

Debate: Larry Wessels Versus Two Jehovah's  
Witnesses at a University Study Center

sermonaudio.com

*JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES*

By Larry Wessels

**Bible Text:** Titus 1:9-16; Matthew 7:15

**Preached on:** Sunday, October 8, 1989

**Christian Answers of Austin, Texas**

9009 Martha's Drive

Austin, TX 78717

**Website:** [www.biblequery.org](http://www.biblequery.org)

**Online Sermons:** [www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers](http://www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers)

If you would like a free newsletter on this or other subjects, just give us a call at Christian Answers. The phone number is area code (512) 218-8022. Or you can email us at [cdebater@aol.com](mailto:cdebater@aol.com).

The following is a theological discussion between representatives of orthodox Christianity, Larry Wessels and Kurt Vesselman and representatives from the Watchtower Bible & Tract Society, otherwise known as Jehovah's Witnesses, Paul and Jason. This discussion took place December 4, 1989 at the Probe Center Austin, which is located directly across the street from the University of Texas campus.

Larry Wessels: What I want to get into first is a lot of times when you're talking about the truth, of course, we all agree the Bible is the truth and so we look at the Bible and we totally agree on that point that that's from revelation from the word of God. What the problem usually entails when you have people that all agree on the Bible being the word of God but then the interpretation comes up, that's where disagreement comes from. What I would like to see as we try to get into Biblical discussion is some kind of agreement on this interpretation but one thing I do know, I've got a King James version here. I know you've all got a New World translation.

Jehovah's Witness: We have the King James also.

Larry: Okay because I know the Watchtower publishes the King James along with the New World translation. A lot of times you can get into a ping-pong match of, "Well, here's my verse. That proves my point." The other guy comes back with a verse and says, "Well, how does that correlate with this verse?" If you've got two different translations which I believe are greatly different, the King James version, I think is tremendously different from a New World translation, i.e., John 1:1 as we all know that.

JW: On darkness and light.

Larry: Yeah. You've got, so discussing from the Bible, when you've got two translations that are almost diametrically opposed to each other on key doctrines, it gets to be a real problem so it makes it hard to decide what the Bible is really saying when you've got two Bibles that are saying different things. Do you know what I mean? So it makes a discussion on biblical truth a little tougher than it would be if you had two people standing on the Street corner and they both had King James.

JW: Or they both had New World.

Larry: Yeah, if they both had New World. People can see things a lot easier.

JW: I understand but we have no qualms with which Bible you use because we'll go to your Bible, the King James or the holy Bible because I'm very up on all of them and, as a matter of fact, I have 8 different Bibles and that is one. But, you mentioned interpretations, we do not interpret the Bible. We take it as the word of God because interpretations are just that, they are left up to Jesus Christ and Jehovah God. Daniel proved that by interpreting the handwriting on the wall and some of the other things, the dreams King Nebuchadnezzar had. So we are not prophets. We do not interpret the Bible. We take it as it is.

Now, of course, everything in the Bible cannot be taken literally. Certain things can as far as God's commandments to us, it's laws and the messages his Son gave to us, Jesus Christ. Some of those can be taken literally. Now, several of the signs in Revelation are figurative and you cannot really take something literal if it is figurative. So we do not interpret the Bible and that is a key misrepresentation that many people have placed on the Jehovah's Witnesses. I do not interpret anything. I think if it's in that Bible, we'll look at it like that and if you accept it as proof, it is proof. God's word. Not my interpretation, not his.

Larry: I was just wondering, why do you prefer New World translation over the King James?

JW: Number 1, it's now, especially in this country, the King James is like Greek to them, to people, society itself. But it's a lot easier to understand. It is directly translated from the original Scriptures, the Hebrew language so it's not one man's views or societies views, an organization's views. It is translated in modern English so it can be understood a lot easier because the King James is quite difficult to understand for a lot of people. ??? That is why, to make it easier to understand. John Doe Public came up and bought a New World translation, "Oh, I can understand this." But if Jane Doe Public bought a King James, "Well, that doesn't say that." Then we get into that conflict. Do you follow?

Larry: I'll take what he's got, he's got a new New International Version which is also in modern American English.

JW: Not totally.

Larry: Well, it was just translated in 1970.

JW: It's understandable to a point but, go ahead...

JW: I would say this is where this point comes in, God's name. Both in the NIV and the King James, in that one, I don't know what year that was but I suppose the King James, not the King James Bible it self but that particular version.

Larry: This is the King James.

JW: That particular. Let me ask you this because some of the King James have God's name in there 4 times and then some of them recently have taken it out and in the original Hebrew and Greek, God's name, Jehovah is found in the Bible 7,210 times and so since the New World translation has put it in there all those 7,210 times and the King James nor the NIV has, that's where we begin. That's another reason that we stick with the New World translation.

Larry: Okay, who translated the New World translation?

JW: You want names?

Larry: Yes.

JW: The names are not, it was a Bible translating committee from the Watchtower Bible & Tract Society.

Larry: So you're assuming that they were Greek scholars and Hebrew scholars.

JW: Well obviously, they would have to take the task on. You're familiar with the knowledge as far as Bible stuff goes, you're familiar with the Watchtower Bible & Tract Society. I see your literature down there so you know.

Larry: I'm familiar with it. Yes. Yes.

JW: I see your literature down there so you know.

Larry: Yes. I definitely know.

JW: That book there.

Larry: This is a book by Raymond Franz who was a member of the governing body of Jehovah's Witnesses.

JW: He's apostate.

Larry: Right. He's also the nephew of the current president of the Jehovah's Witnesses.

JW: You're exactly right.

Larry: And he has written a book here that is filled with photo reprints of Jehovah's Witnesses literature and other teachings of the governing body and his own personal experiences that out of what happened while he was a member of the governing body and his testimony has been backed up by the former editor of The Awake Magazine, Bill S. who was in charge of Awake Magazine in the 1960s.

JW: Do you have a paper towel or something?

Larry: Paper towel. Paper towel.

JW: Tissue or something.

Larry: What I was going to say is those two were there when the 1950, actually I have it here, the New World translation and the Christian Scriptures were produced and so they were familiar with the translating committee. He was on it and according to their testimonies, a member of the governing body and the editor of The Awake Magazine, your translating committee was Daniel Knorr, he was president before Frederick Franz. What was his name, G.. A guy named G.

JW: We're not interested in names.

Larry: Okay, I'm telling you what they said.

JW: Fine. They can say whatever they want. They are apostates and we don't...

Larry: Okay, even though he was...

JW: We think of them as the devil's works.

Larry: I understand. Right.

JW: That's our view.

Larry: I'm saying even though he was in a position where he was on the governing body and one of the controlling members of the Watchtower for years and had a relationship through the president, he and the editor of The Awake Magazine knew specifically who the translators were and they both testified that not a single one of the members of the translating committee had any knowledge of Greek or Hebrew.

JW: Well, I mean, who says they were telling the truth?

JW: Yeah, that's their word against whomever's.

Larry: Well, do you believe the president of the Watchtower Society?

JW: Against theirs?

Larry: No, I'm saying do you believe Frederick Franz is a Hebrew scholar or a Greek scholar?

JW: Do I believe that?

Larry: Right.

JW: Yes.

Larry: You do.

JW: Yes, I know for a fact he is.

Larry: Did you know that he was...

JW: I'm not interested in an apostate.

Larry: Okay, I'm talking about Frederick Franz and his testimony. He testified in a court of sessions court case in 1954 that's on the law books and since you're a lawyer...

JW: No, I'm not one.

