



## Printable Version of Topic

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

---

### BlackSDA \_ 3ABN \_ Save3abn Website

---

**Posted by: Lee Mar 12 2007, 12:35 PM**

Pickle said on another thread:

Bystander and Lee, feel free to start a thread on that topic, if you want.

-----

Thanks Pickle for the invitation to start this up as a new thread. Are you posting on the save3abn site? Was that your email address when the site first started, but has since been removed?

Thanks for your clear and upfront answer.

---

**Posted by: erik Mar 12 2007, 12:49 PM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 12 2007, 10:35 AM) □**

Pickle said on another thread:

Bystander and Lee, feel free to start a thread on that topic, if you want.

-----

Thanks Pickle for the invitation to start this up as a new thread. Are you posting on the save3abn site? Was that your email address when the site first started, but has since been removed?

Thanks for your clear and upfront answer.

Lee,

Does it matter where the stuff on save3abn.com comes from when the defend danny way of doing 3abn, will not defend against the issues being raised other then to say it is all lies and we will prove this in court,

I mean is it was my name and lifes work being attacked I would have place very direct anwsers the charges being leveled and then open my records to be check, and then Trust that God would defend me, but the the Pro danny crowd sounds SO much like adam and eve in the Garden of Eden.

Lord she made me do it, lord the snake made me do It.

Lee instead of attacking the people bringing the issues forward it would seem to me that your side of the topic would be much more concerned with clearing danny's name, I mean did you read the last two letters from danny himself, i would really like to hear danny's side of those letter because to tell

the truth they make danny look like he was losing his mind, and was control freak.

By the way, bob if you are actively posting stuff at save3abn.com thank you getting facts out into the open.

Erik

---

**Posted by: Lee Mar 12 2007, 01:50 PM**

Erik, you mean you are trusting what is posted on save3abn when you don't know for sure who is posting ? Interesting.

I'm not attacking anyone here. I just asked a simple question. I'd like to know if Pickle is posting on there. If he chooses not to answer, then I will know my answer by default.

---

**Posted by: daylily Mar 12 2007, 01:55 PM**

Lee, why does it matter if Bob Pickle is posting stuff on the web site? I don't understand.

---

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 12 2007, 01:59 PM**

I know you are not asking anybody this question. You and your buddies come on, with nothing but your first lying words that you don't know each other or Danny, and ask everybody to believe you, because it will come out in court.....one day. You've got to be kidding me!

Most of the info on that site are not just posts or opinions, they are emails documents. Totally different. Who cares who put it up there, they are not asking you to just take their word for it. They got back up!

---

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 12 2007, 11:50 AM)**

Erik, you mean you are trusting what is posted on save3abn when you don't know for sure who is posting ? Interesting.

I'm not attacking anyone here. I just asked a simple question. I'd like to know if Pickle is posting on there. If he chooses not to answer, then I will know my answer by default.

---

**Posted by: Whtz Happenin Mar 12 2007, 02:02 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 12 2007, 01:35 PM)**

Pickle said on another thread:

Bystander and Lee, feel free to start a thread on that topic, if you want.

---

Thanks Pickle for the invitation to start this up as a new thread. Are you posting on the save3abn site? Was that your email address when the site first started, but has since been removed?

Thanks for your clear and upfront answer.

This looks like the start of another useless thread. If you have a question for Pickle, please just send him a PM.

**Posted by: watchbird Mar 12 2007, 02:06 PM**

**QUOTE(daylily @ Mar 12 2007, 02:55 PM) □**

Lee, why does it matter if Bob Pickle is posting stuff on the web site? I don't understand.

This is my question also. Since last September Gailon Joy has been promising a website. When save3abn went up, it was looked upon by everyone that I know of as the website that he had been promising. If Bob Pickle is helping him with the material or the technical part of posting or the introductions to the various original letters that are being posted.... so what?


Since Bob Pickle is much more widely known than is Gailon Joy... and has a reputation throughout advertism as being a careful researcher and writer on a number of subjects... then that only lends credibility to the site if he is directly associated with it. And it is certainly no secret here on BSDA that he and Gailon are both engaged in research on matters relative to 3abn.

I don't see the point of Lee's question, I think it is just another case of wanting to distract from the importance of the documents that are placed on the site.... and from the information they convey. And the implications that one must know who is posting before trusting it is ludicrous in view of the fact that not one of those posting (supposedly) on Danny's side are revealing their identity to us.

But then.... what do we expect from this team other than ludicrousness.....



Carry on.....



**Posted by: erik Mar 12 2007, 02:06 PM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 12 2007, 11:50 AM) □**

Erik, you mean you are trusting what is posted on save3abn when you don't know for sure who is posting ? Interesting.

I'm not attacking anyone here. I just asked a simple question. I'd like to know if Pickle is posting on there. If he chooses not to answer, then I will know my answer by default.

Lee,

Well what does it matter who is posting on that web site most of the information on there has names on it, why does it matter which person put the letters there they have the persons names on them.

To be honest your request looks to me to a fishing job, for some lawyer.

I am not trust 100% the information on save3abn.com, but when the pro-danny side cannot find it in their hearts to directly address the questions and charges on that site then it makes me think that more truth is on that site then i wish was on that site.

It is becoming more and more painfully clear that Danny had no reason to divorce Linda, and even less reason to remarry. NOW in the new big tent of SDA'ism that in it self would not be a problem, but when you kick out the co-founder of 3abn, seems like to me that kicking out the other co-founder would be the the fair and wise thing to do at this point.

Lee, but i will go even more then then that even if linda is whoring Tramp( i see an major lack of proof of this at this time) Then at the very least the whole tommy issue cries out for justice.

why is no one from the PPro-tommy, pro danny side willing to say on the public record Tommy shelton did nothing to Victims 1-10 or tommy did make advance to this guy but not that guy, I mean it is much easier to forgive and offer healing to the victims and to the victimizer when the whole truth and nothing but the truth is known.

Erik

---

**Posted by: Noahswife Mar 12 2007, 02:10 PM**

---

**QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 12 2007, 02:59 PM) □**

Most of the info on that site are not just posts or opinions, they are emails documents. Totally different. Who cares who put it up there, they are not asking you to just take their word for it. They got back up!

PrincessDi:

In follow up to your post and if I recall correctly, I have always found it very interesting that not once has anyone with the possible exception of Aletheia suggested that TS's confession was not written by him or had been edited in some way. Do you recall them ever making that claim? This also seems to be the case regarding the emails and letters that have been posted at save3abn. For all the posts and all the distractions here at BSDA, have they denied DS did not write the letters he is purported to have written?

No. Instead they ask Pickle if he writes for the site. Where is that picture of the red herring I saw Clay post on some other thread? Now if they are claiming Pickle has written the emails and letters himself, that would be an entirely different matter. However, I have no doubt the individuals who are posting the documents to the website are quite aware of the legalities involved and that is why we are not

hearing such claims by the supporters of 3abn.

nw  
C"i"

---

**Posted by: daylily Mar 12 2007, 02:16 PM**

**QUOTE**

I am not trust 100% the information on save3abn.com, but when the pro-danny side cannot find it in their hearts to directly address the questions and charges on that site then it makes me think that more truth is on that site then i wish was on that site.

Erik, I agree. It seems like the easy thing for Danny and his helpers to do would be to simply deny that Danny wrote the emails we've all been reading and discussing...IF he didn't write them. How difficult is that? Why can't they just deny the things that are false?

I could be wrong and somebody please correct me if I am, but I can't remember a single accusation that has actually been denied by Danny or Tommy except in general terms. Such as "all those lies being posted on teh Internet", etc.

Noah's Wife, Looks like we jposted about the same time with the same idea!

---

**Posted by: Noahswife Mar 12 2007, 02:18 PM**

**QUOTE(daylily @ Mar 12 2007, 03:16 PM)**


Noah's Wife, Looks like we jposted about the same time with the same idea!



And Daylily, why do you think that might be?

---

**Posted by: daylily Mar 12 2007, 02:30 PM**



I wonder if the logic escapes them?



---

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 12 2007, 02:57 PM**

Lee,

If the emails and documents that are showing up on save3abn.com are counterfeit or outright lies, start providing proof so folks can get a balanced picture.

So far, the more that gets posted over there the more clear the picture becomes - and this, by in large, from Danny's, Dr. Thompson's and Tommy's own words. What I have personally found is that one can look solely at the documents, ignoring any commentary, and still come to exactly the same conclusions.

Please, if you have proof that any of these documents are lies show us. Otherwise, we will have to view the documents as authentic.

(edited to put "that" in where I forgot it)

---

**Posted by: Pickle Mar 12 2007, 03:36 PM**

Lee,

Before I contemplate assisting you in your diversionary and irrelevant fishing expedition, I wonder if we could take care of some unfinished business first.

I took your post at <http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?showtopic=12650&st=240&p=183035&#entry183035> to be calling me a liar, as I made clear at <http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?act=ST&f=48&t=12650&hl=liar&view=findpost&p=183088>. Correct me if I am wrong, but I don't think you addressed my concerns.

To be specific, I think you need to list for us what I have clearly and unequivocally fabricated.

I'd also like you to backtrack on what you said about how <http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?s=&showtopic=11955&view=findpost&p=167315>, that would somehow make a difference regarding the Tommy Shelton child molestation allegations. I don't recall you doing that yet, though you certainly have had enough time.

---

**Posted by: Lee Mar 12 2007, 08:15 PM**

Pickle your unwillingness to answer the question shows your are not a honest person. Period end of sentence. But no matter because I have my answer very plainly. Thanks.

I "backtrack" on nothing! The post you are speaking about that has to do with minors were just questions Pickle....HONEST questions which is more than what you can possibly do. Any "reasonable" intelligent person reading my post could see that.

But then perhaps I got too close to the truth of the matter.

---

**Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 12 2007, 08:22 PM**

Why didn't you just say "lier lier pants on fire". Goodgrief....what a great post

---

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 12 2007, 09:15 PM)**

Pickle your unwillingness to answer the question shows your are not a honest person. Period end of sentence. But no matter because I have my answer very plainly. Thanks.

I "backtrack" on nothing! The post you are speaking about that has to do with minors were just questions Pickle....HONEST questions which is more than what you can possibly do. Any "reasonable" inteligent person reading my post could see that.

But then perhaps I got too close to the truth of the matter.

---

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 12 2007, 08:26 PM**

Lee,

In my post #13 above, I honestly asked you for some information. If you apply your own hypothesis to yourself, I'm either going to get some answers from you or that will make you a dishonest person as well. Right?

So, for the record I will frame my request in the form of two questions:

1. Which documents or emails are false, counterfeit or lies?
2. What is your proof that they are false, counterfeit or lies?

---

**Posted by: Noahswife Mar 12 2007, 08:40 PM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Jan 3 2007, 12:41 PM)**

Bob, you said out of the seven people supposedly molested by TS, one is under age over on Maritime. Did I understand you correctly?

If so, then six of the seven would be considered "consenting" adults. And perhaps even the one under age was consenting, who knows if any of this is true. I have my doubts not because you posted it or because Mr. Joy investigated this, but because none of the 7 prosecuted TS or took him to court. I would certainly suggest to them that they do so as soon as possible.

Lee,

The only questions I see are you asking Pickle if you understood him correctly and you questioning if any of it were true. I believe I have the intelligence of a reasonable person.

nw  
C"i"

---

**Posted by: Noahswife Mar 12 2007, 08:57 PM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 12 2007, 10:15 PM)** □

Pickle your unwillingness to answer the question shows your are not a honest person. Period end of sentence. But no matter because I have my answer very plainly. Thanks.

So Lee, may I conclude from your post that when WWJD, Bystander, or yourself are unwilling to answer a question, I and others have the plain answer?

IMO, any "reasonable" intelligent person would not conclude that Pickle is not an honest person but one that is not willing to answer until you have answered his prior questions to you.

nw  
C"i"

---

**Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 12 2007, 09:14 PM**

**QUOTE(Noahswife @ Mar 12 2007, 10:57 PM)** □

So Lee, may I conclude from your post that when WWJD, Bystander, or yourself are unwilling to answer a question, I and others have the plain answer?

IMO, any "reasonable" intelligent person would not conclude that Pickle is not an honest person but one that is not willing to answer until you have answered his prior questions to you.

nw  
C"i"

NW C"i"

The track record shows that Bob Pickle will not answer any question. He does not feel he has to. He feels he is free to act as he wishes, say what he wants regardless of its veracity, and has no responsibility to answer any questions.

The idea that he doesn't have to answer until they answer is juvenile. He has portrayed himself as a man of integrity and reliability and with nothing to hide. So, if you are correct that he parades around with the attitude that he must have his questions answered first is simply an arrogance that betrays his portrayal of himself. If he has nothing to hide, then just answer the questions and ask yours.

When the JoyPickle web site surfaced it was obvious that the work was being done by Mr. Bob Pickle. He had already made a previous statement to someone that he was involved in a "major internet project" and that it was taking a lot of his time. Shortly after this statement the JoyPickle site surfaced. The language, syntax, sentence structure, and paragraph development are clearly that of Bob Pickle as they are easily overlaid with his postings here and on MSDAOL and the similarity is more than coincidence. Now, recently the pages on that site (JoyPickle) have changed so either there are more people working on the site or he is taking great pains not to sound like himself. He follows this up with posts that are designed to make the casual reader think he has nothing to do with the site (something that is certainly disingenuous if not just a form of lying).

The main point is this, Bob Pickle demands answers from everyone, while always conveniently avoiding questions put to him. I guess he gets what he gives. His methods have proven duplicitous



and dishonest, which for those who are aware of what he has done, calls into question the results of his work.

- FHB

**QUOTE(watchbird @ Mar 12 2007, 04:06 PM)**

Since Bob Pickle is much more widely known than is Gailon Joy... and has a reputation throughout Adventism as being a careful researcher and writer on a number of subjects... then that only lends credibility to the site if he is directly associated with it. And it is certainly no secret here on BSDA that he and Gailon are both engaged in research on matters relative to 3abn.

WB,

To get a more complete view of Bob Pickle's veracity, reliability and his "good reputation" why don't you find out what a number of individuals who work on Wikipedia think of Bob's research methods. On that site, he is not very well thought of by many who work hard to put together reliable information for people to use to do research and obtain reliable information.

You will find him listed on Wikipedia as "DrPickle."

A Dr. he is not and as a reliable source of information there he is not consider that either.

- FHB

---

**Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 12 2007, 09:25 PM**

**QUOTE(Noahswife @ Mar 12 2007, 04:10 PM)**

. . . Now if they are claiming Pickle has written the emails and letters himself, that would be an entirely different matter . . .

nw  
C"i"

NW C"i"

I don't know if any one who is supportive of 3ABN would make this claim exactly. There are a number of us however who have experienced first hand Bob Pickle's duplicitous methods, his dishonest claims, and incessant haranguing in an effort to victimize anyone he sets his sights on. There is clear evidence that he has a way with words - a manipulative way where he makes subtly rearrangements, posts this and attaches insinuation and innuendo so that not to many posts later he begins to attribute claims and words to people that they never said or wrote. Of course it is subtly enough that no one notices - and when it is pointed out he puts on his top hat, takes out his cane and does his best imitation of Gene Kelly . . . and of course never addresses the truth.

It is the experience of a number that has led to this thread. You don't have to accept the first hand commentary - but then, you would need to throw out all the other proclaimed first hand testimony in this forum.

- FHB

---

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 12 2007, 09:44 PM**

---

**QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 12 2007, 08:25 PM)**

It is the experience of a number that has led to this thread. **You don't have to accept the first hand commentary - but then, you would need to throw out all the other proclaimed first hand testimony in this forum.**

- FHB

Wow, that is quite a broadly brushed statement. I'm not sure it will go down in history as a principle as helpful as Occam's Razor. If you don't agree with our opinions you can't agree with the opinions of anybody else. Hmmm.

If you, Lee, wwjd and Bystander can establish credibility as first-hand commentary, your opinions will count every bit as much as the others who have developed credibility for theirs. But that is JMO.

PB

---

**Posted by: lookin4truth Mar 12 2007, 09:58 PM**

---

**QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 12 2007, 10:14 PM)**

You will find him listed on Wikipedia as "DrPickle."

FHB,

Could you provide a link to the Wikipedia info you referred to. I did a search on the following (results listed).

DrPickle. -- No results

drpickle -- No results

dr pickle -- 380 hits

The hits that resulted from "dr pickle" were everything from the cast of Rug Rats, to information about Lyndon Johnson, etc.

I would like to read the information you referred to.

Thanks,

L4T

---

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 12 2007, 09:58 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Noahswife @ Mar 12 2007, 07:40 PM)**

Lee,

The only questions I see are you asking Pickle if you understood him correctly and you questioning if any of it were true. I believe I have the intelligence of a reasonable person.

nw  
C"j"

NW,

Your post piqued my curiosity and led me to do some research into that January 3rd post by Lee. Okay, I began searching for Lee's post of and the closest I can come up with is Aletheia's ranting attempt at rebutting a post by Bob attributed to Lee.

<http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?showtopic=12110&st=345&p=173953&#entry173953>

**QUOTE**

Excuse me? The only reason there is a public "factual forum" on MSDAOL, is so you can air your opinions while everyone else is muzzled Yes I know, if we submit something in the "hidden forum" it will be considered, and you are the moderator, and post "off topic" whenever you are questioned....

AND:

Who said "maybe THE MINOR was consenting?" Not Lee, I know that. Is that why it was on the save 3abn "not" website yesterday, and is not now?

Lee wrote:

Bob, you said out of the seven people supposedly molested by TS, one is under age over on Maritime. Did I understand you correctly?

If so, then six of the seven would be considered "consenting" adults. And perhaps even the one under age was consenting, who knows if any of this is true. I have my doubts not because you posted it or because Mr. Joy investigated this, but because none of the 7 prosecuted TS or took him to court. I would certainly suggest to them that they do so as soon as possible.

underage= under 18  
consenting= age of consent 17

and all at this point "alleged"

So, with a little further searching I found Lee's original text and it is just as Noahswife quoted.

<http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?showtopic=11955&st=0&p=167315&#entry167315>

What was the point of Aletheia's rebuttal? As you posted and anyone can read by going to the link above, it is true that Lee said "And perhaps even the one under age was consenting..." but did not say "maybe THE MINOR was consenting.

What Aletheia went on to attempt to establish was that, per her post, "underage=under 18 and consenting=age of consent 17." On further examination of her statement I must ask, huh? Where did this statistic come from?

With the help of Google I found:  
<http://www.actwin.com/eatonohio/gay/consent.htm>

**ILLINOIS 17 Illinois law makes 18 the minimum age at which teachers and their students may legally have sex. Age 17 does not apply to teachers or any other school employee in a "position of authority" over the minor.**

So, further Googling brought up the following bit of Illinois state Law on Article 11 Sex Offenses:  
<http://www.moraloutrage.net/staticpages/index.php?page=Illinois>

**"Child" means a person under 17 years of age.**

Google is such an informative tool. FindLaw states:  
<http://writ.news.findlaw.com/grossman/20060829.html>

**According to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit - addressing a claim under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a federal anti-discrimination law that prohibits workplace sexual harassment -- the answer is that an adult's advances to an underage teen need not be unwelcome in order to be actionable.**

So it looks like Illinois law is pretty specific on the fact that "an adult's advances to an underage teen need not be unwelcome in order to be actionable.

Lee,

On January 3, 2007, when you stated "And perhaps even the underage one was consenting" the State of Illinois strongly disagrees with you.

PB

**Posted by: Pickle Mar 12 2007, 10:20 PM**

**QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 12 2007, 09:14 PM)**

WB,

To get a more complete view of Bob Pickle's veracity, reliability and his "good reputation" why don't you find out what a number of individuals who work on Wikipedia think of Bob's research methods. On that site, he is not very well thought of by many who work hard to put together reliable information for people to use to do research and obtain reliable information.

You will find him listed on Wikipedia as "DrPickle."

A Dr. he is not and as a reliable source of information there he is not consider that either.

- FHB

Fallible, you know as well as I do that usernames don't necessarily have any basis in reality. "Bystander" certainly doesn't. He is anything but a bystander. So what's the big deal what username anyone chooses at this forum or on WikiPedia?

