

**Do you believe the Bible was written to all people?**

Acts 17:30 ...all men, everywhere...

**Do you think a person should examine not only the teachings, but also the history of any religious organization before deciding it is the truth?**

“It is important to examine one's religion; there is nothing to fear from such an examination” (TRUTH, p. 13)

**What would you think if members of a certain religion were not allowed to read other religious literature while expecting others to read their own literature?**

“Examine the evidence. Reasonable persons want to examine both sides of a matter. That is how one arrives at the truth.” (Awake 10/22/1973, p. 6)

**Do you believe that anyone, anywhere, who just had a Bible, and no other literature, could understand it and be saved?**

If “No,” how can this be reconciled with 2 Timothy 3:16-17? If modern writings are considered scripture, how could anyone obey 2 Timothy 2:15 before 1879, when Russell founded the Watchtower Society? If it was around before 1879, can you give any documented factual evidence to back it up?

If “Yes,” how can you reconcile that with the following quotes-

“We all need help to understand the Bible, and we cannot find the Scriptural guidance we need outside the 'faithful and discreet slave' organization,” (Watchtower, Feb. 15, 1981).

“A person would go into darkness after two years of reading the Bible alone; would be in the light reading the Studies in the Scriptures alone.” (Watchtower 9/15/1910, p. 4685)

“The Bible is a sealed book except to the organization.” (Watchtower 7/1/1973 p.402)

“An individual must have the Watchtower to understand the Bible.”(1983 yearbook)

How can the Watchtower Society claim to be the only organization that can interpret the Bible while condemning the Vatican for the same? Consider the following quote, “The Vatican belittles Bible study by claiming it is the only organization authorized and qualified to interpret the Bible,” (Watchtower, July 1, 1943, p. 201).

**Does the Watchtower Society claim to be a “prophet” of God?**

“Who will be Jehovah’s prophet? Who will be the modern Jeremiah? The plain facts show God has been pleased to use Jehovah Witnesses” (Watchtower 1/15/1959)

Unlike any other Organization the Jehovah Witnesses say they alone represent God as his spokesman on earth. "The Watchtower is a magazine without equal on earth because God is the author."(W.T. April

15, 1943 pg.127)

**If so, shouldn't the Watchtower Society be given the same test of a prophet as given in Deuteronomy 18:20-22?**

If not, why not?

**If a prophet foretells something that does not come to pass, would he be considered a false prophet?**

If not, why not?

**Has the Watchtower ever made a "false prophecy?"**

If not, how can you explain prophecies that failed?

See following -

"In the coming 26 years, all present governments will be overthrown and dissolved." (C.T. Russell, Studies in the Scriptures, Vol. 2, p. 98-99, 1889)

"...the 'battle of the great day of God Almighty' (Rev. 16:14), which will end in A.D. 1914 with the complete overthrow of earth's present rulership, is already commenced."—The Time is At Hand, Studies in the Scriptures, vol. 2, 1886, 1911 edition, p. 101

"We see no reason for changing the figures—nor could we change them if we would. They are, we believe, God's dates, not ours. But bear in mind that the end of 1914 is not the date for the beginning, but for the end of the time of trouble."—Zion's Watch Tower, July 15, 1894, p. 226-231 [Watchtower Reprints, p. 1677]

"...the 'battle of the great day of God Almighty' (Rev. 16:14), which will end in A.D. 1915 with the complete overthrow of earth's present rulership, is already commenced."—The Time is At Hand, Studies in the Scriptures, vol. 2, 1886, 1915 edition, p. 101

"Also, in the year 1918, when God destroys the churches wholesale and the church members by millions, it shall be that any that escape shall come to the works of Pastor Russel to learn the meaning of the downfall of 'Christianity.' " —The Finished Mystery, Studies in the Scriptures, vol. 7, 1917, p. 485

