

[July 31, 2011 - Introductory Note: The following was originally referenced and in parts discussed on an earlier version of the Elihu Books Chat from January-May, 2007, with a more formal version titled, “Response to Dr. James White’s Blog, Part One: Introducing the Issues,” appearing in May, 2007, on an earlier version of the Elihu Books web site Blog. However, since then the Elihu Books Blog hosting has changed, and so the above link is no longer active. Therefore, now that I have re-presented Part Two of this 2007 Blog series between me and Dr. White (see below), and since Dr. White’s original Blogs involved with this 2007 series are still available online (see references below), I am re-presenting Part One as a PDF copy to which I have made some stylistic and editorial changes, but without any change to any conclusion or to any of the critical substance of any of my arguments. I have also added some reference dates, such as the dates of the referenced aomin.org Blogs written by Dr. White in association with this discussion, and I have added page headers and page numbers to make easier any citing or referencing of any part of what follows. This “Part One” was directly associated with what was also posted on the earlier 2007 Elihu Chat and then on the earlier Elihu Books Blog, namely, “Response to Dr. James White, Part Two: ‘He Saw His Glory, and He Spoke About Him.’” Both Parts One and Two are now listed on the Elihu Books Topical Index which can be accessed through this link: http://www.elihubooks.com/content/topical_index.php. From the top of the Topical Index, simply scroll down and look under “**D**, Debates: Article: James White,” “**G**, Greg Stafford: Re: 2007 James White Blog Series,” and “**J**, James White: Stafford’s 2007 Blog Response.” Further, some of this material is based on my 2000 discussion of similar issues in my Second Edition of *Jehovah’s Witnesses Defended*, as well as from my 2003 Tampa, Florida debate with Dr. White as you will see upon reading through what follows. Finally, see the new Elihu Books Blog, “Watching the Ministry” (<http://elihubooks.blogspot.com>) and the article dated August 1, 2011, “Dr. James White and the Assumptions of Trinitarianism Revisited,” for more on both Parts One and Two, as well as for additional, related comments and references to the balance of the substance of the discussion intended to be a part of this 2007 Blog series.]

Response to Dr. James White Part One: Introducing the Issues

(With an Addendum Containing Original, Related 2007 Elihu Chat Posts)

by

Greg Stafford
(January-May, 2007)

In this Part One response to a recent Blog series by Dr. James White, I am going to spend a little time introducing the issues. The reason for this is because precision and accuracy are essential when trying to find the truth. We all want the truth. Most of us believe we have the truth. But not everyone is committed to finding the truth, as it can involve a change or even a dramatic shift in a person’s position and/or life. Indeed, finding the truth

Response to Dr. James White

is hard work, after all. But sometimes issues need closer attention before the truth can be clearly seen. Sometimes difficult or obscure issues need a proper introduction.

One of my web sites, Elihu Books (www.elihubooks.com), has an “Interactive Chat” page where questions can be posted, approved, and then discussed. On March 28 and on April 1, 2007, I received two inquires about the status of audio links on the Elihu Books web site for my 2003 debate with Dr. James White. Those links are currently down due to recent and ongoing changes to the Elihu Books site, but the debate itself has been produced and made available on DVD and through other media by Elihu Books and by Alpha and Omega Ministries (Dr. White’s organization [www.aomin.org]).

I replied to these two inquires on the Elihu Chat regarding the audio links on April 10, 2007. I explained that the Elihu site was undergoing revision and I also stated that if the two people who had inquired about the audio debate links did not have the DVD for it then they should get it and that if they could not afford it then I would send copies to them for free. About this same time, Dr. White began posting a series of entries on his Blog concerning selections from our 2003 debate, the very debate being discussed at that time on the Elihu Chat.

