Printable Version of Topic

Click here to view this topic in its original format

BlackSDA _ 3ABN _ Things That Make You Go Hmmm...

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 07:28 AM

Bob,

AFAIC The more letters you publish the more it calls into account the credibility and truthfulness of the previous testimony on this forum.

Let's start here.

QUOTE

Bob Pickle posted on Dec 26 2006, 09:28 AM:

.....

Regarding furnishings and such, that stems from an email from Walt Thompson, posted courtesy of Gregory Matthews:

QUOTE

(Walt Thompson)
".....He bought her interest in the house, helped her move to Southern Illinois, build a porch on her home there, **gave her all of the things in their home including things that were really his.** (He did these things with money obtained in a loan from a friend.) Over and over again he took her out to eat and did many other things to show how much he really cared for her. In fact, many of the employees and some of us on the board were concerned because of how she was leading him on and keeping him in turmoil. Over and over, she threatened him, saying, that if she was going down, she would bring him and the ministry down with him."

Since Danny was the sole source of Walt's information about the Tommy Shelton child molestation allegations, we can assume that Danny is possibly the sole source of his information here.

Now notice the following quote from a person that I will not name:

QUOTE

6) Yes, he did buy my half of the house.

7) Well, I guess if you can call bringing truckloads of my clothes and dumping them on my living room floor "helping me move" to Carbondale, then he helped me move. At that time I was locked out of the house and the only things I got were the things he allowed me to have.

8) Yes, he did build a porch on to my mobile home in Carbondale.

9) **No, he did not give me "all of the things in the home..." He has all of the furniture,** the boat, the jacuzzi, the sauna, about 18 Gibson guitars, the horses, horse trailor, etc...subject to divorce case which is pending.

10) We did meet occasionally in Marion at a restaurant to discuss the issues.

..

Aletheia, if you would be so kind, why don't you start another thread where we can hash out other issues other than questions that need to be directed to Joe. I really don't want to get into he said, she said here. **How could we prove whether Danny gave the furnishings or not?**

...

ere you go Bob..

QUOTE

---- Original Message -----
From: ****
To: ~ Cindy
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2007 12:41 AM

"I was in the house some time after she moved out and she had taken almost everything including stripping the walls of everything. I asked DS why he had let her take practically everything when actually he had paid her his share for it, he said , well I know, but she wanted it.....And people say he didn't love her and just wanted to dump her!!!! Yes, I remember they got a truck, a Uhaul or something"

QUOTE

Excerpt from Newest letter published on Save3ABN:

------- *Original Message* --------
From: Danny Shelton
To: Linda Shelton
Date: Monday, September 06, 2004 12:17 AM

..

Alyssa said you wanted to move on Sunday the 19th.

I have a board meeting that day so it won't work to get **the rest of the furniture out of my house**. You have lots of books too that need moving.

I guess if they took everything early in the day on the truck that's already loaded maybe they could load up the furniture at my house late in the day.

here's alot more...

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 07:46 AM

For whose benefit are you sharing this? Or let me ask another way, do you really think that those people who really believe that Danny, Tommy and others are guilty of something are going to be convinced by the "information" you are attempting to provide?

You have not been swayed that they are guilty and I suspect that those who believe that they are guilty are as firm in their position as are you.....

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 07:52 AM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 09:46 AM) ☐

For whose benefit are you sharing this? Or let me ask another way, do you really think that those people who really believe that Danny, Tommy and others are guilty of something are going to be convinced by the "information" you are attempting to provide?

You have not been swayed that they are guilty and I suspect that those who believe that they are guilty are as firm in their position as are you.....

Well if Linda lies, how can you trust anything that's come from her? or those like Johann who bear testimony based on what she's told them?

Truth matters to those who have a heart for the Lord, Clay. Those are the ones I'm writing for.

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 08:06 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 09:52 AM) ☐

Well if Linda lies, how can you trust anything that's come from her? or those like Johann who bear testimony based on what she's told them?

Truth matters to those who have a heart for the Lord, Clay. Those are the ones I'm writing for.

Bystander and others in your camp have lied... more than once...and have been caught in their lies... and yet you have no problem trusting what they say... you, yourself have lied... yet you insist that people trust whay you say... so that dog is not hunting, Cindy.

You are not in a position to say who does or does not 'have a heart for the Lord'... and for the umpteenth time... your attacking Linda... or Pickle... or Gailon... or sister... or Duane Clem... or whoever... does not justify or vindicate Danny or Tommy or whoever.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 08:20 AM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 22 2007, 10:06 AM) ☐

> Bystander and others in your camp have lied... more than once...and have been caught in their lies... and yet you have no problem trusting what they say... you, yourself have lied... yet you insist that people trust whay you say... so that dog is not hunting, Cindy.
>
> You are not in a position to say who does or does not 'have a heart for the Lord'... and for the umpteenth time... your attacking Linda... or Pickle... or Gailon... or sister... or Duane Clem... or whoever... does not justify or vindicate Danny or Tommy or whoever.
>
> In His service,
> Mr. J

I know that Bystander has admitted to being mistaken and moved to correct that, and I certainly wouldn't call that lying.

I have not lied either. I have no idea who else you are accusing of lying here....

And Mr J, even if what you say was true (it's not) didn't your Mama ever teach you 2 wrongs don't make a right? Using your own standard which you just posted, what you just wrote doesn't justify or vindicate her. Please try nnot to be so partial.

Linda lied. or Pickle did. I provided the evidence to show that. The thing about lies is they can be proven.

Where's your proof?

Also-- I did not say who does or does not have a heart for the Lord, as you claim. The bible plainly says God's people have a love of the truth. I am writing for them, whoever they may be.

later--

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 08:38 AM

> **QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 10:20 AM)** ☐
>
> I know that Bystander has admitted to being mistaken and moved to correct that, and I certainly wouldn't call that lying.
>
> I have not lied either. I have no idea who else you are accusing of lying here....
> And Mr J, even if what you say was true (it's not) didn't your Mama ever teach you 2 wrongs don't make a right?
>
> Linda lied. or Pickle did. I provided the evidence to show that. The thing about lies is they can be proven. Where's your proof?
>
> Also-- I did not say who does or does not have a heart for the Lord. The bible plainly says God's people have a love of the truth. I am writing for them, whoever they may be.
>
> later--

Evidence of missteps, misstatements and outright fabrications by you and yours are extensively documented. You've seen them as everyone else has.

And what you claim as truth is largely spin and deflection. Not once have you or any in your camp provided the 'truth' you claim to have that convicts Linda and exonerates Danny. Until you do so, your attacks are an exercise in futility... not to mention inconsistent with your purported love of 'truth'.

And for all your camp's complaining about these 'oh so horrible discussions'... you do nothing but perpetuate them. If you have the 'truth' you claim, why do you not just post it and end them?

This question has been presented to you time and time and time again... and not a one of you has stepped up and provided anything verifiable... you claim to know about events... but amazingly when asked were you there and did you see it... the answer is consistently 'no... but I heard...'.

And yet you expect that to be deemed a more trustworthy report that that of people who *were* there.

And you think this silliness to be truth on your part... not to mention representative of God...

Not even close.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 08:41 AM

why would one ask for proof when one will not accept the proof that has been provided?

Is the real request give me something else other than what has already been provided because I don't believe that "proof?"

The denial that some here who have come to Danny's defense have not been engaged in reality shaping, spin and/or distraction is interesting but rings hollow.... IMO.....

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 08:46 AM

Mr J,

Unsupported accusations may be repeated over and over, and a hunded people may even jump up and repeat them also, but repetition will never establish them as the truth. Only facts and evidence can prove what is true or false.

Your unsupported accusations, and constant railings, aren't facts and evidence, they are only opinion, and say more about yourself then who you are attacking. You are entitled to your opinion, but it proves nothing.

Feel free to carry on and do what you must though...

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 08:49 AM

Cindy said:

QUOTE

Unsupported accusations may be repeated over and over, and a hunded people may jump up and repeat it also, but repetition will never establish it as the truth. Only facts and evidence can prove what is true or false.

Your opinions, and unsupported accusations, and constant railings, aren't facts and evidence, sorry.

Of course the same can be said about your comments here..... as your attempt to establish yourself as credible has had its obstacles....

You stated if Linda lies how can you believe anything from her... so if a person is engaged in twisting the "facts" or spinning the story a certain way, how are they to be believed?

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 08:58 AM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 10:41 AM)

why would one ask for proof when one will not accept the proof that has been provided?

Is the real request give me something else other than what has already been provided because I don't believe that "proof?"

The denial that some here who have come to Danny's defense have not been engaged in reality shaping, spin and/or distraction is interesting but rings hollow.... IMO.....

That is a rather general statement, so I'm not sure what you are talking about specifically.

But Clay, respectfully, I think what you are calling proof, is evidence.

Evidence and or testimony for one side of an issue, may be rebutted.

If you were the one being falsely accused I am quite sure you would not call the evidence against you, "proof"

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 09:04 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 10:46 AM)

Mr J,

Unsupported accusations may be repeated over and over, and a hunded people may even jump up and repeat them also, but repetition will never establish them as the truth. Only facts and evidence can prove what is true or false.

> Your unsupported accusations, and constant railings, aren't facts and evidence, they are only opinion, and say more about yourself then who you are attacking. You are entitled to your opinion, but it proves nothing.
> Feel free to carry on and do what you must though...

My observations of your behavior are not 'unsupported accusations'. Facts and evidence have been given to support said observations. You have attempted to rationalize said behavior but you have not been able to deny it...

As for your second statement... "physician, heal thyself..."

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 09:06 AM

> **QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 09:58 AM)**
>
> That is a rather general statement, so I'm not sure what you are talking about specifically.
>
> But Clay, respectfully, I think what you are calling proof, is evidence.
>
> Evidence and or testimony for one side of an issue, may be rebutted.
>
> If you were the one being falsely accused I am quite sure you would not call the evidence against you, "proof"

Cindy,
We are in the 3abn subforum, in a thread you started.... so my statement is not as general as it appears....

I know what proof is, and I know what evidence.... my position is that whatever the evidence is, because you don't believe Danny and others have done anything, you will not believe any of it because it does not agree with your perception.

Likewise if there was evidence of wrongdoing on Linda's part it would have surfaced by now.

However, that is not the core issue, which some people who have defended Danny continue to ignore. The sinple fact is this, even if Linda did every thing she was accused of, even if she was a modern day Gomer, she should not have been treated as she was. That's it in a nutshell for me. It seems to me that those who support Danny have condoned his initial treatment of her. I do not. His treatment lacked compassion, justice and humility... it did however include humiliation...