"...the old order of things, the old world, is ending and is therefore passing away, and that the new order is coming in, and that 1925 shall mark the resurrection of the faithful worthies of old... it is reasonable to conclude that millions of people now on the earth will be still on the earth in 1925. Then, based upon the promises set forth in the divine Word, we must reach the positive and indisputable conclusion that millions now living will never die."—Millions Now Living Will Never Die, 1920, p. 97

"...the scriptural evidence and the physical facts strongly indicate that such witness work is now almost done; and when it is done the universal war will begin. Universal war is absolutely certain to come and that soon, and no power can stop it. ...during the few remaining months until the breaking of that universal cataclysm the powers that rule the nations of the earth will continue to make treaties and tell the people that by such means they will keep that world peace and bring about prosperity. (Universal War Near, 1935, p. 3, 26-27)

"Man cannot by airplane or rockets or other means get above the air envelope which is about our earthly globe..."(The Truth Shall Make you Free, p. 285, 1943 edition)

If the wicked system of this world survived until the turn of the century (the year 2000), which is highly improbable in view of world trends and the fulfillment of Bible prophecy, there would still be survivors of the World War I generation. However, the fact that their number is dwindling is one more indication that "the conclusion of the system of things" is moving fast toward its end. (The Watchtower, Oct. 15, 1980, p. 31)

Some of that "generation (of 1914)" could survive until the end of the century. But there are many indications that "the end" is much closer than that! (The Watchtower, March 1, 1984 pp. 18-19)

1995 "Why Awake is Published" [before Nov 8th 1995] Most important, this magazine builds confidence in the Creator's promise of a peaceful and secure new world before the generation that saw the events of 1914 passes away." [After Nov. 8 1995 reference to '1914 generation' deleted] "Most important, this magazine builds confidence in the Creator's promise of a peaceful and secure world that is about to replace the present wicked, lawless system of things."

**Note what the Watchtower Society itself wrote** - "True, there have been those in times past who predicted an "end" to the world, even announcing a specific date. Yet nothing happened. The 'end' did not come. They were guilty of false prophesying. Why? What was missing? Missing from such people were God's truths and the evidence that He was using and guiding them." (Awake, Oct. 8, 1968)

"Of course, it is easy to say that this group acts as a 'prophet' of God. It is another thing to prove it. The only way that this can be done is to review the record. What does it show?" (Watchtower April 1, 1972, p. 197)

"Does this admission of making mistakes stamp them [Watchtower] as false prophets? Not at all, for false prophets do not admit to making mistakes." (Watchtower, Nov. 1, 1972, p. 644)

"Therefore their speech shows them to be false prophets. While they claim to speak in the name of the Lord, their predictions neither come true nor tend to magnify Jehovah's name. According to the divine rule they prove to be false... If these prophecies have not been fulfilled, and if all possibility of fulfillment is past, then these prophets are proven false. (Prophecy, 1929 ed., p. 22)

"Jehovah God is the grand identifier of his true messengers. He identifies them by making the messages he delivers through them come true. Jehovah is also the great exposor of false messengers. How does he expose them? He frustrates their signs and predictions. In this way he shows that they are self appointed prognosticators, whose messages really spring from their own false reasoning-yes, their foolish, fleshly thinking!" (W.T. May 1,1997 pg.8)

**Does the "new light" of Proverbs 4:18 justify the failed prophecies of the Watchtower Society?**

If so, how can you explain prophecies that contradict each other not getting brighter, but getting brighter and dimming?

Will the men of Sodom be resurrected?

Yes – Watchtower 7/18/79 p. 8

No – Watchtower 6/1/52 p. 338  
 Yes – Watchtower 78/1/65 p. 47g  
 No – Watchtower 7 6/1/88 p. 31  
 Yes – Live Forever (old ed. ) p. 179  
 No – Live Forever (new ed. ) p. 179  
 Yes – Insight, vol. 2, p. 985  
 No – Revelation. book, p. 273