In particular, Dr. White chose to focus on two issues raised by him during his cross-examination of me during our 2003 debate, namely: 1) the “glory” ‘seen’ by Isaiah according to John in John 12:41, and 2) whether or not it was impossible for God to become a man, in the light of the Greek participle *labon* in Philippians 2:7. Dr. White also posted comments related to his Blog series on these two topics that interacted with some brief responses I had made on my Chat, responses I made in reply to some of his first remarks concerning John 12:41. In this related Blog post, Dr. White wrote about some issues concerning the possibility of debating me again, in the future. White also then remarked on certain recent interactions between us and between some of our associates.

It is one thing for someone, especially a seasoned scholar like Dr. White, to criticize someone’s argument, or to take issue with it and to then present reasons for believing something different: You cite the argument; you make sure you represent it well; and then you explain why you believe the reasons given in support of it are wrong and/or why there is another belief, with better reasons, to prefer. Dr. White did not choose this path in his Blog in his response to me or concerning me, as it relates to the subject issues described above and further below.

In Dr. White’s 2007 Blog series White misrepresents my arguments and my interests on several important levels. In his 2007 Blogs on these issues, White also deceptively describes then-recent events surrounding our possibly debating again in the future (see aomin.org’s Blog articles, “Greg Stafford on ‘False Doctrine,’” for January 17, 2007; “A Brief Response to Stafford,” for January 19, 2007; “Rolling Eyes, Shaking Head in Disbelief,” for January 20, 2007; and White’s “A Test for Your Listening Skills,” Parts I, II, and III, dated April 10, 11, and 12, 2007, respectively).

Part One: Introducing the Issues

Indeed, so pervasive are the errors and mistakes that White makes in his Blog articles (referenced above) that the method of response demanded here is a near complete citation of his Parts II and III, as well as his related post “Greg Stafford Attempts to Reply,” and then for me to provide an analysis of his claims and then leave it for each reader to decide what went wrong with Dr. White. While that task may not prove practical in these ways here, I will provide a sufficient preliminary assessment of the issues followed by further evaluations of the same and related items.

However, here I must admit that I am at a loss when it comes to trying figure out how Dr. White could have so badly missed the points made in direct debate with him in 2003, and in direct and indirect emails with him more recently, and as stated in my published writings on the subjects, all three of which could have (and should have) been carefully reviewed and studied before writing anything further about them. Yet, to be charitable to Dr. White, I am forced to believe he did not carefully review any of the aforementioned, for if he did then he has more to answer for than simple lack of awareness over what was plainly stated to him during the debate, in my published writings, and in more recent direct and indirect emails, as well as on the Elihu Chat.

Keeping the above in mind, I here introduce more formally the three issues that formed the balance of this Blog series in response to Dr. White’s Blog series earlier in 2007:

Issue #1: The “glory” seen and the things ‘spoken about’ by Isaiah, according to John: In his Blog post, “A Test for Your Listening Skills,” April 10, 2007, Dr. White presents a video clip from our 2003, Tampa, Florida, debate when he asked me questions about John 12:41/Isaiah 6 and about the Greek word *labon* used in Philippians 2:7. On his Blog, White asks his viewers to “make note of the two main questions addressed in this exchange, and the answers provided by Stafford,” and to “assign a relative ‘strength’ to Stafford’s response.” But what was it that Dr. White thought so worthy of such an exercise concerning his questions and my answers regarding John 12:41 and Isaiah 6 from our 2003 debate?

In his “Part II” of his Blog series, Dr. White claims he was “a bit surprised at Stafford’s response to the initial question, because it indicated to [him] that if [Stafford] had in fact read [White’s] book, [then Stafford] had not read the endnotes.” White also suggests another possibility, namely, that perhaps “[Stafford] had no response to that material, because,” according to White, “[Stafford] was unable to interact meaningfully with the point.” White then quotes his discussion of this subject from pages 136-138 of his book *The Forgotten Trinity* (1998) on his Blog, in its entirety (except for the very last paragraph), including the endnotes 7, 8, and 9.

