

President Rutherford Explains

7

IN JUSTICE to the president of the Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society we publish below a letter received from him in which he defends his action in refusing to accept many thousands of parts of the CONCORDANT VERSION which had been specially prepared, without notes, for sale to the members of the Society. There have been a variety of conjectures as to why this action was taken, hence this letter is very welcome.

WATCH TOWER BIBLE & TRACT SOCIETY
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE
124 COLUMBIA HEIGHTS, BROOKLYN, N.Y., U.S.A.

Nov. 25th, 1927.

The Concordant Publishing Concern,
2823 E. 6th Str., Los Angeles, Calif.

Dear Sirs:

A copy of a booklet issued by you has been received. On page 327 you speak of a grievance against the International Bible Students Association. As you well know the Society is a corporation. The notice was inserted in the WATCH TOWER by one who had no authority. The order was given by one who had no authority to order them. When I found that you were advocating universal salvation including the Devil himself, I took steps to see that our Society had nothing whatsoever to do with the distribution of the Concordant Version, and that was the first time it was called to my attention as to how the notice got in the WATCH TOWER.

In the service of the Redeemer,

J. F. RUTHERFORD.

Our answer is as follows:

Dear Sir:

I wish to thank you for your letter assuring me that the notice of the CONCORDANT VERSION in *The Watch Tower* of June 15, 1920 was inserted without authority. I am sorry that you find it necessary to offer an excuse which so sorely lacks the support of the facts, which are as follows:

A number of members of the Society who had seen the CONCORDANT VERSION were so pleased with it that they wrote to headquarters. I never approached the Society at all. They wrote to me on their official stationery, signed by a name recognized in *The Watch Tower*. One of the editors was sent to see me. I told him that I did not agree with some of the doctrines of the International Bible Students Association, and that this was to be distinctly understood, so that they could not repudiate any agreement on the ground of differences in

doctrine. To this he heartily agreed. I had assured myself of his identity by going to an International Bible Students Association conference and found that he was a recognized national leader. Because the regular edition contained my notes, it was agreed that I print a special edition for your use, without any notes whatever.

In *The Watch Tower* I found this notice: "This Journal is published under the supervision of an Editorial Committee, at least three of whom must have read and have approved as Truth each and every article appearing in these columns. The names of the Editorial Committee now serving are: W. E. VAN AMBURGH, J. F. RUTHERFORD, H. C. ROCKWELL, F. H. ROBISON, R. H. HIRCH."

I know of no other publication which is so thoroughly safeguarded against unofficial announcements. This is more than sufficient evidence that the commendation of the Version was not inserted by one who had no right to do so, but was backed by the authority of the leaders and published as the official voice of the Society. You asked me if I had a written contract. The endorsement of the Society was a *printed* contract, not only with me but with your members, and *it was my bounden duty to do my part in fulfilling it*. You sold about two thousand parts and paid for them with checks signed by your treasurer. He certainly had authority, for the checks were all honored.

Then, notwithstanding the verbal agreement, which is just as binding on saints as a written document, notwithstanding the printed advertisement guaranteed by your editorial committee, and after you had sold and paid for thousands of copies, without a moment's warning you repudiated your word and your public announcement *on grounds which it was expressly agreed should not affect our business relations on any account*.

You are forced to use versions made by men who do not fully agree with your doctrinal position. There are no others. The CONCORDANT VERSION is the only one which has a practical plan to exclude the private opinion of the translator. No one who renders each Greek word consistently *can* introduce his own ideas, as is done in the Emphatic Diaglott on almost every opening. Without special examination, I have noticed the same Greek word translated four different ways on a single page. *Your reason for rejecting the CONCORDANT VERSION is the very one which should force you to accept it*. It alone, of all versions, has an elaborate plan which makes a deliberate effort to exclude private interpretation, and it alone will provide its readers with the evidence to test each rendering.

I believe that God "through the Son of His love" will "reconcile all things for Him, having made peace by means of the blood of His cross, whether the things on the earth, or the

things in the heavens" (Col. 1:20, Emphatic Diaglott). You do not believe this. I do. This is my crime.

Your own friends here who knew about your course did what they could to get you to right the wrong. They arranged a meeting at which I asked you to make some announcement in *The Watch Tower*. You refused to give any reason for your action or to do anything, because I had no written contract. Being a lawyer, you knew better than I that we had much more than that. I confess that such an attitude from one in your position, under the circumstances, was exceedingly painful to me. I suppose men of the world will go back on their word under the plea of a written contract, but I hoped that you were actuated by superior principles.

I am sorry to see that your letter shows the same spirit. You say the Society is a corporation. I have heard of soulless corporations which descended to anything legal to gain their ends, even repudiating the acts of their employees. Surely you do not voluntarily class your Society among these! Your friends, of course, are responsible with you, but I do not hold it against them, because everyone of them who hears of it is shocked by your attitude.

Lastly, the "Popular" versions, specially prepared for you, had absolutely no indication of our teaching whatever. The Emphatic Diaglott, which you publish, has very much to indicate the bias of the author in its text and notes, yet Pastor Russell contented himself with calling attention to such differences.

I need say no more. You do not seek to justify your action, but prefer to introduce legal technicalities, such as "a written contract" and "a corporation". Does not this convince you, as it does all others, that all is not right in the sight of God?

Yours in the Lord,

A. E. KNOX.