But that username I chose at WikiPedia does have a basis in reality. It's just that you don't know what it is. But if you talk to some of the folks in the NE Mindinao Mission, as well as certain folks who

live in these parts, you'll find out at least two of the reasons I chose that username, which has nothing to do with PhD's or MD's.

Now for you to cite the opinions of papal apologists on WikiPedia who were determined to slam Seventh-day Adventism with bogus claims and information, without also citing where they had to back down and admit that I was right on certain points, aren't you either being dishonest or ignorant in your statements?

May we assume that Danny shares your sentiments, the man who allegedly is dedicated to preaching the undiluted three angels' messages, that he has gone so far as to side with papal apologists who are out to slam the Seventh-day Adventist Church? You and Bystander have alluded to my username on WikiPedia more than once, and Danny went so far as to refer to it on Feb. 15, 2007, on global TV. You guys are so interconnected, one could easily assume that Danny, like you, will at some point cite those same papal apologists as well.

Anything but admit to a mistake. Haven't you guys ever read 1 Jn. 1:9?

---

**Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 12 2007, 11:04 PM**

**QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 13 2007, 12:20 AM) □**

Now for you to cite the opinions of papal apologists on WikiPedia who were determined to slam Seventh-day Adventism with bogus claims and information, without also citing where they had to back down and admit that I was right on certain points, aren't you either being dishonest or ignorant in your statements?

The individuals you refer to were not out to slam Seventh-day Adventists. What they did was to call into question your research (which has also been admitted by Adventist historians and significant members of Adventist research to be the opposite of your stance). Your points were insignificant and their main contention in the one article you are focusing on was correct. No Bob, I am not being dishonest nor am I being ignorant. There has been a long standing issue over the particular information you were talking about on Wikipedia, and over the years it has grown more and more obvious that you are amongst those who will not accept the truth that has been uncovered in this regard. It would be great if you were right - but you are not. Your research is based on a faulty premise that has been proven to be untrue. I don't disagree that the CC has attempted to pin titles on itself - but your research has been soundly taken to task and you have been unwilling to concede that you were wrong (just as you have done here - which, after all

It is a fact that one of the individuals you are in contention with on the site is an Adventist pastor from Bermuda. He disagrees with you and made alterations to more accurately portray current SDA thought on the issue.

As an aside, if you read the discussion page you will find that there is a style evident in your writing that also prevades the JoyPickle website.

**QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 13 2007, 12:20 AM) □**

May we assume that Danny shares your sentiments, the man who allegedly is dedicated to preaching the undiluted three angels' messages, that he has gone so far as to side with papal apologists who are out to slam the Seventh-day Adventist Church? You and Bystander have alluded to my username on WikiPedia more than once, and Danny went so far as to refer to it on Feb. 15, 2007, on global TV. You guys are so interconnected, one could easily assume that Danny, like you, will at some point cite those same papal apologists as well.

Now, Bob, here we have a classic example of your MO. You are trying to take the issue of your questionable methods and the lack of integrity of your research and apply it to the Wikipedia issue. Then by insinuation you try to tie Danny and I together and insinuate that I (and possibly Danny) am a papal apologist and because I support 3ABN they must be also . . . you continue to grow more and more as a good example of dishonesty. So, let me, for the benefit of the innocents who read here make a couple of points:

1. I am not a papal apologist, never will be. I am a Seventh-day Adventist and proud of my affiliation with God's true message. I have no doubt that Danny has never been, and will never be a papal apologist either.
2. I have not spoken to Danny Shelton, nor feed him information about you. (Maybe you would be surprised - no will be surprised at what people do know about you without ever having known each other).

You twist and manipulate the words presented to you. You are unethical in your approaches and this should, for all reasoned readers, call into question your "investigation."

- FHB

---

**Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Mar 12 2007, 11:41 PM**

**QUOTE(erik @ Mar 12 2007, 03:06 PM)**

why is no one from the PPro-tommy, pro danny side willing to say on the public record Tommy shelton did nothing to Victims 1-10 or tommy did make advance to this guy but not that guy, I mean it is much easier to forgive and offer healing to the victims and to the victimizer when the whole truth and nothing but the truth is known.

I'm going to address this. I've been wanting to for a while, but I wouldn't do it because of the cocky and arrogant way I was asked about it from certain unnamed people (and I **DO** mean unnamed).

I posted the apology letter from Tommy Shelton to me for 2 reasons. Obviously, number one was because he took responsibility for what happened and said that I resisted him. He said it was his fault (It was). This puts me in the clear.

Number two was because it did show at least some remorse on Tommy's part for what happened. I thought that maybe it would help to shine a little better light on him. After the letters he and Carol wrote blasting everyone and still not denying what happened, though, I think that's probably a lost cause now.

Now everyone knows why the apology is online. I did it for myself AND Tommy. It's not my fault that it blew up in his face. He has done all this to himself. I'm not happy about it, that's just the way it is.

**QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 12 2007, 10:14 PM)**

The main point is this, Bob Pickle demands answers from everyone, while always conveniently avoiding questions put to him. I guess he gets what he gives. His methods have proven duplicitous and dishonest, which for those who are aware of what he has done, calls into question the results of his work.

He has answered plenty of questions from me. I guess it all depends on whether he thinks you can handle the answers.

---

**Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 12 2007, 11:43 PM**

**QUOTE(lookin4truth @ Mar 12 2007, 11:58 PM) □**

FHB,

Could your provide a link to the Wikipedia info your referred to. I did a search on the following (results listed).

DrPickle. -- No results  
drpickle -- No results  
dr pickle -- 380 hits

The hits that resulted from "dr pickle" were everything from the cast of Rug Rats, to information about Lyndon Johnson, etc.

I would like to read the information you referred to.

Thanks,  
L4T

L4T,

Here you go:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User\\_talk:DrPickle](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User_talk:DrPickle)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Vicarius\\_Filii\\_Dei&action=history](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Vicarius_Filii_Dei&action=history)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Vicarius\\_Filii\\_Dei](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Vicarius_Filii_Dei)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User\\_talk:Str1977/Archive4](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User_talk:Str1977/Archive4)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:AMA\\_Requests\\_for\\_Assistance/Archive6](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:AMA_Requests_for_Assistance/Archive6)

The issue there is not whether the CC has faulty theology - it is the methods of Bob Pickle's work. His research has been proven to be faulty and even disavowed by the SDA churches historians. It would be a great thing to pin this on the CC, but the evidence isn't there to support it. Even when he has been proven wrong he will not admit it.

- FHB

---

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 13 2007, 12:15 AM**

**QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Mar 12 2007, 10:41 PM) □**

I'm going to address this. I've been wanting to for a while, but I wouldn't do it because of the

cocky and arrogant way I was asked about it from certain unnamed people (and I **DO** mean unnamed).

I posted the apology letter from Tommy Shelton to me for 2 reasons. Obviously, number one was because he took responsibility for what happened and said that I resisted him. He said it was his fault (It was). This puts me in the clear.

am still trying to understand why you didn't post your answer to him. that is only fair.

---

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 13 2007, 12:38 AM**

**QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 12 2007, 10:04 PM)**

The individuals you refer to were not out to slam Seventh-day Adventists. What they did was to call into question your research (which has also been admitted by Adventist historians and significant members of Adventist research to be the opposite of your stance). Your points were insignificant and their main contention in the one article you are focusing on was correct. No Bob, I am not being dishonest nor am I being ignorant. There has been a long standing issue over the particular information you were talking about on Wikipedia, and over the years it has grown more and more obvious that you are amongst those who will not accept the truth that has been uncovered in this regard. It would be great if you were right - but you are not. Your research is based on a faulty premise that has been proven to be untrue. I don't disagree that the CC has attempted to pin titles on itself - but your research has been soundly taken to task and you have been unwilling to concede that you were wrong (just as you have done here - which, after all

It is a fact that one of the individuals you are in contention with on the site is an Adventist pastor from Bermuda. He disagrees with you and made alterations to more accurately portray current SDA thought on the issue.

As an aside, if you read the discussion page you will find that there is a style evident in your writing that also prevades the JoyPickle website.

Now, Bob, here we have a classic example of your MO. You are trying to take the issue of your questionable methods and the lack of integrity of your research and apply it to the Wikipedia issue. Then by insinuation you try to tie Danny and I together and insinuate that I (and possibly Danny) am a papal apologist and because I support 3ABN they must be also . . . you continue to grow more and more as a good example of dishonesty. So, let me, for the benefit of the innocents who read here make a couple of points:

1. I am not a papal apologist, never will be. I am a Seventh-day Adventist and proud of my affiliation with God's true message. I have no doubt that Danny has never been, and will never be a papal apologist either.
2. I have not spoken to Danny Shelton, nor feed him information about you. (Maybe you would be surprised - no will be surprised at what people do know about you without ever having known each other).

You twist and manipulate the words presented to you. You are unethical in your approaches and this should, for all reasoned readers, call into question your "investigation."

- FHB



Never have I seen a more beautiful example of the Pickled Propaganda. He first says you "must be" a papal apologists, then says if you are then that means that Danny S must be.

Honestly, since we have called everyone's attention to this so much, you would think he would be more careful. Instead he is amplifying his ludicrous assassination of word play.

Also, for those that say Bobby boy does not have to answer questions if the rest of us don't. You would be comparing apples and oranges. None of us have claimed to be an "investigator" on the trail of a "so called corrupt" ministry. None of us have claimed to be a direct representative of anyone. He has. You all tell me. He claims all his info his true, he claims he doesn't push and harass to get it, he claims to be part of an investigative team with Joy, so why distance yourself from the writing at save 3abn not? Somebody has to make up those enquirer type sensational headlines. Sounds right up your alley BBP.

**Posted by: Whtz Happenin Mar 13 2007, 12:42 AM**

**QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Mar 13 2007, 01:41 AM)**

I'm going to address this. I've been wanting to for a while, but I wouldn't do it because of the cocky and arrogant way I was asked about it from certain unnamed people (and I **DO** mean unnamed).

I posted the apology letter from Tommy Shelton to me for 2 reasons. Obviously, number one was because he took responsibility for what happened and said that I resisted him. He said it was his fault (It was). This puts me in the clear.

Number two was because it did show at least some remorse on Tommy's part for what happened. I thought that maybe it would help to shine a little better light on him. After the letters he and Carol wrote blasting everyone and still not denying what happened, though, I think that's probably a lost cause now.

Now everyone knows why the apology is online. I did it for myself AND Tommy. It's not my fault that it blew up in his face. He has done all this to himself. I'm not happy about it, that's just the way it is.

...

Duane, It takes a God fearing man to take a stand like you have. It has and will allow others to have the confidence to come forward and start the healing process that God will provide if they seek Him.

If only Tommy would realize that he is doing more harm to himself and others by staying in hiding.


**QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 13 2007, 01:43 AM)**

L4T,

Here you go:

...

- FHB




FHB, If this is keeping you up at night and you feel this strong about it, I suggest that you start your own website, possibly [www.savepickle.com](http://www.savepickle.com). I do not see where this has anything to do with 3ABN or child abuse.

**Posted by: Ralph Mar 13 2007, 01:04 AM**

**QUOTE(Whtz Happenin @ Mar 12 2007, 11:42 PM)**

If only Tommy would realize that he is doing more harm to himself and others by staying in hiding.



FHB, If this is keeping you up at night and you feel this strong about it, I suggest that you start your own website, possibly [www.savepickle.com](http://www.savepickle.com). I do not see where this has anything to do with 3ABN or child abuse.

It has nothing to do with 3ABN. It is just another red herring.

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 13 2007, 01:25 AM**

**QUOTE(Whtz Happenin @ Mar 12 2007, 11:42 PM)**


Duane, It takes a God fearing man to take a stand like you have. It has and will allow others to have the confidence to come forward and start the healing process that God will provide if they seek Him.

I do not see where this has anything to do with 3ABN or child abuse.

It has everything to do with it since Pickle is a self appointed investigator and reporter on the alleged events surrounding 3abn. His credibility is being called into question as well as, his manipulation of words which totally changes the actual facts. We already know that he is not a credentialed investigator or reporter and has absolutely no standing where 3abn is concerned. Now, he is showing time and again how he "changes words to change the facts." If he is not truthful, and an unreliable source, then obviously that has a big impact on what he "reports" about 3abn.

**Posted by: erik Mar 13 2007, 02:29 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 12 2007, 10:38 PM)**

Never have I seen a more beautiful example of the Pickled Propaganda. He first says you "must be" a papal apologists, then says if you are then that means that Danny S must be. 

Honestly, since we have called everyone's attention to this so much, you would think he would be more careful. Instead he is amplifying his ludicrous assassination of word play.

Also, for those that say Bobby boy does not have to answer questions if the rest of us don't. You would be comparing apples and oranges. None of us have claimed to be an "investigator" on the trail of a "so called corrupt" ministry. None of us have claimed to be a direct representative of anyone. He has. You all tell me. He claims all his info his true, he claims he doesn't push and harass to get it, he claims to be part of an investigative team with Joy, so why distance yourself from the writing at save 3abn not? Somebody has to make up those enquirer type sensational headlines. Sounds right up your alley BBP.

TO THE PRO-DANNY GROUP,

Can you explain how proving Mr. Pickle and Mr. Joy are idiots, fools, and all around bad guys.

DOES one thing to make the 3abn mess any better.

If they are are wet behind the ears, or even worse yet, proven to be liars.

How does that make the lack of danny's right to remarried any different.

How does that make the wild and down right silly emails that mr. Danny Shelton has penned, any more Godly or Christian?

How does that make Tommy asking boys and young men for sexual favors any less hard to look the other way on?

Plus this looks like more of the same old same old, out of the 3abn crowd smear smear, and then act like a victim.

If 3abn has nothing to hide then why all the attacks, when the truth would shut Mr. Pickle and Mr. Joy, much faster then acting like a bunch of guilty kids with your hands in the cookie jar.

On side note, Are you claiming that the letters appear to written by various people at 3abn including danny all true emails or have has the words and letters been change?

YES or NO?

I personally found mr. Pickle's book confronting the video that attacked the SDA church to be very helpful and well researched, that book is sold in various abc across the US, and that book is why when realized that he was the same guy called bob, and this posts had some weight in my mind personally.

BUT, i will say that Danny Shelton and the Pro-3abn crowd is what changed my mind from being on the side to lets clean out the trash, and restore 3abn, danny, linda, and tommy to what gods ants them to be.

Also letters of Barbara Kerr really moved my understanding of the whole deal. Then when Mabel Dunbar wrote her letter it was like ok, the smoke has turned to fire and the church and better start smell the mess at 3abn.

So again why go after Mr. Pickle, and Mr. Joy if 3abn has nothing to hide, just bring out the truth and they will be shown to the lairs you are claiming them to be.

Erik

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 12 2007, 11:25 PM) □**

It has everything to do with it since Pickle is a self appointed investigator and reporter on the alleged events surrounding 3abn. His credibility is being called into question as well as, his manipulation of words which totally changes the actual facts. We already know that he is not a credentialed investigator or reporter and has absolutely no standing where 3abn is concerned. Now, he is showing time and again how he "changes words to change the facts." If he is not truthful, and an unreliable source, then obviously that has a big impact on what he "reports" about 3abn.

Bystander,

Then are you claiming he is making up the letters from victims of tommy's, if so then i would be in court so fast his head would spin, or if i was being nice i would just have the "victims" right a letter saying this never happended to me.

IF Mr. Pickle or MR. Joy were wrong has to the basic facts of the 3abn issue it would be so easy to prove them wrong, so that fact that you and others are going out side this 3abn stuff to try and show some how that they are are all wrong just looks silly, and certain rings hollow on the proof dept.

Erik

---

**Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Mar 13 2007, 11:29 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 13 2007, 12:15 AM) □**

I am still trying to understand why you didn't post your answer to him. that is only fair.

If I still had a copy, I would.

---

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 13 2007, 12:56 PM**

**QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 12 2007, 10:44 PM) □**

Wow, that is quite a broadly brushed statement. I'm not sure it will go down in history as a principle as helpful as Occam's Razor. If you don't agree with our opinions you can't agree with the opinions of anybody else. HmMMM.

If you, Lee, wwjd and Bystander can establish credibility as first-hand commentary, your opinions will count every bit as much as the others who have developed credibility for theirs. But that is JMO.

PB

'B,

Bob kept e-mailing me how we had the same concerns and questions, and pretending to be my friend, he told me that FHB lived in my immediate area (very small) or was travelling through because of his job and was up to no good, and his proof of this was the IP# he had from FHB. This was outright false.

But stupidly I believed all his insinuations at first and got worried and alarmed by what he kept telling me, but still wanting to give FHB the benefit of the doubt sent Bob a email from FHB which I told him made me believe FHB was sincere.

It was all a trick to track FHB down, proven by Bob's reply as soon as I did so. And as you can plainly see from our posts Bob is not a friend to me, and disagrees with me about almost everything. Then Bob tried to intimidate me into not posting any more....

I sent copies of Bob's and my messages to FHB, and apologised for what I had done, and FHB confronted him, Bob denied all, even though it was all in plain black and white.

So when FHB talks about personal experience with Bob's tactics and methods, yes some of us have personal experience.

So I am genuinely concerned here and respectfully ask, When it comes to opinions and first hand testimony from other posters, whether anonymous or identified, whom you don't know, what do you use as a criteria to determine what is truth , error, or even lies?

I ask, For you have written many times you came here with an open mind, and it was only after reading here that you formed your opinions, and you advise other other "newbies" to do the same.

I'd really like to know. I hope and pray it's not the court of public opinion members here keep talking about. For the history of this world is full of examples proving how the Court of public opinion, and the majority rules, is nothing more then mob rule, and doesn't prove anything as far as what the true acts are, or what is right or wrong.

---

**Posted by: wwjd Mar 13 2007, 01:03 PM**

---

**QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Mar 13 2007, 12:29 PM) □**

If I still had a copy, I would.

Could you just give an "overall" of what you said.  
Thanks

---

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 13 2007, 01:08 PM**

---

**QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Mar 12 2007, 09:41 PM) □**

I'm going to address this. I've been wanting to for a while, but I wouldn't do it because of the cocky and arrogant way I was asked about it from certain unnamed people (and I **DO** mean unnamed).

I posted the apology letter from Tommy Shelton to me for 2 reasons. Obviously, number one was because he took responsibility for what happened and said that I resisted him. He said it was his fault (It was). This puts me in the clear.

Number two was because it did show at least some remorse on Tommy's part for what happened. I thought that maybe it would help to shine a little better light on him. After the letters he and Carol wrote blasting everyone and still not denying what happened, though, I think that's probably a lost cause now.

Now everyone knows why the apology is online. I did it for myself AND Tommy. It's not my fault that it blew up in his face. He has done all this to himself. I'm not happy about it, that's just the way it is.

Duane,

I just have to commend you, once again, for taking the bold step you did in bringing this all forward. Your courage has started others on that journey, as well, and that is a wonderful thing! I know it has brought you pain and probably even heart ache as you have seen some of the responses to your testimony. Stay strong in the Lord and keep hope in your heart.

I pray and want to believe that, in the long run, even Tommy will be edified by the public exposure of his problems. Before it became public knowledge, at the very least Tommy and God have always known of his deeds. It has to be eating away at his heart unless he has so closed his ears to the Holy Spirit that he is unreachable. I hope he is not to that point. Yes, the letters from both he and Carol are evidence that they are still deep in denial. What they don't seem to grasp is the freedom that will come with true repentance, forgiveness and accountability.

I continue to pray that other alleged victims will have the strength to break the silence and start the healing.

PB

---

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 13 2007, 01:20 PM**

**QUOTE(wwjd @ Mar 13 2007, 02:03 PM) □**

Could you just give an "overall" of what you said.  
Thanks

I would sincerely appreciate that also. As it is my understanding that you and Tommy remained friends?

I have been very worried about your involvement in this whole Pickle and Joy investigation, and their

accusations of Tommy being a child molester, Worried for you. Reason being Bob claimed to me on the phone, that you were first defending Tommy, and that he and Joy were working on you, and then suddenly here you were, and no longer defending Tommy.