It is my contention, and in my “Response to Dr. James White, Part Two: ‘He Saw His Glory, and He Spoke About Him’” I will show even more clearly, that not only did I respond to Dr. White’s questions on this subject in our 2003 debate, but that I also did so in my Second Edition (2002) of *Jehovah’s Witnesses Defended* (hereafter, JWD2), which Dr. White had read prior to our 2003 debate, even though his questions to me suggest he was deliberately ignoring what I wrote in JWD2 during our 2003 debate. This is clear

Response to Dr. James White

from the fact that *Dr. White himself* alludes to the essence of my arguments made in direct response to his questions and, in fact, in response also to his endnotes in *The Forgotten Trinity!* Yet, White prefaces his presentation of my arguments by saying that I “had no response” to his book’s endnotes, and that I “was unable to interact meaningfully with the point” he raised during our 2003 debate. So I am compelled to ask, which is it, Dr. White? Do I have a response with which you simply do not agree, or did I have “no response” at all, as you claim? Clearly, it is the former though White deceives his viewers (and, apparently, himself) into somehow believing the latter.

From what I have observed, Dr. White often downplays his opponents’ arguments at times (as here) even making it seem as if they have no credible arguments or positions, when in fact they not only often do have credible arguments but White usually shows an awareness of them as he proceeds to either unfairly downplay their significance or by his presentation of only a watered-down version of them for use in his subsequent attacks (the proverbial “straw man” approach). This tactic serves Dr. White by making it seem as if the arguments or answers given to in response to White’s arguments are so pathetic that, even though White will quote and attempt to refute them, for all practical purposes they are non-existent so why bother further with taking them seriously. This is White’s way of insulating himself and others from the strength of his opponents’ arguments and the answers given to his own arguments, that is, by first effectively ignoring and thereby reducing to the level of nothing the salient points of his opponents.

In my “Response to Dr. James White, Part Two: ‘He Saw His Glory, and He Spoke About Him,’” I will summarize each and every single argument White presents on pages 136-138 of his book, *The Forgotten Trinity* (especially his endnotes) and then I will present my arguments against his views as found in my JWD2. I will also present a transcription of the entire exchange on this subject of John Chapter 12 and Isaiah Chapters 6, 52/53 from our 2003 debate, which I believe will clearly show that Dr. White has completely ignored or otherwise failed to recognize and/or appreciate fully my arguments and how they, in fact, defeat his doctrinal positions concerning these texts.

Further, I intend in my “Part Two” to also clearly show how Dr. White has, in fact, recently distorted the issues concerning John 12:41 with respect to my arguments from JWD2 and from our 2003 debate, and that White has also misrepresented my arguments from my (2007) Elihu Books Chat in relation to these same and other issues, all of which has kept White and those who follow him from addressing the main point of contention which White was able to dodge during the 2003 debate cross-examination because he was the one asking the questions rather than me at the time when this particular issue came up, that is, when I questioned him as a part of the reasons for my belief concerning the “glory” seen by Isaiah according to John in response to one of White’s questions about this very same subject.

Issue #2: The second issue from our 2003 debate that forms the basis for Dr. White’s Blog series “exercise” involves the meaning of the Greek participle *labon* in Philippians 2:7. In his Part III White claims that his purpose in questioning me about this text during our debate was “to expose, through the exegesis of the text, the presuppositional nature of

Part One: Introducing the Issues

unitarianism in Stafford's position." White's extended remarks on this matter of his intent in questioning me during our 2003 debate are worth repeating here:

It is vital, in examining the argumentation of Jehovah's Witnesses, Oneness Pentecostals, and Muslims, to recognize the presuppositional nature of their commitment to unitarianism. They rarely defend it, they simply assume it. Here Stafford admits that it is a starting place in his theology that if one is God, *one cannot be man*. He begins by precluding the possibility of the Incarnation, seen in Philippians 2:5-11 or John 1:14. If you begin with your conclusion, you will always be arguing in circles, and this becomes the operative factor in his interpretational methodology. Though Stafford is far more polished in his presentation than your regular Witness, or Oneness Pentecostal, or Muslim, take the time to examine their materials: you will find the exact same foundational assumption. Paul could not actually be saying Jesus became a servant, *because that just isn't possible*. [Dr. James White, "A Test for Your Listening Skills – Part III," from aamin.org's Blog for April 12, 2007.]