Larry: ...where he testified he did not know Hebrew.

JW: He did not?

Larry: And he could not translate it or the Greek. I've got the records here and the references if you'd like to check. It's on file in the court of sessions in Scotland.

JW: How many years has that been?

Larry: 1954 and that was four years after the New World translation was translated of which he was one of the members of the translating committee.

JW: The New World translation has been revised since then. It was revised in '71 and revised in '84 also.

Larry: One thing that freaked out Brother Paul here was when I showed him Hebrews 1:6 in a 1950 New World translation where it said that, "All the angels of God worshipped him," and of course, they have changed it now to "Let the angels do obeisance to him." So there are definitely changes and so I agree with you on that.

JW: ?? Jesus?

Larry: Well, that's what I'd like to discuss a little bit more as we get into it here and so we move into the conversation. What I'd like to say about that...

JW: Can I ask you a question? Our theme tonight is, what is your theme?

Larry: My theme is I'd like to get into this translation of the Bible whether it is a reliable translation and for the sake of argumentation...

?????

Larry: What I'd like to say is, you know, you take this for what it's worth and we can get back into this after a while but I've done quite a bit of research on the New World translation myself.

Speaker: Larry, can I stop real quick?

Larry: Go ahead.

Speaker: That original Greek text had over 10,000... Hebrew and Greek. ????

Speaker: Exclusively, there wasn't any.

Speaker: YHWH, the tetragrammon.

Speaker: Y'all are saying that in the other translations it was reduced from 7,210 to...

Speaker: He names, 5, 4 and 1.

Speaker: ???

Larry: I've got a book here that's available. It's called "The English Bible from KJV to NIV: a history and evaluation by Jack P. Lewis put out by Baker Book House. It lists all the different translations and, of course, one of the translations it covers is the New World translation. I'll just preface this whole conversation. He does an analysis of the Greek and the Hebrew, not an indepth. The New World translation of the Holy Scriptures. He's covering every Bible, every translation there is and he points out errors and problems in each one. He concludes all his remarks here with an interesting comment but it's going to lead us into this conversation. He says after analyzing the New World translation and different words and problems in the text or whatever, he says, "This study is by no means a comprehensive review of all the merits or faults of the New World translation. These examples are adequate, however, to show that it is unsuited for the use of people who want to know what the Bible really teaches." On page 235.

JW: ??

Larry: This is Jack P. Lewis. The name of the book is "The English Bible from KJV to NIV." He's a Hebrew and Greek New Testament scholar and he goes through all the different translations: the Revised Standard, English Bible, so forth, right down the line. But I just wanted to show you guys. Here is someone that has researched all the different translations and out of all the translations, he marks that particular Bible as one that is unsuited for people who really want to know what the Bible teaches so what I'm saying there is maybe there are some doctrinal problems that are inherent in the New World translation.

Speaker: He could either be saying that in a positive light or a negative ??? In other words, he could be saying that to keep people away from it because it was the truth or because it was not the truth.

Larry: Oh, I see what you're saying now. Well, yeah...

JW: There is that possibility.

Larry: Alright, it's a possibility. The key is, though, that was a definite negative argument for but if he's lying, I see what you're saying.

JW: No, not even if he's not lying. Think about this: if that's the only Bible throughout all these Bibles that are spoken of negatively, it can...

Larry: Well, he said negative things about all the Bibles but this is the only one he said was unsuited for what the Bible really teaches.

JW: He said there were problems in translation in all of them.

Larry: Exactly. But he said this particular one....

JW: Why ours? That's what I mean.

Larry: Well, that's what we want to discuss. That's what I'm prefacing in this situation. Why does he pick on....

JW: I cannot answer why he picked on...

JW: I don't know the guy.

JW: I don't know him either and I really don't want to.

Larry: I'm just saying there is a published work...

JW: I understand. I would like to meet him, you know, but....

Speaker: Don't you think that's a pretty strong statement that he made there?

Larry: Oh, of course. That's why I think it's totally for a purpose...

JW: His shoulders are bearing a burden ??? He doesn't look like too solid of an individual from his picture I saw.

Larry: Oh, well, I never judge people by their....

JW: An observation is not a judgment.

Larry: Okay, but that's the point of the controversy now. We have established that. I say there's a controversy like I said before in that the New World translation says different things than a King James does where the King James says that all the angels worship him and the New World translation changes that. And another passage where men fell down at Jesus' feet and worshiped him, they changed that to obeisance so there is a different meaning.

JW: What's the difference?

Larry: One is worship. We know, Paul brought it out last time we talked. Luke 4:8, I think it was, worship God only. If men are worshiping Jesus, that's obvious blasphemy there. I mean, they shouldn't be worshiping Jesus but only God and so obviously if he's not God, then whenever these people fall down, they must be doing obeisance so you can see the difference.

JW: Right. Right. But see, obeisance and worship I think can be totally different or starkly similar, okay? But obeisance in the case of Jesus receiving that ??? You are not necessarily on or higher than Jehovah God. Do you follow what I'm saying? Okay but as our last discussion was about a month ago.

Larry: Yeah, it was about a month.

JW: About a month ago on a Saturday.

Larry: Yeah, it went for about three hours.

JW: Yeah.

Larry: I enjoyed it.

JW: I did too. I always do but if I remember correctly, which I try to do all the time, you said you don't believe in the Trinity, I think. I may be incorrect. No?

Larry: Well, I said we haven't come to that decision yet. Let's talk about it from the Scripture....



JW: Okay, because it seems like this is what this is involving here, the difference between God, Jesus and the Holy Spirit of the singleness of the three as being one and that's fine. We'll discuss that from the Bible.

Larry: Right, but the key is before we can discuss that, we've got to get our Bibles straight, right?

JW: Next question? You believe in God. You believe in Jesus. You believe in his word is the Bible, correct? So one Scripture based on your belief and faith in God and Jesus Christ should suffice in you believing that his word is so and showing the difference between the two. Would you agree on that or not?

Larry: Well, one Scripture sometimes...

JW: Your Bible.

Larry: One Scripture? Well, you have to take everything in context as you well know. You said it yourself.

JW: One Bible.

Larry: One Scripture in my Bible.

JW: Yeah, your Bible.

Larry: Well, even then you have to understand the other Scriptures to understand what that one Scripture is really saying. Hermeneutics is the key to understanding the Scriptures. I had a guy the other day, "Use one verse," and he said that he misquoted a verse, whatever it was, and he threw out, he said, "When you die you won't remember anything." He said, "When you die, you remember nothing. You won't even remember." He was talking about in the next life you wouldn't remember anything so you wouldn't remember who God was. You wouldn't remember anything. He's taking one verse to justify. That's ridiculous. All the other Scriptures show that you'll be praising God. You'll be worshiping the Lord Jehovah. ?? the verse says. You can't take one verse and throw out all the rest that the Bible teaches.

JW: I'm not saying throw out the rest of the Bible teaching.

Larry: Take them in context.

JW: Jesus Christ own words, glorify Jesus Christ after he has been resurrected. That should suffice if your belief and faith is strong enough in Jesus Christ and Jehovah God and the Bible as his word. That's what I'm getting at because I used to be a Catholic. I didn't even know what a Bible looked like, okay, as a Catholic. Catechism. Sunday School everything. The sacraments. The rosary and all this other stuff and I was doing

idolatry without realizing what it was so that's why I can say strongly as a Jehovah's Witness, now I can take one Scripture out of the Bible, God's word, and based on my belief and faith know it is God's word and know the difference between Jehovah God and Jesus Christ. That's all I'm saying. Regardless of the Bible you use or I'm not trying to translate or interpret it but taking Jesus Christ, the glorified Jesus Christ's words as that.