I just don't understand how you could go from one point to another so quickly when you were around when Tommy was first accused and knew all involved, and had a Mom who even worked at the school all those years, But knowing Bob's tactics I have been worried you were manipulated by things he told you which may not be true.

That may or may not be the case, but you could help here if you choose.

---

**Posted by: wwjd Mar 13 2007, 01:21 PM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 13 2007, 01:56 PM) □**

PB,

Bob kept e-mailing me how we had the same concerns and questions, and pretending to be my friend, he told me that FHB lived in my immediate area (very small) or was travelling through because of his job and was up to no good, and his proof of this was the IP# he had from FHB. This was outright false.

But stupidly I believed all his insinuations at first and got worried and alarmed by what he kept telling me, but still wanting to give FHB the benefit of the doubt sent Bob a email from FHB which I told him made me believe FHB was sincere.

It was all a trick to track FHB down, proven by Bob's reply as soon as I did so. And as you can plainly see from our posts Bob is not a friend to me, and disagrees with me about almost everything. Then Bob tried to intimidate me into not posting any more....

I sent copies of Bob's and my messages to FHB, and apologised for what I had done, and FHB confronted him, Bob denied all, even though it was all in plain black and white.

So when FHB talks about personal experience with Bob's tactics and methods, yes some of us have personal experience.

So I am genuinly concerned here and respectfully ask, When it comes to opinions and first hand testimony from other posters, whether anonymous or identified, whom you don't know, what do you use as a criteria to determine what is truth , error, or even lies?

I ask, For you have written many times you came here with an open mind, and it was only after reading here that you formed your opinions, and you advise other other "newbies" to do the same.

I'd really like to know. I hope and pray it's not the court of public opinion members here keep talking about. For the history of this world is full of examples proving how the Court of public opinion, and the majority rules, is nothing more then mob rule, and doesn't prove anything as far as what the true facts are, or what is right or wrong.

Aletheia, Pickle knows what he does with words and insinuation. Unless he has done it so long he has lost discernment between right and wrong. His "conclusions" that are drawn from statements made by others, continue to become more and more incredible. The people here are "all for him" because he is on their side. Now, if was to "cross over" and start his spins from the other side, they would laugh and ridicule him into the ground. I can see clearly what would be done to his word

manipulation. See what I tell you. When they read this, they will start attacking me, instead of addressing my statement of what they would do to him if the shoe was on the other foot. Oh well, doesn't really matter. We know it and so does God.

---

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 13 2007, 01:32 PM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 13 2007, 10:56 AM) □**

PB,

Bob kept e-mailing me how we had the same concerns and questions, and pretending to be my friend, he told me that FHB lived in my immediate area (very small) or was travelling through because of his job and was up to no good, and his proof of this was the IP# he had from FHB. This was outright false.

But stupidly I believed all his insinuations at first and got worried and alarmed by what he kept telling me, but still wanting to give FHB the benefit of the doubt sent Bob a email from FHB which I told him made me believe FHB was sincere.

Did Bob Pickle ask you to send him one of FHB's emails?

**QUOTE**

It was all a trick to track FHB down, proven by Bob's reply as soon as I did so. And as you can plainly see from our posts Bob is not a friend to me, and disagrees with me about almost everything. Then Bob tried to intimidate me into not posting any more....

I sent copies of Bob's and my messages to FHB, and apologised for what I had done, and FHB confronted him, Bob denied all, even though it was all in plain black and white.

What was Bob's reply as soon as you did so? Can you post your proof of your claims here?

I have seen Bob take many posters to task when they post something that needs a response. I have often seen problems in things you have posted so I am not surprised that you would get disagreement from Bob.

**QUOTE**

So when FHB talks about personal experience with Bob's tactics and methods, yes some of us have personal experience.

So I am genuinely concerned here and respectfully ask, When it comes to opinions and first hand testimony from other posters, whether anonymous or identified, whom you don't know, what do you use as a criteria to determine what is truth , error, or even lies?

I do my best to determine the credibility of the person posting or making the claims. I look for corroboration of their claims from other witnesses, as the Bible counsels. Are the claims/accusations made from first-hand experience? Are they mere he said/she said hearsay? I also consider the motivation or goal of the one making the claims/accusations. Are they looking to destroy or are they attempting to bring truth to light in order to edify.



**QUOTE**

I ask, For you have written many times you came here with an open mind, and it was only after reading here that you formed your opinions, and you advise other other "newbies" to do the same.

I'd really like to know. I hope and pray it's not the court of public opinion members here keep talking about. For the history of this world is full of examples proving how the Court of public opinion, and the majority rules, is nothing more then mob rule, and doesn't prove anything as far as what the true facts are, or what is right or wrong.

Reading here with an "open" yet cautious mind is part of what I used to come to my opinions. I also factored in what I have seen for myself of Danny's and other's comments and the documentation on save3abn.com as well as other credible resources.

With a ministry such as 3abn, the most important court IS the court of public opinion. What evidence that "court" is given will, to a great degree determine the future of the ministry. You and others need to give the public at large more credit for being capable of independant thought and the ability to discern evidence for themselves.

I maintain that looking down your noses at "chat rooms" is a dangerous position if you want to save the reputation of 3abn. There are lots of good and honest folk here. You would do well to keep that in mind.

PB

---

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 13 2007, 01:48 PM**

You really need to quit, Cindy. TS was/is a married pastor. Him asking anyone but his wife for sex is wrong. However, you and your friends are only intersted in keeping him out of prison, so you continue to victimize his victim by insinuation that they had a homosexual affair, instead of dealing with the real issues. That is no better. That is sick, real sick.

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 13 2007, 12:20 PM)**

I would sincerely appreciate that also. As it is my understanding that you and Tommy remained friends?

I have been very worried about your involvement in this whole Pickle and Joy investigation, and their accusations of Tommy being a child molester, Worried for you. Reason being Bob claimed to me on the phone, that you were first defending Tommy, and that he and Joy were working on you, and then suddenly here you were, and no longer defending Tommy.

I just don't understand how you could go from one point to another so quickly when you were around when Tommy was first accused and knew all involved, and had a Mom who even worked at the school all those years, But knowing Bob's tactics I have been worried you were manipulated by things he told you which may not be true.

That may or may not be the case, but you could help here if you choose.

---

Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 13 2007, 02:00 PM

QUOTE(wwjd @ Mar 13 2007, 11:21 AM) □

Aletheia, Pickle knows what he does with words and insinuation. Unless he has done it so long he has lost discernment between right and wrong. His "conclusions" that are drawn from statements made by others, continue to become more and more incredible. **The people here are "all for him" because he is on their side.** Now, if was to "cross over" and start his spins from the other side, they would laugh and ridicule him into the ground. I can see clearly what would be done to his word manipulation. See what I tell you. When they read this, they will start attacking me, instead of addressing my statement of what they would do to him if the shoe was on the other foot. Oh well, doesn't really matter. We know it and so does God.

wwjd,

While I would personally like to see Bob Pickle put aside his word play and just stick to straight and clear statements, I don't think it reflects on him as a lack of discernment. Anyone with a clear mind can look at the statement by Walt Thompson and see that he is, in effect, saying just what Bob Pickle is relaying by "putting words into WT's mouth". I think the impact of Bob's conclusions would be more positive and the influence of his clear perception greater if he would not play word games with the information. Saying that, each of us has our own personalities and ways to communicate. If that is Bob's way, we just need to work a little harder to "get" what he is pointing out.

There, I addressed your statement. Unfortunately, I must also "attack" your statement for I find your statement rather narrow minded and bordering on silliness. I would suggest that is Bob was posting on "the other side", whatever that is, thoughtful people would consider his points to see if what he was speaking was credible. Those not capable of clear thinking would simply jump to criticize the messenger without considering the message. But that is all JMO.

PB

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 13 2007, 11:20 AM) □

I would sincerely appreciate that also. As it is my understanding that you and Tommy remained friends?

I have been very worried about your involvement in this whole Pickle and Joy investigation, and their accusations of Tommy being a child molester, Worried for you. Reason being Bob claimed to me on the phone, that you were first defending Tommy, and that he and Joy were working on you, and then suddenly here you were, and no longer defending Tommy.

I just don't understand how you could go from one point to another so quickly when you were around when Tommy was first accused and knew all involved, and had a Mom who even worked at the school all those years, But knowing Bob's tactics I have been worried you were manipulated by things he told you which may not be true.

That may or may not be the case, but you could help here if you choose.

Once again, Aletheia, you have shown that you don't understand the subject of sexual abuse.

That you would try to second guess and undermine the testimony of Duane does not reflect well on you at all!

PB

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 13 2007, 02:08 PM

QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 13 2007, 02:32 PM)

Did Bob Pickle ask you to send him one of FHB's emails?  
What was Bob's reply as soon as you did so? Can you post your proof of your claims here?

I have seen Bob take many posters to task when they post something that needs a response. I have often seen problems in things you have posted so I am not surprised that you would get disagreement from Bob.

I do my best to determine the credibility of the person posting or making the claims. I look for corroboration of their claims from other witnesses, as the Bible counsels. Are the claims/accusations made from first-hand experience? Are they mere he said/she said hearsay? I also consider the motivation or goal of the one making the claims/accusations. Are they looking to destroy or are they attempting to bring truth to light in order to edify. Reading here with an "open" yet cautious mind is part of what I used to come to my opinions. I also factored in what I have seen for myself of Danny's and other's comments and the documentation on save3abn.com as well as other credible resources.

With a ministry such as 3abn, the most important court IS the court of public opinion. What evidence that "court" is given will, to a great degree determine the future of the ministry. You and others need to give the public at large more credit for being capable of independant thought and the ability to discern evidence for themselves.

I maintain that looking down your noses at "chat rooms" is a dangerous position if you want to save the reputation of 3abn. There are lots of good and honest folk here. You would do well to keep that in mind.

PB

Yes Pb, Bob asked me to send him FHB's email, he said it would help the others such as Fran, to accept FHB's sincerity. It was not used for that purpose, he then claimed he wanted the e-mail address and IP# on it which is included with an attached e-mail..

And truthfully, I do not know if I can post those messages, because I'm on thin ice here, I was warned, then banned without posting a word, and then warned again yesterday still while not posting or saying even one word and told I will have no further warnings by someone who keeps telling me to stop posting. --- any post could therefore be my last.

--Also, when FHB tried to post to Bob about all this here to warn you all, the thread was closed, so I don't know if it would be violating some rule.

Also -- Respectfully I disagree that the court of public opinion is the most important when it comes to **a ministry**, It is God's court that trumps all, and his spirit which rules and convicts. I believe these words apply to 3ABN and any other ministry, as well, even if they are totally apostate:

It was the court of public opinion that murdered Christ, it was the court of public opinion that persecuted his disciples, and it was the majority, the court of public opinion who ruled during the dark ages and slew the saints and martyrs of God.

Act 5:27 And when they had brought them, they set [them] before the council: and the high priest asked them,

28 Saying, Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us.

29 Then Peter and the [other] apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men.

30 The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree.

31 Him hath God exalted with his right hand [to be] a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.

32 And we are his witnesses of these things; and [so is] also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.

33 When they heard [that], they were cut [to the heart], and took counsel to slay them.

34 Then stood there up one in the council, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, had in reputation among all the people, and commanded to put the apostles forth a little space;

35 And said unto them, Ye men of Israel, take heed to yourselves what ye intend to do as touching these men.

36 For before these days rose up Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves: who was slain; and all, as many as obeyed him, were scattered, and brought to nought.

37 After this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him: he also perished; and all, [even] as many as obeyed him, were dispersed.

38 And now **I say unto you, Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought:**

**39 But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.**

40 And to him they agreed: and when they had called the apostles, and beaten [them], they commanded that they should not speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go.

41 And they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name.

42 And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ.

~ Aletheia

P.S. I do not look down my nose at chat rooms . Far from it. I simply am saying God has standards to prove sin and error, or truth and lies, and so does our civil governments. I do not believe all the members here are following those standards and principles, but they have nothing to do with the other members who are, and are also members here.

---

**Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 13 2007, 02:15 PM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 13 2007, 12:25 AM) □**

It has everything to do with it since Pickle is a self appointed investigator and reporter on the alleged events surrounding 3abn. His credibility is being called into question as well ...

You SAYING "His credibility is being called into question" does not mean it is. Who is calling it into question? umm, besides YOU? But you make blanket statements (as usual) out to sound as though they are majority/group statements...why do you do this? Do you still believe that if you say it is so, it is so? Nope, not so. WAKE UP WAKE UP!

You don't have to have a detective license to put 2+2+2 together...people do it all the time. Get involved in a good cause and gather information, with witness, etc. Thank goodness we have people that care enough to get involved....it's the people that make things happen, everyone working together for the cause, and it works everyday in this world.

You keep attacking the messenger...nice distraction, but it doesn't work. I know, I know ... you can't help it.

---

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 13 2007, 02:20 PM**

**QUOTE(Whitz Happenin @ Mar 12 2007, 03:02 PM)**


This looks like the start of another useless thread. If you have a question for Pickle, please just send him a PM.

I agree....

**QUOTE(Noahswife @ Mar 12 2007, 03:10 PM)**

... Where is that picture of the red herring I saw Clay post on some other thread?

Here's one....




# Red Herring!

**QUOTE(Ralph @ Mar 13 2007, 02:04 AM)**

It has nothing to do with 3ABN. It is just another red herring.

...and here it goes again....



# Red Herring!

**QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 13 2007, 02:48 PM)**

You really need to quit, Cindy. TS was/is a married pastor. Him asking anyone but his wife for sex is wrong. However, you and your friends are only intersted in keeping him out of prison, so you continue to victimize his victim by insinuation that they had a homosexual affair, instead of dealing with the real issues. That is no better. That is sick, real sick.

I truly wonder what the exact same folks that continually try to make this about the victim will say when sexual abuse hits their families and homes.....


I wonder.....

Satan is busy.....

**Posted by: Noahswife Mar 13 2007, 02:25 PM**

**QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 13 2007, 04:20 PM)**

...and here it goes again.....



# Red Herring!



This veggie has to get me one of those critters for myself as it looks like I might be needing it a lot in the near future.

nw  
C"I"

**Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 13 2007, 02:26 PM**

**QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 13 2007, 01:20 PM)**

I agree....  
Here's one....



# Red Herring!

...and here it goes again....



# Red Herring!

I truly wonder what the exact same folks that continually try to make this about the victim will say when sexual abuse hits their families and homes.....

I wonder.....

Satan is busy.....

Maybe it has hit their families and this is how they deal with it....won't get the right help, just live in denial, justification and dysfunction.

**Posted by: Noahswife Mar 13 2007, 02:55 PM**

**QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 13 2007, 03:00 PM)**

PB

Once again, Aletheia, you have shown that you don't understand the subject of sexual abuse.

PB

And although I find interesting the fact Aletheia still ignores the concept of sexual exploitation where sexual preference is not the issue and consent is not possible when a professional such as a pastor is involved, I think this is all offtopic again and needs to go to another thread.  off

The whole point of this thread was to ask Pickle to respond to a specific question. He stated he would when Lee answered a prior very specific question of his. She said she would not. So why does this thread continue?

W  
:"i"

**Posted by: calvin Mar 13 2007, 02:56 PM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 13 2007, 02:08 PM)**

And truthfully, I do not know if I can post those messages, because I'm on thin ice here, I was warned, then banned without posting a word, and then warned again yesterday still while not posting or saying even one word and told I will have no further warnings by someone who keeps telling me to stop posting. --- any post could therefore be my last.  
--Also, when FHB tried to post to Bob about all this here to warn you all, the thread was closed, so I don't know if it would be violating some rule.

When in doubt about what you can post here, send it to me in an PM for approval.

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 13 2007, 02:58 PM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 13 2007, 12:08 PM)**

Yes Pb, Bob asked me to send him FHB's email, he said it would help the others such as Fran, to accept FHB's sincerity. It was not used for that purpose, he then claimed he wanted the e-mail address and IP# on it which is included with an attached e-mail..

And truthfully, I do not know if I can post those messages, because I'm on thin ice here, I was warned, then banned without posting a word, and then warned again yesterday still while not posting or saying even one word and told I will have no further warnings by someone who keeps telling me to stop posting. --- any post could therefore be my last.  
--Also, when FHB tried to post to Bob about all this here to warn you all, the thread was closed, so I don't know if it would be violating some rule.

Also -- Respectfully I disagree that the court of public opinion is the most important when it comes to **a ministry**, It is God's court that trumps all, and his spirit which rules and convicts. I believe these words apply to 3ABN and any other ministry, as well, even if they are totally apostate:

**It was the court of public opinion that murdered Christ, it was the court of public opinion that persecuted his disciples, and it was the majority, the court of public opinion who ruled during the dark ages and slew the saints and martyrs of God.**

Act 5:27 And when they had brought them, they set [them] before the council: and the high priest asked them,  
28 Saying, Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us.  
29 Then Peter and the [other] apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men.  
30 The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree.  
31 Him hath God exalted with his right hand [to be] a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.  
32 And we are his witnesses of these things; and [so is] also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.  
33 When they heard [that], they were cut [to the heart], and took counsel to slay them.  
  
34 Then stood there up one in the council, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, had in reputation among all the people, and commanded to put the apostles forth a little space;  
35 And said unto them, Ye men of Israel, take heed to yourselves what ye intend to do as touching these men.  
36 For before these days rose up Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves: who was slain; and all, as many as obeyed him, were scattered, and brought to nought.  
37 After this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people



after him: he also perished; and all, [even] as many as obeyed him, were dispersed.

38 And now **I say unto you, Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought:**

**39 But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.**

40 And to him they agreed: and when they had called the apostles, and beaten [them], they commanded that they should not speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go.

41 And they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name.

42 And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ.

~ Aletheia

P.S. I do not look down my nose at chat rooms . Far from it. I simply am saying God has standards to prove sin and error, or truth and lies, and so does our civil governments. I do not believe all the members here are following those standards and principles, but they have nothing to do with the other members who are, and are also members here.

believe you are mistaken that it was the court of public opinion that "murdered" Christ, persecuted he disciples and martyred God's saints in the dark ages. It was the corrupt leaders in those times who were responsible for those things.

The true court of public opinion during Christ's time were His disciples and the multitudes of followers that became Christians. They saw the evidence, used the brains God blessed them with and followed the truth!

'B

---

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 13 2007, 03:00 PM**

**QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 13 2007, 03:00 PM)**

PB

Once again, Aletheia, you have shown that you don't understand the subject of sexual abuse.

That you would try to second guess and undermine the testimony of Duane does not reflect well on you at all!

PB

'B, I was not undermining or second guessing him. I actually care about Duane and because of that, and because unlike many here I don't know what other people's motives and intents and actions are without asking questions; I prefer to ask Duane himself his side and perspective first and foremost, rather than hearing it from Pickle, Joy, or any other, and or assuming..

Why that is a problem to you all is something I don't understand.

---

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 13 2007, 03:26 PM**

Cindy, stop it! If you have questions about why you were suspended, PM myself, Calvin, or Clay.

This kind of stuff will get suspended again. But I can say this, if you want to know why you were suspended last Friday, just ask somebody, anybody, and they will tell you. Another hint, you need to give respect to ALL Admins, trying to front me off ain't the way to show respect.

As ofr me, as a member telling you to stop posting, you are partially correct, telling only half of the truth whiech stilla whole lie. I ask you to stop posting....until you understand that which you are posting about. until you read and get a good understanding of the subject at hand.

I don't do well with thinly disguised insults, if you got something to say to me be a woman about it and say it(in PM). There is a good reason for every action taken, don't pretend you don't know. If you have anything further to say about this post, PM myself, Clay or Calvin.

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 13 2007, 01:08 PM) □**

And truthfully, I do not know if I can post those messages, because I'm on thin ice here, I was warned, then banned without posting a word, and then warned again yesterday still while not posting or saying even one word and told I will have no further warnings by someone who keeps telling me to stop posting. --- any post could therefore be my last.

---

**Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 13 2007, 03:31 PM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 13 2007, 04:08 PM) □**

Also -- Respectfully I disagree that the court of public opinion is the most important when it comes to **a ministry**, It is God's court that trumps all, and his spirit which rules and convicts. I believe these words apply to 3ABN and any other ministry, as well, even if they are totally apostate:

It was the court of public opinion that murdered Christ, it was the court of public opinion that persecuted his disciples, and it was the majority, the court of public opinion who ruled during the dark ages and slew the saints and martyrs of God.