So according to White, I "simply assume" my belief that "if one is God, one cannot be man." But that is a complete misrepresentation of what I gave in response to White during our 2003 debate! In fact, I believe the very texts White cites (John 1:14 and Philippians 2:5-11) show or teach us that such an event is not possible *because of what they teach*, not in spite of their teaching, as White claims! I do not assume any such things before having the reasons to do so and, therefore, if I do assume anything it is only for the sake of convenience in a discussion or in a debate at a particular point, as is often the case (no one continuously reargues the same points already established, unless it is necessary at another point to do so, also).

In Part Three of my Blog series in response to White, I will provide a complete transcription of this part of our debate and you will see, clearly, that I did not assume anything apart from having good reasons and, in fact, I tied my response to White to several different kinds of evidence. White, on the other hand, is without question assuming his belief in both his question and in his answer, without any good, non-anachronistic reasons, as is the "eminent Greek scholar" on whom White relies for support of his assumed belief, namely, Daniel B. Wallace. I will consider these matters further in my Part Three.

Issue #3: Debating and communicating with Dr. White: Anyone who has followed the Elihu Books Chat over the past few months [back in 2006/2007] knows that I have made myself available to debate Dr. James White and Dr. Robert Morey pretty much anytime and almost any place. Indeed, as I will make clear in Part Four of this series of Blog articles in response to Dr. White's recent Blog series, I really had no interest at all in debating White at the present time, nor since our 2003 debate which, based on its content and outcome, I am quite happy to let be our first and last formal debate.

However, just after Dr. Morey recently challenged me to a debate on Pastor Gene Cook's The Narrow Mind [this occurred back on September 27, 2006 (see the Elihu Books Topical Index, "A, Audio: September 27, 2006")], Dr. White approached me through a member of his "Team Apologist," Jeff Downs, offering to debate me on issues having to

Response to Dr. James White

do with “God's eternal decree and predestination.” The complete text of Mr. Downs’ October 7, 2006, 3:15:51 CDT email is as follows:

From: Jeff Downs jeff@rctr.org
Date: 2006/10/07 Sat PM 03:15:51 CDT
To: Greg Stafford gregstafford@verizon.net
Subject: Debate Topics

James White would be interested in debating these issues with you:

Defending God's eternal decree and predestination

As you probably know, James would be coming from a reformational perspective. Also, again, the debate, if I have involvement, would have to take place in Pennsylvania, since this is where I live.

Let me know your thoughts.

Jeff Downs

PS. Frankly, I'd rather you see debate James on these issues, but I know you have committed to Morey as well. I have doubts that you debates with Morey will take place, but I could certainly be wrong. Those plans might be moving right along and I don't even know it.

Notice there is no email address provided for Dr. White in Mr. Down’s above email. Therefore, after receiving it I went to Dr. White’s site (www.aomin.org) and there I found the email address mail@aomin.org. I then sent an email reply to both Mr. Downs and to mail@aoming.org and in it I wrote, in part:

From: Greg Stafford gregstafford@verizon.net
Date: 2006/10/07 Sat PM 06:13:27 PDT
To: Jeff Downs jeff@rctr.org
CC: mail@aomin.org
Subject: Re: Debate Topics

(Note: I am sending this to AOMIN's mail email, as it is the only email I have for James. If you have a better one, Jeff, please either share it with me or forward this to Dr. White.)

I will debate Dr. White, or anyone else, on these subjects. However, I was challenged to a debate by Dr. Robert Morey. My post was preparatory to that debate, as I promised him. I am not sure why you, Jeff, are jumping around trying to find new debate partners all of a sudden, in Pennsylvania of all places, when I have a debate just recently accepted.