Larry: Okay, let's take one verse then. Let's take John 1:1. That's a major discrepancy in doctrine between one Bible and the next. Why is it Jehovah's Witnesses translate John 1:1, "The Word was a God," rather than almost all your other translations, "The Word was God"? Why do they translate it like that instead of, "The Word was God"?

JW: Well, I'm not a Greek scholar nor a Greek linguist so I know there's some difficulty in understanding between a definite article and indefinite article and things like that.

Speaker: I'm sure you know the answer.

Larry: Well, I hope I do. I wouldn't ask the question if I didn't but I'm saying if you know the answer.

Spear: If you study the discrepancy, we'd like to hear what you have to say about it.

JW: According to ???

Larry: Right, because I checked the Kingdom Interlinear and currently I have, right, I have a Watchtower publication, the Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures and I wanted to find out why they translated it that way and they give the reason why. Back here, page, I used to know right off the bat. It's back here somewhere. Here it is, 1158. They give their reasons for translating John 1:1 "a God," and they go through here and they argue all these points and quoting all these Greek scholars for why they can translate it "a God." Well, you see, what I did was I said, "Well, the argument sounds plausible. Everything they're saying sounds pretty good but I still don't jibe why do all these other translations always translate it, 'the Word was God'?" That just doesn't seem to have an area...I mean, this sounds great here but why don't the rest of them do that? So what I did is I went to the Austin Presbyterian Seminary where they have all the volumes of Greek books you could ever want and everything else on theology and I went down there and spent an entire day looking up all their quotations from these Greek scholars to which I have them all right here on the table. Do you know that every translation, everywhere they quoted, they quoted them out of context? Out of context. They put an ellipsis in the middle of the sentence or near the end of the sentence to completely flip-flop what the Greek scholar was arguing for. And as you get into the Greek texts themselves, every one of these scholars translates it and "the Word was God." The very ones they are quoting and I'll be glad to give you these to research and look at yourself and check it with your own Kingdom Interlinear but I spend an entire day with a friend of mine, we were pulling these books and finding every page that they were quoting and saying, "How is it that they came up with this and everyone else says the other thing?" Every one of these Greek scholars they quote translates it, "the Word was

God." So it started to make sense when I could start to see that when they're quoting Greek scholars and taking half of a sentence, putting an ellipsis in and sticking the other half of the sentence somewhere else or leaving off the end of the half sentence, you know, then they could say what they wanted to say. This sounds harsh saying it, but I did the research. I've got the papers right here on the table for anyone who wants to take it. I did the work.

JW: I did the homework also on that particular subject also from the original Greek and cross referenced it to the original Hebrew, what the word means in Hebrew and John 1:1 is no way saying it possibly could be Jehovah God himself. No way.

Speaker: Why not?

JW: Because if you go from the word in Greek and research it straight down, it will lead you into Hebrew meaning, I forget what the word is.

Speaker: Logos?

JW: No, it's not Logos. ??? I don't remember. I'll look it up and give it to you but it does not in any way signify....

Larry: I think I know what you're talking about because I think it's on page 18 here of the foreword in the Kingdom Interlinear. Page 18, let me just read it here. Here's what I think you're talking about. It says, "How is a modern translator to know or determine when to render the Greek word Kyrios and Theos into the divine name in his version? By determining where the inspired Christian writers have quoted from the Hebrew Scriptures." You see, that's basically what I think you were saying.

This is Larry Wessels, the Director of Dayspring Evangelism. I'd like to interject at this point for the sake of brevity and clarity what this whole discussion which went on for quite a while revolved around in that the Jehovah's Witness Bible put into the New Testament the name "Jehovah." They inserted it 237 times in their particular Bible. Since the discussion is centering on the differences between what most people have as a translation of the Bible, either King James or NIV of something and the Jehovah's Witness Bible, we're wondering why is it they put "Jehovah" 237 times into the New Testament whereas other Bibles don't do that and I'm going to read a few quotations here from Robert Bauman's fine article that appeared in a Christian research journal and hopefully this will shed a little light on the situation and save a lot of time on the tape so we can get to other points of issue as we talked with our Jehovah's Witness friends.

The divine name in the Septuagint. The Septuagint for which the abbreviation LXX is standard, was a translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek that was produced in the third century BC and from which the New Testament frequently quotes. In most versions of the LXX which have come down to us through ancient manuscript copies, the word "Lord" in the Greek, known as Kyrios, is used in place of the divine

name and this practice is also followed in all the thousands of ancient New Testament Greek manuscripts that have survived. In order to counter this evidence, Jehovah's Witnesses argue that "Jehovah" was used in the original LXX and New Testament manuscripts and that the versions which used "Kyrios" were produced after the first century by apostate scribes. They base this claim on some pre New Testament manuscripts of the Septuagint containing the divine name which have been discovered in this century.

It is unnecessary here to discuss all the pros and cons of this theory. Several recent studies have been done which show that there is insufficient evidence to prove that the divine name was used in the original Septuagint though everyone admits that some, not many, copies of the Septuagint did use it. These studies point out that the manuscripts on which the theory is based all contain signs that they were not typical examples of the Septuagint. Furthermore, internal evidence from the Septuagint itself shows that from the beginning it must have used Kyrios in place of the divine name. Even if it should turn out that the original Septuagint did use the divine name, that would not necessitate that the New Testament writers used it when quoting from the Old Testament since they did not always follow the Septuagint exactly even when quoting from it.

The only way we can know what the New Testament writers did is by examining the New Testament itself. Thousands of New Testament manuscripts in either portions or its entirety written in Greek, its original language, have been found. So far none of these manuscripts which date from the second century and later, have contained the divine name. This the Jehovah's Witnesses admit. All the manuscripts have regularly used Kyrios in places where the New Testament quotes from or alludes to an Old Testament passage which in the original Hebrew used the divine name. That's the New Testament as it has actually been preserved in the manuscripts which have come down to us definitely does not contain the divine name. Even if Matthew had used the divine name in a now lost Hebrew Gospel, this in no way proves that the rest of the New Testament writers did the same in their original Greek writing.

Jehovah's Witnesses also appeal to a large number of medieval translations of the New Testament into Hebrew which frequently used the divine name in place of Kyrios. However, since these manuscripts were translated from the Greek and were produced over a thousand years after the New Testament was written, they cannot lend support to the theory that the New Testament originally contained the divine name.

We see ultimately the New Testament belief in this matter rests not on these textual considerations but on their understanding of what the New Testament actually has to say about the divine name. Jehovah's Witnesses argue that the practice of using substitutes such as Lord and God for the divine name was a superstitious practice which developed among the Jews as a way of avoiding taking the name of Jehovah in vain. Jesus, they reason, would not have followed such an unscriptural tradition given his forthright condemnation of the Pharisees for their traditions. They maintain that Jesus showed his respect for God's name when he taught the disciples to pray, "Let your name be sanctified," in Matthew 6:9 and by his statement and prayer to the Father, "I have made

your name manifest," John 17:6. They argue on this basis that when Jesus read aloud in the synagogue from Isaiah 61:1-2 which contain the divine name in Hebrew, he must have spoken the divine name rather than a substitute. The apostles are said to have continued Jesus' teaching in this regard by their referring to Christians as "a people for his name," Acts 15:14-15.