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 09:12 AM

> **QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 10:49 AM)**
>
> Cindy said:

> Of course the same can be said about your comments here..... as your attempt to establish yourself as credible has had its obstacles....
>
> You stated if Linda lies how can you believe anything from her... so if a person is engaged in twisting the "facts" or spinning the story a certain way, how are they to be believed?

.et me correct that please, I am not trying to establish myself as credible or anything else. I)ersonally am nobody. I simply came here with questions. I read what was posted, as so many kept elling me to do. I have tried on my own, whenever possible, to find out what was, or was not credible)y making inquiries of others, and trying to verify things. Others can do the same.

3ut I am not a witness. I am merely commenting on and posting about what has been presented here, ınd citing the material when I do so, which supports my understanding and conclusions. It seems to ne, if people disagree, then that could be addressed and objected to, or rebutted, with other or urther evidence, rather then taking issue with me personally.

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 09:18 AM

> **QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 10:12 AM)**
>
> Let me correct that please, I am not trying to establish myself as credible or anything else. I simply came here and read what was posted, as so many kept telling me to do, I tried on my own whenever possible to find out what was or was not credible by making inqiries of others, and trying to verify things. Others can do the same.
> But I am not a witness. I am merely commenting on and posting about what has been presented here, and citing the material when I do so, which supports my understanding and conclusions. It seems to me, if people disagree, then that could be adressed and objected to, or rebutted rather then taking issue with me personally.

:indy, your correction is problematic... you stated:

> **QUOTE**
>
> Truth matters to those who have a heart for the Lord, Clay. Those are the ones I'm writing for

;o if you are writing for those who have a heart for the Lord, there must be some credibility. So how :an you write for those, and yet not have a degree of credibility?

have not made our discussion today personal, so I am assuming you are talking past tense?

am not a witness either, I have only been following this story since it unfolded... and as I stated, :ven if Linda was the devil incarnate, she should not have been treated as she was..... do you not ıgree?

Posted by: HUGGINS130 Mar 22 2007, 09:19 AM

> **QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 09:12 AM)**

> Let me correct that please, I am not trying to establish myself as credible or anything else. I simply came here and read what was posted, as so many kept telling me to do, I tried on my own whenever possible to find out what was or was not credible by making inqiries of others, and trying to verify things. Others can do the same.
> But I am not a witness. I am merely commenting on and posting about what has been presented here, and citing the material when I do so, which supports my understanding and conclusions. It seems to me, if people disagree, then that could be adressed and objected to, or rebutted rather then taking issue with me personally.

No one is taking issue with you personally, all they have done is asked you to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that you have verifiable proof that Linda cheated...we have no proof, only what has been said, and as Clay pointed out, even if Linda did the things she has been accused of, in Christian Spirit, she should have never been treated in the manner that she was...What you are failing to understand is that it's not our business to make her look good and to make Danny look bad, as a ministry this should have been handled in a manner in which it was not...As for concrete evidence, Calvin said this long ago, none of us knows exactly what went on in their marriage, but as for spiritual adultery, that is not even close to coming to biblical grounds for divorce...Are you even married???

Posted by: västergötland Mar 22 2007, 09:23 AM

-He said
-no, she said
-did not
-did too
-did not
...
...
...

And all I heard was "blah blah blah"...

Dont you folks have something usefull to do?

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 09:28 AM

> **QUOTE(HUGGINS130 @ Mar 22 2007, 10:19 AM)**
>
> No one is taking issue with you personally, all they have done is asked you to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that you have verifiable proof that Linda cheated...we have no proof, only what has been said, and as Clay pointed out, even if Linda did the things she has been accused of, in Christian Spirit, she should have never been treated in the manner that she was...What you are failing to understand is that it's not our business to make her look good and to make Danny look bad, as a ministry this should have been handled in a manner in which it was not...As for concrete evidence, Calvin said this long ago, none of us knows exactly what went on in their marriage, but as for spiritual adultery, that is not even close to coming to biblical grounds for divorce...Are you even married???

No need to question if Cindy has been married or not, your position is clear without that last question.... and even if someone is married you know that the marriage experiences vary greatly..... The main issue is simple... The bible that many say they believe tells us to love our enemies.... if Linda was an enemy, Danny should have loved her and followed the bible as far as his treatment of her.... if she was not an enemy, then his love should have compelled him to treat her according to his love....

His actions tell us how he viewed her and how he viewed the biblical advice on dealing with your enemies..... IMO....

> **QUOTE(västergötland @ Mar 22 2007, 10:23 AM)**
>
> -He said
> -no, she said
> -did not
> -did too
> -did not
> ...
> ...
> ...
>
> And all I heard was "blah blah blah"...
>
> Dont you folks have something usefull to do?

Of course Thomas.... however would you be so kind to define "useful?" I want to make sure we are on the same page....

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 09:29 AM

> **QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 11:12 AM)**
>
> Let me correct that please, I am not trying to establish myself as credible or anything else. I personally am nobody.

In trying to indict others, you have to establish your own credibility to such a degree that your indictment is taken as fact... You continue to attack others while your own credibility is suspect due to your obvious lack of objectivity...

> **QUOTE**
>
> I simply came here with questions.

No, you didn't. You came here with an agenda which you had formed in other forae under the initial guise of having no knowledge of this situation or the discussions surrounding it and desiring to learn more... which was a lie.

> **QUOTE**
>
> I read what was posted, as so many kept telling me to do. I have tried on my own, whenever possible, to find out what was, or was not credible by making inquiries of others, and trying to verify things. Others can do the same.

And others have done the same... and you have been found less than credible.

> **QUOTE**
> But I am not a witness.

Which is the primary reason why you are not credible. Your entire position is based on what you heard from others... who themselves were not witnesses either. Johann speaks of what he himself has witnessed and experienced. Duane speaks of what he himself has witnessed and experienced. Pickle and Gailon are detailing actual conversations they have had with principles in this and putting their cards on the table face up.

And juxtaposed against that is the ad hominem game you continue to play and your demanding proof and then when it is given demanding more.

Yet you are supposed to be more credible? In the words of the immortal Dick Dastardly... wake up muttley; you're dreamin' again...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: västergötland Mar 22 2007, 09:31 AM

> **QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 04:28 PM)** ☐
>
> Of course Thomas.... however would you be so kind to define "useful?" I want to make sure we are on the same page....

Go to work, read a good book, cook a meal, take a long walk with someone you like to bond with, excercise, go to church, something useful.

Posted by: HUGGINS130 Mar 22 2007, 09:32 AM

> **QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 09:28 AM)** ☐
>
> No need to question if Cindy has been married or not, your position is clear without that last question.... and even if someone is married you know that the marriage experiences vary greatly..... The main issue is simple... The bible that many say they believe tells us to love our enemies.... if Linda was an enemy, Danny should have loved her and followed the bible as far as his treatment of her.... if she was not an enemy, then his love should have compelled him to treat her according to his love....
>
> His actions tell us how he viewed her and how he viewed the biblical advice on dealing with your enemies..... IMO....
> Of course Thomas.... however would you be so kind to define "useful?" I want to make sure we are on the same page....

True, I just figured that her lack of compassion upon the female in question was because she has never experienced the married life, and if she has, I was going to say, that you have to be kidding if you don't believe that most of this is not about proving which side is correct, but the biblical basis of forgiveness to those that you claim to love in marriage...my bad

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 09:34 AM

QUOTE(västergötland @ Mar 22 2007, 10:31 AM)

Go to work, read a good book, cook a meal, take a long walk with someone you like to bond with, excercise, go to church, something useful.

well in my opinion... this is useful.... and apparently to a degree you share my view, otherwise you would not be here reading these threads.....

Posted by: västergötland Mar 22 2007, 09:36 AM

Posted by: HUGGINS130 Mar 22 2007, 09:38 AM

QUOTE(västergötland @ Mar 22 2007, 09:36 AM)

that's neither useful nor smart, damaging the brain could keep you from reading...

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 09:40 AM

QUOTE(HUGGINS130 @ Mar 22 2007, 10:32 AM)

True, I just figured that her lack of compassion upon the female in question was because she has never experienced the married life, and if she has, I was going to say, that you have to be kidding if you don't believe that most of this is not about proving which side is correct, but the biblical basis of forgiveness to those that you claim to love in marriage...my bad

well lack of compassion can be caused by many things, however we don't know Cindy other than her comments here, so we cannot suggest that she lacks compassion, only that she may not be able to empathize with this present situation... and that's a maybe.....

Forgiveness transcends marriage but I suspect if a person has not learned to forgive prior to marriage, then it might be a difficult lesson to learn during the course of marriage..... but that's just me...

QUOTE(västergötland @ Mar 22 2007, 10:36 AM)

[x]

jotcha.... [x] rofl

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 09:40 AM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 11:06 AM)

Cindy,
We are in the 3abn subforum, in a thread you started.... so my statement is not as general as it appears....

I know what proof is, and I know what evidence.... my position is that whatever the evidence is, because you don't believe Danny and others have done anything, you will not believe any of it because it does not agree with your perception.

Likewise if there was evidence of wrongdoing on Linda's part it would have surfaced by now.

However, that is not the core issue, which some people who have defended Danny continue to ignore. The sinple fact is this, even if Linda did every thing she was accused of, even if she was a modern day Gomer, she should not have been treated as she was. That's it in a nutshell for me. It seems to me that those who support Danny have condoned his initial treatment of her. I do not. His treatment lacked compassion, justice and humility... it did however include humiliation...

irst. Lying is wrongdoing, and that has surfaced.

econd, I have never condoned the words which Danny may or may not have spoke out of hurt or vhatever. I say whatever, because I keep reading people making claims about what he said, but ıever heard him myself, and haven't seen anyone quote him???

am quite sure that they both spoke hastily however, because people say things in a divorce that they lon't normally do , and later regret, or wish they had phrased differently. Those things are wrong, but surely we can afford to have a little compassion and understanding and not judge either of them who vere in a very emotional time in their lives.

hird.

inda chose another man over her ministry and her husband. The facts are her Doctor is not the only Doctor in Adventism or otherwise who could have helped Nathan, and after the beginning you don't even see Nathan being mentioned anyway.

personally can't understand someone having this opinion:
The sinple fact is this, even if Linda did every thing she was accused of, even if she was a modern lay Gomer, she should not have been treated as she was. That's it in a nutshell for me. It seems to ne that those who support Danny have condoned his initial treatment of her. I do not. His treatment acked compassion, justice and humility... it did however include humiliation..."

vho can't in all fairness after reading all here and on the Save3ABN website, make this same claim:

The sinple fact is this, even if Danny did every thing he was accused of, even if he was a modern day _ he should not be treated as he is. That's it in a nutshell for me. It seems to me that those who support Linda have condoned her initial treatment of him, and their continuing treatment of him. I do

not. Their treatment lacks compassion, justice and humility... it dioes however include humiliation..."