I have committed to debate Dr. Morey. I will also commit to debate Dr. White, if he would like to open up that dialogue and work on a time, place, and format.

...

James, if you would like to work something up in the way of a debate in the California/Arizona areas, I think I can make myself available at pretty much any time. Obviously, a radio show would be the best option for anything in the next 3-4 months, again unless it's in California or possibly Arizona. Then I can do one as we did before. Otherwise, traveling to Pennsylvania will take some planning,

Part One: Introducing the Issues

more along the lines of 6-8 months, and that kind of travel would have to be considered with my family first before committing, here.

...

James, no rush in getting back to me. Consider the possibilities, and if something along the lines of what I have suggested can be arranged, just let me know what is possible and when. I will then get back to you promptly and we can surely make it happen, before or after the Morey debate. Until then, I will resume my interest in Morey and remain content with the knowledge that you are interested in a debate on these same subjects, at a time and a place yet to be determined.

Thank you both.

Greg

This was turned into the following by Dr. White in his Blog, "Greg Stafford Attempts to Reply," April 11, 2007:

I will never cease to find it amusing whenever anyone accuses me of being afraid to debate someone, especially when it is someone I've already debated! Stafford is now sounding like Sungenis, for example. Stafford's behavior a few months ago left a very bad taste in my mouth, to be sure. Further, when the idea was first raised, Stafford believed it a ruse to draw him away from a debate with Morey that, to my knowledge anyway, has not taken place. But more to the point, Greg Stafford does not determine the Lord's direction for my areas of study. I have nothing to prove to someone such as Mr. Stafford, and I do not make decisions on what is worthwhile as far as the investment necessary to produce an edifying, useful debate on the basis of school-yard taunts.

Again, I was not the one who approached White. I know I already debated White, and as I wrote previously I am quite happy to let our first debate stand throughout history without further comment unless I choose to speak to similar issues or related issues, as in this Blog series. But Dr. White has kept talking about the 2003 debate since the debate and he is the one who approached me through Mr. Downs in October, 2006. I have been trying to help Dr. Robert Morey stand behind his challenge to debate me on the same topics proposed by White since that time, only now Dr. Morey has vanished from the matter at hand. Indeed, in my Part Four in response to White's Blog series I will have more to say about Morey and about his communications with me concerning a debate over similar issues.

However, the "bad taste" to which White refers in the above quoted paragraph from his April 11, 2007, Blog has to do directly with White's false testimony concerning the use of mail@aomin.org as an email available on his web site. There never has been an apology by Dr. White for his false testimony or for his malicious attack on me for using a one-time-current email address listed on his site, which was removed without announcement or apology to me after my use of it and after White's malicious attack on me claiming it was not a valid email address.

Indeed, whether mail@aomin.org was an email White ever used actively does not explain why, after making his accusation against me, the very same email address mysteriously disappeared from White's site, which mysterious removal was confirmed through cached

Response to Dr. James White

copies of White's web site's pages, nor does it explain why the person who obviously removed it from White's site after the issue of my use of it came up did not, apparently, simply tell White that the email I used was, in fact, on the site at that time. Instead, White's own staff allowed White's false testimony to stand, waiting until cached copies of his site's pages were brought forth to contradict White's claims and to show that I had, in fact, used a then-listed email address from White's aomin.org web site. Yet, after all this, it is White who claims to be 'left with a bad taste' in his mouth!

Therefore, I have re-introduced these issues here because they are part of White's previously false and still available (on his Blog) depiction of my behavior concerning our proposed second debate, one which never did take place, and also so the truth about both debates can be better known or understood since White's 2007 Blog series. Also, I am introducing part of the evidence here because there is so much more to reveal from other emails and from our respective Blog and Chat posts to show what really happened. A good portion of this material as it relates to what was presented on an earlier version of the Elihu Books Chat is given in the Addendum to this newer version of my Part One in response to Dr. White.