### **Is the New World Translation (NWT) a reliable translation of the Bible?**

If so, how can you explain the translation committee's lack of qualifications and the liberties taken with the text? What I am referring to are the facts that the committee was made up of only 5 men: Nathan Knorr, Fred Franz, Albert Schroeder, George Gangas, and Milton Henschel, with only one of them, Fred Franz, having studied two years of Classical Greek (not Koine, the original written text of the New Testament) and having taught himself Hebrew (compared with the KJV's 54 man committee who were so well-versed in both Greek and Latin, they would debate in said languages). Also, I refer to the blatant attempts to undermine the Divinity of Christ -

John 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. (KJV)

John 1:1 In [the] beginning the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god. (NWT)

Colossians 1:13-17 Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated [us] into the kingdom of his dear Son: In whom we have redemption through his blood, [even] the forgiveness of sins: Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether [they be] thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. (KJV)

Colossians 1:13-17 He delivered us from the authority of the darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of the Son of his love, by means of whom we have our release by ransom, the forgiveness of our sins. He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; because by means of him all [other] things were created in the heavens and upon the earth, the things visible and the things invisible, no matter whether they are thrones or lordships or governments or authorities. All [other] things have been created through him and for him. Also, he is before all [other] things and by means of him all [other] things were made to exist, (NWT)

Isaiah 7:14 Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. (KJV)

Isaiah 7:14 Therefore Jehovah himself will give YOU men a sign: Look! The maiden herself will actually become pregnant, and she is giving birth to a son, and she will certainly call his name Im·man'u·el. (NWT)

1 Timothy 3:16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. (KJV)

1 Timothy 3:16 Indeed, the sacred secret of this godly devotion is admittedly great: 'He was made manifest in flesh, was declared righteous in spirit, appeared to angels, was preached about among nations, was believed upon in [the] world, was received up in glory.' (NWT)

**Can it be proven, from the Bible, that Jesus is Michael the archangel?**

If not, why hold to that belief?

**Your book says that Jesus existed as a spirit person before coming to earth. Is this found in the Bible? If so, where?**

**Your book promotes the doctrine of inherited sin. How does this compare with Ezekiel 18:20?**

**Your book shows Jesus dying on a stake. Under what government was Jesus executed? Wouldn't it make logical sense that He would be executed under the standard laws and customs of that particular government? What was the customary execution of that government, stake or cross?**

**Your book says that if a religion tells lies about God, that religion serves Satan. Do prophecies come from God? If so, shouldn't they come true? If a prophecy doesn't come true, then either the prophet is telling lies or God is telling lies. Since God cannot lie, then the prophet must be lying. Considering that the prophet is lying, should one listen to what that prophet says?**

**Your book says that the earth will never be destroyed and lists Psalm 104:5. How does this harmonize with 2 Peter 3:10?**

The answer lies with perspective. In one context, the Psalmist is praising the Lord, speaking of His power, and that to humans, it seems like the earth will be around. Also, the earth will stand until the Lord decides otherwise. 2 Peter 3:10 is from the perspective of prophecy. When the Lord comes back, the earth will be burned up.

**Can you explain why the 5 man committee to translate the New World Translation was not revealed until a former Jehovah's Witness revealed the information? Also, can you explain why the Watchtower Society blatantly misquoted several Greek scholars on their review of the NWT to make it look like they endorse that translation when, in fact, they do not?**

**What the Watchtower said scholars said -**

\*Careful translators recognize that the articular construction of the noun points to an identity, a personality, whereas an anarthrous construction points to a quality about someone. That is what A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament by Dana and Mantey remarks on page 140, paragraph vii. Accordingly on page 148 paragraph (3) this same publication says about the subject of a copulative sentence:

"The article sometimes distinguishes the subject from the predicate in a copulative sentence. In Xenophon's Anabasis 1:4:6, ...and the place was a market, we have a parallel case to what we have in John 1:1, ...and the word was deity. The article points out the subject in these examples. Neither was the place the only market, nor was the word all of God, as it would mean if the article were used with  $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ."