Posted by: HUGGINS130 Mar 22 2007, 09:44 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 09:40 AM)

First. Lying is wrongdoing, and that has surfaced.

Second, I have never condoned the words which Danny may or may not have spoke out of hurt or whatever. I say whatever, because I keep reading people making claims about what he said, but never heard him myself, and haven't seen anyone quote him???

I am quite sure that they both spoke hastily however, because people say things in a divorce that they don't normally do , and later regret, or wish they had phrased differently. Those things are wrong, but surely we can afford to have a little compassion and understanding and not judge either of them who were in a very emotional time in their lives.

third.

Linda chose another man over her ministry and her husband. The facts are her Doctor is not the only Doctor in Adventism or otherwise who could have helped Nathan, and after the beginning you don't even see Nathan being mentioned anyway.

I personally can't understand someone having this opinion:
"The sinple fact is this, even if Linda did every thing she was accused of, even if she was a modern day Gomer, she should not have been treated as she was. That's it in a nutshell for me. It seems to me that those who support Danny have condoned his initial treatment of her. I do not. His treatment lacked compassion, justice and humility... it did however include humiliation..."

who can't in all fairness after reading all here and on the Save3ABN website, make this same claim:

"The sinple fact is this, even if Danny did every thing he was accused of, even if he was a modern day __ he should not be treated as he is. That's it in a nutshell for me. It seems to me that those who support Linda have condoned her initial treatment of him, and their continuing treatment of him. I do not. Their treatment lacks compassion, justice and humility... it dioes however include humiliation..."

I for one forgave him, and even prayed for both Danny and Linda, you know why, because Christ desires us to show mercy and compassion, but all in all, I still think he could have handled this better, and I keep trying to tell Clay that accusing her of lying is lack of compassion but Clay and I both know that OMMV...otoh, there seems to be more evidence against Danny...but frankly I am not into who is wrong or right at this point, there seems to be issues unresolved in their lives that only God can heal, the praying shall continue for all involved!

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 09:47 AM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 11:18 AM)

Cindy, your correction is problematic... you stated: so if you are writing for those who have a heart for the Lord, there must be some credibility. So how can you write for those, and yet not have a

> degree of credibility?
>
> I have not made our discussion today personal, so I am assuming you are talking past tense?
>
> I am not a witness either, I have only been following this story since it unfolded... and as I stated, even if Linda was the devil incarnate, she should not have been treated as she was..... do you not agree?

Actually, I wasn't talking about you at all.

It isn't me that needs to be credible afaic, either what is presented as evidence is credible or it is not...

Posted by: HUGGINS130 Mar 22 2007, 09:49 AM

Aletheia stated:

> **QUOTE**
> It isn't me that needs to be credible

Then why the rampage to call out Linda as a lie...

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 09:51 AM

> **QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 10:40 AM)**
>
> First. Lying is wrongdoing, and that has surfaced.

Perhaps.... are you righteous enough to cast the first stone?

> **QUOTE**
> Second, I have never condoned the words which Danny may or may not have spoke out of hurt or whatever. I say whatever, because I keep reading people making claims about what he said, but never heard him myself, and haven't seen anyone quote him???

So your point is what? Because you did not hear them, it must not have happened? Again, other people have indicated they some things Danny said to them, yet you have chosen not to believe them. Which supports my point that you will not believe anything negative about Danny because it does not agree with your perception of him.

> **QUOTE**
> I am quite sure that they both spoke hastily however, because people say things in a divorce that they don't normally do , and later regret, or wish they had phrased differently. Those things are wrong, but surely we can afford to have a little compassion and understanding and not judge either of them who were in a very emotional time in their lives.

When relationships break down it is my experience that there is more than enough blame to go

around.

> **QUOTE**
>
> third.
>
> Linda chose another man over her ministry and her husband. The facts are her Doctor is not the only Doctor in Adventism or otherwise who could have helped Nathan, and after the beginning you don't even see Nathan being mentioned anyway.

You know this to be a fact how? You have stated that you were not a witness. So you don't know what happened behind closed doors or on the phone. In essence you have chosen to believe Danny's version of what happened. That is fine, just admit that as opposed to suggesting that Danny's version is the only version that exists.

> **QUOTE**
>
> I personally can't understand someone having this opinion:
> "The simple fact is this, even if Linda did every thing she was accused of, even if she was a modern day Gomer, she should not have been treated as she was. That's it in a nutshell for me. It seems to me that those who support Danny have condoned his initial treatment of her. I do not. His treatment lacked compassion, justice and humility... it did however include humiliation..."
>
> who can't in all fairness after reading all here and on the Save3ABN website, make this same claim:
>
> "The simple fact is this, even if Danny did every thing he was accused of, even if he was a modern day __ he should not be treated as he is. That's it in a nutshell for me. It seems to me that those who support Linda have condoned her initial treatment of him, and their continuing treatment of him. I do not. Their treatment lacks compassion, justice and humility... it dioes however include humiliation..."

Then Cindy if that is the way you feel, perhaps you need to go to that other site and state just that.....

> **QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 10:47 AM)** ☐
>
> Actually, I wasn't talking about you at all.
>
> It isn't me that needs to be credible afaic, either what is presented as evidence is credible or it is not...

indeed it is Cindy.... if the messenger is not credible then people tend not to believe the message.... People will evaluate the message based on the credibility of the messenger....

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 09:51 AM

> **QUOTE(HUGGINS130 @ Mar 22 2007, 11:19 AM)** ☐
>
> No one is taking issue with you personally

O.. kay. Guess you missed Mr J's usual accusations, and focus on the poster, rather then on what is posted??

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 09:54 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 10:51 AM)

O.. kay. Guess you missed Mr J's usual accusations, and focus on the poster, rather then on what is posted??

Cindy, that is not the focus of this discussion.... at least I didn't think it was.... now if that is the direction you wish to go in, let us know....

Posted by: HUGGINS130 Mar 22 2007, 09:59 AM

Aletheia said:

QUOTE

Linda chose another man over her ministry and her husband.

Verify the facts please

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 10:04 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 11:51 AM)

O.. kay. Guess you missed Mr J's usual accusations, and focus on the poster, rather then on what is posted??

Mat 7:1-5 Judge not, that ye be not judged. (2) **For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.** (3) And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? (4) *Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and,* behold, a beam is in thine own eye? (5) Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

All you have done since coming to this forum is sling accusations and focus on attacking and discrediting posters.

"...with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged and with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again... "

Mat 7:12 Therefore **all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them**: for this is the law and the prophets.

Or in the vernacular... "dont start none; wont be none..."

You neither like nor appreciate being held to this scrutiny; ergo the Christianity you profess say you need to stop scrutinizing others in like manner... right now you have the golden rule twisted; you want men to treat you one way while you do something altogether different to them.

So, in the words of a hip-hop prophet... you need to check yourself before you wreck yourself...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 10:09 AM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 22 2007, 11:04 AM)

Mat 7:1-5 Judge not, that ye be not judged. (2) **For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.** (3) And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? (4) Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? (5) Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

All you have done since coming to this forum is sling accusations and focus on attacking and discrediting posters.

"...with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged and with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again... "

Mat 7:12 Therefore **all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them**: for this is the law and the prophets.

Or in the vernacular... "dont start none; wont be none..."

You neither like nor appreciate being held to this scrutiny; ergo the Christianity you profess say you need to stop scrutinizing others in like manner... right now you have the golden rule twisted; you want men to treat you one way while you do something altogether different to them.

So, in the words of a hip-hop prophet... you need to check yourself before you wreck yourself...

In His service,
Mr. J

while what you have said may be true... my concern is that Cindy has chosen to view Danny's version of the events to the exclusion of everything else no matter how compelling that evidence may be.....

It goes back to a comment I made earlier and probably ties into something you have just posted

(judging evidence but not wanting our evidence judged in like manner), that being even with compelling evidence some that support Danny will not believe said evidence..... and that may have to do with perception... and those who support Danny perceive that he is more "credible."

We can continue to discuss that interesting position without making this thread about Cindy.... even though she started this thread.....

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 10:16 AM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 12:09 PM) ☐

while what you have said may be true... my concern is that Cindy has chosen to view Danny's version of the events to the exclusion of everything else no matter how compelling that evidence may be.....

It goes back to a comment I made earlier and probably ties into something you have just posted, that being even with compelling evidence some that support Danny will not believe said evidence.....

We can continue to discuss that interesting position without making this thread about Cindy.... even though she started this thread.....

True... the point I'm making is with her not being a 'witness'... to any of this... she is not in a position to say what happened or did not happen... nor is she in a position to refute the testimony of someone who was there with her own observations and experience... so the only club in her bag is ad hominem, in the hope of discrediting those who have stated their experience enough to make them incredible...

It boils down to she don't know nuthin' 'bout nuthin'; everything she has is based on what someone told someone else who told her... the hypocrisy comes in when she only selectively listens to such hearsay and does not insist those she will believe provide proof in like manner as she demands of those she will not believe...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 10:21 AM

QUOTE

Clay:

Perhaps.... are you righteous enough to cast the first stone?

I don't ever knowingly or willfully lie, if I say something false in error, or because of assuming, I try to correct it and apologise as soon as it's brought to my attention, so in this regard, yes, I believe it's ok for me to point out a lie.

But the problem here Clay, is this forum is full of sticks and stones, so is this thread, and are you asking all the posters doing so, if they are righteous?

> **QUOTE**
>
> so your point is what? Because you did not hear them, it must not have happened? Again, other people have indicated they some things Danny said to them, yet you have chosen not to believe them. Which supports my point that you will not believe anything negative about Danny because it does not agree with your perception of him.

My point is I have neither defended and condoned, nor criticised and condemned, for I lack the knowledge to do either. I said I have not seen evidence of this early trashing, except third party reporting or vague references to the limited explanation offered by 3ABN for Linda's absence, and nothing else specific. Now if someone wants to present the "evidence of the trashing". then I'll look at it. I have asked previously what people were talking about and got nothing.

> **QUOTE**
>
> When relationships break down it is my experience that there is more than enough blame to go around.
> You know this to be a fact how? You have stated that you were not a witness. So you don't know what happened behind closed doors or on the phone. In essence you have chosen to believe Danny's version of what happened. That is fine, just admit that as opposed to suggesting that Danny's version is the only version that exists.

I am only going by what has been posted here, and on the save 3abn website, and what I have or have not been able to verify.