It was the court of public opinion where Danny tried to eradicate and expunge all evidence of Linda's presence at 3ABN; it was in the court of public opinion that he maligned her even while he forbade her from defending herself; it is in the court of public opinion where he continues to try to use his bully pulpit to denigrate those who will not go along with his game and pretend they dont see that the emperor has no clothes.

The court in which this is being played out is the court of Danny's own choosing... and he chose the court of public opinion just as the Sanhedrin did when they persecuted the disciples and when the RCC slew those would not stand by idly as their corruption and indulgences and open sins crucified Christ afresh and put Him to an open shame...

So if you have issues with the court of public opinion... you need to take them and lay them at the feet of the camp wherein you reside.

In His service,  
Mr. J

---

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 13 2007, 03:33 PM**

Then ask him in PM. Trying to insinuate that he has/had some ongoing "relationship" with TS on the world wide web, is not caring for him. Plus, I think he makes his "side" quite clear. That is why we are having such a problem with your posts to him. What point do they serve other than to try to discredit in front of everyone him by insisting there is/was some ongoing relationship? You have inferred this before and were told that further victimization of any victims coming forward here, besides being just sick, will not be tolerated. Rephrasing it and couching it in "christian" love will not help. You had better write down the motto, being a member you may need to use it yourself one day....."This is not Sabbath School....We pay attention here".

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 13 2007, 02:00 PM) □**

PB, I was not undermining or second guessing him. I actually care about Duane and because of that, and because unlike many here I don't know what other people's motives and intents and actions are without asking questions; **I prefer to ask Duane himself his side and perspective first and foremost**, rather than hearing it from Pickle, Joy, or any other, and or assuming..



Why that is a problem to you all is something I don't understand.

---

**Posted by: Jnana15 Mar 13 2007, 03:54 PM**

**QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 13 2007, 04:33 PM) □**

[y....."This is not Sabbath School...We pay attention here". [/color]

 Thank you! Thank you!  snk

---

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 13 2007, 04:27 PM**

**QUOTE(calvin @ Mar 13 2007, 03:56 PM) □**

When in doubt about what you can post here, send it to me in an PM for approval.

ok. Thanks.

**Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 13 2007, 05:14 PM**

**QUOTE(awesumtenor)**

It was the court of public opinion where Danny tried to eradicate and expunge all evidence of Linda's presence at 3ABN; it was in the court of public opinion that he maligned her even while he forbade her from defending herself; it is in the court of public opinion where he continues to try to use his bully pulpit to denigrate those who will not go along with his game and pretend they don't see that the emperor has no clothes.

The court in which this is being played out is the court of Danny's own choosing... and he chose the court of public opinion just as the Sanhedrin did when they persecuted the disciples and when the RCC slew those would not stand by idly as their corruption and indulgences and open sins crucified Christ afresh and put Him to an open shame...

So if you have issues with the court of public opinion... you need to take them and lay them at the feet of the camp wherein you reside.

Very good! I might add that it was the court of archbishops inside compound of the Vatican, during the Inquisition, that slew the saints and martyrs of God, and through their own corrupt bias, determined the innocent were guilty.

Hummmm.....*compound? Inquisition?* There must be a parallel in there somewhere for So Ill.

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 13 2007, 06:47 PM**

**QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 13 2007, 12:48 PM)**

You really need to quit, Cindy. TS was/is a married pastor. Him asking anyone but his wife for sex is wrong. However, you and your friends are only interested in keeping him out of prison, so you continue to victimize his victim by insinuation that they had a homosexual affair, instead of dealing with the real issues. That is no better. That is sick, real sick.

Di, you need to quit making accusing statements. If even one allegation was true concerning anyone underage, jail time would not be a factor anyway. I know. I asked an Illinois lawyer friend of mine. He explained that even though the statute of limitations was supposed to be extended, most cases it would not work in. He then went into a lot of attorney rhetoric that I don't even pretend to understand but the bottom line is no one in these particular circumstances (if true at all) would do any jail time.

My point? Di is just one of many who make these statements that have no basis in fact.

**Posted by: Clay Mar 13 2007, 07:00 PM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 13 2007, 07:47 PM)**

Di, you need to quit making accusing statements. If even one allegation was true concerning anyone underage, jail time would not be a factor anyway. I know. I asked an Illinois lawyer friend of mine. He explained that even though the statute of limitations was supposed to be extended,

most cases it would not work in. He then went into a lot of attorney rhetoric that I don't even pretend to understand but the bottom line is no one in these particular circumstances (if true at all) would do any jail time.  
My point? Di is just one of many who make these statments that have no basis in fact.

he may never go to jail... but the good thing is that the word is out, people will be warned... so parents will never leave their kids alone with T.S. again.... and if that happens, he will never be able to harm another young person again..... so stand aside bystander.... that is a polite way of saying "get out of the way, you are in the way...."

---

**Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 13 2007, 07:08 PM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 13 2007, 05:47 PM) □**

Di, you need to quit making accusing statements. If even one allegation was true concerning anyone underage, jail time would not be a factor anyway. I know. I asked an Illinois lawyer friend of mine. He explained that even though the statute of limitations was supposed to be extended, most cases it would not work in. He then went into a lot of attorney rhetoric that I don't even pretend to understand but **the bottom line is no one in these particular circumstances (if true at all) would do any jail time.**My point? Di is just one of many who make these statments that have no basis in fact.

'es, your right...it's just not a big deal is it? And, whoever your atty is, I think you might check again with someone else....adding up all the evidence, I think it's likely it would go a very different direction. Look at the catholic chuch situations.

---

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 13 2007, 07:11 PM**

One of you also claimed that the age of consent in Il ws 17 and that was not true either. Sorry Bytander, saying you had a discussion with a lawyer friend, much of which you didn't understand does not convince me. Why would the statute of limitations be extended in this particular case? Did you acquire this information recently? Before you all were trying to minizimize the pedophile factor, by saying these young men were of age? I actually think one of our members can help us out here. I'll ask her and see what she can find out and post in language we all can understand. □

Plus, I keep telling you all the problem is that TS, a married pastor, was asking someone other than his wife for sex. Be they male, female, old young, whatever...he was/is wrong. Even if the courts don't do a thing, it is more than reprehensible that you and your friends were trying to rationalize this situation in the least. It is even more troubling that you don't see that.

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 13 2007, 04:47 PM) □**

Di, you need to quit making accusing statements. If even one allegation was true concerning anyone underage, jail time would not be a factor anyway. I know. I asked an Illinois lawyer friend of mine. He explained that even though the statute of limitations was supposed to be extended, most cases it would not work in. He then went into a lot of attorney rhetoric that I don't even pretend to

understand but the bottom line is no one in these particular circumstances (if true at all) would do any jail time.  
My point? Di is just one of many who make these statements that have no basis in fact.


**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 13 2007, 07:13 PM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 13 2007, 04:47 PM)**

Di, you need to quit making accusing statements. If even one allegation was true concerning anyone underage, jail time would not be a factor anyway. I know. I asked an Illinois lawyer friend of mine. He explained that even though the statute of limitations was supposed to be extended, most cases it would not work in. He then went into a lot of attorney rhetoric that I don't even pretend to understand but the bottom line is no one in these particular circumstances (if true at all) would do any jail time.  
My point? Di is just one of many who make these statements that have no basis in fact.

wouldn't be too sure that legal actions are not a possibility. If the person questioning the attorney minimized or downplayed the abuse that person could have gotten incorrect advice. If TS is not brought to accountability here in this world, there is still The Final Judgement to consider.

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 13 2007, 09:19 PM**



Sorry....

**QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 13 2007, 08:00 PM)**

He may never go to jail... but the good thing is that the word is out, people will be warned... so parents will never leave their kids alone with T.S. again.... and if that happens, he will never be able to harm another young person again..... so stand aside bystander.... that is a polite way of saying "get out of the way, you are in the way...."


Then again.... *maybe* Bystander's demonic presence finds children **adorable** in the exact same way as Tommy Shelton did. Bystander seems to be finding loopholes for Tommy Shelton akin to what most hat are members of NAMBLA do for each other.

Those that make excuses and try to find loopholes for a sexual molester of children are assisting in the future assaults on children.


Those that make excuses and try to find loopholes for a sexual molester of children are assisting in them not paying for their crimes on earth.

Those that make excuses and try to find loopholes for a sexual molester of children are stating that the past crime does not merit punishment.

I know...I know...



BOT!




---

**Posted by: inga Mar 13 2007, 09:57 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 12 2007, 09:15 PM)**

Pickle your unwillingness to answer the question shows your are not a honest person. Period end of sentence.

You know, Lee, you display an awful lot of arrogance!

Just because Pickle does not respond to your demands, it "shows" that he is not an honest person?! You certainly know about your own honesty or lack of it. So maybe that's what was on your mind?




---

**Posted by: Pickle Mar 13 2007, 10:55 PM**

Fallible,

Your comments (<http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?s=&showtopic=12885&view=findpost&p=184860> and <http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?s=&showtopic=12885&view=findpost&p=184869>) regarding WikiPedia and Vicarius Filii Dei reveal your ignorance, similar to your accusation on Maritime that I had posted a reply from Danny to me when it was really an email from Danny to Gailon.

Now please understand, I am rusty on some of the specifics, but anyone who chooses to look at the history back when I was editing that page will see something along the lines of a papal apologist belittling what ended up being a pre-1844 reference to Vicarius Filii Dei being on the miter, while he thought that it was a reference to the tiara. You will find some sort of discrepancy like that, and you will see the papal apologist totally unwilling to allow it to be corrected.


You will also find that WikiPedia requires that a neutral point of view be presented, and those papal apologists were not allowing that. For example, based on my rusty recollection, they were not allowing it to be clearly stated how important *The Donation of Constantine* has been in the history of the papacy, preferring rather to discard it as a forgery. Their viewpoint was clearly biased and one-sided, and was definitely derogatory toward Seventh-day Adventism.

As far as what the Bible teaches on the matter, see <http://www.pickle-publishing.com/papers/666.htm> According to the symbols used in Revelation, symbols which are drawn from Exodus, the beast should be a counterfeit high priest who wears a miter with his name on it. Now if you want to argue with the Bible, that's another matter.

---

**Posted by: Pickle Mar 13 2007, 11:15 PM**

Oops. That last post of mine was




Bystander,

I find your calling me Bobby boy to be highly offensive, discourteous, and unchristian, and I respectively ask you to stop, and to not do it again.

**Posted by: Observer Mar 14 2007, 03:39 AM**

**QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 13 2007, 08:19 PM)**



Sorry....


Then again.... *maybe* Bystander's demonic presence finds children **adorable** in the exact same way as Tommy Shelton did. Bystander seems to be finding loopholes for Tommy Shelton akin to what most that are members of NAMBLA do for each other.

Those that make excuses and try to find loopholes for a sexual molester of children are assisting in the future assaults on children.

Those that make excuses and try to find loopholes for a sexual molester of children are assisting in them not paying for their crimes on earth.

Those that make excuses and try to find loopholes for a sexual molester of children are stating that the past crime does not merit punishment.

I know...I know...



BOT!




FYI: NAMBLA is the North American Man Boy Love Association. They advocate the legalization of adult males being allowed to have sex with minor males.

My knowledge of them comes from my professional training and experience.

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 14 2007, 04:35 AM**

**QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 13 2007, 10:19 PM)**




 ofi  
Sorry....


Then again.... *maybe* Bystander's demonic presence finds children **adorable** in the exact same way as Tommy Shelton did. Bystander seems to be finding loopholes for Tommy Shelton akin to what most that are members of NAMBLA do for each other.

Those that make excuses and try to find loopholes for a sexual molester of children are assisting in the future assaults on children.

Those that make excuses and try to find loopholes for a sexual molester of children are assisting in them not paying for their crimes on earth.

Those that make excuses and try to find loopholes for a sexual molester of children are stating that the past crime does not merit punishment.

I know...I know...  ofi

BOT!  
 sn:

Personally I thought he was just referring to Di's false accusation about our motive and intent, and surmising about what we are doing:

**you and your friends are only intersted in keeping him out of prison**, so you continue to victimize his victim by insinuation that they had a homosexual affair"

By saying that isn't true:

Di, you need to quit making accusing statements. **If even one allegation was true concerning anyone underage, jail time would not be a factor** anyway.

Question: What alleged underage victims are you all referring to? What exactly do you know about them, or any circumstances, other then vague references that they exist? Yes I know that Pickle and Roy claim this, and they got it from Dryden, and they were all quoted in Adventist Todayy, but how do you know there are actually any underage victims?

Maybe you could give us some kinda "specific" details so we know what you all keep getting so upset about? But please do it in a thread near here where it is on topic.

It seems to me, if people could discuss this rationally, without all the strawman arguments, and accusations of being demons, or demonically inspired, or pedophiles, or unable to sympathise with victims of sexual abuse,(which is unnecessary, when we should just be able to discuss the facts and evidence without all that ) then we might get somewhere.

It seems to me too many who have been victims themselves here are allowing that to get in the way of objectively looking at the evidence and what is known, and what hasn't been proven or even supported.

My 2 cents...

---

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 14 2007, 05:15 AM**

**QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 13 2007, 02:48 PM)**

You really need to quit, Cindy. TS was/is a married pastor. Him asking anyone but his wife for sex is wrong.

I have said that myself. In fact Seraphim asked that question specifically and I answered that it is wrong. Further, It is sin. And Bystander answered the same.

But here's the problem. Tommy was disciplined by his Church in Illinois, after they investigated and the police did as well, and no charges were filed. the Church in Dunn Loring Virginia looked into all this before hiring him as their Pastor.

Tommy stated in his letter to Duane that he and his wife have long since worked through this themselves. He apologised to Duane, Duane says he's forgiven him. Tommy's wife has forgiven him. Tommy voluntarily gave up his ministerial liscence afrt this happened. Both Tommy and his wife Carol emphatically state nothing sexually immoral or inappropriate has happened at all for at least the past 12 years.It is my understanding he received counselling to help him regarding all this.

What else do you want Di?

Does the blood of Christ cover past confessed and forsaken sins, or not?

And like it or not, the community responded by spraypainting accusations of homosexuality NOT child molester or Pedophile on his house and vehicles etc.

Maybe they knew something you do not?

The truth is the accusations of being a pedophile and Child molester are claimed to be more recent, Dryden claims this was in Dunn Loring Virginia, and tries to tie it in with events in Illinois, in which he had no part, and which were already dealt with, Pickle claims, and tries to do the same, on Joy's and his save 3ABN website but zero evidence has been given to support these recent allegations.

Which are that Tommy Shelton is a child molester and pedophile, and that Danny knew, lied and covered for him, and endangered children.

But that is a different topic totally from what you are arguing about here.

It does raise the question of Pickles honesty though, and his claims and recent insinuations that he has nothing to do with that website.

For it is his "investigations", and only his writings, with his surmisings opinions and conclusions, and his accusations which only he has been posting here for months, which are published there.

Thus the subject, and question of this topic " save3ABN website, who runs it?"

I think it likely Pickle is the webmaster. It is registered to Gailon Joy, but on the same server as Pickle's own site, and the website is designed according to Pickles style and self proclaimed area of

expertise, There's even some website, where pickle is giving lessons about his unique programming and web designing...

---

**Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 14 2007, 06:39 AM**

Who runs the save3abn.com website is irrelevant, Cindy. Shooting the messenger doesn't alter the message. The testimony and accusations made by Duane, beartrap and others regarding Tommy's proclivities and predatory actions remain unchanged whether or not www.save3abn.com exists or not.

This is just the last rabbit hole you have tried to divert people down in an effort to distract and dissemble. Once you admitted his doing these things was sin and that he was wrong in doing them, the debate ends there; the rest of this foolishness is an attempt to create an extenuating circumstance to rationalize Tommy's sin and the subsequent attempts by DS, WT and 3ABN leadership to minimize it or pretend it was not as serious as it is.

He's a pervert, Cindy; one of the worst kind. He preys on children and cannot be 'cured' or 'fixed'. Despite your attempts to make it seem like this is something he 'used to do'... the fact is, as long as he is in a position that brings him in proximity with boys and young men, he will continue to do this.

As for Tommy's confessing his sin... I am sure I am not the only one who sees Achan in such. If he had true contrition and repented, this conversation wouldn't even exist. He hasn't even fully admitted the extent of his malfeasance; he has not attempted to 'make it right' to those he has victimized... and he continues to be in a position where it's just a matter of time before he molests someone else's child.

And your calling his victims homosexuals, saying they were consenting partners and the like is just pouring salt in the wounds Tommy has made... not to mention it's being shameless on your part.

In His service,  
Mr. J

---

**Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 14 2007, 06:54 AM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 14 2007, 06:35 AM)**

Question: What alleged underage victims are you all referring to? What exactly do you know about them, or any circumstances, other than vague references that they exist? Yes I know that Pickle and Joy claim this, and they got it from Dryden, and they were all quoted in Adventist Todayy, but how do you know there are actually any underage victims?

Maybe you could give us some kinda "specific" details so we know what you all keep getting so upset about? But please do it in a thread near here where it is on topic.

This has been asked and answered... not only by those repulsed by your scandalous arguments in support of Tommy... but by duane and beartrap (who was married to Tommy's niece, and was being supervised by Tommy at 3ABN when Tommy propositioned him.. and that wasn't 30 years ago) and others. And your response to even first hand accounts has been to attack the one giving the report... and then claim you need more evidence.

That, Cindy, is, frankly, sick.

**QUOTE**

It seems to me, if people could discuss this rationally, without all the strawman arguments, and acusations of being demons, or demonically inspired, or pedophiles, or unable to sympathise with victims of sexual abuse,(which is unnecessary, when we should just be able to discuss the facts and evidence without all that ) then we might get somewhere.

It seems to me too many who have been victims themselves here are allowing that to get in the way of objectively looking at the evidence and what is known, and what hasn't been proven or even supported.

Tommy propositions and solicits sex from teenage boys ergo he is a pedophile. There are enough first hand accounts of his misdeeds in that regard to make that appellation stick. His propositioning young men who have to work for him is a textbook instance of sexual harassment by creating a 'hostile work environment'. Both are criminal acts in every jurisdiction in this country.

Any examination of 'the evidence and what is known' that omits these points is not objective.

In His service,  
Mr. J

---

**Posted by: Pickle Mar 14 2007, 07:46 AM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 12 2007, 08:15 PM)**

Pickle your unwillingness to answer the question shows your are not a honest person. Period end of sentence. But no matter because I have my answer very plainly. Thanks.

I "backtrack" on nothing! The post you are speaking about that has to do with minors were just questions Pickle....HONEST questions which is more than what you can possibly do. Any "reasonable" intelligent person reading my post could see that.

Have you never read ...

**QUOTE(The Lord's Anointed in Matthew 21:23-27 @ 31 AD)**

And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority? And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in like wise will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? ... And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.

(Matthew 21:23-27)

Surely you aren't saying that the Lord's Anointed was showing Himself to be a dishonest person in the gospel of Matthew, are you? Are you sure you never backtrack?

We all have to backtrack if we want to be saved. That's what repentance and confession are all about. If you can't backtrack over insinuating that a minor being consenting makes a difference in the Tommy Shelton child molestation allegations, I'm not sure the Judge of all the earth will take too kindly to that when you stand before the great white throne. But that's between you and Him.

I see you made no comments about my request for a list of fabrications that you were accusing me of.

By the way, I'm curious about the fact that "Lee" is the sound of the last syllable of MolLee.

**Posted by: Observer Mar 14 2007, 08:28 AM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 14 2007, 04:15 AM) □**

But here's the problem. Tommy was disciplined by his Church in Illinois, after they investigated and the police did as well, and no charges were filed. the Church in Dunn Loring Virginiaia looked into all this before hiring him as their Pastor.