Instead of translating John 1:1, and the word was deity, this Grammar could have translated it, and the word was a god, to run more parallel with Xenophon's statement, and the place was a market The New

World Translation (1971), p. 1362

\*"theos [in John 1:1c] becomes a description, and more of an adjective than a noun...[John] does not say that Jesus was God" (Barclay, Many Witnesses, One Lord, p. 23 - 24). The Watchtower, May 15, 1977, p. 320

\*"a god" - William Loader, Ph.D. and New Testament Lecturer for the Perth Theological Hall, Australia, teacher at Murdoch University as a member of the Perth College of Divinity, and author of several books and journal articles (in *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Structure and Issues* [Peter Lang 1992], 155). Loader refers to "a god" as the "most natural reading of the text." from Greg Stafford's second reply to me on the Julius Mantey letter to the WTB&TS. I had asked Mr. Stafford for a list of scholars who unequivocally support the NWT rendering of John 1:1.

\*John 1:1c: "the Word was divine."

- James Moffatt, *A New Translation of the Bible*

"Every honest person will have to admit that John's saying that the Word or Logos 'was divine' is not saying that he was the God with whom he was. It merely tells of a certain quality about the Word or Logos, but it does not identify him as one and the same God"

- *New Word Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures*, (1951), pp. 773-774

\*"Literally, 'a god was the Word'

- from an email dialog with the webmaster of the now-defunct Trinity Exposed Website.

### **What the scholar said (or how they responded)-**

\*In response to your request, I give you the following facts: In Jehovah's Witnesses' Translation of the New Testament, where I am quoted in a footnote on John 1:1 (cf., D-M Gk. Gram. Pg. 148 (3)), I was writing on how the article "distinguishes the subject from the predicate in a copulative sentence," not on the significance of the absence of the article before THEOS. My closing statement in the paragraph was: "As it stands, the other persons of the Trinity may be implied in THEOS." My interpretation of John 1:1 in that same paragraph was "The Word was Deity," i.e., that Christ is of the same essence as the Father, of the same family. So I was quoted out of context. Is that honest scholarship?

\*"The only modern translator who fairly and squarely faced this problem is Kenneth Wuest, who said: 'The Word was as to his essence, essential deity.' But it is here that the NEB has brilliantly solved the problem with the absolutely correct rendering: 'What God was the Word was'" (Barclay, p. 23).

Barclay also makes his position clear in a response to the Watchtower's citation:

"The Watchtower article has, by judicious cutting, made me say the opposite of what I meant to say. What I was meaning to say, as you well know, is that Jesus is not the same as God, to put it more crudely, that is of the same stuff as God, that is of the same being as God, but the way the Watchtower has printed my stuff has simply left the conclusion that Jesus is not God in a way that suits themselves. If they missed from their answer the translation of Kenneth Wuest and the N.E.B., they missed the whole point" (A letter to Donald P. Shoemaker, 8/26/1977. A photocopy of this letter can be found in Watters, *Thus saith ... the Governing Body of Jehovah's Witnesses*, p. 74).

\*Dr. Loader's book is hardly the unequivocal support for which I was asking Mr. Stafford. Here is the text of a letter I received from Dr. Loader on this subject:

“Dear Robert

Thank you for your email. I am enclosing in this email the wording of my book which shows what I was saying in its context and makes it clear that I would not consider 'the Word was a god' as an appropriate translation. Context must determine meaning not just choices among possible grammatical alternatives.

Cheers,

Bill Loader”

Dr. Loader is quite liberal in his approach to John's Gospel. He ultimately defines the relationship of Father and Son as "not in substantial but in functional terms" (Loader, p. 202). However, he clearly does not support "a god" as an appropriate translation of John 1:1c.

\*"The Word was God...And the Word became flesh,' simply means "The word was divine...And the Word became human.' The Nicene faith, in the Chalcedon definition, was intended to conserve both of these truths against theories that failed to present Jesus as truly God and truly man..." Moffatt, Jesus Christ the Same, (Abingdon-Cokesbury), 1945, p.61.