> **QUOTE**
>
> Then Cindy if that is the way you feel, perhaps you need to go to that other site and state just that.....
> indeed it is Cindy.... if the messenger is not credible then people tend not to believe the message.... People will evaluate the message based on the credibility of the messenger....

The save3abn website is not a forum... the people contributing and running it are here....

Anyone can quote what is posted here as evidence, and it doesn't disapear or lack validity because someone objects to the poster.

I have to go clean out my car before it gets picked up and do some other things.

I'll check back in later, maybe somebody will actually comment on the content of my initial post...

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 10:23 AM

Cindy said:

> **QUOTE**

> I personally can't understand someone having this opinion:
> "The simple fact is this, even if Linda did every thing she was accused of, even if she was a modern day Gomer, she should not have been treated as she was. That's it in a nutshell for me. It seems to me that those who support Danny have condoned his initial treatment of her. I do not. His treatment lacked compassion, justice and humility... it did however include humiliation..."
>
> who can't in all fairness after reading all here and on the Save3ABN website, make this same claim:
>
> "The simple fact is this, even if Danny did every thing he was accused of, even if he was a modern day __ he should not be treated as he is. That's it in a nutshell for me. It seems to me that those who support Linda have condoned her initial treatment of him, and their continuing treatment of him. I do not. Their treatment lacks compassion, justice and humility... it does however include humiliation..."

So then you are agreeing with me Cindy that Linda was mistreated?

Danny is still on the set of the ministry he helped establish.... that ministry has assets of 42 million dollars... It will be difficult to prove how Linda has mistreated Danny given those facts. However, you may have evidence that suggests she did.... do you?

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 10:29 AM

> **QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 12:23 PM)** ☐
>
> Cindy said:
>
> So then you are agreeing with me Cindy that Linda was mistreated?
>
> Danny is still on the set of the ministry he helped establish.... that ministry has assets of 42 million dollars... It will be difficult to prove how Linda has mistreated Danny given those facts. However, you may have evidence that suggests she did.... do you?

How can she... when, by her own admission, she is not a witness, nor has she ever seen or spoken to DS...

Where would such a one obtain said evidence... and how was it verified?

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 10:33 AM

Cindy said:

> **QUOTE**
>
> I have to go clean out my car before it gets picked up and do some other things.
>
> I'll check back in later, maybe somebody will actually comment on the content of my initial post...

Your initial point.... hmmmmmm let's see, it appears you are attempting to suggest that someone or someone's testimony is not "credible" yet you said yourself here in this thread that your credibility is not important. So then, if your credibility is not important why would you make an effort to prove someone else is not credible?

That is my comment on your initial post....

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 10:38 AM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 12:33 PM)

Cindy said:

Your initial point.... hmmmmmm let's see, it appears you are attempting to suggest that someone or someone's testimony is not "credible" yet you said yourself here in this thread that your credibility is not important. So then, if your credibility is not important why would you make an effort to prove someone else is not credible?

That is my comment on your initial post....

That is also the essence of my comment on said post...

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: watchbird Mar 22 2007, 10:44 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 10:51 AM)

O.. kay. Guess you missed Mr J's usual accusations, and focus on the poster, rather then on what is posted??

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 10:54 AM)

Cindy, that is not the focus of this discussion.... at least I didn't think it was.... now if that is the direction you wish to go in, let us know....

Just from reading... and rereading, in fact.... the posts in this thread from its beginning, it seems apparent to me that Cindy's focus was upon personalities who have posted rather than facts that have been posted. The slim amount of "facts" that she presented had only to do with the question of how much Linda moved out of the house that had been hers and Danny's.

But this was never posed as a question. Conflicting statements about this were posted as evidence that Linda was lying. They were not posted in a manner that gave evidence of seeking additional evidence on one side or the other... or possibly on a "third side" which might have found a way to give context to each so they might each be true reflections of what happened. The stated and reiterated purpose was to show that Linda was a liar.

And since we have ample evidence from prior postings of how Cindy has twisted what someone has said in posts that immediately preceded hers, there is little to keep us from assuming that once more she is expecting us to take her reading of things as the only truth that matters. Thus, by default, if not by design, this thread IS about her and her way of looking at things.

> **QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 11:09 AM)**
>
> while what you have said may be true... my concern is that Cindy has chosen to view Danny's version of the events to the exclusion of everything else no matter how compelling that evidence may be.....

And/or her view of the evidence which has been gleaned from Danny's own emails. This, however, does not take into sufficient account the facts that Danny is not consistent in his own emails, and that one can get a MUCH different veiw of the "evidence" just by reading a series of his emails... sometimes done within a very short time of each other... and sometimes the inconsistency shows up within the very same email.

> **QUOTE**
>
> It goes back to a comment I made earlier and probably ties into something you have just posted (judging evidence but not wanting our evidence judged in like manner), that being even with compelling evidence some that support Danny will not believe said evidence..... and that may have to do with perception... and those who support Danny perceive that he is more "credible."
>
> We can continue to discuss that interesting position without making this thread about Cindy.... even though she started this thread.....

I think, if you will occasionally go back and read through the whole series of posts in this thread rather than trusting memory for that, that you will discover that it will be well nigh impossible to keep from "making this thread about Cindy"... since that is the direction she keeps pushing it.

Now IF it were actually about the facts of the topics in her opening post... that is, about the truth of the allegations about the division of their personal property.... then there would be some appeals for information from objective sources. For example... since there is an as yet unconcluded court inquiry into this question.... since there are some yet unanswered questions in some areas.... then surely the lawyers involved must have done some rather detailed work on the divisions that have taken place so far. But I'm not seeing any evidence that Cindy is even interested in this fact.... much less any indication that she has made any effort to contact objective sources as to what the details of the property divisions actually were.

What is interesting is that there are people reading this forum who know some of those facts. Why are they not speaking up? It is my guess that they realize that this thread is not part of a search for truth, but merely one more case of Cindy trying to establish her credibiliy as an arbitrator, judge, and jury all rolled into one... and not merely on the allegations on Danny and Linda, but on the credibility of all who speak up to give their testimonies or the results of their research.

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 10:50 AM

> **QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 12:21 PM)**
>
> I don't ever knowingly or willfully lie

Positing absolute negations you've already violated is not going to help your credibility, Cindy...

> **QUOTE**
>
> if I say somethiing false in error, or because of assuming, I try to correct it and apologise as soon as it's brought to my attention, so in this regard, yes, I believe it's ok for me to point out a lie.

Which means it's ok for your lies to be pointed out... nothing personal; it's strictly business.

> **QUOTE**
>
> My point is I have neither defended and condoned, nor criticised and condemned, for I lack the knowledge to do either.

You do realize this statement contradicts your initial statement quoted above, don't you? There are myriad posts from you full of your defending DS and criticizing/condemning LS... in spite of your professed lack of knowledge.

Which either means that you do, in fact, knowingly and willfully lie... or that you are confused in the extreme and you do not realize when you make contradictory or mutually exclusive statements...

> **QUOTE**
>
> Anyone can quote what is posted here as evidence, and it doesn't disapear or lack validity because someone objects to the poster.

This statement applies to you too; the sooner you realize it, the better you'll be...

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 22 2007, 11:45 AM

> **QUOTE(watchbird @ Mar 22 2007, 12:44 PM)** ☐
>
> . . . Conflicting statements about this were posted as evidence that Linda was lying. They were not posted in a manner that gave evidence of seeking additional evidence on one side or the other... or possibly on a "third side" which might have found a way to give context to each so they might each be true reflections of what happened. The stated and reiterated purpose was to show that Linda was a liar.

Cindy has done her research - included in that are the words of sister and yourself. You and others continually claim that she (among others) is attempting to "spin" things in her direction. It is easily arguable that you, WB, as well as sister, Johann, Bob Pickle, Greg Matthews, and G.A. Joy, via his surrogates, have all spun a story as well. Your dependence on a fictional piece of writing as your basis for your position is a "spin" exercise by the definition that has been developed for that word in this community.

Additionally, Bob Pickle, one of Linda's most ardent spokespersons has developed your idea of spinning into an art. This has been pointed out numerous times and the evidence has been unmistakable and yet you support his interpretations as though they were divinely inspired as well as the words of sister.

Now, along come individuals who are questioning inconsistencies in what you have based your opinions on and you don't like it. I understand. No one likes to have the world they have constructed around themselves to be questioned - because that means having to face inconsistancies and falsehoods that are used to prop up that world. But, that doesn't make the challenges of no import. Instead it should bring you to re-examine your world and see if it needs some housekeeping.

Cindy's point is not to convice you, Emerson said, "A man convinced against his will, is of the same opinion still." . . . so Cindy isn't trying to change your mind - instead she is working to bring a balanced perspective, and truth, to the discussions that have taken place here. She isn't talking to you, but to those who want to examine the situation anew - and part of that means adding an understanding of Linda's character and those defending her, since your side has already attempted to create a picture of Danny's and 3ABN's character.

> **QUOTE(watchbird @ Mar 22 2007, 12:44 PM)** ☐
>
> And since we have ample evidence from prior postings of how Cindy has twisted what someone has said in posts that immediately preceded hers, there is little to keep us from assuming that once more she is expecting us to take her reading of things as the only truth that matters. Thus, by default, if not by design, this thread IS about her and her way of looking at things.

No, you would like to make it about her because then that takes the focus off the evidence of lies and misleading on the other side of the coin. If you can successfully make this about someone other than Linda and her defense team, then you effectively hijack the thread and turn it into a personal attack. However, that does not diminish the fact that what is presented is strong evidence that the "spinning" and misleading has been done by Linda's side of the coin.

> **QUOTE(watchbird @ Mar 22 2007, 12:44 PM)** ☐
>
> . . . For example... since there is an as yet unconcluded court inquiry into this question....

I raised this question in an earlier thread, maybe since your proximity to Linda is what it is, you can answer this question. Why was the case almost thrown out recently? Why did the judge almost end the proceedings? The answer I have received from people very aware of the proceedings would support the claim that Cindy is making in her OP. There is much untruth coming from the Linda camp - always has been.

> **QUOTE(watchbird @ Mar 22 2007, 12:44 PM)** ☐
>
> . . . objective sources as to what the details of the property divisions actually were.

Has your opinion been formed from objective third party sources - or directly from Linda?

> **QUOTE(watchbird @ Mar 22 2007, 12:44 PM)** ☐
>
> It is my guess that they realize that this thread is not part of a search for truth . . .

How do you know the intent of this thread? Can you read minds? You make the above statement as if you talked to Cindy this morning and she said the thread was not a search for the truth.