Tommy stated in his letter to Duane that he and his wife have long since worked through this themselves. He apologised to Duane, Duane says he's forgiven him. Tommy's wife has forgiven him. Tommy voluntarily gave up his ministerial liscence afrt this happened. Both Tommy and his wife Carol emphatically state nothing sexually immoral or inappropriate has happened at all for at least the past 12 years.It is my understanding he received counselling to help him regarding all this.

What else do you want Di?

Does the blood of Christ cover past confessed and forsaken sins, or not?

Aletheia, As I understand your comment above, you are telling us:

- 1) Tommy did something that was serious enough to result in discipline by his local Chruuch.
- 2) It was serious enough to require an apology to Duane.
- 3) It was serious enough for him to apologize to his wife.
- 4) It was serious enough for him to surrender his ministerial license.

In context, it appears to me to be some kind of unspecified sexual misconduct. [See the thought that nothing sexually immoral has happened for at least the past 12 years.]

Then you ask what more one would want, and whether or not the blood of Christ covers sin.

My posiiton on that is: The blood of Christ, shed on Calvery, covers any sins that Tommy may have committed. To me that is unquestioned. I do not challenge that he has confessed whatever sins he may have committed. That is between he and God. I am not involved in that. I am quite willing to say that Christ's blood covers his sins, whatever they may be.

Your question as to what more might be wanted is not such a simple answer. Christ's blood may cover one's sin. But, that does not necessarily release one from the consequences. Forgiveness does not remove the lung cancer. Forgiveness does not release a person from prison. A person who steals chruuch funds, may be forgiven, but should not be places into the position of congregational treasurer. In Tommy's case, whatever his prior sin may be, the alligations are such that his past should be considered in relation to the present. If it is true that his prior sin involved sexual misconduct, society, and the church, has an obligation to consider that in relation to how he is used today in ministry. As an example: One who has sexually molested children, should not work agian in children's ministry. One who has raped a woman should not be working in women's ministry.

I am a professionally trained counselor. If I become sexually involved with a counselee, I should not counsel again. I am a clergyperson. If I become sexually involved with a member of my congregation, I should forfeit my ministry. If I molest children, I should not work again with children. I may be forgiven in all of the above. But, my failure is of sufficient magnitude that there are major consequences that come to me. And, they should.

Those consequences should come regardless of criminal conviction. I may not have violated the law if I become sexually involved with a congregational member. But, I still should forfeit my ministry. The forfeiture of my ministry to children should not depend upon my criminal conviction. I should happen if the allegations are there, regardless of criminal conviction. Society owes those (children) helpless to defend themselves, much in the way of protection.

---

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 14 2007, 08:46 AM**

**QUOTE(Observer @ Mar 14 2007, 07:28 AM)**

Aletheia, As I understand your comment above, you are telling us:

- 1) Tommy did something that was serious enough to result in discipline by his local Church.
- 2) It was serious enough to require an apology to Duane.
- 3) It was serious enough for him to apologize to his wife.
- 4) It was serious enough for him to surrender his ministerial license.

In context, it appears to me to be some kind of unspecified sexual misconduct. [See the thought that nothing sexually immoral has happened for at least the past 12 years.]

Then you ask what more one would want, and whether or not the blood of Christ covers sin.

My position on that is: The blood of Christ, shed on Calvary, covers any sins that Tommy may have committed. To me that is unquestioned. I do not challenge that he has confessed whatever sins he may have committed. That is between he and God. I am not involved in that. I am quite willing to say that Christ's blood covers his sins, whatever they may be.

**Your question as to what more might be wanted is not such a simple answer. Christ's blood may cover one's sin. But, that does not necessarily release one from the consequences. Forgiveness does not remove the lung cancer. Forgiveness does not release a person from prison.** A person who steals church funds, may be forgiven, but should not be placed into the position of congregational treasurer. In Tommy's case, whatever his prior sin may be, the allegations are such that his past should be considered in relation to the present. If it is true that his prior sin involved sexual misconduct, society, and the church, has an obligation to consider that in relation to how he is used today in ministry. As an example: One who has sexually molested children, should not work again in children's ministry. One who has raped a woman should not be working in women's ministry.

I am a professionally trained counselor. If I become sexually involved with a counselee, I should not counsel again. I am a clergyperson. If I become sexually involved with a member of my congregation, I should forfeit my ministry. If I molest children, I should not work again with children. I may be forgiven in all of the above. But, my failure is of sufficient magnitude that there are major consequences that come to me. And, they should.

Those consequences should come regardless of criminal conviction. I may not have violated the law if I become sexually involved with a congregational member. But, I still should forfeit my ministry. The forfeiture of my ministry to children should not depend upon my criminal conviction. I should

happen if the alligations are there, regardless of criminal conviction. Society owes those (children) helpless to defend themself, much in the way of protection.

Greg,

You are right on target here in your answer to Aletheia's posts about Tommy's "sins".

I think we need to go one step further: A person whose sin has victimized another has the responsibility to make restitution to that victim. Look at the example of David. He did some horrible things. When he got to the point that he desired to be forgiven for those sins, he made things right as far as possible. He couldn't bring back the man he caused to be killed, but he restored things as much as he could as a part of his repentance. We know he received the forgiveness he sought and still is known as beloved of God.

Private sins, those which only work to separate you from God, can be forgiven just between you and God. Public sins, those which have negatively affected others, have the consequences you spoke of but there is also the need to tend to the damage done to those victimized.

PB

---

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 14 2007, 08:57 AM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 14 2007, 03:35 AM)**

It seems to me too many who have been victims themselves here are allowing that to get in the way of objectively looking at the evidence and what is known, and what hasn't been proven or even supported.

My 2 cents...

You are nothing if not consistant in your attacks on the messengers! We victims can't objectively look at the evidence because we have been victimized?

So, we should leave the job of discerning the truth in these matters to you or Lee who have both consistantly demonstrated that you have no clear understanding of the subject of sexual abuse?

---

**Posted by: Pickle Mar 14 2007, 09:10 AM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 14 2007, 05:15 AM)**

But here's the problem. Tommy was disciplined by his Church in Illinois, after they investigated and the police did as well, and no charges were filed. the Church in Dunn Loring Virginia looked into all this before hiring him as their Pastor.

Aletheia,

Why post if you can't get your facts straight?

1. It was because the Ezra CoG wouldn't deal with Tommy that the entire congregation got disfellowshipped by the Church of God (Anderson).
2. Dunn Loring was never informed about what the allegations in Illinois were, and they never inquired to find out.

**Posted by: Observer Mar 14 2007, 09:13 AM**

**QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 14 2007, 08:46 AM)**

Greg,

You are right on target here in your answer to Aletheia's posts about Tommy's "sins".

I think we need to go one step further. A person whose sin has victimized another has the responsibility to make restitution to that victim. Look at the example of David. He did some horrible things. When he got to the point that he desired to be forgiven for those sins, he made things right as far as possible. He couldn't bring back the man he caused to be killed, but he restored things as much as he could as a part of his repentance. We know he received the forgiveness he sought and still is know as beloved of God.

Private sins, those which only work to separate you from God, can be forgiven just between you and God. Public sins, those which have negatively affected others, have the consequences you spoke of but there is also the need to tend to the damage done to those victimized.

PB

Sometimes people feel that I have overwhelmed them with a massive response. I can do that.

So, I sometimes pick one small part of the issue and respond to it. I to not claim to be exhaustive.

So, there is often more that may be said.

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 14 2007, 09:18 AM**

**QUOTE(Observer @ Mar 14 2007, 08:13 AM)**

Sometimes people feel that I have overwhelmed them with a massive response. I can do that.

So, I sometimes pick one small part of the issue and respond to it. I to not claim to be exhaustive.

So, there is often more that may be said.

And, usually, plenty of us to pipe up and say it!



**Posted by: watchbird Mar 14 2007, 09:29 AM**

**QUOTE(Observer @ Mar 14 2007, 10:13 AM)**

Sometimes people feel that I have overwhelmed them with a massive response. I can do that.

So, I sometimes pick one small part of the issue and respond to it. I do not claim to be exhaustive.

So, there is often more that may be said.

When there is more that needs to be said.... please say it. We are not overwhelmed with your careful analysis of situations. In fact, you doing as you do is one of the things which helps us keep from being overwhelmed by the massive tirades that we are getting from certain quarters.

Many of these tirades scatter their shot so widely that it is probably impossible to address all points that need addressing in one post. In that case break them up and give us your response to all that you feel need addressing. There is no law that says that one cannot use two or three posts in responding to one previous one.

sig: Thank you for your continued participation and analytical responses.

Carry on.....  TVsnack. ....

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 14 2007, 09:44 AM**

**QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 14 2007, 09:57 AM)**

You are nothing if not consistent in your attacks on the messengers! We victims can't objectively look at the evidence because we have been victimized?

So, we should leave the job of discerning the truth in these matters to you or Lee who have both consistently demonstrated that you have no clear understanding of the subject of sexual abuse?

What are you the messenger of? What do you know specifically of the allegations and circumstances regarding Tommy Shelton and any alleged victims, beyond what has been posted here by Brad Dunning or Duane Clem?

See, this is what I am talking about PB, you can't ever discuss the facts and evidence or lack thereof in relation to Tommy Shelton without getting all upset and emotional. You either talk about your own experience, or someone else's, or someone brings up a case that was reported in a paper somewhere OR you take personal offense, and start accusing another.

And BTW, You and others are falsely assuming and making false accusations. Just because I do not

tell my life's story here, doesn't mean I have no experience with sexual abuse, and pedophiles, and did not have very close friends both as a child and as an adult who were victims of sexual molestation, and repeated rape, or that I haven't supported and helped get through really terrible things, or do not have a niece who was molested. I do have a upfront and personal experience with all this.

the truth is I already brought up the fact that I myself am a survivor of sexual abuse when I first arrived here but because I didn't just accept the accusations against Tommy without all the evidence and facts, I was insulted and ridiculed about my own experience, just as I have been about my abusive marriage and my divorce because of adultery. I shared how God was able to heal me, to help others and that has been something which Mr J has used as a weapon and accusation against me ever since.

But do you know what? That's ok, because none of it does anything to prove or disprove anything regarding the allegations against Tommy, or the validity of the cases of any alleged victims.

It just seems to be a convenient excuse and accusation to throw at people who you disagree with, that they can't understand, that they have no experience and they never felt like you did, to try and make them look bad, and as if you know what you are talking about in regards, to T.S. and 3ABN. Give it up, PB!

---

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 14 2007, 10:17 AM**

---

**QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 14 2007, 05:54 AM)**

This has been asked and answered... not only by those repulsed by your scandalous arguments in support of Tommy... but by Duane and Beartrap (who was married to Tommy's niece, and was being supervised by Tommy)

Oh, I guess you didn't know that the "niece" told years ago, that she had found out her husband had lied about the incident and she apologized for it. That makes your next paragraph about "hostile work environment" a moot point.

Also, if it had been true, Beartrap was a grown married man, not a child.

That, Cindy, is, frankly, sick.

Tommy propositions and solicits sex from teenage boys ergo he is a pedophile. There are enough first hand accounts of his misdeeds in that regard to make that appellation stick. His propositioning young men who have to work for him is a textbook instance of sexual harassment by creating a 'hostile work environment'. Both are criminal acts in every jurisdiction in this country.

The statement in red and several more in your earlier post have been forwarded to the Attorney's in Minnesota who constantly monitor the site, but "especially slanderous" statements are always forwarded just in case they missed it. You notice I said Statements. There is a big difference in making the IF THIS IS TRUE allegations or in what you did, which was, pronounce your judgments as fact. Even if you believe there is no suit coming, most people would still be careful in how that phrase their accusations, just in case.

Obviously you have no qualms in that direction.

Good.

---

**Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 14 2007, 10:27 AM**

Ooooo....don't scare us like that

And welcome to the wild wild world of the internet.

---

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 12:17 PM)**

The statement in red and several more in your earlier post have been forwarded to the Attorney's in Minnesota who constantly monitor the site, but "especially slanderous" statements are always forwarded just in case they missed it. You notice I said Statements. There is a big difference in making the IF THIS IS TRUE allegations or in what you did ,which was ,prononce your judgments as fact. Even if you believe there is no suit coming, most people would still be careful in how that phrase their accusations, just in case. Obviously you have no qualms in that direction. Good.

---

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 14 2007, 10:28 AM**

...and what exactly is it you want us to do with this? The statements are only slanderous if untrue. There are more than enough victims coming forward to place doubt on slander. The lawyer in Minnesota surely are not disregarding the victims statements, are they? Now, to prove slander you do know that all this will have to play out in court, victims statments and all? Are you so sure of TS's innocence?

---

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 09:17 AM)**

The statement in red and several more in your earlier post have been forwarded to the Attorney's in Minnesota who constantly monitor the site, but "especially slanderous" statements are always forwarded just in case they missed it. You notice I said Statements. There is a big difference in making the IF THIS IS TRUE allegations or in what you did ,which was ,prononce your judgments as fact. Even if you believe there is no suit coming, most people would still be careful in how that phrase their accusations, just in case. Obviously you have no qualms in that direction. Good.

---

**Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 14 2007, 10:29 AM**

---

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 12:17 PM)**

The statement in red and several more in your earlier post have been forwarded to the Attorney's in Minnesota who constantly monitor the site, but "especially slanderous" statements are always

forwarded just in case they missed it. You notice I said Statements. There is a big difference in making the IF THIS IS TRUE allegations or in what you did ,which was ,pronounce your judgments as fact. Even if you believe there is no suit coming, most people would still be careful in how that phrase their accusations, just in case.

Obviously you have no qualms in that direction.

Good.

bring it, lap dog.... unless of course your master wants you to play fetch now... those same attorneys recognize that the first amendment says your threat is toothless... so go find some ignorant yokel to threaten...as I've told you before... everyone isn't from west frankfort and at such time as when we hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music even if you and the rest of the lackeys in your camp are content to bow down and worship the image of Danny... I will NOT bow down... so bring on your fiery furnace... but be mindful you dont get yourself burned up calling yourself throwing me and others in... and don't worry about what God will save me out of the hand of Danny Shelton and his Minnesota lawyers; I know Him even if you don't.

In His service,

Mr. J

---

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 14 2007, 10:33 AM**

See, this is exactly why I ask you not to post, until you read and/or comprehend the information. To my knowledge there are more than two victim accounts. Also, if there are victim's(meaning more than one) what else do you need?

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 14 2007, 08:44 AM)**

What are you the messenger of? **What do you know specifically of the allegations and circumstances regarding Tommy Shelton and any alleged victims, beyond what has been posted here by Brad Dunning or Duane Clem?**See, this is what I am talking about PB, you can't ever discuss the facts and evidence or lack thereof in relation to Tommy Shelton without getting all upset and emotional. You either talk about your own experience, or someone elses, or someone brings up a case that was reported in a paper somewhere OR you take personal offense,and start accusing another.

And BTW, You and others are falsely assuming and making false accusations. Just because I do not tell my life's story here, doesn't mean I have no experience with sexual abuse, and pedophiles, and did not have very close friends both as a child and as an adult who were victims of sexual molestaion, and repeated rape, or that I haven't supported and helped get through really terrible things, or do not have a neice who was molested. I do have a upfront and personal experience with all this.

the truth is I already brought up the fact that I myself am a survivor of sexual abuse when I first arrived here but because I didn't just accept the accusations against Tommy without all the evidence and facts, I was insulted and ridiculed about my own experience, just as I have been about my abusive marriage and my divorce because of adultery. I shared how God was able to heal me, to help others and that has been something which Mr J has used as a weapon and accusation against me ever since.

But do you know what? That's ok, because none of it does anything to prove or disprove anything regarding the allegations against Tommy, or the validity of the cases of any alleged victims.

It just seems to be a convenientt excuse and accusation to throw at people who you disagree with,

that they can't understand, that they have no experience and they never felt like you did, to try and make them look bad, and as if you know what you are talking about in regards, to T.S. and 3ABN. Give it up, PB!

**Posted by: Noahswife Mar 14 2007, 10:39 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 12:17 PM) □**

The statement in red and several more in your earlier post have been forwarded to the Attorney's in Minnesota who constantly monitor the site, but "especially slanderous" statements are always forwarded just in case they missed it. You notice I said Statements. There is a big difference in making the IF THIS IS TRUE allegations or in what you did ,which was ,pronounce your judgments as fact. Even if you believe there is no suit coming, most people would still be careful in how that phrase their accusations, just in case. Obviously you have no qualms in that direction. Good.

Bystander,

Please stop using words with specific legal meanings if you do not know what they mean.

Slander

A type of defamation. Slander is an untruthful oral (spoken) statement about a person that harms the person's reputation or standing in the community. Because slander is a tort (a civil wrong), the injured person can bring a lawsuit against the person who made the false statement. If the statement is made via broadcast media -- for example, over the radio or on TV -- it is considered libel, rather than slander, because the statement has the potential to reach a very wide audience.

<http://www.nolo.com/definition.cfm/term/85BAB88B-0660-4AB6-A2F5C32E716A6D52>

Because you have used the term as if you knew what you were talking about, the responders to your post have done as well.

1W  
:"I"

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 14 2007, 10:55 AM**

Cindy you asked some questions, and I don't want you to think I didn't respond. However, Awesumtenor, Observer, PB, etc. have done a wonderful job in answering your questions. So, my answer is "Yeah, what they said!"

I just have to add this. The problem is your comment, opinions should stop there. Admitting it is a wrong. All the rest sound like rationalizations. There is no need to try to discredit the victims, especially since you "know" they are victims of two of three offenses, pedophilia, abuse of power and position of authority in approaching young men for sex, and adulterer. He was wrong, period.

Also, to be truthful, I have always just maintained that TS needed to be sidelined until an investigation was done. I thought that only fair. That is the only true way to maintain focus on the true mission of 3ABN.

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 14 2007, 04:15 AM)**

I have said that myself. In fact Seraphim asked that question specifically and I answered that it is wrong. Further, It is sin. And Bystander answered the same.

---

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 14 2007, 11:05 AM**

**QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 14 2007, 09:28 AM)**

...and what exactly is it you want us to do with this? The statements are only slanderous if untrue. There are more than enough victims coming forward to place doubt on slander. The lawyer in Minnesota surely are not disregarding the victims statements, are they? Now, to prove slander you do know that all this will have to play out in court, victims statments and all? Are you so sure of TS's innocence?

I am very sure of what are lies and what is truth. You all underestimate the attorneys that have taken on this case. Mr. J, in his ridiculous post says the attorneys know "my threat" is toothless.  rofl  
 Right. I am not making a threat. The case is what defines whether this suit will be a threat. That is why they took the case. They don't know things like: 1. Mr. J made the statements, he has the burden of proof. 2. they don't know the difference between the first ammendment and slandering a persons character and reputation. 3. I am sure they also "don't know" that in certain parts of the suit, 3 abn might be required to prove the facts in a false allegation towards them.  
 Nah, they don't know near as much as some of you here. They just took the case for the heck of it knowing they will lose.....yah right.

Now Mr. J. you're tough, you can take it. You want to make slanderous statements as in fact and you want to be sued. Ok good. I want to be there when you, yourself have to prove what you have said about TS. This will be especially gratifying when you don't know any of the people involved, don't know anything about them except what you have read in a "chat room"  and have absolutely no connection to, 3abn, The Shelton's or even the alleged victims for that matter. Yes Mr. J. You will certainly have a credible and valid defense when you have no proof whatsoever to bring forward. You and everyone else can act incensed all you want but you know what I say is truth. Are you willing to go through a nightmare, hire a defense attorney, make a fool of yourself in court, since you, yourself can't prove anything, and then take a chance on paying some huge fines and penalties, all so you can have the enjoyment of slandering someone you don't even know?  
 Not too smart.

**QUOTE(Noahswife @ Mar 14 2007, 09:39 AM)**

nw  
C"1"

Unlike the rest of you, I don't profess to have legal knowledge. I don't need to. That is why those attorneys who specialize in these types of cases, get to do the work. I can't wait to see how many more of you will challenge their knowledge against what You "know". What arrogance.