\*Here are Vine's comments in full:

"and the Word was God'; here a double stress is on theos, by the absence of the article and by the emphatic position. To translate it literally, 'a god was the Word,' is entirely misleading" (Vine, Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary, "God", p. 272). "Literally" merely signifies that "a god" is possible from the standpoint of grammar alone; a "literal" translation is not necessarily an accurate one, and other "literal" translations are possible, including the traditional rendering.”

(From [http://www.forananswer.org/Top\\_JW/Scholars%20and%20NWT.htm](http://www.forananswer.org/Top_JW/Scholars%20and%20NWT.htm))

### **More reviews from scholars -**

Dr. J. R. Mantey (who is quoted on pages 1158-1159) of the Witnesses own Kingdom interlinear Translation):

"A shocking mistranslation." "Obsolete and incorrect." "It is neither scholarly nor reasonable to translate John 1:1 'The Word was a god.'"

Dr. Bruce M. Metzger of Princeton (Professor of New Testament Language and Literature):

"A frightful mistranslation." "Erroneous" and "pernicious" "reprehensible" "If the Jehovah's Witnesses take this translation seriously, they are polytheists."

Dr. Samuel J. Mikolaski of Zurich, Switzerland:

"This anarthrous (used without the article) construction does not mean what the indefinite article 'a' means in English. It is monstrous to translate the phrase 'the Word was a god.'"

Dr. Paul L. Kaufman of Portland, Oregon:

"The Jehovah's Witnesses people evidence an abysmal ignorance of the basic tenets of Greek grammar in their mistranslation of John 1:1."

Dr. Charles L. Feinberg of La Mirada, California:

"I can assure you that the rendering which the Jehovah's Witnesses give John 1:1 is not held by any reputable Greek scholar."

Dr. James L. Boyer of Winona Lake, Indiana:

"I have never heard of, or read of any Greek Scholar who would have agreed to the interpretation of this verse insisted upon by the Jehovah's Witnesses...I have never encountered one of them who had any knowledge of the Greek language."

Dr. Walter R. Martin (who did not teach Greek but has studied the language):

"The translation... 'a god' instead of 'God' is erroneous and unsupported by any good Greek scholarship, ancient or contemporary and is a translation rejected by all recognized scholars of the Greek language many of whom are not even Christians, and cannot fairly be said to be biased in favor of the orthodox contention."

Dr. William Barclay of the University of Glasgow, Scotland:

"The deliberate distortion of truth by this sect is seen in their New testament translations. John 1:1 is translated: '...the Word was a god,' a translation which is grammatically impossible...It is abundantly clear that a sect which can translate the New Testament like that is intellectually dishonest."

Dr. F. F. Bruce of the University of Manchester, England:

"Much is made by Arian amateur grammarians of the omission of the definite article with 'God' in the phrase 'And the Word was God.' Such an omission is common with nouns in a predicative construction... 'a god' would be totally indefensible." [Barclay and Bruce are generally regarded as Great Britain's leading Greek scholars. Both have New Testament translations in print!]

Dr. Ernest C. Colwell of the University of Chicago:

"A definite predicate nominative has the article when it follows the verb; it does not have the article when it precedes the verb...this statement cannot be regarded as strange in the prologue of the gospel which reaches its climax in the confession of Thomas. 'My Lord and my God.' - John 20:28"

Dr. Phillip B. Harner of Heidelberg College:

"The verb preceding an anarthrous predicate, would probably mean that the LOGOS was 'a god' or a divine being of some kind, belonging to the general category of THEOS but as a distinct being from HO THEOS. In the form that John actually uses, the word "THEOS" is placed at the beginning for emphasis."

Dr. J. Johnson of California State University, Long Beach:

"No justification whatsoever for translating THEOS EN HO LOGOS as 'the Word was a god.' There is no syntactical parallel to Acts 28:6 where there is a statement in indirect discourse; John 1:1 is direct....I am neither a Christian nor a trinitarian."

