

This document is a question and answer email between Peter and JW Pioneer, concerning the deity of Yeshua (Jesus).

Subject: Research of Charles Taze Russell

Hello <name suppressed>,

Good to hear from you. I will respond to the article on pastor-russell.com by taking out one complete extract and responding afterwards. I will attempt to answer you with honesty as I believe you too have a genuine heart. I too research, as I said already, eternity is too long a time to spend in regret.

--- --- ---

<http://www.pastor-russell.com/legacy/zwt15july06.html>

*"No, the truths I present, as **God's mouthpiece**, were not revealed in visions or dreams, nor by God's audible voice, nor all at once, but gradually, especially since 1870, and particularly since 1880. Neither is this clear unfolding of truth due to any human ingenuity or acuteness of perception, but to the simple fact that God's due time has come; and if I did not speak, and no other agent could be found, the very stones would cry out." [Luke 19:40]*

What I am understating here is that Russell is saying that God did not use visions, dreams nor audible voice to communicate to him, but rather he (Russell) spoke as a mouth piece for God. Do correct me if I am wrong. To conclude God spoke through Russell's mouth.

Okay, for now lets accept that God is speaking through the mouth of Russell. As I read the document, I note that they only highlight the non-controversial words that came out of Russell's mouth. Why?

Anthony, please answer the following.

Why are the controversial words that came from Russell's mouth not highlighted in the document?

Why not share both sides of the "truth" as God gave to His "mouthpiece" (Russell's lips)?

--- ---- ---

I will now look at the words (not mentioned in the article) that came from God through the mouth of Russell. I can site many more examples of controversial statements (in other words, prophecies that did not come to pass) but I only need site one. Why? The TRUE God is never wrong.

From the mouthpiece of "God" (Russell)

Watchtower/ The time is at Hand pg 99

"In view of this strong Bible evidence concerning the Times of the Gentiles, we consider it **an established truth** that the final end of the Kingdoms of this world, **and the full establishment of the Kingdom of God**, will be accomplished by the end of A.D. 1914"

The Watchtower 1894 page 226

"Now in view of recent labor troubles and threatened anarchy, our readers are writing to know if there **may not be a mistake in the 1914 date**. They say that they do not see how present conditions can hold out so long under the strain. **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 the end of the time of trouble.**"

Questions:

Is the end of the time of trouble the time that the Kingdom of God is established?

Was God's Kingdom established in 1914?

Is the time of trouble referred to by God's mouthpiece taken from the following verse in Daniel?

(Dan 12:1 [KJV])

And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: **and there shall be a time of trouble**, such as **never was since there was a nation even to that same time**: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.

(Dan 12:2 [KJV])

And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

(Dan 12:3 [KJV])

And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.

Let me now turn my attention to "a god" translations.

The bibles that use "a god" at John 1:1,

NTIV the New Testament in an Improved Version (1808) published in London John 1:1 a god.

The man behind this bible was [Thomas Belsham](#) and he gave himself over to the [Unitarian movement](#) (similar to what Russell taught). He later in life denied the virgin birth of Yeshua (Jesus). So there is no doubt why Mr Belsham would have called the word "a god".

Do you deny the virgin birth too?

AT The Bible an American Translation (1935) J.M.Powis Smith, Edgar J. Goodspeed.

This bible rendered the verse, "the word was divine". This rendering is questionable in light of what other translations wrote (including NWT – saying "a god", rather than "a divine" – in other words there is no indefinite article – a- in this translation; so this is not a good comparison)

MO A New Translation of the Bible (1934) James Moffatt.

James Moffatt rendered the verse, "the word was divine". This rendering is questionable in light of what other translations wrote (including NWT – saying "a god", rather than "a divine" – in other words there is no indefinite article – a- in this translation; so this is not a good comparison)

Found Here: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_1:1

Here is a list of the major group of about 20 versions and not one calls the word "a god".

<http://biblehub.com/john/1-1.htm>

Questions based on John 1:1

Is there a created angel in heaven that is “a god” in heaven?

Is there a created angel called the “Mighty God” in heaven?

