danny, but for all of the other "top eschelon" employees who have been paid premium wages and perks for encouraging Danny in his errant ways.

Hi Watchbird,

I was always taught that there are consequences to our actions. At least that's what we spend the first several years of our childrens' lives teaching them.

In a church, if an offense is a public one, then the consequence and restitution needs to be public. It is my personal belief that Danny has gone to far down this road to humble himself in a way that is necessay to change this situation around and make it right. He is a very proud and stubborn man. I think he still believes he'll get away with it.

Posted by: västergötland Aug 16 2006, 12:45 PM

Considering the Zaccheus story, there is hope for everyone. Zaccheus being a corrupt leader of a corrupt organisation and publicly known for lining his pockets with stolen money could still be troubled over his life and be drawn to Jesus. And upon meeting Jesus melting compleately before Gods mercy. It does not appear that any of the contemporary characters is quite so infamous and perhaps not shameless enough to continue should he/she become widely infamous for it. There is hope for everyone till they curse God and die.

Posted by: PaperTigers Aug 16 2006, 12:54 PM

> **QUOTE(västergötland @ Aug 16 2006, 01:45 PM)**
>
> Considering the Zaccheus story, there is hope for everyone. Zaccheus being a corrupt leader of a corrupt organisation and publicly known for lining his pockets with stolen money could still be troubled over his life and be drawn to Jesus. And upon meeting Jesus melting compleately before Gods mercy. It does not appear that any of the contemporary characters is quite so infamous and perhaps not shameless enough to continue should he/she become widely infamous for it. There is hope for everyone till they curse God and die.

that's a very good point västergötland

Posted by: watchbird Aug 16 2006, 01:41 PM

> **QUOTE(sister @ Aug 16 2006, 11:56 AM)**
>
> Watchbird if you read the newest installment from Jorgen, he mentions restitution as well.

Yes, I noticed. I read that immediately after making my post. It is something that a number of us have discussed at length the last few years ... but it is still something that gets no where near the attention that IMO it deserves to have when people are discussing the situation publicly.

The questions, of course, once one "goes there" are..... What would it take for Danny to make restitution for all the monies he has misappropriated, wasted, or flat out stolen from the offering plates? What would it take in terms of unfair low paid employees just "back pay"? What would it take to replace the employee hour time that has gone into the building and maintaining of Danny's private stables and dwellings? What would it take to replace the months and years of unemployment caused by Danny's spreading of lies and threats to prospective employers of ex-employees? What would it take to replace the reputations tattered, the joy and hopes smashed to smithereens? What would it take? How could it be done ..... even if by some sudden miracle Danny were willing to do so?

And what of his gullible public. If he uses the difficulties and even, let's face it, the impossibilities of making restitution of all these things as an excuse for not giving up all he has..... including ownership of 3ABN and all he has acquired from there..... I say, if he uses all of these mixed with real tears of self-pity and pious proclamations that say on bottom line that these can all be washed away by a dip in the baptismal tank......

What then. Will people be so confused that they do not see the difference between washing away the guilt of sin (which is possible for the worst sinner) and washing away all balance sheets and debts and obligations so that the debtor walks away exhonerated .... still clutching his ill gained riches in his varous banks?

These are questions that are still to be raised. Let's not let the seeming impossibilities of them keep us from thinking them through and bringing them out in the open.

Posted by: Fran Aug 16 2006, 02:00 PM

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 16 2006, 01:20 PM)**
>
> Any operations/organization that receives and disburse monies are businesses. That includes ministries, your local church, GC, etc. Don't get hung up on the type of business, be it a ministry (non-for-profit) or for-profit. 3ABN has employees and is required to withhold taxes, uses double entry accounting to record its transactions, pays bills, deposits funds, has a bank account, does sales and marketing, etc. These are all business functions.
>
> Now if you want to debate and discuss whether 3ABN is a corrupt business then carry on.
>
> Danny is an employee and so was Linda. He being the founder and owner has no bearing on his

> status as an employee. He receives a salary for service to 3ABN and gets a W2 every January as proof of his employment like all the other employees.

Normally, I would agree with you because businesses are required to follow Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. (GAAP)

However, 3ABN has chosen not to follow Gaap. Reference the IL vs. 3ABN Property Tax lawsuit. It CLEARLY STATES that 3ABN, a 20 year old corporation, **DID NOT** follow **GAAP**.