Dr. Eugene A. Nida, head of Translations Department, American Bible Society:

"With regard to John 1:1, there is of course a complication simply because the New World Translation was apparently done by persons who did not take seriously the syntax of the Greek." [Responsible for the Good News Bible - The committee worked under him.]

Dr. B. F. Wescott (whose Greek text - not the English part - is used in the Kingdom Interlinear Translation):

"The predicate (God) stands emphatically first, as in IV.24. It is necessarily without the article...No idea of inferiority of nature is suggested by the form of expression, which simply affirms the true deity of the Word...in the third clause 'the Word' is declared to be 'God' and so included in the unity of the Godhead."

Dr. J. J. Griesbach (whose Greek text - not the English part - is used in the Emphatic Diaglott):

"So numerous and clear are the arguments and testimonies of Scriptures in favour of the true Deity of Christ, that I can hardly imagine how, upon the admission of the Divine authority of Scripture, and with regard to fair rules of interpretation, this doctrine can by any man be called in doubt. Especially the passage, John 1:1-3, is so clear and so superior to all exception, that by no daring efforts of either commentators or critics can it be snatched out of the hands of the defenders of the truth."

(From <http://www.apologeticsindex.org/j01.html>)

**If the Watchtower publications contain nothing more than what is in the Bible, why not just use the Bible?**

**Your book says that Satan deceives us via means of national pride and racial pride. Your book also condemns abortion as murder. While these are true, how can such a claim have any validity when it is made by an organization, whose founder, Charles Taiz Russell, not only had ties to, but was involved with groups, such as the Masons (who also had ties to the KKK), the Rosicrucians, and who was head of one of the 13 Illuminati bloodlines – groups that not only have infiltrated every level of our government, promote eugenics (part of which is abortion), and promotes racism? Would that not make him deceived by Satan?**

**The WTS claims that Jerusalem was destroyed in 607 B.C.E. and uses Dan 4:23-25, Rev 12:6, 14, Num 14:34, and Ezek 4:6 to come up with 1914 C.E., which is 2,520 years later, as the year that Jesus began his reign in heaven. If the WT's claim that Jerusalem was destroyed in 607 B.C.E. is correct, then why is it that every reference source, including the Encyclopedia Britannica, Microsoft Encarta, The World Book Encyclopedia, Encyclopedia Americana, Compton's Encyclopedia, Academic American Encyclopedia, Cambridge Ancient History – Vol. III, The Oxford Dictionary of World History, etc, etc, all state that Jerusalem was destroyed in 586 BC?**

**Since the Organization has received "new light" regarding the 1914 generation, and completely changed their view on this, does this mean that all the former Jehovah's witnesses who were disfellowshipped years ago for the same view the organization is now teaching will automatically be accepted into fellowship again? Were these Ex-Jw's in fact disfellowshipped for truth and knew things that the governing body did not?**

**Can Jehovah's Witnesses hold and discuss openly with other Jehovah's Witnesses opinions that differ from orthodox Watch Tower doctrine?**

**How do you prove from the Bible that 1935 was the year for the selection to heaven stopped due to being filled? What is the difference between a Catholic appealing to "what the organization tells him" about December 25 being the date of Jesus' birthday and a Jehovah's Witness9 appealing to "what the organization tells him" about the date 1935? Is it not hypocritical when**

**you chide the "poor deluded Catholic" that his faith cannot find a Bible passage to support it, when the same goes for you and 1935?**

**Your book condemns spiritism, or the use of the occult. How can you explain why the Watchtower uses, on a repetitive basis, the occult to justify their publications, one of which was Johannes Greber, calling him a scholar to defend the NWT?**

(Johannes Greber was a spiritualist and his wife was was a medium.)

**How can you defend the doctrine of "justified lying," a Watchtower doctrine, with Exodus 23:1, Proverbs 12:17, James 5:12, and a host of other passages in God's word that condemn lying?**

On several occasions, the Watchtower has defended lying to suit their needs. They even put out a publication teaching Jehovah's Witnesses how to commit perjury, or how to lie, in court (in Child Protective Services cases).