In concluding the main text of my re-introduction to some of the issues involved in my 2006/2007 Blog and email discussions with Dr. White and with some of his staff, it seems to me that all we get from White nowadays are challenges to debate that, if accepted, are rescinded or thrown into the undeterminable future of debates he has with others, so much so that we could not even set a date to debate again two years in advance! When I indicated as much, Dr. White criticized me for saying something I have never said but which White continues (on his Blog) to claim I kept saying, namely, as White had me say since I never did actually say these words, "White is afraid of me" (White's Blog "Greg Stafford Attempts to Reply," April 11, 2007). Clearly, White's days of debating in have made him spiritually (or otherwise) "punch drunk" to the point where he communicates with himself and with others as if those whom he has debated are actually a part of the conversation, when they are not.

But White did not stop there. White continued as follows in his same April 11, 2007, "Greg Stafford Attempts to Reply" Blog:

I am more than happy to allow those not trapped in a cult (and those who are) to view the debate and check the assertions of both sides. Unlike Mr. Stafford, I have no need to blow my horn and proclaim victory, etc. I will leave him to join many of my other former opponents in that game.

Well, when White actually finds the time to show me where I ever "blow my horn and proclaim victory" I would sure like to see it! Indeed, if Dr. White had ever bothered to view my post-debate interview on the Elihu DVD he would have noted the following question and my answer at which contradicts his further false depiction of my disposition. What follows here is my transcription of the post-debate interview as presented on the Elihu Books DVD for the 2003 Tampa, Florida debate, "Jesus Christ: God or a god? a debate between Greg Stafford & Dr. James White" (available on the listings of items

Part One: Introducing the Issues

given here, http://www.elihubooks.com/content/books_media.php), where the time on the Elihu DVD runs from 2:08 to 2:23 in minutes and sections into the interview:

Question: So with respect to this debate, do you think you won?

Answer: Well, you know ... it's ... I can't ...
(Stafford) without Dr. White here, of course, I don't like to comment on what I think is ... or "who won?"

After this, I went on to discuss 'winning' a debate in ways other than when it comes to identifying one person as "the winner." So, once again, White has invented for me a disposition which does not match my own, revealed in fact in or in association with the debate which is (by White's design) the very subject of his unfair and, in fact, downright wrong depiction of my expressed disposition concerning our 2003 debate.

In the future, a full transcription of my debates with White, Bowman, and Morey will be made available online and in print for all to further consider, that is, in addition to the visual and audio presentation of the same events. But in transcribed form the debates will be citable in ways which I hope will make for easier and more effective comparisons and evaluations of the presented reasons for our respective beliefs.

As for what White has written on his Blog since our 2003 debate and as it relates to our 2006/2007 Blog, email, and Elihu Chat-related posts and discussions, White appears to me to be quite clearly making things up to suit his own ends in some meaningfully measurable manner as he has, in fact, done before when and where involves or in some way has to do with openly attempting to fit his Trinitarian theology with what we are taught in the biblical and even in other related, historical and other writings about the "one God," "Jah," and those others have existed with him since before the beginning of humankind.—Genesis 1:1; Job 38:7; John 1:1; 1 Corinthians 8:6; Revelation 19:1-6.

Now that we have here in Part One a clear introduction to some of the issues before us as they relate to the 2003 debate, let us follow Dr. White's advice and "view the debate and check the assertions of both sides." Let us then see if what we all saw, heard, or read matches how White has presented it to us. In furtherance of this and after reviewing the Addendum below, please consider my "Response to Dr. James White, Part Two: 'He Saw His Glory, and He Spoke About Him.'"

ADDENDUM TO PART ONE ELIHU ONLINE CHAT POSTS FROM JANUARY 15, 2007

The posts below are from an earlier version of the Elihu Books Online Chat. Discussions in the earlier Elihu Chats involved multiple parts, parts which at times took the discussion

Response to Dr. James White

beyond the intended 'chatting' limits of the forum. Further, at times these multi-part replies were posted in *reverse order*, due to the viewing or posting system of the earlier Chat(s).