Your post is an attempt to discredit and call into question Cindy, you are not addressing the OP, nor are you adding any information that is substantive. Instead you are continuing your exercise of disparaging anyone who comes along to claim that there is filth in the Linda camp and that if one is to understand the whole complex issue they need to know that the "evidence" presented by Joy, Matthews, Pickle, et. al. has been altered, manipulated, and I am going to go out on a limb and say some of it may be manufactured.

For ages now, you and others of Linda's staunch defenders have claimed that she has said nothing. That in itself is a massive untruth. The emails between her and Danny for instance come directly from her - and you can not hide behind the idea that they came from a third party because she happened to BCC people in her replies. Her personal correspondence, between herself and Danny, had to be turned over by her to others either in the from of BCC, or emailing them to a third party who then passed them on . . . the point being that they could have not come from any other originating source then Linda since she was the one who received them. They were hers, she decided to do what she did with them and it is obvious she shared them with others and then clearly gave her permission for their use as they are currently being used. A thrid party, sympathizing with Linda, would not pass them on to individuals such as Bob Pickle, Greg Matthews, or Gailon A. Joy, without her permission. She has clearly given the go ahead for all that has been made public about her relationship with Danny and his family and friends - that is the same thing as saying it yourself. The things that are so deeply personal and are now public have her signature of approval all over them.

At any given point, if she truly wanted to take the high road she would have said "NO" to making public all of these things. If she wanted to take the high road she wouldn't have shared stories about her intimate life with Johann (and that is the one we know of so far). The truth is this, you expected to be able to have your space here and vent your anger and frustrations about 3ABN without challenge. Challenge has arrived and you would like to do nothing more than silence it and keep the world you have created in tact.

- FHB

Posted by: Lee Mar 22 2007, 11:48 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 11:21 AM) ☐

I don't ever knowingly or willfully lie, if I say somethiing false in error, or because of assuming, I try to correct it and apologise as soon as it's brought to my attention, so in this regard, yes, I believe it's ok for me to point out a lie.

But the problem here Clay, is this forum is full of sticks and stones, so is this thread, and are you asking all the posters doing so, if they are righteous?
My point is I have neither defended and condoned, nor criticised and condemned, for I lack the knowledge to do either. I said I have not seen evidence of this early trashing, except third party reporting or vague references to the limited explanation offered by 3ABN for Linda's absence, and nothing else specific. Now if someone wants to present the "evidence of the trashing". then I'll look at it. I have asked previously what people were talking about and got nothing.
I am only going by what has been posted here, and on the save 3abn website, and what I have or have not been able to verify.
The save3abn website is not a forum... the people contributing and running it are here....

Anyone can quote what is posted here as evidence, and it doesn't disapear or lack validity because someone objects to the poster.

I have to go clean out my car before it gets picked up and do some other things.

I'll check back in later, maybe somebody will actually comment on the content of my initial post...

Cindy--just go ahead and post your facts on here. Show us the lies. Obviously Clay and Mr. J. are rying to stop you from doing this by arguing over trite issues. Ignore them. Just ignore all their posts ınd all their comments and all the unfounded accusations as well as others. I'm very interested in vhat you have found. And I appreciate your first post on here. I am quite sure others do too.

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 11:56 AM

QUOTE(Lee @ Mar 22 2007, 12:48 PM)

Cindy--just go ahead and post your facts on here. Show us the lies. Obviously Clay and Mr. J. are trying to stop you from doing this by arguing over trite issues. Ignore them. Just ignore all their posts and all their comments and all the unfounded accusations as well as others. I'm very interested in what you have found. And I appreciate your first post on here. I am quite sure others do too.

Cindy indicated she was not a witness so she cannot post facts... she can share what she believes..... Jo effort has been made to stop Cindy from posting anything, I asked her a few questions....

Remember Lee things will be done politely as possible from this point on... so mind your manners..... his is not a threat, but a reminder... if you need to speak to me specifically, feel free to PM me...

Posted by: Rosyroi Mar 22 2007, 12:02 PM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 22 2007, 09:50 AM)

Positing absolute negations you've already violated is not going to help your credibility, Cindy... Which means it's ok for your lies to be pointed out... nothing personal; it's strictly business. You do realize this statement contradicts your initial statement quoted above, don't you? There are myriad posts from you full of your defending DS and criticizing/condemning LS... in spite of your professed lack of knowledge.

Which either means that you do, in fact, knowingly and willfully lie... or that you are confused in the extreme and you do not realize when you make contradictory or mutually exclusive statements... This statement applies to you too; the sooner you realize it, the better you'll be...

Thank you watchbird, now I won't have to go back and reread several times all those posts to come up vith the same thing you pointed out. I agree with everyone else's comments about Alethia's posts.

My question is to Alethia: How about asking the people themselves about the questions you have and post their replies and add your comments to the replies. Also ask others (witnesses) who might have been involved in the move and post their replies and offer your comments.

One other suggestion. After typing it all out, BEFORE sending the post, scroll down to the very bottom of the page. Look for the place next to ADD REPLY, click on PREVIEW POST. Check for spelling, content and anything else. click save. Then walk away. Take a break. Mabe an hour or two or longer as needed. Then come back view your post then EDIT what you wrote then if it looks like it is postable then click ADD REPLY. The main idea is be sure what you are posting is understandable to others.

Mabe the above seems too simplistic but I am just trying to be helpful. Hoping Alethia takes the suggestion to heart. I would dearly love to be able to understand the posts in the threads.

By the way Alethia, I do have my own personal witness but I am unable to produce the letters to prove that Linda was trashed. There were three letters sent each one week apart, the first one no one has heard about and I won't discuss it, the second one has been discussed but I am unable to find the post for it. The third one was about Linda and the Dr. Now if they didn't need the first two rumors to trash Linda why would they send them? I believe the first two were sent to show Linda was not a nice person. The third one was the worst trashy one to smash the last nail in the coffin. (I had asked an employee about the first rumor sent and the person said that as far as they knew the first rumor was a lie. I believe all three were lies) My witness may not be the right witness for you but it is all that I have.

Just my opinion
Rosyroi

Posted by: Noahswife Mar 22 2007, 12:07 PM

I know this is off topic, but I believe everyone posting on this thread thus far either knows Barbara Kerr or knows of her since many have posted on her thread. How about taking a minute from this thread and wishing her well and tell her you are including her concerns in your prayers. She needs our support and prayer today. She will be back tomorrow and I know she will be encouraged by our BSDA show of support.

nw
C"i"

Posted by: Pickle Mar 22 2007, 12:15 PM

Cindy, you've raised some http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?s=&showtopic=13025&view=findpost&p=186973.

Now we need to put all of that along side of Danny's http://www.save3abn.com/danny-shelton-royalty-disclosures-financial-affidavit.htm of July 2006, which states that he owns and received from Linda,

> **QUOTE(Danny Shelton)**
>
> Bowflex exercise machine
> Stove
> 2 Refrigerators
> Dishwasher
> 2 Freezers
> Master bedroom set
> Downstairs bedroom set
> Old outside lawn furniture

I think we can scrounge up a number of other documents along these lines if we try.

So how do we understand Danny's email to Linda about picking up all the furniture? In light of the above, I would think that would refer to the specific furniture she was to receive, which was spelled out in their house agreement of June 4, 2004. It would be all that furniture, not all the furniture in the entire house.

I don't know how to comment on your March 22 email. Perhaps you can get Danny to list everything he kept vs. everything she took, and we can see if it might match up with a similar list from Linda. It is possible that if we did that that the two lists would agree.

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 12:54 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 22 2007, 01:45 PM) ☐

Cindy has done her research - included in that are the words of sister and yourself. You and others continually claim that she (among others) is attempting to "spin" things in her direction. It is easily arguable that you, WB, as well as sister, Johann, Bob Pickle, Greg Matthews, and G.A. Joy, via his surrogates, have all spun a story as well. Your dependence on a fictional piece of writing as your basis for your position is a "spin" exercise by the definition that has been developed for that word in this community.

The problem is if the piece of writing is indeed utterly fictional... why are you and others spending so much time doing damage control around it? It's not the existence of the writing... or of those making commentary said writing that is nearly as damning as the perceived need to defend against something you claim to know is fiction....

Your doing so is then tantamount to putting forth an apologetic argument for the easter bunny or santa claus... if indeed the writing is utterly fictitious...

QUOTE

Additionally, Bob Pickle, one of Linda's most ardent spokespersons has developed your idea of spinning into an art. This has been pointed out numerous times and the evidence has been unmistakable and yet you support his interpretations as though they were divinely inspired as well as the words of sister.

Both sides of this debate can be charged with that...

QUOTE

Now, along come individuals who are questioning inconsistencies in what you have based your opinions on and you don't like it. I understand. No one likes to have the world they have constructed around themselves to be questioned - because that means having to face inconsistancies and falsehoods that are used to prop up that world. But, that doesn't make the challenges of no import. Instead it should bring you to re-examine your world and see if it needs some housekeeping.

And the fruit of said soul-searching by you of your own private idaho has reaped what results, exactly? Or is this another one of those do as I say, not as I do things... do me a favor... look into the mirror and then read what I've quoted above... because it is plain that you have not considered the possibility that you are wearing those self-same Hush Puppies...

> **QUOTE**
>
> Cindy's point is not to convice you, Emerson said, "A man convinced against his will, is of the same opinion still." . . . so Cindy isn't trying to change your mind - instead she is working to bring a balanced perspective, and truth, to the discussions that have taken place here.

How can Cindy bring balance when by her own admission she is "not a witness"? How can she provide a balanced picture of Linda when, by her own admission, she neither knows nor has met either Danny or Linda?

Cindy, by Cindy's own admission, has no facts, first hand experience or personal testimony upon which to base any conclusions she has drawn... she is relying on what she has been told by others... the overwhelming majority of whom, like Cindy, are not witnesses either... by their own admission.

That's not a 'balanced perspective'; that's the blind leading the blind... watch that first step...

> **QUOTE**
>
> She isn't talking to you, but to those who want to examine the situation anew - and part of that means adding an understanding of Linda's character and those defending her, since your side has already attempted to create a picture of Danny's and 3ABN's character.

Re-acquaint yourself with the definition of a public forum, por favor...

> **QUOTE**
>
> No, you would like to make it about her because then that takes the focus off the evidence of lies and misleading on the other side of the coin. If you can successfully make this about someone other than Linda and her defense team, then you effectively hijack the thread and turn it into a personal attack. However, that does not diminish the fact that what is presented is strong evidence that the "spinning" and misleading has been done by Linda's side of the coin.
> I raised this question in an earlier thread, maybe since your proximity to Linda is what it is, you can answer this question. Why was the case almost thrown out recently? Why did the judge almost end the proceedings? The answer I have received from people very aware of the proceedings would support the claim that Cindy is making in her OP. There is much untruth coming from the Linda camp - always has been.
> Has your opinion been formed from objective third party sources - or directly from Linda?