This final reasoning is mistaken at every step. First, the practice of substituting Lord or God for the divine name can be traced back as far as the Old Testament. For example, Psalm 53 is nearly identical word-for-word with Psalm 14 but four times substitutes "God" in place of "Jehovah." That's Psalm 14:2, 4, 6 and 7 and see Psalm 53:2, 4, 5 and 6. This one example proves that using substitutes for the divine name is not an unscriptural practice.

Secondly, Jesus evidently used various substitutes as can be seen from passages where he was not quoting the Old Testament like "power" in Matthew 26:64; "in heaven," Luke 15:21.

Third, Jesus' references to God's name are striking in that the immediate context, even in the New World translation, neither the name "Jehovah" nor any substitute is used. Thus the model prayer which Jesus taught his disciples addressed God not as "Jehovah" but as "our Father," Matthew 6:9. See also Luke 11:2. Not once in Jesus' long prayer in John 17 does he address God as "Jehovah" but always as "Father," John 17:1, 11, 21, 24 and 25. In these passages, God's name evidently stands for his character and reputation. While Christians are to honor these, there is no concern expressed that they use the divine name.

Finally, the claim that the divine name was removed from the New Testament by apostate scribes and an unscriptural substitute put in its place, besides contradicting the Bible's own teachings and having no evidence to support it, contradicts one of the Jehovah's Witnesses' own teachings about the Bible. Repeatedly one finds in their publications strong affirmations that the Bible has not been changed through the process of copying and recopying over the centuries. This affirmation is not only factually correct, it is necessarily true if the Bible is to be believed as God's unchanging word according to Isaiah 40:8, Isaiah 55:11 and Matthew 5:18.

Larry: Okay, the point is, using the rules of putting in the divine name which Paul has argued before has to be used from the Hebrew, using pages 17 and 18 where if it's quoted out in the Old Testament in the New Testament, then we translate "Kyrios" or "Theos" every time as "Jehovah." We just saw a point blank passage in Philippians 2 where God is speaking out of Isaiah 45:23 and Paul takes that very same passage out of Isaiah 45:23 and applies it to Jesus in Philippians 2:11. The word "Kyrios" is used back in the Hebrew in Isaiah 45:23, is the Hebrew, what's the Hebrew word? Yahweh, I suppose. I'm saying if we use this translation principle according to pages 17 and 18 as we read out of the Kingdom Interlinear, then that should be translated, "every knee shall bow, every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Jehovah to the glory of God the Father," or "Jehovah the Father." But in this case it says "God the Father" there isn't mentioned specifically. ???

God or Theos ???? But he's quoting directly out of an Old Testament passage using the word "Kyrios" and linked it in with that passage in Isaiah 45:23.

To back this up and to buttress it a little bit, I would like to take a look at John 1:1 where you were making that point also and taking this translation principle of using the divine name and things of this nature. John 1:1, I'm using the Kingdom Interlinear now.

JW: John 1:1, right? Referencing Philippians 2:10 and 11, correct?

Larry: Referencing it to Isaiah 45:23.

JW: Kyrios and what's the other word?

Larry: Elohim.

JW: Elohim? Yahweh?

Larry: Something like that. I'm not sure. I don't read the Hebrew there, I just know that that corresponds to what they were arguing in pages 17 and 18.

JW: Go to Acts 2:36, he then reads, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."

Larry: Acts 2:36. Okay. "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Right. Okay. "All the house of Israel." Kyrios, him and Christ, Christos made the whole Theos, this Jesus whom you put on the stake. Okay, so that is translated correctly in the New World translation and in the interlinear and the reason is it's not quoted out of the Old Testament according to what we just read.

Speaker: Or does the reference mean, though, with Philippians and Isaiah as an actual quote.

Larry: Okay, let me prove it and I should have done this a minute ago but I guess I didn't. Let me prove it with Romans 14. Let's go to Romans 14 and this should prove the correlation. Let me prove the correlation. You're right. I agree with you Jason. Go to Romans 14:11.

Speaker: Okay, now this is better.

Larry: Yeah, well I figure this will clear it up. I should have, I just skipped it in my hurry to get back to John 1:1 but you're right, I should have....does this make it clearer? John 14:11. Okay, "For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God." Now, look what they did there in the New World translation.

Speaker: Okay, let's talk slower, okay, if we can?

Larry: Gotcha. Gotcha. Okay, I'm reading from the New World translation.

Speaker: 45:23, that's our quote. That's our reference.

Larry: Exactly and look how they translate "Kyrios" there.

Speaker: One second.

Larry: The tape hasn't stopped. We're still here. I should have made the point a minute ago. I apologize. I think it becomes very clear "Kyrios" has been translated "Jehovah" by the New World translation taking from Isaiah 45:23 and we just got that quote a minute ago in Philippians 2:11, the same quote from the same passage but yet they translated it "Lord" there but they translated it "Jehovah" in the other passage.

Speaker: I'm saying that's biased. That's wrong.

Speaker: In the New World it doesn't use "Jehovah" here.

Larry: In the New World?

Speaker: No, it doesn't use God's name.

Speaker: Isaiah what?

Speaker: 45:23.

Larry: 45:23. I have "God." I'm taking it from 22, the word "God" there.

Speaker: Oh, the word "Theos."

Larry: Well, that's in Hebrew there. We haven't figured out, since some of us are Hebrew scholars, we can't figure out if it's Elohim or Adonai or something like that. Obviously that's where their translation principle came from when they translated "Jehovah" in Romans 14:11.

Speaker: Actually, the Hebrew and the Greek Scriptures in Hebrew, the Septuagint, ??? Elohim but, okay now, that was the translation, the ones the Jews had of the Greek Scriptures so then they had to write it down in Hebrew first so people could understand it and that, itself, that's a good question.

Larry: I'm just saying it's the same passage, Isaiah 45:23 is our passage we're coming from and both those passages, Philippians 2:11 and Romans 14:11 are both coming from Isaiah 45:23 and as we established from the foreword of the Kingdom Interlinear pages 17 and 18, how they put in the word "Jehovah" to supplant either "Theos" or "Kyrios."

We find in Romans 14:11 they had taken the word "Kyrios" which in the Kingdom Interlinear right under it it says "Lord" here but over there in the New World translation they translated it "Jehovah." But over here in the other passage they don't do that. They leave it at "Lord." I'm wondering, why don't we have consistency here when both passages are coming from the same place.

JW: I'm not sitting up here trying to analyze the brothers that translated the New World translation because I have complete faith in it.

Larry: Okay, is that a blind faith?

JW: No, I'm not blind to anything. I have a mind and I think quite well.

Speaker: We don't have to look at any quotes or anything and you guys could explain to us why you left God's name out even in the original Hebrew.

Larry: Can you say it was ever like that?

JW: God is Jehovah Almighty and is supreme...

Speaker: ...in the original. I mean, you go to the library and you find it.

Larry: Here I've got a bibliography right here which would disagree with you totally.

Speaker: ?????

Larry: No, no, how they left the divine name out in the New Testament. Here are just a few source books. You're welcome to write down and go and check yourself but the thing is, whose word are you taking that the divine name has been left out of the New Testament?

JW: I'm taking this....

Larry: I'm saying there are plenty of scholarship that would disagree with you.

JW: I could care less about scholars, I believe in Jehovah God and Jesus Christ. I've met a number of scholars in school and in my lifetime. I'm not into this. I did not come into Jehovah's kingdom ??? All angels are sons of God. Jesus Christ said that he was the Son of God. People knew him as the Son of God. The apostles knew him as the Son of God. Am I right or wrong? Am I right or wrong?

Speaker: ??? A Son of God ??? created by God or some ?????

JW: We're in agreement with that. Christ was the Son of God.