**Posted by: erik Mar 14 2007, 11:09 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 10:01 AM)**

I am very sure of what are lies and what is truth. You all underestimate the attorneys that have taken on this case. Mr. J, in his ridiculous post says the attorneys know "my threat" is toothless.

rofl Right. I am not making a threat. The case is what defines whether this suit will be a threat. That is why they took the case. They don't know things like: 1. Mr. J made the statements, he has the burden of proof. 2. they don't know the difference between the first ammendment and slandering a persons character and reputation. 3.I am sure they also "don't know" that in certain parts of the suit, 3 abn might be required to prove the facts in a false allegation towards them. Nah, they don't know near as much as some of you here. They just took the case for the heck of it knowing they will lose.....yah right.

Now Mr. J. you're tough, you can take it. You want to make slanderous statements as in fact and you want to be sued. Ok good. I want to be there when you, yourself have to prove what you have said about TS. This will be especially gratifying when you don't know any of the people involved, don't know anything about them except what you have read in a "chat room"  and have absolutely no connection to, 3abn, The Shelton's or even the alleged victims for that matter. Yes Mr. J. You will certainly have a credible and valid defense when you have no proof whatsoever to bring forward.

You and everyone else can act incensed all you want but you know what I say is truth. Are you willing to go through a nightmare, hire a defense attorney, make a fool of yourself in court, since you, yourself can't prove anything, and then take a chance on paying some huge fines and penalties, all so you can have the enjoyment of slandering someone you don't even know? Not too smart.

bystander,

you just gave way your whole "case", it will interesting to watch how lawyers handle, loss of superise.

erik

bystander,

lawyers takes cases often because they are getting paid to do so, that in no way reflects on the

winable it of the case, it more likely reflects on the size of checkbook hiring them.

erik

---

**Posted by: Pickle Mar 14 2007, 11:24 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 10:17 AM)**

The statement in red and several more in your earlier post have been forwarded to the Attorney's in Minnesota ....

So I take it that you either work for them, or they work for you. Correct? How else would you know that so soon after those comments were posted?

Or were you fibbing?

---

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 14 2007, 11:28 AM**

[quote name='erik' date='Mar 14 2007, 10:09 AM' post='185270']

bystander,

you just gave way your whole "case", it will interesting to watch how lawyers handle, loss of superise.

erik

bystander,

Erik, do you really think I "accidentally" gave something away. Of course not. It is too late to change past posts by those that do most of the slandering. Every evil charge stated now is just another nail in the coffin.

**QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 14 2007, 10:24 AM)**

So I take it that you either work for them, or they work for you. Correct? How else would you know that so soon after those comments were posted?

Or were you fibbing?

Unlike you, I said what I meant. End of story. Also, I don't answer your questions anymore. Your "word manipulation" game is a little too tiring.

---

**Posted by: Noahswife Mar 14 2007, 11:30 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 01:05 PM)**

I am very sure of what are lies and what is truth.



So you believe your statement alleging that Mr. J had committed slander was a "truthful" statement because you are excused from knowing what a word means?

Your response suggesting I am arrogant speaks for itself. Continuing to post using the term erroneously suggests more than intellectual sloppiness IMO.

I do find it interesting that you have acknowledged that the Minnesota law firm is considering bringing a case on behalf of TS as I believe he is the one that would need to bring the suit as the plaintiff. Good thing someone has deep pockets to pay for all that hourly rate work at such a prestigious firm since we have been advised no money is coming directly from the 3abn coffers for same.

Erik, I can't help but wonder if the same firm is so convinced they will win on this exact issue they would be willing to take the case on contingency seeing they are going to collect so much from the alleged defendants?

nw  
C"i"

**Posted by: Pickle Mar 14 2007, 11:39 AM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 14 2007, 04:35 AM)**

Question: What alleged underage victims are you all referring to? What exactly do you know about them, or any circumstances, other than vague references that they exist? Yes I know that Pickle and Joy claim this, and they got it from Dryden, and they were all quoted in Adventist Todayy, but how do you know there are actually any underage victims?

Why post if you don't know or can't remember the facts?

Roger Clem states that he was victimized in 1988 when he was 16. I got that straight from Roger himself, and you can too if you have the interest. His letter says as much.


**Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 14 2007, 11:39 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 01:05 PM)**

I am very sure of what are lies and what is truth. You all underestimate the attorneys that have taken on this case. Mr. J, in his ridiculous post says the attorneys know "my threat" is toothless.

rofl Right. I am not making a threat. The case is what defines whether this suit will be a threat. That is why they took the case. They don't know things like: 1. Mr. J made the statements, he has the burden of proof. 2. they don't know the difference between the first ammendment and slandering a persons character and reputation. 3.I am sure they also "don't know" that in certain parts of the suit, 3 abn might be required to prove the facts in a false allegation towards them. Nah, they don't know near as much as some of you here. They just took the case for the heck of it knowing they will lose.....yah right.

Now Mr. J. you're tough, you can take it. You want to make slanderous statements as in fact and

you want to be sued. Ok good. I want to be there when you, yourself have to prove what you have said about TS. This will be especially gratifying when you don't know any of the people involved, don't know anything about them except what you have read in a "chat room"  and have absolutely no connection to, 3abn, The Shelton's or even the alleged victims for that matter. Yes Mr. J. You will certainly have a credible and valid defense when you have no proof whatsoever to bring forward.

You and everyone else can act incensed all you want but you know what I say is truth. Are you willing to go through a nightmare, hire a defense attorney, make a fool of yourself in court, since you, yourself can't prove anything, and then take a chance on paying some huge fines and penalties, all so you can have the enjoyment of slandering someone you don't even know? Not too smart.

f the statement that follows is true, the blather that precedes is just that... blather. The fact of the matter is Tommy has conceded enough of his issues that I am well within my first amendment rights to deem him a pervert and trumpet it on the 6 o'clock news if I wish.

**QUOTE**

Unlike the rest of you, I don't profess to have legal knowledge.

'ou aren't exactly Einstein when it comes to things not related to the law either, bub...

**QUOTE**

What arrogance.

Does that mean I won't be getting the high water bib overalls, flannel shirt, straw hat and obligatory piece of straw to place in my mouth straight from the Ma and Pa Kettle mail order catalog?

How will I ever deal with such loss...

In His service,  
Mr. J

---

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 14 2007, 11:44 AM**

**QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 14 2007, 10:39 AM)** 

If the statement that follows is true, the blather that precedes is just that... blather. The fact of the matter is Tommy has conceded enough of his issues that I am well within my first amendment rights to deem him a pervert and trumpet it on the 6 o'clock news if I wish.

You aren't exactly Einstein when it comes to things not related to the law either, bub...

Does that mean I won't be getting the high water bib overalls, flannel shirt, straw hat and obligatory piece of straw to place in my mouth straight from the Ma and Pa Kettle mail order catalog?

How will I ever deal with such loss...

In His service,  
Mr. J

hey if you are satisfied in what you are doing...go right on doing it. After all, you are confident that you know what can or cannot happen to you in court. Knock yourself out...I hope you do.

**Posted by: Lee Mar 14 2007, 11:49 AM**

3ABN has no desire to take this to court. The decision was made after more than a year of insinuations and lies on this forum and save3abn site. This seems to be the only way to get to the truth. I know Observer made the comment that he thought this was a good thing--to get the truth out.

Sister, there is one donor who has offered to cover all costs for the lawyer. Not one penny from donors are going towards this lawsuit. This has been said before, but perhaps you missed that post.

I believe all we want on here is the truth--both sides. Why can't we stop and discuss this without attacking each other? I want to apologize to all of you for any times I've retaliated to your posts. It would be so nice if we could just forget the past and start all over again, both sides trying to come to just the truth--discussing it like Christian men and women. I believe there is valuable input that can be had on both sides to come to an agreement here.

Is anyone willing to try?

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 14 2007, 11:51 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 09:05 AM)**

Nah, they don't know near as much as some of you here. They just took the case for the heck of it knowing they will lose.....yah right.

As erik said, lawyers get paid to take cases. And, unless they have taken this case on a pro bono basis, they will get paid whether they bring the case to trial, win or lose.

**QUOTE**

Now Mr. J. you're tough, you can take it. You want to make slanderous statements as in fact and you want to be sued. Ok good. I want to be there when you, yourself have to prove what you have said about TS. This will be especially gratifying when you don't know any of the people involved, don't know anything about them except what you have read in a "chat room"  and have absolutely no connection to, 3abn, The Shelton's or even the alleged victims for that matter. Yes Mr. J. You will certainly have a credible and valid defense when you have no proof whatsoever to bring forward.

You and everyone else can act incensed all you want but you know what I say is truth. Are you

willing to go through a nightmare, hire a defense attorney, make a fool of yourself in court, since you, yourself can't prove anything, and then take a chance on paying some huge fines and penalties, all so you can have the enjoyment of slandering someone you don't even know? Not too smart.

Mr. J may not personally know any of the victims or have personally witnessed them being victimized but he has a brain that can look at evidence and come to opinions and conclusions based on that evidence. Does he really need to hire a defense attorney to defend his right to have and express his opinions? Not in this country.

Now make that red, copy it and fax it off to Minnesota if you wish.

---

**Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 14 2007, 11:59 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 01:44 PM) □**

Knock yourself out...I hope you do.

It's your only hope of winning... you lack even the proverbial puncher's chance...

In His service,  
Mr. J

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 01:49 PM) □**

Sister, there is one donor who has offered to cover all costs for the lawyer. Not one penny from donors are going towards this lawsuit.

Do you realize these two statements are contradictory, don't you?

In His service,  
Mr. J

---

**Posted by: erik Mar 14 2007, 11:59 AM**

Bystander,

In regards to your statement below.

Erik, do you really think I "accidentally" gave something away. Of course not. It is too late to change past posts by those that do most of the slandering. Every evil charge stated now is just

another nail in the coffin.

no I do not think you did by mistake, only think you are foolish to go on and on about your case, either you have one or you do not.

so bring or admit you are full of hot air.

I can say with a fairly high degree of being 100% correct that Tommy shelton is in fact a child sexual abuser, based on the signed letter of brad dunning, and of roger clem, also add to that the two letters from the mothers of the unnamed boys that would make 4 cases of abuse of some kind.

now if i am going to be guilty of either slander or libel then you would need to show that one the statements were false.

and secondly that I knew them to be false based on public information, at this point tommy has choosen not to deny anything so the charges in my mind are true.

IF I read in the newspaper that Tommy had sex with some boys, and i then make posts about on the internet that is not slander or libel.

SO i would be careful how you legal beagles play this out, Unless you know for a 100% certain that tommy shelton never once made any type of a sexual advance on any minor child(under 18) period.

and if that is the case in fact then WHY, WHY would tommy have not issued a simple statement i did do anything of any kind to these boys, and why would 3abn have not sent a letter on tommy behave instead of going straight to the we are going to sue you all.

If you could be so kind has to ask WWJD to reply to my request I made of her, over a week ago.

Erik

---

**Posted by: Lee Mar 14 2007, 12:03 PM**

**QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 14 2007, 12:59 PM) □**

It's your only hope of winning... you lack even the proverbial puncher's chance...

In His service,

Mr. J

You do realize these two statements are contradictory, don't you?

In His service,

Mr. J

You're right Mr. J. I meant one "person" not donor.

---

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 14 2007, 12:04 PM**

Ok, but BS, you can't have it both ways. Either the "Chat Room' as you put it, is of no consequence, not credible or it is credible has an impact and has caused damage to someone, DS, TS. If Awesum, did only hear evidence in said chat room, and also made his comments in said

chat room, then there is no problem, no case. By your own admission, said "chat room" is not credible. His comments made in said chat room cannot be any more credible than the information posted from which his comments are formed. If the information has no credibility, then neither do his comments based on said information. Now, I said that three times three different ways, I hope it is clear.

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 10:05 AM)**

I am very sure of what are lies and what is truth. You all underestimate the attorneys that have taken on this case. Mr. J, in his ridiculous post says the attorneys know "my threat" is toothless.

rofl Right. I am not making a threat. The case is what defines whether this suit will be a threat. That is why they took the case. They don't know things like: 1. Mr. J made the statements, he has the burden of proof. 2. they don't know the difference between the first amendment and slandering a persons character and reputation. 3. I am sure they also "don't know" that in certain parts of the suit, 3 abn might be required to prove the facts in a false allegation towards them. Nah, they don't know near as much as some of you here. They just took the case for the heck of it knowing they will lose.....yah right.

Now Mr. J. you're tough, you can take it. You want to make slanderous statements as in fact and you want to be sued. Ok good. I want to be there when you, yourself have to prove what you have said about TS. **This will be especially gratifying when you don't know any of the people involved, don't know anything about them except what you have read in a "chat room"**

and have absolutely no connection to, 3abn, The Shelton's or even the alleged victims for that matter. Yes Mr. J. You will certainly have a credible and valid defense when you have no proof whatsoever to bring forward.

You and everyone else can act incensed all you want but you know what I say is truth. Are you willing to go through a nightmare, hire a defense attorney, make a fool of yourself in court, since you, yourself can't prove anything, and then take a chance on paying some huge fines and penalties, all so you can have the enjoyment of slandering someone you don't even know? Not too smart.

Unlike the rest of you, I don't profess to have legal knowledge. I don't need to. That is why those attorneys who specialize in these types of cases, get to do the work. I can't wait to see how many more of you will challenge their knowledge against what You "know". What arrogance.

---

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 14 2007, 12:04 PM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 09:49 AM)**

3ABN has no desire to take this to court. The decision was made after more than a year of insinuations and lies on this forum and save3abn site. This seems to be the only way to get to the truth. I know Observer made the comment that he thought this was a good thing--to get the truth out.

Sister, there is one donor who has offered to cover all costs for the lawyer. Not one penny from donors are going towards this lawsuit. This has been said before, but perhaps you missed that post.

I believe all we want on here is the truth--both sides. Why can't we stop and discuss this without

attacking each other? I want to apologize to all of you for any times I've retaliated to your posts. It would be so nice if we could just forget the past and start all over again, both sides trying to come to just the truth--discussing it like Christian men and women. I believe there is valuable input that can be had on both sides to come to an agreement here.

Is anyone willing to try?

.ee,

Will the donor paying for the legal costs be claiming it as a donation to 3abn?

Bless you, Lee. Yes most of us on here want ALL of the truth, whatever side it is from. I have personally been begging for that all along. I am willing to accept your apology and definitely willing to try.

'B

---

**Posted by: erik Mar 14 2007, 12:13 PM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 09:49 AM)**

3ABN has no desire to take this to court. The decision was made after more than a year of insinuations and lies on this forum and save3abn site. This seems to be the only way to get to the truth. I know Observer made the comment that he thought this was a good thing--to get the truth out.

Sister, there is one donor who has offered to cover all costs for the lawyer. Not one penny from donors are going towards this lawsuit. This has been said before, but perhaps you missed that post.

I believe all we want on here is the truth--both sides. Why can't we stop and discuss this without attacking each other? I want to apologize to all of you for any times I've retaliated to your posts. It would be so nice if we could just forget the past and start all over again, both sides trying to come to just the truth--discussing it like Christian men and women. I believe there is valuable input that can be had on both sides to come to an agreement here.

Is anyone willing to try?

ee,

That would be great but to discuss this your side needs to bring the proof that following in fact did happen.

1. that tommy never has approached any boy or young men for any kind of sexual favors.?
2. that Linda had an affair with someone anyone before her marriage was ended.?
3. On the money questions, i think the fairest way to handle that one is to pick a independent national auditing company and have them do a tottall check of the books at 3abn, i personally would be willing to put some money up towards paying for this to happen and maybe others would has well.
4. Bring forward statements and or Proof that the letters being present at save3abn.com are false, if in fact some or all of the made are false.

Lee, when i first came to this site about year ago, and started reading i was 100 % sure danny was being falsely attacked, but after reading danny and walts own words i found that they left a lot of room for doubt, and then when others came forward with first hand personal information it really changed my mind.

so if 3abn and Danny are about putting any end to this then lets get all the facts on the table, this forum is a place were that can happen, because the otherside is already here, my guess is that they have a lot more to say, and they also should place all there information on the table, truth is never, never, never scared of public display, even when it is tough to do. Look at the cross that was the truth about God hanging in wide space for all to see, nothing being held back. 3abn claims to want to follow Jesus example in this matter then let the Truth hang out for all to see, not in some court room. or better yet open up forum at 3abn's website about the truth make open discussion of the Facts.

I look forward to discussing the facts of these matters with you and others.

Erik

**Posted by: Pickle Mar 14 2007, 12:23 PM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 11:49 AM)**

3ABN has no desire to take this to court. The decision was made after more than a year of insinuations and lies on this forum and save3abn site.

Please oh please, list the lies.

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 11:49 AM)**

This seems to be the only way to get to the truth.

No, it isn't. All we have to do is have genuine, open, two-way communication.

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 11:49 AM)**

Why can't we stop and discuss this without attacking each other? I want to apologize to all of you for any times I've retaliated to your posts.

Amen, and gladly accepted.

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 11:49 AM)**

It would be so nice if we could just forget the past and start all over again, ...

Biblical Christianity doesn't work that way in situation like this. There is no forgiveness without attempts at restitution, and restitution is in order. After that we can talk about forgetting the past.

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 11:49 AM)**

... both sides trying to come to just the truth--discussing it like Christian men and women. I believe



there is valuable input that can be had on both sides to come to an agreement here.

Is anyone willing to try?

Of course. I am.

If you are MolLee, let's think back to my polite correspondence of October 3, 10, 16, and 17. Let's go back to that. John Lomacang promised me that I could see the phone card phone records documenting hundreds of hours of phone calls between Linda and Dr. Abrahamsen. That promise was broken, and here was a refusal to answer very simple questions, like whether the hundreds of hours were actual time spent on the phone or billed units.

Let's go back to that and discuss the matter like Christian men and women. Are there really such phone records? If so, how much actual time do they represent? Of that actual time, how much time were calls made to Dr. Abrahamsen and not Johann, Irmgard, and Nathan?

Really, I could care less if John lied to me IF there is a willingness to come clean and apologize. And unlike some folks, I am not the kind of person who will then use an apology to crucify someone else.

---

**Posted by: Noahswife Mar 14 2007, 01:09 PM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 01:49 PM) □**

I believe all we want on here is the truth--both sides. Why can't we stop and discuss this without attacking each other? I want to apologize to all of you for any times I've retaliated to your posts. It would be so nice if we could just forget the past and start all over again, both sides trying to come to just the truth--discussing it like Christian men and women. I believe there is valuable input that can be had on both sides to come to an agreement here.

Is anyone willing to try?

Lee,

I made this VVV request to Aletheia in my post on Sunday as you know since you responded to my post.

I do not understand why you are not willing to engage in a real dialogue about what you have come to believe, as you have stated. From your posts you give me the impression that you believe your mission here is to convince people that you have more discernment than many others who hold contrary views to your own and who have been misled. Since you have apparently reached your conclusions, what other reason would there be to continue to post? I am a simple reader. I came for information. Let's have an adult conversation Aletheia, you and I. I am sure the administrators will allow us our own thread so we do not post off topic. I am willing if you are.

<http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?s=&showtopic=10145&view=findpost&p=184592>

I am still waiting for a response.

Lee  
 ~"j"

**Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 14 2007, 02:22 PM**

Everytime Bystander, WWJD, and all the other Dannyscribes post they prove that it important, and they just add fuel to the fire being built around Danny.

Will they never learn?

**QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 14 2007, 01:04 PM)**

Ok, but BS, you can't have it both ways. Either the "Chat Room" as you put it, is of no consequence, not credible or it is credible has an impact and has caused damage to someone, DS, TS. If Awesum, did only hear evidence in said chat room, and also made his comments in said chat room, then there is no problem, no case. By your own admission, said "chat room" is not credible. His comments made in said chat room cannot be any more credible that the information posted from which his comments are formed. If the information has no credibility, then neither do his comments based on said information. Now, I said that three times three different ways, I hope it is clear.

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 14 2007, 03:08 PM**

**QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 14 2007, 10:39 AM)**

Why post if you don't know or can't remember the facts?

Roger Clem states that he was victimized in 1988 when he was 16. I got that straight from Roger himself, and you can too if you have the interest. His letter says as much.

Bob,

If this is the case then, since the state of Illinois defines a child as **"Child" means a person under 17 years of age.**, that would make Tommy Shelton exactly what some are saying he is not - a child molestor.