And you get your information how, exactly? Were you in the courtroom? Was it broadcast on courtTV? Or did you get yet another report from somebody else? Also... you make much over the fact that in your estimation... or according your info the case was *almost* thrown out... almost means it continues... which means that in spite of whatever you are crowing about, the prima facie case retains suffifcient merit to continue through the process of jurisprudence... which is far more significant a point than what almost happened...

> **QUOTE**
>
> How do you know the intent of this thread? Can you read minds? You make the above statement as if you talked to Cindy this morning and she said the thread was not a search for the truth.

Watchbird stated her "guess". Nothing more. She never presented it as anything more than that... your accusation notwithstanding.

> **QUOTE**
>
> Your post is an attempt to discredit and call into question Cindy, you are not addressing the OP, nor are you adding any information that is substantive. Instead you are continuing your exercise of disparaging anyone who comes along to claim that there is filth in the Linda camp and that if one is to understand the whole complex issue they need to know that the "evidence" presented by Joy, Matthews, Pickle, et. al. has been altered, manipulated, and I am going to go out on a limb and say some of it may be manufactured.

And your post is an effort to discredit watchbird's post and my post yours and I am sure you will respond in an effort to discredit mine... b ut you fail to acknowledge that Cindy's post which started this thread was intended to discredit Pickle and Linda... so if you find that objectionable, you need to find it objectionable where all these attempts to discredit began and which you continue to perpetuate...

which would be at Cindy's feet.

> **QUOTE**
>
> At any given point, if she truly wanted to take the high road she would have said "NO" to making public all of these things. If she wanted to take the high road she wouldn't have shared stories about her intimate life with Johann (and that is the one we know of so far). The truth is this, you expected to be able to have your space here and vent your anger and frustrations about 3ABN without challenge. Challenge has arrived and you would like to do nothing more than silence it and keep the world you have created in tact.
>
> - FHB

Your camp is not in a position to speak about the high road... if Danny had taken the high road 3 years ago, we arent even having this conversation.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 22 2007, 01:15 PM

> **QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 22 2007, 11:54 AM)** ☐
>
> Your camp is not in a position to speak about the high road... if Danny had taken the high road 3 years ago, we arent even having this conversation.
>
> In His service,
> Mr. J

AMEN brother!

Odd isn't it....they are unhappy because Linda has spoken up to defend herself. I mean, that really is

upsurd, isn't it? To defend yourself? Aren't you a witness to your own life? Don't you yourself know what happens to you? Shouldn't you be able to speak? Now again, why would DS want her quiet? High road? Think people think. Does this mean you sit by and let someone crush you, when God gave you a voice, common sense, and a God given defense mechanism that we all need as long as we are on this planet to protect ourselves from our enemies? Do we just sit by on our bottoms and do nothing when we are attacked? What about self respect?

Read Linda's website. She certainly takes the high road.

They simply don't like the fact that she can speak and they can't stop that. That speaks volumes all by itself. It's not complicated. Control control control...when they lose it, it seems to just drip from their comments and intent. That is what makes me go HMMMMMM.....

Truth. It is what it is, they can't change it, no one can.

Posted by: Jnana15 Mar 22 2007, 01:29 PM

You know, I said, "self, you need to not comment on this topic anymore". Well, I lied to self after I recieved a phone call this morning from a friend who told me that Danny answered her e-mail. ~~After reading it to me, I really do believe that Bystander, Lee and Alethcia are Danny or have been brain washed to say "repeat after me". If my friend hears from him within the next 24 hours, then I really know that I'm not crazy because they will have reported this information to him.~~
When she started reading the e-mail to me, it had some of the same content that is being said here by these three individuals. [x] He wanted things to be kept quiet that were in the e-mail and wants my friend to consider to start supporting 3ABN AGAIN.

My friend and I both agree that Barbara Kerr had no reason to lie when she posted her letter here and we are believers now for sure about this 3ABN saga...oops, let me get my facts straight, Johann started the thread.

When I first started posting here, I said that I knew what was going on before it was made known to the public as I am sure that many of you knew also.

I believe that God IS going to clean house soon in regards to 3ABN.
JMHO

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 22 2007, 02:12 PM

QUOTE(Jnana15 @ Mar 22 2007, 12:29 PM) ☐

You know, I said, "self, you need to not comment on this topic anymore". Well, I lied to self after I recieved a phone call this morning from a friend who told me that Danny answered her e-mail. .....

When she started reading the e-mail to me, it had some of the same content that is being said here by these three individuals. [x] He wanted things to be kept quiet that were in the e-mail and wants my friend to consider to start supporting 3ABN AGAIN.

My friend and I both agree that Barbara Kerr had no reason to lie when she posted her letter here and we are believers now for sure about this 3ABN saga...oops, let me get my facts straight, Johann started the thread.

When I first started posting here, I said that I knew what was going on before it was made known to the public as I am sure that many of you knew also.

I believe that God IS going to clean house soon in regards to 3ABN.
JMHO

Thank you for sharing Jnana15

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 02:16 PM

A reminder SSOM and Jnana.... address the issues that people have and not the people themselves.... we don't know who those who post really are, neither can we or should we say they are brainwashed.... certainly if they chose they could say the same about you..... Notice that I have edited both of your posts, striking through the content that is questionable..... in the future that type of content will be deleted....

keep to the issues..... not the person posting..... thank you.....

Posted by: Pickle Mar 22 2007, 02:17 PM

I thinkJnana15, all such emails should get sent to Save3ABN.com for analysis, and possible posting whether anonymous or not.

Posted by: Bystander Mar 22 2007, 02:19 PM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 22 2007, 09:16 AM)

True... the point I'm making is with her not being a 'witness'... to any of this... she is not in a position to say what happened or did not happen... nor is she in a position to refute the testimony of someone who was there with her own observations and experience... so the only club in her bag is ad hominem, in the hope of discrediting those who have stated their experience enough to make them incredible...

It boils down to she don't know nuthin' 'bout nuthin'; everything she has is based on what someone told someone else who told her... the hypocrisy comes in when she only selectively listens to such hearsay and does not insist those she will believe provide proof in like manner as she demands of those she will not believe...

In His service,
Mr. J

Well, I have just finished reading this thread and couldn't be more shocked.
Those of you that are saying that Cindy isn't credible because she wasn't there, are looking in the mirror. Mr. J, your first paragraph describes you, clay and so many others exactly. You said Cindy is not in a position to say what did or did not happen. Yet, repeatedly you have done exactly that. You have made your statements as fact about what DS has done and not done. What he is and what he isn't. So has Clay. The difference is, Cindy has consistently verified what she says with the posting of the emails and/or links to such, that back it up. She has done a lot of research to back what she says and she has done an excellent job doing it.
You, and Clay and others have fell into line with your above paragraphs. You have judged, accused and made mountains out of molehills towards anything concerning DS and 3ABN, while at the same

time, ignoring, proven lies, twisted stories, the pickle spin on words, and emails that only prove the things that DS has said all long.
On the other hand, you believe everything that watchbird or sister says even knowing that they were not eyewitnessess to most things between DS and LS as their marriage blew up. They only knew what LS told them. Yet, you find this credible and accept their stories from Linda without a word. I have never once seen any of you acknowledge a PROVEN, lie that has come from LS's side.
Until you can show a little more unbiased opinions and until you provide something, anything, of substance to back up what you have accused DS of, you have absolutely no validity when you call Cindy to task.
She has been diligent, thorough, and put many hours into verifying truth and lies. What she has contributed has been invaluable to the lurkers that come here to find truth. The outsider can see for themselves who is backing up what they say versus those that give all their opinions with nothing but the word of Linda's friends to back it up. Those who are truly objective will see who has validity here. That will be those who have actually witnessed or been a party to certain events, and those who have produced the emails, pictures or whatever to back up what they say. I am sorry. The rest of you have taken the lazy way out by believing the pinned threads that were put here in the beginning and then continueing to base your opinion on that 2nd and 3rd hand testimoney from the lindanites.
Until you and others have anything to bring to the table, please refrain from attacking those that do.

Posted by: Clay Mar 22 2007, 02:23 PM

QUOTE(Bystander @ Mar 22 2007, 03:19 PM) ☐

Well, I have just finished reading this thread and couldn't be more shocked.
Those of you that are saying that Cindy isn't credible because she wasn't there, are looking in the mirror. Mr. J, your first paragraph describes you, clay and so many others exactly. You said Cindy is not in a position to say what did or did not happen. Yet, repeatedly you have done exactly that. You have made your statements as fact about what DS has done and not done. What he is and what he isn't. So has Clay. The difference is, Cindy has consistently verified what she says with the posting of the emails and/or links to such, that back it up. She has done a lot of research to back what she says and she has done an excellent job doing it.
You, and Clay and others have fell into line with your above paragraphs. You have judged, accused and made mountains out of molehills towards anything concerning DS and 3ABN, while at the same time, ignoring, proven lies, twisted stories, the pickle spin on words, and emails that only prove the things that DS has said all long.
On the other hand, you believe everything that watchbird or sister says even knowing that they were not eyewitnessess to most things between DS and LS as their marriage blew up. They only knew what LS told them. Yet, you find this credible and accept their stories from Linda without a word. I have never once seen any of you acknowledge a PROVEN, lie that has come from LS's side.
Until you can show a little more unbiased opinions and until you provide something, anything, of substance to back up what you have accused DS of, you have absolutely no validity when you call Cindy to task.
She has been diligent, thorough, and put many hours into verifying truth and lies. What she has contributed has been invaluable to the lurkers that come here to find truth. The outsider can see for themselves who is backing up what they say versus those that give all their opinions with nothing but the word of Linda's friends to back it up. Those who are truly objective will see who has validity here. That will be those who have actually witnessed or been a party to certain events, and those who have produced the emails, pictures or whatever to back up what they say. I am sorry. The rest of you have taken the lazy way out by believing the pinned threads that were put here in the beginning and then continueing to base your opinion on that 2nd and 3rd hand testimoney from the lindanites.
Until you and others have anything to bring to the table, please refrain from attacking those that do.

Bystander... you have not paid attention.... Cindy herself said she was not credible....

likewise your comments have not addressed the issues but are personal attacks.... time out.... 24 hours...

Posted by: fallible humanbeing Mar 22 2007, 02:35 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 22 2007, 04:17 PM)

I thinkJnana15, all such emails should get sent to Save3ABN.com for analysis, and possible posting whether anonymous or not.

Why hassle with the middle man (unless all correspondence to the JoyPickle site is forwarded to you) just have her send them directly to you.