Larry: Well, so are people sons of God.



JW: No.

Larry: That's what the New Testament says. John 1:10-12.

JW: Okay, that's good. I'm glad you brought that up. It's not in the sense of this angelic creatures. ??? sons of God.

Speaker: I understand what you're saying.

JW: ??? building up the foundation on the sons of God. Angelic creatures. You cannot be a son of God, you're not an angelic creature. I can see you. Do you follow what I'm saying?

Larry: Well, the Bible says we're sons of God according to Scripture but give me that concordance and I can show you a ton of verses on that.

JW: Well, I'm not disputing that but I can see you. I cannot see Jesus Christ. I cannot see any of his other servants that are sons of God or angelic creatures.

Speaker: So the distinction between an angel and a person, you can see one and not the other.

JW: True.

Speaker: Could an angel appear ???

Speaker: Sure, he has the power to if he is allowed to by Jehovah God.

Speaker: I'm just making sure of the distinction between an angel. An angel being the son of God is an angelic...

Speaker: ...creature created by him. ???

Larry: And the sons of God are not wicked.

JW: Okay, now, I want to get an agreement here before we ??? Jesus Christ was the Son of God. All angels according to ??? were sons of God, angelic beings, spirit beings in heaven. Is that right or is....

Larry: Well, there have been a lot of times...half the scholarship agrees with that and half kind of thinks that it could be the royal line of Seth, you know, when Adam had the sons.

JW: I understand.

Larry: You've got the two seeds.

JW: I understand.

Larry: Genesis 3:15. I'm just explaining the scholarship, contemporary scholarship. There is the seed of the devil and there is the seed of God.

JW: I understand. Still, the seeds of the devil, they are still angelic creatures less powerful than the heavenly creatures. They are still sons of God. Do you follow?

Speaker: Spirit ??

JW: They are spirits, right. Do you follow? We're agreed, right? Sons of God. Angelic creatures.

Larry: In that sense, yeah, that you're talking about.

JW: Okay, we've established that. So Jesus Christ is the Son of God, that's our foundation, right?

Larry: Well, not totally in context of Hebrews 1 which also Psalms 2 which would disagree with what you are about to say but I know what you're about to say but go ahead and say it anyway. Revelation 22, right?

JW: Anyway, Revelation 22, the glorified Jesus Christ is speaking. Revelation 22:16, read it for me.

Larry: "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."

JW: Okay, stop, bright and morning star. The glorified Jesus Christ speaking. Am I wrong?

Larry: That's Jesus speaking.

At this point in the conversation, the audio cassette recorder that was recording the conversation ran out of tape so to fill in the gap in between the time the tape ran out and a new tape was put in, I'll reiterate what our Jehovah's Witness friend, Paul, was arguing here. He was arguing from Revelation 22:16 that when Jesus made the statement of "the bright and morning star," that Jesus was actually admitting his own angelic nature at that point and that he wasn't God, that he was angelic in nature.

Well, checking Greek scholarship, we can go to one of the foremost New Testament Greek scholars, A. T. Robertson in his Word Pictures in the New Testament, page 486, he made the statement concerning this phrase "bright and morning star." In the Greek it's ho aster ho lampros ho proninos and he states, "The Davidic king is called a star in Numbers

24:17, in Luke 1:78. This 'day-star' (prosporos) is interpreted as Christ in 2 Peter 1:19. In Revelation 2:28 the phrase 'morning star' occurs in Christ's words which is here interpreted. Christ is the Light of the world, John 1:9, 8:12)." So reference to "bright and morning star" are actually references to position, title, a position of authority, power and light that this isn't reference to nature as to angelic nature as implied by our Jehovah's Witness friends but to a prominent position of light, bright, power and authority.

But with that said, let's pick up where the conversation left off as a new tape was put in and the conversation was once again recorded.

Speaker: ??? he is now in the spiritual world ??? creative world. He could be called the morning star but that doesn't prove that he is lumped together with angels.

JW: No, you're alright. I follow you. ??? clear me up on it. If I'm wrong, I shall apologize. Tell me the basis of your belief is...

Larry: ...what the Bible says.

Speaker: You show us. ??? Paul and I will listen to ????

Larry: That's what we're here for. That's what we're here for. I don't want to dogmatically state it, I'm saying let's get into the Scripture. That's why we're trying to find....

JW: Before we go to the Scriptures, I want to know what your...yes, what it is.

Larry: Okay.....

JW: I know you believe in the Bible but in the relation, correlation between God and Jesus and the Holy Spirit, what is it?

Larry: I believe Scripture.

JW: You're speaking for yourself, right?

Larry: Speaking for myself, I believe personally that Scripture teaches that Jesus Christ is God Jehovah but not Jehovah the Father, you see? I believe that the Holy Spirit is Jehovah. I'm believing that the Father is Jehovah. Yet the Scripture says in Deuteronomy 6:4, "Shema Yisrael, Adonai Elohenu echad. Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD," that there is one God but even that Hebrew there, echad, for Isaiah 6:4 means composite unity. It's like a bundle of grapes. When the spies went out from Moses and they went into the Promised Land, they came back and said, "There are giants in the land. We can't go," but then you had Caleb and Joshua that said, "Let's go on in. The Lord is with us," and they said, "No," and they turned aside but they brought back honey and grapes and stuff like that and the word there in Hebrew, the grapes they brought back was "echad," clusters of grapes but yet it was one bundle. But the word "echad" means

composite unity so when it says the Lord is one, it means he's not just a singular one like a Unitarian view would have but a composite unity. What...I believe...I'm trying to give you something quick because I want to get back into ??? because I can tell you this but it's not going to mean anything until we get back into where it really counts, the Bible. Do you want to say something?

JW: No offense....

Larry: No, go ahead. Go ahead.

JW: ???

Larry: Well, basically I'm saying that when you get the baptismal formula in Matthew 28:19, "go out and make disciples, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit," once again, I can give you a ton of Greek references but there's no way you can get away with the thing like in your Trinity attack publication where they quote certain Greek texts and try to say neuter and this stuff because they leave out the word *ikanos* which taken into account with the *pneuma* in the Greek, it has a masculine pronoun there which makes it clear it's a distinct personality, especially in John 14:26. You also have that, I think, in John 14:17, if my mind serves me correct. I might be off on the second verse but anyway, what I'm saying is as we go through the whole gamut of Scriptures, there is no question that the Father is God.

JW: God Almighty.

Larry: God Almighty and we all agree on that. We all agree there is only one God but then the question comes: who is Jesus? Who or what is the Holy Spirit? You see, once you get a handle on who is Jesus, who or what is the Holy Spirit, then you can make your definitive definition of the nature of God but that's what we're trying to get to is who is Jesus, who or what is the Holy Spirit and once we get a firm grip from the Scriptures on what that is, then you make your doctrine of God based on that. And it didn't come from the Nicene Creed in 325 AD because if you get back into the works of the Ante-Nicene fathers...I'll give you another bibliography on that if you want from Clement and Ignatius, Polycarp, right down the line, they all held this view. So just to say it all came about in 325 by the Nicene Creed is ludicrous because it's denying all the 300 years of early church history on the Trinity before that. Go ahead, Jason.

Jason: Where are they taught the doctrine?

Larry: Where are they taught it? You want some references?

Jason: No, the 300 years before it you were saying.

Larry: You mean like when I mentioned Irenaeus, Clement.

Jason: No, like the apostle.

Larry: Tertullina.

Jason: No, we're talking about Bible writers, the apostles. Where are they taught the Trinity doctrine?