To view the text of Article 11 - Sex Offenses in Illinois  
<http://www.moraloutrage.net/staticpages/index.php?page=Illinois>.

**Posted by: sister Mar 14 2007, 03:25 PM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 12:49 PM)**

3ABN has no desire to take this to court. The decision was made after more than a year of insinuations and lies on this forum and save3abn site. This seems to be the only way to get to the truth. I know Observer made the comment that he thought this was a good thing--to get the truth out.

**Sister, there is one donor who has offered to cover all costs for the lawyer. Not one**

**penny from donors are going towards this lawsuit. This has been said before, but perhaps you missed that post.**

I believe all we want on here is the truth--both sides. Why can't we stop and discuss this without attacking each other? I want to apologize to all of you for any times I've retaliated to your posts. It would be so nice if we could just forget the past and start all over again, both sides trying to come to just the truth--discussing it like Christian men and women. I believe there is valuable input that can be had on both sides to come to an agreement here.

Is anyone willing to try?

Lee, am I correct in assuming that the above bolded paragraph is addressed to me? If so, would it not be better use of this individual donor's money in a ministry project than in lawsuits? I agreed the truth should be gotten out, why not start with a forensic audit of 3ABN's books by the GC? This could go a long way in showing cooperation on the part of 3ABN and a willingness for accountability and transparency.

For one I am tired of the continuous attacks that have recently taken place on BSDA, earlier this was not the case in regard to the issues surrounding 3ABN. Are you now speaking only on behalf of yourself or do you also represent Cindy, WWJD and Bystander?

Sister

---

**Posted by: Pickle Mar 14 2007, 04:08 PM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 11:28 AM)**

Unlike you, I said what I meant. End of story.

Glad to hear you weren't fibbing. That leaves one of the two other possibilities. You either work for them or they work for you.

---

**Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 14 2007, 04:16 PM**

There is but one reason for the any of this to go to court: the unwillingness of Danny and Company to be open and transparent. Period. And he still could be, it's not too late, it's the choice of Danny, he alone has control of the situation, he is the one who is calling the shots and the only one that can ratchet the rhetoric back down.

Even if you are on Danny's side the above is a factual statement.

Richard

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 12:49 PM)**

3ABN has no desire to take this to court. The decision was made after more than a year of

insinuations and lies on this forum and save3abn site. This seems to be the only way to get to the truth. I know Observer made the comment that he thought this was a good thing--to get the truth out.

Sister, there is one donor who has offered to cover all costs for the lawyer. Not one penny from donors are going towards this lawsuit. This has been said before, but perhaps you missed that post.

I believe all we want on here is the truth--both sides. Why can't we stop and discuss this without attacking each other? I want to apologize to all of you for any times I've retaliated to your posts. It would be so nice if we could just forget the past and start all over again, both sides trying to come to just the truth--discussing it like Christian men and women. I believe there is valuable input that can be had on both sides to come to an agreement here.

Is anyone willing to try?

---

**Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 14 2007, 04:43 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 10:17 AM)**

The statement in red and several more in your earlier post have been forwarded to the Attorney's in Minnesota who constantly monitor the site, but "especially slanderous" statements are always forwarded just in case they missed it. You notice I said Statements. There is a big difference in making the IF THIS IS TRUE allegations or in what you did ,which was ,pronounce your judgments as fact. Even if you believe there is no suit coming, most people would still be careful in how that phrase their accusations, just in case.

our legal counsel must be the same one that proved themselves incompetent in the 3abn vs. Dept of Rev, State of Illinois. Defamation through libel requires a much deeper understanding of the law than you demonstrate. For example, how would I be able to prove that you are you using your computer? You may be at the public library, posting not only anonymously in this forum, but anonymously through someone elses computer. Or you may be posting under someone elses name and email/isp. They can't be held accountable for that. There's no way to prove who used the computer, or who actually posted, unless there's a record of some kind, like video cameras focused on the computer at the time of posting, clearly identifying who posted.

But, surely you knew that. Maybe not.

BTW, regarding being careful how a statement is phrased, legally, you can ask any question you'd like. Now, it may not be safe to call someone an "\_\_\_\_\_", but I can make the same point by phrasing it with a question like, "why are you always trying to prove yourself to be an \_\_\_\_?" Or, I can infer it v/o actually stating it in black and white. I can say, "you remind me of the \_\_\_\_ who repeatedly hung himself with his own words.

---

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 14 2007, 08:38 PM**

---

**QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 14 2007, 12:29 PM)**

.... as when we hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music even if you and the rest of the lackeys in your camp are content to bow down and

worship the image of Danny... I will NOT bow down... so bring on your fiery furnace... but be mindful you dont get yourself burned up calling yourself throwing me and others in... and don't worry about what God will save me out of the hand of Danny Shelton and his Minnesota lawyers; I know Him even if you don't.

Excellent literary skills Bro J! Excellent!

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 01:05 PM)**

..... I can't wait to see how many more of you will challenge their knowledge against what You "know". What arrogance.

too cannot wait. I cannot wait for a lawyer to waste time trying to "sue me" while in turn 1-losing the case, 2-his client having to pay me, and finally 3-instead of a handful (100,000 or less) knowing the story" it being known by the "whole world".....  
 Yep. I can't wait either....

sn:

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 01:49 PM)**

....I believe all we want on here is the truth--both sides. Why can't we stop and discuss this without attacking each other? I want to apologize to all of you for any times I've retaliated to your posts. It would be so nice if we could just forget the past and start all over again, both sides trying to come to just the truth--discussing it like Christian men and women. I believe there is valuable input that can be had on both sides to come to an agreement here.

Is anyone willing to try?

took out the stuff prior to this post because it didn't quite make sense to me. You also spoke on it after the fact and corrected yourself.

All anyone has ever wanted (most at least) is the truth about the entire 3ABN Saga. You have 1st hand experiences, letters, and countless posts from countless folks.

agree with the main questions:

1. Did Tommy Shelton molest any children? - Per letters he did. He was not "charged" however that doesn't mean that the molestation didn't happen/should not be punished now/no other victims after the fact.
2. Did Linda Shelton cheat/commit adultery on Danny Shelton? - Danny Shelton and his "camp" have stated they have "proof" yet it has never been shown. No one's gonna believe you are a winner unless you show your hand and win the game. So far he's losing all his chips at the table. He's doubled down; he's "pushed" and got nuthin' to show for it...

That's the main deal for me.

Wow.

If Tommy Shelton can prove that he didn't molest the children - (and his letters prove that he did) then he is not a child molestor.

If Danny Shelton can prove that Linda Shelton cheated on him prior to his divorcing her and marriage to another woman (and so far he has shown no proof and has even stated statements that have been proved false) then he is not in the wrong.

That's it in a nutshell. One is provable due to the actual perpetrator (those that molest - Tommy Shelton) admitting to the allegations in letters.

The other one would be provable if Danny Shelton would put his evidence on the table.

What else is necessary?




---

**Posted by: Lee Mar 14 2007, 08:52 PM**

**QUOTE(sister @ Mar 14 2007, 04:25 PM) □**

Lee, am I correct in assuming that the above bolded paragraph is addressed to me? If so, would it not be better use of this individual donor's money in a ministry project than in lawsuits? I agreed the truth should be gotten out, why not start with a forensic audit of 3ABN's books by the GC? This could go a long way in showing cooperation on the part of 3ABN and a willingness for accountability and transparency.

I for one am tired of the continuous attacks that have recently taken place on BSDA, earlier this was not the case in regard to the issues surrounding 3ABN. Are you now speaking only on behalf of yourself or do you also represent Cindy, WWJD and Bystander?

Sister

I only write for myself Sister and you know this. Because I might say "we" or "us" or whatever is in reference to those of us on Danny's side. If you will read further, you will notice I used the wrong word in reference to the "person" paying court costs. Instead of "donor" it is "person" or whatever you want to call them. Honestly--they can do what they want with their money if they so choose to give it to help pay for lawyers so be it. You can contact them if you want to know why they are doing this.

---

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 14 2007, 09:23 PM**

Lee,

PrincessDrRe's list is a really good start, but I think that there is at least one more that I can think of right off the top of my head:

Danny and whoever was supporting him in his endeavor, must be held accountable for attempting to cover up the abuse by Tommy and intimidating at least one victim (that we know of) and an entire Church organization with threats of legal action for speaking out about the abuse.

A reasonable attempt at restitution should be made for any victims of inappropriate actions.

PB

---

**Posted by: sister Mar 14 2007, 09:41 PM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 09:52 PM) □**

I only write for myself Sister and you know this. Because I might say "we" or "us" or whatever is in reference to those of us on Danny's side. If you will read further, you will notice I used the wrong word in reference to the "person" paying court costs. Instead of "donor" it is "person" or whatever you want to call them. **Honestly--they can do what they want with their money if they so choose to give it to help pay for lawyers so be it. You can contact them if you want to know why they are doing this.**

.ee, to contact someone I must first have knowledge of whom to contact. Since it appears that you have that information, would you please tell us who it is, then any of us who chooses can contact that individual.

sister

---

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 14 2007, 09:54 PM**

**QUOTE(Richard Sherwin @ Mar 14 2007, 03:16 PM) □**

There is but one reason for the any of this to go to court: the unwillingness of Danny and Company to be open and transparent. Period. And he still could be, it's not too late, it's the choice of Danny, he alone has control of the situation, he is the one who is calling the shots and the only one that can ratchet the rhetoric back down.

Even if you are on Danny's side the above is a factual statement.

Richard

□


---

**Posted by: Jnana15 Mar 15 2007, 05:33 PM**


[quote] name='Bystander' date='Mar 14 2007, 11:17 AM' post='185251'[quote]  
 The statement in red and several more in your earlier post have been forwarded to the Attorney's in Minnesota who constantly monitor the site, but "especially slanderous" statements are always forwarded just in case they missed it.[quote]

Since you and others of 3ABN have been so highly praised for being "Christ like" behind the scenes of 3ABN, what is your view on suing your brethren in a court of law? I have been trying to locate that scripture in the bible refering to such. Any Pastors/ Elders out there?

You see, my husband has only been an SDA for about 13 years, and me, 4th generation, and he pointed out that scripture to me. He refuses to take anyone to court for fear that they are believers, so therefore we have had so called SDA family members suing our socks off. The brighter side to this, is what a wonderful Savior we serve. We have seen how He has dealt with the



SDA family opposers when we trust fully in Him to defend us.

It's really sad that we have resorted to threats and lawsuits.   
JMHO


Jnana

**Posted by: lookin4truth Mar 15 2007, 05:46 PM**

1Co 6:1-7

- (1) Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?
- (2) Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters?
- (3) Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?
- (4) If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church.
- (5) I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren?
- (6) But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers.
- (7) Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 15 2007, 08:40 PM**



**Posted by: LaurenceD Mar 15 2007, 08:43 PM**

The other one is...

Matthew 5:40 And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 16 2007, 05:04 PM**

**QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 14 2007, 01:04 PM)**

Lee,  
Will the donor paying for the legal costs be claiming it as a donation to 3abn?

Bless you, Lee. Yes most of us on here want ALL of the truth, whatever side it is from. I have personally been begging for that all along. I am willing to accept your apology and definitely willing to try.

PB

PB,



Here is Danny Shelton's explanation from the LIVE show:

**I'm being honest with you. Before this gets out I want to be the first to set this record straight. Well people say, I don't want my money going to pay lawyers. And so if there's any lawsuits going on, defamation, whatever, I don't want my money...well, we have some people who have donated and did not take a tax deduction and say we're going to help with this so you don't have to take donor's money. If you need legal fees or if you need attorneys to write letters, or if ya gotta go to court to defend yourself, we will help with those bills. And so money is coming in every month. They're paying every month and saying we want to help with situation, so you can let your donor's know that their money is still going just the way it should. When you give money it is going to give the gospel to all the world.**

The quote is from the program where the 3ABN panel was addressing the negative article in Adventist today and Pickle and Joy's Save3ABN website, etc..

I believe Ralph transcribed most of the second hour except for 3ABN's explanation of how to support them through prayer, money, labour, and by calling your local networks and stations which have 3ABN and thanking them, or by asking them to add it, if it's not offered in your area.

For those who haven't read it, you can do so here:  
<http://mypage.direct.ca/r/rseland/private/second.html>

Have a Happy Sabbath.

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 16 2007, 05:29 PM**

Thank you, Aletheia for posting this response. I haven't see the second hour of that broadcast and also haven't read all of what Ralph has transcribed.

PB

**Posted by: seraph|m Mar 16 2007, 05:33 PM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 16 2007, 06:04 PM)**

PB,

Here is Danny Shelton's explanation from the LIVE show:

[color=#3333FF] [b]I'm being honest with you. Before this gets out I want to be the first to set this record straight. Well people say, I don't want my money going to pay lawyers. And so if there's any lawsuits going on, defamation, whatever, I don't want my money...well, we have some people who have donated and did not take a tax deduction and say we're going to help with this so you don't have to take donor's money.

In light of the FACT that peoples donations as well as how they file their taxes, happen to be confidential you can only speak for yourself in regards to who does or does not receive deductions.

**Posted by: lookin4truth Mar 16 2007, 05:39 PM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 16 2007, 06:04 PM) □**

PB,

Here is Danny Shelton's explanation from the LIVE show:

**I'm being honest with you. Before this gets out I want to be the first to set this record straight. Well people say, I don't want my money going to pay lawyers. And so if there's any lawsuits going on, defamation, whatever, I don't want my money...well, we have some people who have donated and did not take a tax deduction and say we're going to help with this so you don't have to take donor's money. If you need legal fees or if you need attorneys to write letters, or if ya gotta go to court to defend yourself, we will help with those bills. And so money is coming in every month. They're paying every month and saying we want to help with situation, so you can let your donor's know that their money is still going just the way it should. When you give money it is going to give the gospel to all the world.**

I hope that 3ABN is documenting well how this money is being used. The donor may be giving it as a NON-tax deductible gift, which means that they cannot claim it on their taxes, but there are still restrictions on how the money can be used.

For example, if the money is designated to be for Danny Shelton, it could be viewed by the IRS as income. Danny would be required to declare the money as income, and pay taxes on it.

In the church setting, many churches take up an offering for their pastor for birthdays, etc. If this money is taken up by the church, and people MAY feel compelled to contribute, it must be claimed as income.

Sometimes churches will purchase cars for their pastors. After all, the pastor uses his car to visit the sick, attend church related meetings, etc. The IRS says this gift is taxable.

If a donor sends money to 3ABN to support the 501C3 organization, it has certain legal implications. If the donor is sending money to support Danny Shelton, the implications could be quite different.

---

**Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 17 2007, 07:01 PM**

The fact is, and will remain, that Danny and 3abn does not have to go to court to defend it's self. He can at any time he wishes bring this whole sordid issue to it's conclusion without any lawyers getting involved. It's his choice to unwisely spend donor money to go after fellow believers, money that could be better spent spreading the Gospel. Stubbornness is an awful burden to bear.

Richard

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 16 2007, 06:04 PM) □**

PB,

Here is Danny Shelton's explanation from the LIVE show:

**I'm being honest with you. Before this gets out I want to be the first to set this record straight. Well people say, I don't want my money going to pay lawyers. And so if there's any lawsuits going on, defamation, whatever, I don't want my money...well, we have some people who have donated and did not take a tax deduction and say we're going to help with this so you don't have to take donor's money. If you need legal fees or if you need attorneys to write letters, or [b] if ya gotta go to court to defend yourself, we will help with those bills. And so money is coming in every month. They're paying every month and saying we want to help with situation, so you can let your donor's know that their money is still going just the way it should. When you give money it is going to give the gospel to all the world. [/b]**

The quote is from the program where the 3ABN panel was addressing the negative article in Adventist today and Pickle and Joy's Save3ABN website, etc..

I believe Ralph transcribed most of the second hour except for 3ABN's explanation of how to support them through prayer, money, labour, and by calling your local networks and stations which have 3ABN and thanking them, or by asking them to add it, if it's not offered in your area.

For those who haven't read it, you can do so here:

<http://mypage.direct.ca/r/rseland/private/second.html>

Have a Happy Sabbath.

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 17 2007, 07:44 PM**

[quote name='LaurenceD' date='Mar 14 2007, 03:43 PM' post='185351']

Your legal counsel must be the same one that proved themselves incompetent in the 3abn vs. Dept of Rev, State of Illinois. Defamation through libel requires a much deeper understanding of the law than you demonstrate. For example, how would I be able to prove that you are you using your computer? You may be at the public library, posting not only anonymously in this forum, but anonymously through someone elses computer. Or you may be posting under someone elses name and email/isp. They can't be held accountable for that. There's no way to prove who used the computer, or who actually posted, unless there's a record of some kind, like video cameras focused on the computer at the time of posting, clearly identifying who posted.

[/quote]

Laurence,I could state all of this in an entirely different way, but I won't. I will get straight to the point. Of course this is not the same legal counsel. These people are experts at what they do. As to what you stated about finding computers, you are not well versed on the expertise of that subject and I will leave it at that.

As far as the rest of your "lesson" on what constitutes a case, whatever your opinion is,it is of no consequence in comparison to those, who have practiced the art of law succesfully for over 30 years. It pales in comparison to those who are experts not just in law but in these types of cases. They know what they can prove, how to prove it, how to best try the cases (seperately or together) and in what order said cases should be handled. They know the hows, the why's and the way's and for anyone, here, on this forum to argue with their assessments, their knowledge and their success, well, it isn't the most intelligent thing to do.

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 17 2007, 07:46 PM**

I know this is totally  off however....

Hey Bystander! How was your Sabbath?

---

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 17 2007, 07:48 PM**


**QUOTE(Richard Sherwin @ Mar 17 2007, 06:01 PM)**

The fact is, and will remain, that Danny and 3abn does not have to go to court to defend it's self. He can at any time he wishes bring this whole sordid issue to it's conclusion without any lawyers getting involved. It's his choice to unwisely spend donor money to go after fellow believers, money that could be better spent spreading the Gospel. Stubbornness is an awful burden to bear.

Richard

No, they don't. And they aren't.

**QUOTE(princessdi @ Mar 17 2007, 06:46 PM)**

I know this is totally  however....

Hey Bystander! How was your Sabbath?

Very relaxing and peaceful. How was yours. I love our day of rest.

---

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 17 2007, 08:04 PM**

Great!!! It is indeed a blessing. Why dont you extend it a while and "enjoy the rest of the board, paly a game in teh arcade, chat in LC, read the other forums. Try it, you'll like it!

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 17 2007, 06:48 PM)**

Very relaxing and peaceful. How was yours. I love our day of rest.

---

**Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 17 2007, 09:00 PM**

So are you saying that 3abn has decided not to take legal action?

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 17 2007, 08:48 PM)**

No, they don't. And they aren't.

Very relaxing and peaceful. How was yours. I love our day of rest.

---

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 17 2007, 09:05 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Richard Sherwin @ Mar 17 2007, 09:01 PM)**

The fact is, and will remain, that Danny and 3abn does not have to go to court to defend it's self. He can at any time he wishes bring this whole sordid issue to it's conclusion without any lawyers getting involved. It's his choice to unwisely spend donor money to go after fellow believers, money that could be better spent spreading the Gospel. **Stubbornness is an awful burden to bear.**

---

**QUOTE(Richard Sherwin @ Mar 17 2007, 11:00 PM)**

So are you saying that 3abn has decided not to take legal action?

See? I caught that too....

One mouth says "prepare for lawsuit".... "sending off evidence".....another mouth says, "No, they aren't...."

Somebody's lying...

---

**Posted by: Fran Mar 17 2007, 09:09 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Richard Sherwin @ Mar 17 2007, 09:00 PM)**

So are you saying that 3abn has decided not to take legal action?

think I heard the very same thing, Richard. Why am I not surprised?

---

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 17 2007, 09:14 PM**


Probably because (let's be serious) they will end up losing more money and lookin' real crispy (moted/embarrassed/stank/stupid) than before any case would have started....

---

**Posted by: Brenda Mar 17 2007, 09:15 PM**

---

**QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 18 2007, 01:05 PM)**



See? I caught that too....

One mouth says "prepare for lawsuit".... "sending off evidence".....another mouth says, "No, they aren't...."