- FHB

Posted by: Jnana15 Mar 22 2007, 02:39 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 03:16 PM)

A reminder SSOM and Jnana.... address the issues that people have and not the people themselves.... we don't know who those who post really are, neither can we or should we say they are brainwashed.... certainly if they chose they could say the same about you..... Notice that I have edited both of your posts, striking through the content that is questionable..... in the future that type of content will be deleted....

keep to the issues..... not the person posting..... thank you.....

My apology Clay. 

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 22 2007, 02:49 PM

QUOTE(Jnana15 @ Mar 22 2007, 01:39 PM)

My apology Clay. 

Meee toooo. 

Posted by: watchbird Mar 22 2007, 03:37 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 22 2007, 01:15 PM)

Cindy, you've raised some http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?s=&showtopic=13025&view=findpost&p=186973.

Now we need to put all of that along side of Danny's http://www.save3abn.com/danny-shelton-royalty-disclosures-financial-affidavit.htm of July 2006, which states that he owns and received from Linda,

> QUOTE(Danny Shelton)
> Bowflex exercise machine
> Stove
> 2 Refrigerators
> Dishwasher
> 2 Freezers
> Master bedroom set
> Downstairs bedroom set
> Old outside lawn furniture

I think we can scrounge up a number of other documents along these lines if we try.

So how do we understand Danny's email to Linda about picking up all the furniture? In light of the above, I would think that would refer to the specific furniture she was to receive, which was spelled out in their house agreement of June 4, 2004. It would be all that furniture, not all the furniture in the entire house.

I don't know how to comment on your March 22 email. Perhaps you can get Danny to list everything he kept vs. everything she took, and we can see if it might match up with a similar list from Linda. It is possible that if we did that that the two lists would agree.

I find this list about as credible as that his total cash assets were two bank accounts with only 1500 in each. If who got what out of the house is important enough to bother with, then it would seem to me that we need to get some testimonies from those who were involved in the moving process... or watched the movers, or saw the contents of Danny's house before and after the moving process.

Surely someone was around at that time and has at least some recollection of what was taken and what was left.

And where is the June 4, 2004 document. What was really spelled out there?

Posted by: Pickle Mar 22 2007, 04:16 PM

QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 22 2007, 03:35 PM)

> Why hassle with the middle man (unless all correspondence to the JoyPickle site is forwarded to you) just have her send them directly to you.
>
> - FHB

Naw, send them to Save3ABN.com, the Gailon Joy site.

> **QUOTE(watchbird @ Mar 22 2007, 04:37 PM)**
>
> And where is the June 4, 2004 document. What was really spelled out there?

Certain items that Linda brought into the marriage were excluded, as well as the guitars and horses, two glass cases, two treadmills, all antiques and knicknacks in the basement and closet, a blue vibrating chair, a white wicker shelf unit, baby chairs, a doll house, a bedroom set, three glass curio cabinets, antique family tables, and miscellaneous small items. Something like that.

Perhaps there are some items above that have been mentioned twice.

> **QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 08:28 AM)**
>
> AFAIC The more letters you publish the more it calls into account the credibility and truthfulness of the previous testimony on this forum.

You know, Cindy, it just might be possible that the discrepancy you've brought up will get featured on Save3ABN. On the one hand we have Walt saying that Linda got all the furniture. on the other hand we've got Danny saying in an official document that Linda didn't get all the furniture. Who's telling the truth?

I appreciate you bringing this to our attention.

> **QUOTE(fallible humanbeing @ Mar 22 2007, 12:45 PM)**
>
> Additionally, Bob Pickle, one of Linda's most ardent spokespersons has developed your idea of spinning into an art.

Really? You think so?

If I start classes, will you sign up?

Posted by: seraph|m Mar 22 2007, 04:17 PM

Posted by: Noahswife Mar 22 2007, 04:27 PM

> **QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 22 2007, 06:16 PM)**

You know, Cindy, it just might be possible that the discrepancy you've brought up will get featured on Save3ABN. On the one hand we have Walt saying that Linda got all the furniture. on the other hand we've got Danny saying in an official document that Linda didn't get all the furniture. Who's telling the truth?

I appreciate you bringing this to our attention.

Posted by: princessdi Mar 22 2007, 04:40 PM

I keep saying it.....comprehension is key.....

QUOTE(Noahswife @ Mar 22 2007, 02:27 PM)

Posted by: daylily Mar 22 2007, 06:01 PM

If Shelly Quinn is co-author, wouldn't she get half the profits from the books?

Posted by: PrincessDrRe Mar 22 2007, 06:49 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 09:49 AM)

You (Aletheia) stated if Linda lies how can you believe anything from her... so if a person is engaged in twisting the "facts" or spinning the story a certain way, how are they to be believed?

Pot. Kettle. Black.
Excellent point Clay!

sna

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 10:18 AM)

....I have only been following this story since it unfolded... and as I stated, **even if Linda was the devil incarnate, she should not have been treated as she was.....** do you not agree?

..and that's it in a nutshell. Hook. Line. Sinker.

End of story.

Pernt blank.



Posted by: seraph|m Mar 22 2007, 06:56 PM

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 22 2007, 07:49 PM)

Pot. Kettle. Black.
Excellent point Clay!

...and that's it in a nutshell. Hook. Line. Sinker.

End of story.

Pernt blank.



Can we say - 

 - We know these folks aren't listenin

I agree... Pernt blank - 

Posted by: Observer Mar 22 2007, 07:28 PM

QUOTE

Cindy has done her research - included in that are the words of sister and yourself. You and others continually claim that she (among others) is attempting to "spin" things in her direction. It is easily arguable that you, WB, as well as sister, Johann, Bob Pickle, Greg Matthews, and G.A. Joy, via his surrogates, have all spun a story as well. Your dependence on a fictional piece of writing as your basis for your position is a "spin" exercise by the definition that has been developed for that word in this community.

FHB:

Please show me one instance where I have depended upon THE TELEVANGELIST for anything that I said.

NOTE: You called it a fictional piece of work. I am not intendimg to argue in this post whether THE TELEVANGELIST is true, or fictional. On the assumption that you refernced it, I have named it. Show

me once where I have done that.

It appears to me that you have smeared with a wide brush, where you have no facts to back you up.

NOTE: I realize that you can respond that you only stated that one person had depended on that work. But, in one sentence you clearly state that I am one who have spun the story. Then in your next sentence you mention THE TELEVANGELIST. So, did (do) I depend upon it? Are you including me? If so, produce the evidence. If not, clearly state such.

Posted by: HUGGINS130 Mar 22 2007, 07:58 PM

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 22 2007, 07:49 PM)

Pot. Kettle. Black.
Excellent point Clay!



...and that's it in a nutshell. Hook. Line. Sinker.

End of story.

Pernt blank.



QUOTE(seraph|m @ Mar 22 2007, 07:56 PM)

Can we say -

- We know these folks aren't listenin

I agree... Pernt blank -



PERNT BLANK, now back to our regularly scheduled program...

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 09:36 PM

QUOTE(Clay @ Mar 22 2007, 04:23 PM)

Bystander... you have not paid attention.... Cindy herself said she was not credible....

likewise your comments have not addressed the issues but are personal attacks.... time out.... 24 hours...

Excuse me?!?

certainly did not say "I am not credible" You just said that, Mr J has said that, as have others.

said I am not trying to establish my credibility here. Meaning that was, and is not my intent in posting. What I posted was quotes from others, those quotes stand on their own, and do not rise or all because of who or what I am. They could have been posted by anybody, and have been adressed by practically nobody, that is far different then saying "I am not credible"

Please do NOT put your opinions in my mouth.

Posted by: Pickle Mar 22 2007, 09:49 PM

QUOTE(daylily @ Mar 22 2007, 07:01 PM)

If Shelly Quinn is co-author, wouldn't she get half the profits from the books?

Hard to say. Maybe. But what sort of deal did they work out?

Here's another question: We know TCTR is an excerpt of *Antichrist Agenda*. Is the latter a rework or an expansion of an earlier work (pamphlet or whatever) on the Sabbath? Anyone know?

Posted by: seraph|m Mar 22 2007, 09:55 PM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 10:36 PM)

Excuse me?!?

I certainly did not say "I am not credible"...

Please do NOT put your opinions in my mouth.

Now that IS a scary visual

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 10:02 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 22 2007, 11:49 PM)

Hard to say. Maybe. But what sort of deal did they work out?

Here's another question: We know TCTR is an excerpt of *Antichrist Agenda*. Is the latter a rework or an expansion of an earlier work (pamphlet or whatever) on the Sabbath? Anyone know?

[x] offi

\ ongoing discussion about this has already taken over the "new letters at Save3ABN" thread, maybe ather then spreading it out over a bunch of threads it could all be kept in one place?

Can you and daylilly, and whoever else take this discussion there, or to another thread where it is on opic?

Thank you.

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 10:18 PM

QUOTE(PrincessDrRe @ Mar 22 2007, 08:49 PM)

QUOTE

Clay wrote:
....I have only been following this story since it unfolded... and as I stated, even if Linda was the devil incarnate, she should not have been treated as she was..... do you not agree?

Pot. Kettle. Black.

Excellent point Clay!

[x] sna

...and that's it in a nutshell. Hook. Line. Sinker.

End of story.

Pernt blank.

[x] sna

'IF* that is YOUR standard, *IF* that is how YOU see it, then I agree you should follow that, so do 'OU also believe this?

....I have only been following this story since it unfolded... and as I stated, even if Danny was the devil incarnate, he should not have been treated as he was..... do you not agree?

Do YOU?

Rom 2:11 For there is no respect of persons with God.

Act 10:34 ... Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons

Jam 2:9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 10:32 PM

> **QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 11:36 PM)** ☐
>
> Excuse me?!?
>
> I certainly did not say "I am not credible" You just said that, Mr J has said that, as have others.
>
> I said I am not trying to establish my credibility here. Meaning that was, and is not my intent in posting.

True; your intent in posting here is to attempt to destroy the credibility of others. The problem you continue to face is that you, by your own admission, are not a "witness"... and you are trying to refute the testimony of those who are.

Lacking a first person testimony of your own, the only way for you to make them less credible is for you to establish that you are more credible than they, in spite of their being principals and participants and your not being so... so whether you are trying to establish your credibilty or not... everything you post is dependent on said credibility... because you have nothing else.

Your read on events and statements is irrelevant if you are not credible... and to date... you are not credible.

Attitude and indignation from you and those who wish to defend you doesn't change that.

Because you are not a 'witness', you can review, assess and interpret statements and events... but your doing so is contingent upon how credible you are deemed by others. You don't have first hand facts to refute anything... because you are not a 'witness'.