Look at the following scriptures while considering your answers to the above:

(Jer 32:18 [KJV])

Thou shewest lovingkindness unto thousands, and recompensest the iniquity of the fathers into the bosom of their children after them: the Great, **the Mighty God**, the **LORD of hosts**, is his name (**The NWT changed Mighty God to Mighty One. IMPORTANT NOTE: THE NWT TRANSLATED THE LORD OF HOSTS TO THE JEHOVAH OF ARMIES**)

(Isa 10:20-21 [KJV])

And it shall come to pass in that day, that the remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall no more again stay upon him that smote them; but shall stay upon the LORD, the Holy One of Israel, in truth. 21 The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, **unto the mighty God**. (The NWT translated correctly using Mighty God)

(Isa 9:6 [KJV])

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, **The mighty God**, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. (The NWT translated correctly using Mighty God)

The same two words “Mighty God” appear the same way in every instance (IN Hebrew) in the **above three scripture references** (Jer 32:18, Isa 9:6 and Isa 10:20-21). **Why would the Watchtower choose to call Him the Mighty One and not leave it as the Mighty God in Jer 32:18?** (note: kjv was consistent with the translations whereas the NWT was not)

Hebrew for **Mighty** used in all three instances.

H1368 גִּבּוֹר gibbowr (ghib-bore') adj.

גִּבּוֹר gibbor (ghib-bore') [shortened]

1. powerful.
2. (by implication) a warrior, tyrant.

Hebrew for **God** used in all three instances.

H410 אֱלֹהִים 'el (ale) n-m.

1. firm strength, sturdiness.
2. (figuratively) a firm grip (of the hand).
3. (as adjective) sturdy (as indomitable, supreme durability).
4. (an abbreviated spelling, but especially) God, as the Superior or Indomitable Strength (but used also of any deity).

Here is the Answer to the last question: In case you do not know why the Watchtower translated “mighty one” in Jer 32:18 ; it is because He is also called the “**Lord of Host**”. Having the **Lord of Host** (Jehovah of Armies) in the same verse would mean that the Mighty God is Jehovah (which He is – because He is not an angel, he is God).

Read who the **Lord of Host** is and you will see what I mean:

(Ps 46:11 [KJV])

The **LORD of hosts** (NWT –Jehovah of Armies) is with us; **the God (Jehovah) of Jacob** is our refuge. Selah. (the NWT totally changed up and **removed the Lord of host** from this verse and called Him the Jehovah of Armies. But we can clearly see the Mighty God is indeed the Jehovah of armies; again, this means the mighty God is none other than Jehovah)

(Jer 19:15 [KJV])

Thus saith the **LORD of hosts, the God of Israel**; Behold, I will bring upon this city and upon all her towns all the evil that I have pronounced against it, because they have hardened their necks, that they might not hear my words.

CHANGES WITH THE NWT IS NOTHING NEW!

Before 1950 look what was done by the Watchtower to change the “I am” (God called himself the “I Am” in the old testament. In the new Testament Yeshua called himself by the same name, I Am – That is why they wanted to stone Him)

John 8:58 (before 1950 edition - NWT)

“Before Abraham was born, I am”

John 8:58 (1950 edition until now – NWT –change made to support doctrine)

“Before Abraham came into existence, I have been”

Take a look at this, https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_James_Version.

I am well aware of the history of the kjv bible. As I mentioned to you the KJV is based on the Textus Receptus (derived from the Latin Vulgate) which has a direct link (root) to the majority text from Sierra. The difference between the kjv and the JW NWT is that King James did not have a doctrine and then translated a book to support it. King James asked 47 scholars to translate the Bible into the language of the people (*his instruction to the scholars: King James gave the translators instructions intended to ensure that the new version would conform to the ecclesiology and reflect the episcopal structure of the Church of England and its belief in an ordained clergy*). On the other hand Russell/watchtower took the already translated bible and changed it to fit the doctrine of himself (Charles Russell, the mouthpiece of God) . As far as my research showed, there were no more than 12 men with no understanding of the ancient language that did this sinister work in a dark room located in New York City.

IMPORTANT FOR YOUR STUDY AND RESEARCH:

When doing research you should not take information from one source but from multiple. Also, each source should be independent of each other and there should be no association between them that relate to the topic at hand. Also, you must always be on the lookout for bias when checking any one source.

You did not answer this from a prior email.

(Heb 1:8 [KJV])

But unto the Son he (Jehovah) saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.

Why? **I note your translation calls Jehovah a throne. I would like to see if another translation does this too?**

I look forward to your response to my questions including the last one that you did not answer. Be blessed.

Peter

From: <email suppressed>
Sent: Friday, December 08, 2017 3:33 PM
To: Peter Clark
Subject: Research of Charles Taze Russell

Hello Peter,

I have been doing some research, I will like you to take a look at some of it, go to <http://www.pastor-russell.com/legacy/zwt15july06.html>.

The bibles that use a god at John 1:1, there are NTIV the New Testament in an Improved Version (1808) publ in London
John 1:1 a god. AT The Bible An American Translation (1935) J.M. Powis Smith, Edgar J. Goodspeed. MO A New
Translation of the Bible (1934) James Moffatt.

Take a look at this, https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_James_Version.

Thanks for email.