Larry: Well, I'm saying they taught it when they talked about the Holy Spirit being God, when they talked about Jesus being God, when they talked about...

Jason: ???

Larry: ...when they gave the benediction. At the end of a lot of the books of the Bible, they give a benediction, "in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit." It never says the word "Trinity." The word "Trinity" is not in the Bible but neither is the word "theocracy."

Jason: What does theocracy mean?

Larry: That's what I mean. "Trinity" is not in the Bible but it doesn't mean it's not in there as far as the definition of this goes.

Jason: But what does theocracy mean, though?

Larry: It means rule by God.

Jason: Right.

Larry: Right but I'm saying a lot of people attack the Trinity because the word "Trinity" is not in the Bible.

JW: There's not a word for it in Hebrew either.

Larry: Just like the word "theocracy" is not a word found in the Bible. It doesn't exist in the Bible. So the key is the definition of the word is taught in the Scriptures. But where I want to get back to is angels. You were talking about angels a minute ago. This is a Watchtower publication, 1934. These are all my notes on the back.

Jason: I remember that being mentioned ??? angels.

Larry: It's "Angels: the Bible Treatises" by J. F. Rutherford, the second president of the Watchtower Bible & Tract Society. It's copyrighted in 1934 and published by Watchtower Bible & Tract Society International Bible Association. I wanted to ask you on this, we were talking about angels a minute ago and that's why...

JW: I've never read that.

Larry: Okay, this has been out for half a century by the Jehovah's Witnesses. I wanted to ask you about some of the things taught in this book on angels because you were bringing that subject up.

Jason: Before you get started, the question you're going to ask is something that we're no longer teaching. Is that what you're going to ask? You said it was taught for half a century.

Larry: Well, I don't know. I want to make sure on that. It may or may not.

Jason: ??? publication in the 30s and we've had all this updated in the 70s and the 80s.

Speaker: It's relevant because of the weight given to it by Paul from this revelation.

Jason: That's the Bible, this is written by men. But go ahead.

Larry: It's a Watchtower publication, the channel of communication. Okay, he's teaching here, J. F. Rutherford, the Watchtower Society is teaching that the office and power of the Holy Spirit became defunct and is no more, is no longer the helper or comforter of the anointed. It is no longer the power that teaches doctrine to the anointed class. Now all interpretation comes through J. F. Rutherford's writings.

JW: Who is comment is that, yours?

Larry: No, any documentation that's in J. F. Rutherford's book "Preservation," pages 201-203 published in 1932. This is for the sake of those on tape that want to check this out. Also from the Watchtower Magazine, November 1, 1931, page 327; the Watchtower Magazine, April 1, 1934, page 105.

Jason: Do you have anything more recent than that?

Larry: Well, what I'm saying is ??? Okay, you've got the Watchtower Magazine, November 1, 1931 on page 327. Well, I don't know what happened to the tape there but it got jammed and we've just now fixed it. We're looking at the ??? mystery a little bit. We brought up angels, reprints but available at the Library of Congress in Washington, DC. It's a reprint of the actual. Like I said, I'm willing for anyone to research this.

Jason: What you're dealing with though here, according to Scripture and that the light is getting brighter and we are the channel of God, okay? Then we have the merit to in 1917, the 30s, references out of the 30s of the Watchtower, you know, we're talking how many years ago?

Larry: Quite a few.

Jason: Look at what we have now.

Larry: This is the guy that founded the organization.

Jason: No. We're not interested...no, he's dead, okay? You show us stuff from now. You show us our publications of the 80s or the 70s or even maybe some book...

Larry: Let me ask you this question: are y'all inspired of God?

Jason: Well, if the light is getting brighter and we've found more truth, that's pretty advanced.

Larry: Okay, what I was about to say....

Jason: Are we inspired?

Larry: Yes. What y'all teach, is it the inspired teachings of God? The question is: if you're inspired, you're talking about new truth, right? New truth?

Jason: No, we did not say we were inspired.

Larry: Clearer truth?

JW: The light is getting brighter.

Larry: Okay, do y'all believe what I just said a minute ago about the office of the Holy Spirit being defunct?

Jason: No.

JW: No.

Larry: Can you say the teachings have changed since this was taught....

Jason: We can't believe it until we look at it ourselves anyway.

Larry: Well, I'm willing to put myself on tape and on the line, you know. I'll give the references, the page numbers, everything for anyone that wants to do the research because I have done the research.

Jason: No, we don't believe that. In fact, if you've seen...maybe you can pick it up in there the Holy Spirit is actually the actuating force behind God's will.... We would like to bring that to you. Where do you get all this literature from?

Larry: Okay, well, I'll take anything you want to give me. I always have, always will. All I wanted to say especially for our listening audience here is what you're basically saying is the doctrines the Jehovah's Witnesses taught for years past were a lie and are not true.

Jason: No, it was a misunder...it was a not understanding.

Larry: It was a not understanding so they taught as truth something that was wrong.

Speaker: ??? doing the same thing right now.

Larry: Yeah, because you could be lying right now thinking you're telling the truth but the light will get brighter 20 years from now so everything you're telling us is a lie but you didn't know it was a lie so it was just a misunderstanding.

Jason: First of all, we don't think this generation can go on for 20 more years because the Lord says ??? Don't you agree?

Larry: The Lord's day?

Jason: The time of the end, the last days.

Larry: It could be.

JW: No man knows the....

Larry: No man knows the day or the hour.

Jason: We're not talking about ?? the last days...

JW: ...that are described by Christ.

Larry: Oh yeah, we are living in the last days. No doubt about that.

Jason: Jesus said this generation will by no means pass away until all these things occur.

Larry: Well, he's talking about there the Romans in Jerusalem in 70 AD by the Roman conqueror Titus.

JW: ???

Larry: Oh obviously. That's what it teaches in Matthew 24.

Jason: ??? the composite sign in 24, though? You don't think any of those things apply?

Larry: No, they ask him three questions. He answered the first question, then he answered the second question, then he answered the third question. The third question pertained to when he would come back and that's what he's talking about there. Everything before that is answering the other question.

Jason: When do you think he came back?



Larry: No, he hasn't come back yet.

JW: Why not? Half the signs....

Larry: Well, let's not get off on Bible prophecy right now because we're trying to establish this other reference.

Jason: Why? We're spinning our wheels on the Trinity because you know how we feel and we know how you feel.

Larry: Well no, I'm not trying to get to a....

Jason: ??? anywhere in the Bible.

Larry: ...I'm trying to get a focal point. We've got to look at the New World translation to see if it's a reputable translation.

Jason: ??? look at the King James.

Larry: You will accept the King James version as we discuss Scripture and not even refer to the New World translation? You will accept what the King James version says?

Jason: In every Scripture?

Larry: Oh, especially that.

Jason: Well, you know our answer to that one.

Larry: That's why we've got to establish some credibility here for the New World translation.

Jason: We can use ours, you mean?

Larry: Yeah, if that's credible. We can use yours or not because I read in the foreword of the Kingdom Interlinear a minute ago where it says the Bible is a translated copy and it's untrustworthy and all these kind of attacks against the Bible but I don't see any proof of that, you know, so I'm saying what I'm looking here tonight is to try to show some proof maybe going against your position. I know that the Kingdom Interlinear is good at attacking other Scriptures but what about them or do they invite investigation and analysis? But before we get back to that, I want to get back to all these doctrines the Jehovah's Witnesses taught for years. You couldn't get a vaccination. You weren't allowed to have a vaccination for years and then all of a sudden they changed the doctrine so the people that believed they were truly in God's will not to get a vaccination, they were actually living in error. Then, of course, the light got brighter and, you know, they

see the light better now but what it really comes down to is back when they weren't allowed to get polio vaccinations.