You can only go on what you have been told by others... and the majority of those feeding you information are no more 'witnesses' than you... and yet you expect people to take your slant as gospel... even over first hand statements... without your establishing your credibility...

Riiiiiiiiight.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: seraph|m Mar 22 2007, 10:41 PM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 10:36 PM)

Excuse me?!?

You may be excused. Then again maybe not.

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 10:42 PM

QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 22 2007, 02:15 PM)

Cindy, you've raised some http://www.blacksda.com/forums/index.php?s=&showtopic=13025&view=findpost&p=186973.

Now we need to put all of that along side of Danny's http://www.save3abn.com/danny-shelton-royalty-disclosures-financial-affidavit.htm of July 2006, which states that he owns and received from Linda,

QUOTE

(Danny Shelton)
Bowflex exercise machine
Stove
2 Refrigerators
Dishwasher
2 Freezers
Master bedroom set
Downstairs bedroom set
Old outside lawn furniture

I think we can scrounge up a number of other documents along these lines if we try.

So how do we understand Danny's email to Linda about picking up all the furniture? In light of the above, I would think that would refer to the specific furniture she was to receive, which was spelled out in their house agreement of June 4, 2004. It would be all that furniture, not all the furniture in the entire house.

I don't know how to comment on your March 22 email. Perhaps you can get Danny to list everything he kept vs. everything she took, and we can see if it might match up with a similar list from Linda. It is possible that if we did that that the two lists would agree.

Bob, didn't you quote a letter from Linda saying:
"No, he did not give me "all of the things in the home..." **He has all of the furniture**"?

any comment?

Regarding the rest of what you posted, I received this by email also:

QUOTE

----- Original Message -----
From: ****
To: ~ Cindy...
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2007 1:39 PM
Subject: Re: New Thread

"Great thread Cindy. Your OP was great and illicted the expected response . . . stone throwing, character assassination, etc.

Nobody offered anything to refute your point, in fact they never addressed your point at all, instead trying to turn it into a personal attack on your integrity and character (guess the rules are out the window already!) "

"There is new material on Pickled's web site. It includes Danny's financial affidavit. Nothing for Linda is posted for comparison. More evidence of the unbalanced approach the man uses. I wonder how he would feel if his entire life were posted on the Internet for public review?"

Good question, How would you feel?

Mat 7:12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 22 2007, 10:52 PM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 23 2007, 12:42 AM) ☐

I think we can scrounge up a number of other documents along these lines if we try.

So how do we understand Danny's email to Linda about picking up all the furniture? In light of the above, I would think that would refer to the specific furniture she was to receive, which was spelled out in their house agreement of June 4, 2004. It would be all that furniture, not all the furniture in the entire house.

I don't know how to comment on your March 22 email. Perhaps you can get Danny to list everything he kept vs. everything she took, and we can see if it might match up with a similar list from Linda. It is possible that if we did that that the two lists would agree.
Bob, didn't you quote a letter from Linda saying:
"No, he did not give me "all of the things in the home..." **He has all of the furniture**"?

> any comment?
>
> Regarding the rest of what you posted, I received this by email also:
>
> Good question, How would you feel?
>
> Mat 7:12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.

That's a door that swings both ways... I find it interesting you and your co-conspirator are contemplating 'exposing' someone who is hiding nothing... while your co-conspirator is desperately seeking to remain hidden...

Ponder that in light of Mat 7:12... no matter how you slice it, it comes up hypocrisy.

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 10:58 PM

> **QUOTE(Pickle @ Mar 22 2007, 06:16 PM)**
>
> You know, Cindy, it just might be possible that the discrepancy you've brought up will get featured on Save3ABN. On the one hand we have Walt saying that Linda got all the furniture. on the other hand we've got Danny saying in an official document that Linda didn't get all the furniture. Who's telling the truth?

Well Bob, it seems to me that both Walt Thompson, and my witness who visited a barren house and wrote:
I was in the house some time after she moved out and she had taken almost everything including stripping the walls of everything. I asked DS why he had let her take practically everything when actually he had paid her his share for it, he said , well I know, but she wanted it.....And people say he didn't love her and just wanted to dump her!!!! Yes, I remember they got a truck, a Uhaul or something"

May indeed have percieved that all, or almost all the furniture was gone, they probably did not go looking into closets and bedrooms, so most likely missed the two bedroom sets, you listed that Danny allegedly retained.

But what you fail to mention is Linda's claim:
No, he did not give me "all of the things in the home..." **He has all of the furniture"**

Even according to what you just cited and posted, that is false...

Shame on you.

Posted by: Aletheia Mar 22 2007, 11:40 PM

QUOTE(awesumtenor @ Mar 22 2007, 12:50 PM)

> **QUOTE**
>
> (Aletheia)
> I don't ever knowingly or willfully lie

Positing absolute negations you've already violated is not going to help your credibility, Cindy...

> **QUOTE**
>
> if I say somethiing false in error, or because of assuming, I try to correct it and apologise as soon as it's brought to my attention, so in this regard, yes, I believe it's ok for me to point out a lie.

Which means it's ok for your lies to be pointed out... nothing personal; it's strictly business.

> **QUOTE**
>
> My point is I have neither defended and condoned, nor criticised and condemned, for I lack the knowledge to do either.

You do realize this statement contradicts your initial statement quoted above, don't you? There are myriad posts from you full of your defending DS and criticizing/condemning LS... in spite of your professed lack of knowledge.

Which either means that you do, in fact, knowingly and willfully lie... or that you are confused in the extreme and you do not realize when you make contradictory or mutually exclusive statements...

Mr J,

You are taking my statement out of context and applying it to other issues, in order to justify your accusations. That is clearly not what I said or meant at all, I was only referring to the allegations that Danny trashed Linda in the beginning. Honest people on reading posts" #25, 29,and 36 and will be able to see that, and what you are doing also.

In context:

QUOTE

Clay:
It seems to me that those who support Danny have condoned his initial treatment of her

Aletheia:
I have never condoned the words which Danny may or may not have spoke out of hurt or whatever. I say whatever, because I keep reading people making claims about what he said, but never heard him myself, and haven't seen anyone quote him???

I am quite sure that they both spoke hastily however, because people say things in a divorce that they don't normally do , and later regret, or wish they had phrased differently. Those things are wrong, but surely we can afford to have a little compassion and understanding and not judge either of them who were in a very emotional time in their lives.

Clay:
so your point is what? Because you did not hear them, it must not have happened? Again, other people have indicated they some things Danny said to them, yet you have chosen not to believe them. Which supports my point that you will not believe anything negative about Danny because it does not agree with your perception of him.

Aletheia:
My point is **I have neither defended and condoned, nor criticised and condemned, for I lack the knowledge to do either.** I said I have not seen evidence of this early trashing, except third party reporting or vague references to the limited explanation offered by 3ABN for Linda's absence, and nothing else specific. Now if someone wants to present the "evidence of the trashing". then I'll look at it. I have asked previously what people were talking about and got nothing.

And I have better things to do then keep responding to your personal attacks and accusations, Mr J. so I'll be moving on here...and getting back on topic, if possible.

Posted by: sonshineonme Mar 23 2007, 12:36 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 22 2007, 09:58 PM) ☐

Well Bob, it seems to me that both Walt Thompson, and my witness who visited a barren house and wrote:
"I was in the house some time after she moved out and she had taken almost everything including stripping the walls of everything. I asked DS why he had let her take practically everything when actually he had paid her his share for it, he said , well I know, but she wanted it.....And people say he didn't love her and just wanted to dump her!!!! Yes, I remember they got a truck, a Uhaul or something"

May indeed have percieved that all, or almost all the furniture was gone, they probably did not go poking into closets and bedrooms, so most likely missed the two bedroom sets, you listed that Danny allegedly retained.

But what you fail to mention is Linda's claim:
"No, he did not give me "all of the things in the home..." **He has all of the furniture"**

Even according to what you just cited and posted, that is false...

Shame on you.

Shame on you!!!
ust so there is clarification here on the FACTS, if you are interested in FACTS, I will give you a list ıere. Oh, and this is from "my witness" who was there for moving day. Things were moved in to late 2004, not all at once. But this is a list of the main items....

Dan kept these items:
All of the living room furniture
The dining room furniture
The master bedroom furniture,
One of the other bedroom's furniture
Along with all of the office furniture.

Linda took these items:
The piano
Alyssa's bedroom furniture
A few nicknack cases,
think she took a couple of chairs.
She took her clothes
The nicknacks
Her books
Her pictures
Alyssa and Nathan's stuff from when they were kids... that kind of stuff.
All of her current living room, dining room, office and bedroom furniture (other than the one set she ook) was purchased later.

Now, how could anyone walk into the house and see it empty? Hmmm....

more to come.....

Posted by: awesumtenor Mar 23 2007, 06:19 AM

QUOTE(Aletheia @ Mar 23 2007, 01:40 AM)

Positing absolute negations you've already violated is not going to help your credibility, Cindy...

Which means it's ok for your lies to be pointed out... nothing personal; it's strictly business.

You do realize this statement contradicts your initial statement quoted above, don't you? There are myriad posts from you full of your defending DS and criticizing/condemning LS... in spite of your professed lack of knowledge.

Which either means that you do, in fact, knowingly and willfully lie... or that you are confused in the extreme and you do not realize when you make contradictory or mutually exclusive statements...
Mr J,

You are taking my statement out of context and applying it to other issues, in order to justify your accusations. That is clearly not what I said or meant at all, I was only referring to the allegations that Danny trashed Linda in the beginning. Honest people on reading posts" #25, 29,and 36 and will

> be able to see that, and what you are doing also.
> In context:
> And I have better things to do then keep responding to your personal attacks and accusations, Mr J.
> so I'll be moving on here...and getting back on topic, if possible.

Bottom line, Cindy... what can you say you have actually learned first hand... of all the things you claim to 'know'... what do you know because you were there and saw with your own eyes and heard with your own ears and what do you accept as true because someone told you "this is how it was".

Given your own admission that you have never met or spoken to Danny or Linda, I'd say the former is 0% and the latter is 100%. You have no first hand facts because you are not a witness... to 'anything*.

You have based your entire argument on what someone told you... how have you verified what they told you? And what will you do if what you've been told is not true?

In His service,
Mr. J

Posted by: Clay Mar 23 2007, 07:01 AM

Interesting twists this thread has taken.... one that I don't particularly care for..... maybe Thomas was correct.... this one is done, closed for now.....

Posted by: calvin Mar 23 2007, 07:32 AM

Seraph|m,

Thankfully, Clay deleted your crass statement before most could read it. Your membership has been suspended for 48 hours.