Somebody's lying...

Well it could mean that 3ABN/management are not considered to be stubborn.

---

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 17 2007, 09:31 PM**

or....they are not communicating like they should....




---

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 17 2007, 10:11 PM**

"They" being the Danny-ites....




---

**Posted by: mozart Mar 17 2007, 10:54 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 12 2007, 07:15 PM)**

Pickle your unwillingness to answer the question shows your are not a honest person. Period end of sentence. But no matter because I have my answer very plainly. Thanks.

I "backtrack" on nothing! The post you are speaking about that has to do with minors were just questions Pickle....HONEST questions which is more than what you can possibly do. Any "reasonable" intelligent person reading my post could see that.

But then perhaps I got too close to the truth of the matter.

Now! No offense, honestly, but did he hit a nerve with you danny lee? Not sure how much scripture you have the time to read anymore but remember this one? "**See to it that no one misses the grace of God and that no bitter root grows up to cause trouble and defile many**". The more you wallow in the mud the dirtier you get. Isn't it time to repent and get baptised again and get all his over with? Please for everyone's sake. I'm begging you to stop all this. It's worse than Jim Bakker and Jimmy Swaggert combined!

---

**Posted by: mozart Mar 17 2007, 11:11 PM**

---

**QUOTE(lookin4truth @ Mar 12 2007, 08:58 PM)**

FHB,


Could you provide a link to the Wikipedia info you referred to. I did a search on the following (results listed).

DrPickle. -- No results  
 drpickle -- No results  
 dr pickle -- 380 hits

The hits that resulted from "dr pickle" were everything from the cast of Rug Rats, to information about Lyndon Johnson, etc.

I would like to read the information you referred to.



Thanks,  
 L4T



**Posted by: mozart Mar 17 2007, 11:38 PM**

**QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Mar 12 2007, 10:41 PM)**

He has answered plenty of questions from me. I guess it all depends on whether he thinks you can handle the answers.

maybe it's because bob knows who these aliases are. therefore it's just a cat and mouse game. not many at 3abn have answered questions totally and completely honest if at all so that's why they accuse others of doing what they do. it keeps them from having to answer those questions that they don't want to answer. it's like the politicians. all the rhetoric has nothing to do with resolving the issues at hand. round and round we go. gets us nowhere. folks over at 3abn using aliases here are playing a human game. one day they will have to play God's game. i don't know enough to feel anything but shame and pity for them. if they don't know what they've done wrong, then they shouldn't be running that station. by the way; can anyone tell me when the undiluted 3 angels program will be airing or have they quit showing those   ?

**Posted by: mozart Mar 18 2007, 12:07 AM**

**QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 14 2007, 07:46 AM)**

Greg,  
 You are right on target here in your answer to Aletheia's posts about Tommy's "sins".


I think we need to go one step further. A person whose sin has victimized another has the responsibility to make restitution to that victim. Look at the example of David. He did some horrible things. When he got to the point that he desired to be forgiven for those sins, he made things right as far as possible. He couldn't bring back the man he caused to be killed, but he restored things as much as he could as a part of his repentance. We know he received the forgiveness he sought and still is know as beloved of God.

Private sins, those which only work to separate you from God, can be forgiven just between you and God. Public sins, those which have negatively affected others, have the consequences you spoke of but there is also the need to tend to the damage done to those victimized.

PB

AMEN !! and may i add: and anyone who shelters them.

**Posted by: Noahswife Mar 18 2007, 12:11 AM**





And for your commentary on the prior posts.

noahswife  
C"i"

**Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 18 2007, 12:18 AM**

**QUOTE(mozart @ Mar 17 2007, 10:38 PM)**

maybe it's because bob knows who these aliases are. therefore it's just a cat and mouse game. not many at 3abn have answered questions totally and completely honest if at all so that's why they accuse others of doing what they do. it keeps them from having to answer those questions that they don't want to answer. it's like the politicians. all the rhetoric has nothing to do with resolving the issues at hand. round and round we go. gets us nowhere. folks over at 3abn using aliases here are playing a human game. one day they will have to play God's game. i don't know enough to feel anything but shame and pity for them. if they don't know what they've done wrong, then they shouldn't be running that station. by the way; can anyone tell me when the undiluted 3 angels program will be airing or have they quit showing those   ?

WELCOME Mozart! You make excellent points! Thank you for your contribution! Well said!! think DS has totally underestimated the sda church at large, contrary to what he thinks in his mind .



He may have control over a shrinking small sect and has forgotten about the rest of us.

**Posted by: mozart Mar 18 2007, 12:35 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 14 2007, 10:05 AM)**

I am very sure of what are lies and what is truth. You all underestimate the attorneys that have taken on this case. Mr. J, in his ridiculous post says the attorneys know "my threat" is toothless.

rofl Right. I am not making a threat. The case is what defines whether this suit will be a threat. That is why they took the case. They don't know things like: 1. Mr. J made the statements, he has the burden of proof. 2. they don't know the difference between the first ammendment and slandering a persons character and reputation. 3.I am sure they also "don't know" that in certain parts of the suit, 3 abn might be required to prove the facts in a false allegation towards them. Nah, they don't know near as much as some of you here. They just took the case for the heck of it knowing they will lose.....yah right.

Now Mr. J. you're tough, you can take it. You want to make slanderous statements as in fact and you want to be sued. Ok good. I want to be there when you, yourself have to prove what you have said about TS. This will be especially gratifying when you don't know any of the people involved, don't know anything about them except what you have read in a "chat room"  and have absolutely no connection to, 3abn, The Shelton's or even the alleged victims for that matter. Yes Mr. J. You will certainly have a credible and valid defense when you have no proof whatsoever to bring forward.

You and everyone else can act incensed all you want but you know what I say is truth. Are you willing to go through a nightmare, hire a defense attorney, make a fool of yourself in court, since you, yourself can't prove anything, and then take a chance on paying some huge fines and penalties, all so you can have the enjoyment of slandering someone you don't even know? Not too smart.

Unlike the rest of you, I don't profess to have legal knowledge. I don't need to. That is why those attorneys who specialize in these types of cases, get to do the work. I can't wait to see how many more of you will challenge their knowledge against what You "know". What arrogance.

i got a couple questions.....so are you saying that your attorneys in minn. are going to track down and prove the identities of these people online that you are referring to and drag them into court to file personal libel/slander lawsuits against them??  hmm....how much is that costin' ya?

these attorneys have any second jobs or anything to tithe them over 'til this ship comes in??

**QUOTE(sonshineonme @ Mar 17 2007, 11:18 PM)**

WELCOME Mozart! You make excellent points! Thank you for your contribution! Well said!! I think DS has totally underestimated the sda church at large, contrary to what he thinks in his mind . He may have control over a shrinking small sect and has forgotten about the rest of us.

i tend to agree with you. manipulated out of blind loyalty. not looking out for 3abn.

**Posted by: mozart Mar 18 2007, 01:06 AM**

**QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 14 2007, 10:49 AM)** □

3ABN has no desire to take this to court. The decision was made after more than a year of insinuations and lies on this forum and save3abn site. This seems to be the only way to get to the truth. I know Observer made the comment that he thought this was a good thing--to get the truth out.

Sister, there is one donor who has offered to cover all costs for the lawyer. Not one penny from donors are going towards this lawsuit. This has been said before, but perhaps you missed that post.



I believe all we want on here is the truth--both sides. Why can't we stop and discuss this without attacking each other? I want to apologize to all of you for any times I've retaliated to your posts. It would be so nice if we could just forget the past and start all over again, both sides trying to come to just the truth--discussing it like Christian men and women. I believe there is valuable input that can be had on both sides to come to an agreement here.

Is anyone willing to try?

yes, if you will admit who you are.

believe it or not, 3abn ministry is more important than you danny or tommy or any of us. while you are jabbering in your defense, poor lost souls are hanging in the midst. i'm here to fight for 3abn, the station, the ministry. the lost souls. i'm here for them, not all these arguments. but dont pretend to play mr. nice guy all the while playing mr. slydog. just because we are not directly involved in the day to day workings over there at 3abn doesn't mean we are stupid and can easily be manipulated and deceived. don't think that we will miss those things so swiftly swept under the rug or that when one day the co-founder disappears never to be seen on air again that none of us will actually notice or miss her or care. you highly underestimated her ministry there and you highly underestimate us, the audience and supporters. you ought to know, adventists are some of the smartest people out there, especially 'praying adventist', so there is no pulling the wool over our eyes. you're wasting all of our time and time is short. for every minute you are wasting, a soul is lost. you may fool a few but just because you can fool a few doesn't mean you can fool all. and the one's you can't fool are strong-hearted lions. the longer you hide, the more lost you get. you'd be surprised at how many still love you danny lee. we are a very forgiving people. how about you start finding that out?

**Posted by: Jnana15 Mar 18 2007, 02:30 PM**



**Posted by: Richard Sherwin Mar 18 2007, 06:03 PM**

Well BS didn't answer, not surprised. They (the Dannyites) obviously have no idea what they are saying. As usual they do more to hurt their credibility than to enhance it.

Richard

**QUOTE(Richard Sherwin @ Mar 17 2007, 11:00 PM)**

So are you saying that 3abn has decided not to take legal action?

---

**Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Mar 19 2007, 09:05 AM**

**QUOTE(mozart @ Mar 17 2007, 11:38 PM)**

maybe it's because bob knows who these aliases are.

I'm sure he does know who some of them are at least. I do know of one case of a single person using (at least) two different accounts in an attempt to make it look like they had someone agreeing with them. (and no, I'm not talking about Bystander/wwjd). You're right, they're playing a game.

---

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 19 2007, 02:09 PM**

**QUOTE(mozart @ Mar 18 2007, 02:06 AM)**

yes, if you will admit who you are.  
believe it or not, 3abn ministry is more important than you danny or tommy or any of us. while you are jabbering in your defense, poor lost souls are hanging in the midst. i'm here to fight for 3abn, the station, the ministry. the lost souls. i'm here for them, not all these arguments. but dont pretend to play mr. nice guy all the while playing mr. slydog. just because we are not directly involved in the day to day workings over there at 3abn doesn't mean we are stupid and can easily be manipulated and deceived. don't think that we will miss those things so swiftly swept under the rug or that when one day the co-founder disappears never to be seen on air again that none of us will actually notice or miss her or care. you highly underestimated her ministry there and you highly underestimate us, the audience and supporters. you ought to know, adventists are some of the smartest people out there, especially 'praying adventist', so there is no pulling the wool over our eyes. you're wasting all of our time and time is short. for every minute you are wasting, a soul is lost. you may fool a few but just because you can fool a few doesn't mean you can fool all. and the one's you can't fool are strong-hearted lions. the longer you hide, the more lost you get. you'd be surprised at how many still love you danny lee. we are a very forgiving people. how about you start finding that out?

I'm sorry but what you wrote is just weird. You are way off base. I don't know who you think you are talking to, but to start with Lee is a woman, not Danny Lee, and I can't figure out how anything else you wrote even applies to her either...

---

**Posted by: Noahswife Mar 19 2007, 03:02 PM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 19 2007, 03:09 PM)**

I'm sorry but what you wrote is just weird.

I have heard that applied to more than one post here at BSDA but that was not my impression from reading it nor apparently others who responded.

You are way off base.

I have heard this said about many posts here at BSDA by both sides. What do you base your opinion on if you do not understand whom Mozart is speaking to?

I don't know who you think you are talking to, but to start with Lee is a woman, not Danny Lee, and I can't figure out how anything else you wrote even applies to her either...

Aletheia, I can't speak for anyone but myself but I found that Mozart's post was very clear as to whom he was speaking to.

You have been reminded before to ask some questions in a PM. Maybe this would be one of those times.

nw

C"i"

**Posted by: PeacefullyBewildered Mar 19 2007, 03:23 PM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 19 2007, 01:09 PM)**

I'm sorry but what you wrote is just weird. You are way off base. I don't know who you think you are talking to, but to start with Lee is a woman, not Danny Lee, and I can't figure out how anything else you wrote even applies to her either...

**Aletheia,**

Before you jump into attack mode, take a moment to think about who this new member, Mozart, just might be. You may want to take a moment to really reflect on what he is saying in his post. Have you taken into consideration that Mozart just may be one of the viewing audience/donors that have seen him characterizing these online "chat rooms" in a poor light? What kind of welcome does he receive from those defending Danny when they jump directly into attack mode?

**NW,**

I also thought what Mozart wrote was very clear.

**Mozart,**

Welcome to the 3abn Forum on BSDA!

hug.gif

I don't yet know what drew you here but we are all looking forward to getting to "know" you. I appreciated your posts and enjoy reading your opinions on this saga and your responses to other

members!

PB

---

**Posted by: Johann Mar 19 2007, 05:35 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 19 2007, 10:09 PM)**

I'm sorry but what you wrote is just weird. You are way off base. I don't know who you think you are talking to, but to start with Lee is a woman, not Danny Lee, and I can't figure out how anything else you wrote even applies to her eiither...

Could this be termed a "weird" welcome to a new member who expresses how impressive your spins appear to a newcomer?

---

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 19 2007, 05:45 PM**

**To Aletheia:**

Please take this down a notch or two. This is a new member, and you are in not in authority here to take anybody to task for anything.

**To mozart:**

Welcome to BSDA. I am looking forward to reading more of your posts. However, we try to refrain from trying to identify anyone here, as we all(including you) are her under anonymous IDs. We try to extend the same respect to others that we expect for ourselves. That being said...post away!

---

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 19 2007, 01:09 PM)**

I'm sorry but what you wrote is just weird. You are way off base. I don't know who you think you are talking to, but to start with Lee is a woman, not Danny Lee, and I can't figure out how anything else you wrote even applies to her eiither...

---

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 19 2007, 06:31 PM**


---

**QUOTE(PeacefullyBewildered @ Mar 19 2007, 04:23 PM)**

**Aletheia,**

Before you jump into attack mode, take a moment to think about who this new member, Mozart, just might be. You may want to take a moment to really reflect on what he is saying in his post. Have you taken into consideration that Mozart just may be one of the viewing audience/donors that have seen him charaterizing these online "chat rooms" in a poor light? What kind of welcome does he receive from those defending Danny when they jump directly into attack mode?

**NW,**

I also thought what Mozart wrote was very clear. 

wasn't, and am not in attack mode. I didn't know at first that Mozart was new, but even weirder that a new member would arrive call Lee, Danny Lee and read her the riot act as if she's is Danny Lee shelton. It doesn't matter who mozart is, the point was, who Lee is not.

So it wasn't **spoton**, it was **offbase** as I said. Truth matters.

And Mozart, aside from this, a belated


 welcome.gif

---

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 19 2007, 11:48 PM**

**QUOTE(mozart @ Mar 18 2007, 12:06 AM)**


and the one's you can't fool are strong-hearted lions. the longer you hide, the more lost you get. you'd be surprised at how many still love you danny lee. we are a very forgiving people. how about you start finding that out?

Clay, Calvin, princess Di, would one of you explain to this rampaging person that Lee is a woman that has been here for some time? Please....before he hurts himself 

---

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 20 2007, 12:25 AM**

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 20 2007, 12:48 AM)**

Clay, Calvin, princess Di, would one of you explain to this rampaging person that Lee is a woman that has been here for some time? Please....before he hurts himself 

Thank you -- here's what he wrote in his next post:

Wow! No offense, honestly, but did he hit a nerve with you danny lee? Not sure how much scripture you have the time to read anymore but remember this one? "See to it that no one misses the grace of God and that no bitter root grows up to cause trouble and defile many". The more you wallow in the mud the dirtier you get. Isn't it time to repent and get baptised again and get all this over with? Please for everyone's sake. I'm begging you to stop all this. It's worse than Jim Bakker and Jimmy Swaggert combined!"

Then every one was going on about how wonderful what he wrote was and welcoming him like they couldn't notice.... really, sometimes this place is like being in the twilight zone, or One flew over the

cuckoo's nest.

**Posted by: princessdi Mar 20 2007, 09:07 AM**

BS and Cindy see post #153, He hasn't posted again since.

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 19 2007, 10:48 PM)**


Clay, Calvin, princess Di, would one of you explain to this rampaging person that Lee is a woman that has been here for some time? Please....before he hurts himself

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 20 2007, 10:32 AM**

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 19 2007, 07:31 PM)**


I wasn't, and am not in attack mode. **I didn't know at first that Mozart was new**, but even weirder that a new member would arrive call Lee, Danny Lee and read her the riot act as if she's is Danny Lee Shelton. It doesn't matter who mozart is, the point was, who Lee is not.

So it wasn't spoton, it was **offbase** as I said. **Truth matters.**



And Mozart, aside from this, a belated

How could you not know if someone is "new" or not by looking under their avitar....



Where it straight out says "Welcome Newbie".....


*Spin, Spin, SPIN!!!*



**Posted by: ex3ABNemployee Mar 20 2007, 10:40 AM**

**QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 20 2007, 10:32 AM)**

How could you not know if someone is "new" or not by looking under their avitar....



Where it straight out says "Welcome Newbie".....

*Spin, Spin, SPIN!!!*



The "Joined" date is a nice touch, too.

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 20 2007, 12:24 PM**

**QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 20 2007, 09:32 AM)**

How could you not know if someone is "new" or not by looking under their avitar...



Where it straight out says "Welcome Newbie".....

*Spin, Spin, SPIN!!!*




Aletheia said she didn't notice AT FIRST. I am sure she was so caught up in the wild rampage she was leading, she failed to notice AT FIRST, who the writer was.

**Posted by: Jnana15 Mar 20 2007, 02:00 PM**

**QUOTE**

name='Aletheia' date='Mar 20 2007, 01:25 AM' post='186480']

... really, sometimes this place is like being in the twilight zone, or One flew over the cuckoo's nest.

Since it appears that you are familiar with these places, why don't you go for a long visit and give us a rest...Oh! Please invite Bystander and Lee to go with you. 

**Posted by: Aletheia Mar 20 2007, 06:01 PM**

**QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 20 2007, 12:32 PM)**

How could you not know if someone is "new" or not by looking under their avitar...



Where it straight out says "Welcome Newbie".....



*Spin, Spin, SPIN!!!*

y:

Probably because I am more concerned with what a person says and does, then in who they claim they are. {actions speak louder then words-- you will know them by their fruits)

OW, where this forum is concerned; I tend to focus more on what is posted, then on who the posters, or what they claim to be.

---

**Posted by: Bystander Mar 20 2007, 06:13 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Jnana15 @ Mar 20 2007, 01:00 PM)**

Since it appears that you are familiar with these places, why don't you go for a long visit and give us a rest...Oh! Please invite Bystander and Lee to go with you.

Didn't you get the memo about behaving? New rules. You have to be nice. Try it you might like it.

---

**Posted by: Clay Mar 20 2007, 06:26 PM**

**back on topic folks.....**

---

**Posted by: seraph|m Mar 20 2007, 07:08 PM**

---

**QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 20 2007, 11:32 AM)**

How could you not know if someone is "new" or not by looking under their avitar....

snr

Where it straight out says "Welcome Newbie".....

*Spin, Spin, SPIN!!!*

y:

'anno

---

**QUOTE(ex3ABNemployee @ Mar 20 2007, 11:40 AM)**

The "Joined" date is a nice touch, too.

True, all it takes is for one to simply pay attention.

---

**Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 20 2007, 07:54 PM**

---

**QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 20 2007, 02:24 PM)**

Aletheia said she didn't notice **AT FIRST**. I am sure she was so caught up in the wild rampage she was reading, she failed to notice **AT FIRST**, who the writer was.

The **FIRST** thing you should notice is the person's name, then what's under their name, then what they say.

---

**QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 20 2007, 08:01 PM)**

Probably because I am more concerned with what a person says and does, then in who they claim they are. **{actions speak louder than words-- you will know them by their fruits}**

IOW, where this forum is concerned; **I tend to focus more on what is posted**, then on who the poster is, or what they claim to be.

If this was true then the question of "Who is who" and "Who you know" wouldn't even be a subject that you ask questions on....  
Root Point.

---

**QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 20 2007, 08:26 PM)**

**back on topic folks.....**

Oh yes.... Save3ABN..... Who runs it?

---

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