Speaker: Back then they thought the light probably wouldn't get any brighter than it was then because they were supposedly living in the last days.

Jason: If you know where we're coming from on the generation where we're talking about something totally...I mean, it's the same...our generation, we're talking about beginning in 1940s, okay?

Larry: Okay, so like you said, the Watchtower organization was extremely racist in the beginning and the Watchtower taught that people with black skin had the curse of Cain, the same teaching the Mormon's had. Quotes out of the Watchtower Magazine, July 15, 1902, page 216.

Jason: You keep bringing all this stuff up from a long time ago.

Larry: Okay, I'm saying that Charles Taze Russell was a racist, okay? What I'm saying is...

JW: ???

Larry: No, but I've read his stuff. The literature is out there.

Speaker: Who are you to judge Charles Taze Russell, though?

Larry: Am I to judge him? Jesus says the spiritual man judges all things, 1 Corinthians 2:14 and 15 and you'll know false prophets by their fruit, okay?

Speaker: And what kind of fruits do Jehovah's Witnesses have?

Larry: Okay, then Charles Taze Russell said.....

Speaker: No.

Larry: ...the Lord would come in 1879. Then he said 1914. Then 1925. Of course, he didn't say that, Rutherford did now in 1941 and, of course, you know the latest, 1975.

Jason: That was ??? the Watchtower.

Larry: How about The Awake? I have it right here. I already showed it to Paul. This is the Watchtower, oh yeah, this is the Watchtower, okay, I guess I am right too. Yeah, it was in The Awake also but this is page 494. This is y'all's book. Why are you looking for it in 1975? This here is a cassette tape we could listen to by Jehovah's Witness circuit assemblies convention in Pennsylvania. The relevant documentation, it says on the tape.

If you listen to Jehovah's Witness themselves talk about 1975...I can show you reference after reference from 1975 being the end of the world from Jehovah's Witnesses

Jason: No, not the end of the world, the 6,000 years.

Larry: Well, you know, that's what I meant.

Jason: Did we say the end of the world?

Larry: Armageddon.

Jason: Did we say Armageddon?

Larry: Armageddon. You can listen to this tape, "The Great Day of the God Almighty."

Jason: Is there a speaker on here?

Larry: Brother, well, it's announced on the tape. Brother Secano or something like that.

Jason: ??

Larry: Yeah, that's it. Something like that.

Jason: You say that we said that '75 was the end of the 6,000 year mark, okay? But where did we say it was going to be Armageddon at the end of the world?

Larry: He said it. The Jehovah's Witnesses, the Watchtower.

Jason: Show us.

As per the Jehovah's Witness representative Jason's request for references on this subject, as per calling the end of the world in 1975 the possible date of Armageddon, the end of the world, we find in the Watchtower publication, August 15, 1968, pages 494. It says, "Why are you looking forward to 1975? What about all this talk concerning the year 1975? Lively discussions, some based on speculation, have burst into flame during recent months among serious students of the Bible. Their interest has been kindled by the belief that 1975 will mark the end of 6,000 years of human history since Adam's creation."

We look on page 499, the article goes on from that same Watchtower publication of August 15, 1968. It says, "Are we to assume from this study that the battle of Armageddon will be all over by the autumn of 1975 and the long looked for thousand year reign of Christ will begin by then? Possibly but we wait to see how closely the seventh thousand year of man's existence coincides with the thousand year reign of Christ." He goes on to say many more things about 1975.

Watchtower publications make clear that the millennium cannot take place until after the battle of Armageddon and so with these things well known and documented in Watchtower publications, the argument that the end of the world, battle of Armageddon, and the dates such as 1975 and earlier references in 1914, 1916, 1918 and so forth, have direct bearing. 1925 also. Have direct bearing on this question of the end of the world.

Further references, October 15, 1966 Watchtower, pages 628 and 641. May 1, 1967 Watchtower, page 262. All these are references to 1975 and what will take place, possibly the battle of Armageddon. Looking in their Watchtower book "Life Everlasting and Freedom of the Sons of God," pages 29 and 30, it states, "According to this trustworthy Bible chronology, 6,000 years from man's creation will end in 1975 and the seventh period of a thousand years of human history will begin in the fall of 1975 CE."

On page 35 of that same book, it states, "1975, 6,000 years, end of sixth one thousand year day of man's existence in early autumn." Then right after that it says, "2975, seven thousand, end of seventh one thousand year day of man's existence in early autumn."

Other references October 8, 1968, Awake Magazine, page 14 and with no conditional statements like "possibly" or "maybe" or "could be," we find in the Watchtower publication, "God's eternal purpose now planned," page 51, 1974. They make it clear that 1975 is the end. 1975 yearbook, page 240 in May, 1974 Kingdom Ministry, page 3 states and we're quoting, "Yes, since the summer of 1973, there have been new peaks in pioneers every month. Now there are 20,394 regular and special pioneers in the United States, an all-time peak. This is 5,190 more than there were in February, 1973, a 34% increase. Does that not warm your hearts? Reports are heard of brothers selling their homes and property and planning to finish out the rest of their days in this old system in the pioneer service. Certainly this is a fine way to spend the short time remaining before the wicked world's end, 1 John 2:17." So the Kingdom Ministry publication of May, 1974, page 3, talks about the wicked world's end.

That is the documentation for the Jehovah's Witnesses as far as Armageddon, the end of the world and prophesying 1975 as the end and the end of the 6,000 year period.

Larry: Well, I was just getting to the point that if the 6,000 years are up, we had to have the battle of Armageddon to ??? That's what I was talking about from before.

Jason: Again, we understand that.

Larry: And I know what the Watchtower came up with in '75 and also '76 to explain the discrepancy there, they said because Adam and Eve were created at the same time or within a day or something...

Speaker: Who knows when they were created.

Larry: Yeah, you see, that's what they came up with later.

Speaker: Truly, I mean, who knows when Adam was created. All it goes back to is right here, from the start of the flood ??? from Adam's creation. You see, from Adam's creation there are no numbers here.

Larry: Yeah, I understand what they're arguing that that whole article is on it and I understand how they came up with that conclusion but I'm saying later they said, "Well, now we don't know the time between Eve's creation and Adam's creation so there's that time there that is throwing off this calculation and so...

Speaker: Yeah. ??? calculation was thrown off, wouldn't you agree?

Larry: It's pretty obvious. It's like this other one, you know, names now living will never die when it's prophesied dogmatically, without a doubt, it's on the end of 1925. It's pages 88, 89, 90. That's put out by Rutherford, the Watchtower Bible & Tract Society. You know, you can go back into Russell's teaching and everything but I see what you're saying on that point. I would say that I've got, by the next time we meet, I should have a multitude of actual Watchtower Magazine put right before you that will get even more dogmatic than this.

Speaker: My point is if you say that this is true, okay, you wrote that but that's not true anymore. Now I'm going to write this. This is true. Now we're reading that stuff and we're saying....

Jason: That's why we're telling you to read what we have now. Take a look at what we have now. You're going back to all the stuff, I mean....

Speaker: Yeah, because of that. Okay, we could find a text in the Bible and what the Bible says about it.

????

Larry: He's already in his...the Bible is here all the time. It hasn't changed, unchangeable word of God. Jude 3 says, "once delivered unto the saints," whereas Watchtower doctrine changes. You know...

Speaker: Well, that was obviously a misunderstanding there.

Larry: Yeah but listen, the man who thought of that doctrine also put the prohibition on blood transfusions.