Then if you compare the lawsuit with the yearly non-profit **Income Tax form 990**, you will find they have **problems with valuation of Assets and with TRUST FUNDS.**
Anyone can order copies of their yearly form 990's that have been filed. Anyone can read the 3ABN Tax Lawsuit at:

http://www.revenue.state.il.us/legalinformation/hearings/pt/pt04-1.pdf

Auditors found **$2.45 million not even posted in one year and $1.7 in the next year.** Yes, I have very **STRONG issues about 3ABN TRUST FUNDS.** By the way they call them Split Interest Transactions no less! **They didn't list them with "TRUST FUNDS" until AFTER the Auditors found it.**

Then the auditors said these assets, **TRUST FUNDS, were not properly valued.** Hummmmm.

Wake up viewers. This is the **HABIT of 3ABN!** Follow what Danny says. **Forget those GAAP rules! They do not exist for Danny & LINDA'S 3ABN. Half is hers!**

Posted by: watchbird Aug 16 2006, 02:25 PM

> **QUOTE(Sapphire @ Aug 16 2006, 12:22 PM)**
>
> Hi Watchbird,
>
> I was always taught that there are consequences to our actions. At least that's what we spend the first several years of our childrens' lives teaching them.
>
> In a church, if an offense is a public one, then the consequence and restitution needs to be public. It is my personal belief that Danny has gone to far down this road to humble himself in a way that is necessay to change this situation around and make it right. He is a very proud and stubborn man. I think he still believes he'll get away with it.

I agree completely. I think that all of his cohorts think that if he steps out of the limelight for a few days or weeks, and then comes back professing to have had a "mountaintop experience" with God and that he sees that he was wrong in the way he handled his ex-wife's infidelity ... and gives a teary eyed confession for that "wrong" ... .then tops it off with a dip in the tank ... that he will be joyfully acclaimed, his "anointed" status will be not only returned but enhanced, and it will be "business" as usual for his Pentecostal league of 3ABN directors. (Did you notice that Mollie was already laying the groundwork for this in her announcement of their plans to have another gala "Ten Commandments weekend" next year?

Another point that goes along with this is the matter of trust once someone has proven himself to be untrustworthy. In the business world, once a man has been caught with his hand in the till, that man is never given a job that involves handling money again. Danny has proven, I think, beyond a shadow of a doubt that he has betrayed the trust that people have put in him. Notice Fran's information on finances. Therefore, I think the only acceptable solution is for Danny to be permanently separated from 3ABN.

Unless .....

He refuses to do that. And in that case I think the church should permanently and completely separate from him and let him and his Pentecostal partners to go on their own as a frankly Pentecostal network. If he tries too many shenanigans in that venue .... well, they have watchdog organizations that will catch up with him sooner or later.

Posted by: princessdi Aug 16 2006, 03:33 PM

Calvin, you are exactly right! It IS a business. However, the problem comes in that they only use that when it benefits them. Danny is really glad that you understand his position on this matter. In fact, I am sure he was counting on some level headed business people to help convince everyone else that what he did to Linda was "business as ususal", therefore not wrong.

This is, however, the problem, 99% of the time they are on TV they are promoting themselves as a ministry, knowing full well the common lay person will not connect business and ministry. We assign them both a certain set of values and behaviors. Now while, as an employee 3ABN has covered all of their legal bases, for now, with Linda. As a "ministry" which calls itself a leader in christian[and moral] living, what they did was deplorable. Christian living is based on the fact that we don't do things like the world. In particular in Adventism we worry folks to death about eating meat and their clothes, jewelry. How can we then retreat into acceptance to a less than ethical worldly business practice. Steve is right Donald Trump and Will Smith, and others, did a far better job of being 'Christian[moral]" in their treament of their ex wives than Danny has, and we don't really considered either of them to be christian. By law, they both could have done a lot less and still been within their legal rights, but they took the moral high ground. One who even did them one better is Bernie Mac, who divorced his wife in November 2005, let it be announced *once* this year and said that is all I am going to say. She is till the mother of my child.