Jason: ...which we still hold to.

Larry: Exactly. He's the one that created the faithful and discreet slave class.

Jason: No. ???

Larry: He took that and interpreted that passage where the Watchtower before Rutherford had always applied this to Charles Taze Russell.

Jason: ???

Larry: He created a theocracy in 1914.

Jason: Can I get you a tape?

Larry: I'll listen to it. Yes, I'll ??? I'm hoping that you can see if I spend this much time digging in the libraries, researching, getting old tapes, I do the research.

Speaker: ???

Larry: I get it. I mean, you're not dealing with someone that's going to shovel stuff off. I like to get into the stuff.

Speaker: What would it take to make you ??? Jehovah's Witness ??? the truth?

Larry: Well, if they can prove it to me, I'll be glad to believe it. Right now, I'm showing you Jehovah's Witness literature that even you don't agree with, you know, you don't agree ??? be saved. You don't agree. Here's what Russell and Rutherford says, they said that God lives in a star system, Pleiades, okay, on the planet named ???. That's in Rutherford's 1928 book, called "Reconciliation," page 114.

Speaker: ??? Even we ??? stuff like this.

Larry: Okay, I will grant all that. Do you see my point, though? ??

Speaker: Do you have literature ??? So what are you saying?

Larry: I'm just saying this happened in so many doctrines the Jehovah's Witnesses held on so many different issues.

What always seems to be the case whenever Jehovah's Witnesses are confronted with the facts that their own religion has changed its stance on so many issues over the years, they usually argue that, "Well, that was in the past and now is the present and we have better truth now than we had back then so everything's great." Well, to answer this line of argument that the light is getting brighter and brighter and their opinion to cover for all these doctrinal changes, I'm going to read from David Reeve's book, "How to rescue your loved ones from the Watchtower." We're reading from page 78. Let's hear what he has to say.

"In order to excuse a number of such doctrinal reversals over the years, Jehovah's Witnesses will often turn in their Bibles to Proverbs 4:18 and read, 'But the path of the righteous ones is like the bright light that is getting lighter and lighter until the day is firmly established,' New World translation. Since the changes indicate that their light is getting brighter, they see this as evidence that they are the righteous ones, that is God's chosen channel. However, what if, after the light has gotten brighter, the organization then returns to the darkness it had been in before? What if it returns to a teaching that had previously been rejected in favor of new light? The Watchtower Society has done this very thing on a number of occasions.

"One that older witnesses alive today should remember involves the significance of Romans 13:1, 'Let every soul be in subjection to the superior authorities,' New World translation. To whom should everyone be in subjection? Around the time of WWI, the teaching was that the superior authorities were the earthly political governments. Later, this was rejected in favor of a new truth, namely that the superior authorities were Jehovah God and Jesus Christ. That's from their publication, 'Make sure of all things,' 1953 edition, page 369, see page 92.

"During the 1950s, Jehovah's Witnesses looked back at the prior teaching and said, 'When the society began to be freed for further preaching following WWI, they soon realized that they had been held in spiritual bondage too in many ways.' There were many false doctrines and practices that had not yet been cleaned out of the organization. With considerable misunderstanding, they had accepted earthly political governments as the superior authorities that God had ordained according to Romans 13:1, particularly the civil rulers." That's from "Jehovah's Witnesses, and the Divine Purpose," 1959, page 91.

"This false doctrine had been cleaned out of the organization by the 1950s but in the 1960s it was reintroduced. Who are these superior authorities to whom Christians are to be in subjection? The duly constituted political governments of this world." That's from the Watchtower Magazine, January 1, 1963, page 31.

The Watchtower of May 15, 1976 made this observation, "It is a serious matter to represent God and Christ in one way, then find that our understanding of the major teachings and fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures was in error and then, after that, to go back to the very doctrines that by years of study, we had thoroughly determined to be in error. Christians cannot be vacillating, wishy-washy about such fundamental teachings. What confidence can one put in the sincerity or judgment of such persons?" Page 298.

Not only has the Watchtower Society shown itself capable of going back to doctrines that it had "thoroughly determined to be in error," but there are even cases of the organization flip-flopping back and forth on the same issue a number of times. A prime example of this is the question of whether or not the men of Sodom and Gomorrah will be resurrected. At last count, the Watchtower Bible & Tract Society had changed their position four different times on this issue alone. They said, "Yes, the men will be resurrected of Sodom and Gomorrah," in their Watchtower publication of 1879, July, page 8. Then in the June 1, 1952 Watchtower, page 338, they said, "No, the men will not

be resurrected." But then again in August 1, 1965 on page 479, the men of Sodom and Gomorrah were again resurrected and will be resurrected according to Watchtower teaching. But on June 1, 1988 on page 31 of the Watchtower, the men of Sodom and Gomorrah, alas, would not be resurrected.

Larry: I would say you know what the penalty was in the Old Testament for someone that ate blood.

Speaker: Yes.

Larry: What was the penalty?

Speaker: Cut off.

Larry: Okay, do you want to read that? Well, you don't have to read it because I want to get on other things but it's in Leviticus 17. It tells you the penalty for eating blood, it says they will be cut off from their people for 24 hours, for one day. So go out, was their clothes and then come back into the congregation. You don't believe that, do you?

Speaker: Let me find it for you and I'll give it to you.

Larry: Leviticus 17, "it is for the life thereof: therefore I said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh: for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof: whosoever eateth it shall be cut off." The Hebrew word there is karath or whatever and in the Theological Word Book of Old Testament words, Harris, Archer and ?? page 457, you translate that Hebrew word for "cut off" as being "excommunicated." Now, here's what God means by being cut off. From verse 14 to verse 15 he says, "And every soul that eateth that which died of itself, or that which was torn with beasts, whether it be one of your own country, or a stranger, he shall both wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until the even: then shall he be clean. But if he wash them not, nor bathe his flesh; then he shall bear his iniquity." I've got a cross reference. We could go on. ??? The gist is the Hebrew doesn't mean destroy or kill, it means he's excommunicated from the community until he goes and washes his clothes.

Speaker: It's wrong, out of context.

Speaker: ....something that has been killed or something like that.

Larry: Every soul which eateth... ??? What about all the way through 14, though? I just read them. That's why I read the whole thing from 14 to 15 to 16 because it tells you. Okay, what happens to this guy that does it, what can he do about it? Verse 15, what does he do about it?

Speaker: It's a totally different thing here. Can I read it out of mine? It's easier to understand.



Larry: Well, you've got the New World translation.

We'll have final remarks here. The New World translation, once again, is the Jehovah's Witness Bible which is translated by Milton Henschel, Albert Schroeder and Daniel Knorr, Frederick Franz and G. D. G., none of which had any scholarship or credentials in New Testament Greek or Old Testament Hebrew so their translation is biased and totally unreliable. As far as the Jehovah's Witness' stance on refusing blood transfusion goes, Mark 3:4 makes it clear it's better to save life than to kill it. Many Jehovah's Witnesses have paid with their lives by refusing blood transfusions when nowhere in the Bible is this taught. Jesus said in Matthew 7:15, "Beware of false prophets."

Please contact Christian Answers for further information.

Check out our websites:

[biblequery.org](http://biblequery.org). This site answers 7,700 Bible questions.

[historycart.com](http://historycart.com), this site reveals early church history and doctrine proving Roman Catholicism is not historically or doctrinally viable.

[muslimhope.com](http://muslimhope.com), this site is a classic refutation of Islam, a counterfeit religion created by Mohammed.

Free newsletters are also available.