Even if the 3ABN board(the true bsuiness end) wanted to treat Linda in such a manner, Danny should have been using his influence over them to discourage that. 3ABN is a buisness their marriage was not, at least to Linda.

If that is even good buisness as usual, I want to see Danny be booted out and take only $250,000.00. We will be back to "I am the founder" before we know it, we will hear nothing about Danny being an employee.

> **QUOTE(calvin @ Aug 16 2006, 11:20 AM)**
>
> Any operations/organization that receives and disburse monies are businesses. That includes ministries, your local church, GC, etc. Don't get hung up on the type of business, be it a ministry (non-for-profit) or for-profit. 3ABN has employees and is required to withhold taxes, uses double entry accounting to record its transactions, pays bills, deposits funds, has a bank account, does sales and marketing, etc. These are all business functions.
>
> Now if you want to debate and discuss whether 3ABN is a corrupt business then carry on.
>
> Danny is an employee and so was Linda. He being the founder and owner has no bearing on his status as an employee. He receives a salary for service to 3ABN and gets a W2 every January as proof of his employment like all the other employees.

Posted by: västergötland Aug 16 2006, 05:57 PM

Some interesting reading in this document that Fran provided...

> **QUOTE**
>
> p28 First, the record in Inter-Varsity shows that the fellowship based the price of each publication that it sold strictly on its cost to the fellowship. Id. at 800, 803. The record contains absolutely no evidence proving how 3ABN determines the prices of the satellite dishes, videos, airtime, CD's and other items that it sells other than **Danny Shelton's testimony that the pricing**
> **guide applicant uses for sales of its videos, CD's etc. is "that they are affordable."** (Tr. pp. 168-
> 170). Absent this evidence, I must resolve all failures of proof against the applicant and in favor of taxation. People ex rel. Norland v. Home for the Aged, 40 Ill.2d 91 (1968); Gas Research Institute v. Department of Revenue, 154 Ill.App.3d 430 (1st Dist. 1987). Therefore, I conclude that applicant employs a non-exempt commercial or retail pricing system unlike the Inter-Varsity Fellowship pricing method.
>
> Second, the Inter-Varsity record specifically disclosed that the fellowship provided "a substantial amount of materials free or below cost to groups that are targeted for its message." Inter-Varsity, supra, at 803. Specifically, the fellowship gave away no less than 10% of its total publications free of charge and sold an unspecified amount of its literature "at half price to individuals with the idea that they would give the books away." Id. at 800.
> Such is not the case here. **Applicant did not establish that they gave anything away free except for the catalogues that list the merchandise that is for sale. In addition, absent evidence to**
> **the contrary, I conclude that at least one private individual, Linda Shelton, profits from the sale**
> **of items listed in the catalogue.** Applicant's board has no written policy to give away or donate
> 29
> its satellite systems, nor was a clear policy even articulated through oral testimony. Rather, if an individual were unable to pay the cost of the system, applicant's secretary would contact Danny Shelton who would determine, with the board's guidance, whether the product should be given away. "Applicant has no policy that says give away." (Tr. pp. 295-303).
> **In fact, applicant has no records of materials given away in 2000 or 2001.** Applicant has no specific written policy that outlines what factors are used or what direction is given by applicant's board or president that allows applicant to distribute items at a reduced rate or free of charge. (Tr. pp. 586-589, 614-616). Applicant has, therefore, failed to establish that the facts relied upon by the Inter-Varsity court to grant the exemption therein are present in this case.

Posted by: JustTana Sep 2 2006, 08:05 PM

Hi, CJO:

Thanks for your note. How do you use the virgin coconut oil and where do you get it? Do you have to take it on a monitoring dosage or can you just take it when you need it? You may have answered these questions, but it looks like some of your message was lost . . . anyway, thanks for the suggestion. I will check on the possibilities. Blessings, Tana

Posted by: husbandoftheyear Sep 2 2006, 09:02 PM

Have I missed something? There is a lot of discussion that seems to imply that Danny is on his way out. (By the way - I'm not heartbroken over the possibility! Just curious.)

And IF Dan severs himself from 3ABN - do you honestly think there will be restitution? If that subject were given a moment's consideration by the board I'd be surprised. To pay restitution would imply wrongdoing now wouldn't it?! The pres is definity not going to admit to anything of the sort.