As a result of this, some reordering of the post #s, but not to any of the substance or to any of the text of any of the material (meaning, no text has been added to or taken from any of the Chat posts which are listed below), the following posts have been put in order of how they should be read straight through, as listed from first to last here, rather than according to the post #s listed in each post.

This means also that you must not follow the top-left corner post numbers in your reading, though you can cite the post #(s) for any use by or for reference, since the post #s in each post are correctly given; they have been correctly reorganized to be read in the order of their multiple parts, rather than according to each post's post #.

#391 | 2007-01-15 21:08:59 | Greg Stafford

You know, sometimes I hear things. No, not those kinds of things. But things from the mouths, or pens, or as they appear on the blogs and web sites of others. Take Dr. James White, for example.

A debate with him over the merits of Calvinism, a system of belief that has no business being associated with the name "Christian," let alone "Jesus Christ," appears unavoidable. That's a good thing. But until that happens, Dr. White can talk all he wants on his blog. He can post here, or there, or anywhere, if he chooses. But until he takes the stage with me, or until he gets on the radio to defend his traditions, he's just talking to himself, or only to those who already think as he does. Frankly, though he's talking, he's not really saying much of anything.

As I told you months ago, Dr. White, and as I have offered to your friends at "The Bible Answer Man," and through others, by all means let us bring our differences out in the open, as we did with the Trinity. If you are so confident in your beliefs about the knowledge of God and the will of man, then surely you can pull some strings, somewhere, and talk to me, not just to yourself on your blog, or elsewhere only to those who think like you.

I respect you as a person, James, and I admire your accomplishments. But you are teaching false doctrine, still, and so I cannot allow you to hide behind the shallow, in fact, hollow words of "amazing forms of argumentation," "lengths to which he [me] will go," and the like. There's nothing of substance there, and you know it. Yet you say it anyway, and so where does that leave us? The same place it always leads. So let's hurry up and get there.

Greg

#397 | 2007-01-18 15:38:04 | Greg Stafford

JAMES WHITE'S January 17, 2007 BLOG, PART 1:

Part One: Introducing the Issues

Well, I'm no longer hearing things. I'm seeing them firsthand for myself. But it's not getting any better.

James White continues to comment about things I have said but what he says is not making much sense and because some of what he says is simply wrong in ways that will confuse and mislead others about our involvement, I am compelled to use this Chat to once again respond.

Before reading what I have to say here, I suggest those interested read his latest remarks, first. Simply go to his web site, aomin.org, and scroll down to his 1-17-2007 Blog entry, "Greg Stafford on 'False Doctrine,'" which is in response to what I wrote in msg# 391, below. What I wrote in msg #391 was itself a response to another recent Blog entry by White, wherein he made baseless comments about Part Three of my "The Knowledge of God and the Will of Man," currently on IN MEDIO. White did not like my calling him to account for what he said so he offered additional comment in the aforementioned Blog entry.

In traditional James White fashion he attempts to minimize the significance of his original mistakes so that any response given to them is, by association, minimized. James, I don't care if you write one sentence, or two, one paragraph, or ten, if what you write is false, misleading, or represents an attempt by you to take a cheap shot (= negative comments by you directed at what I write but without any examples or other credible support) at what I write, then it's important to me.

I am not on any "campaign" against "Reformed theology." I oppose all false doctrine associated with Jehovah and Jesus Christ, whether it be yours, the Watchtower Society's, or my own. Truth is all that matters, James, and so where you teach false doctrine on the issues of God's sovereignty, his name, his identity, or his Son, as a Christian I am compelled to speak out against what you say.

No, Witnesses have not "denied Yahweh's exhaustive divine foreknowledge for a long time." That is itself a misrepresentation, a false teaching of yours. We teach what the Bible teaches, not what you teach, and not what John Calvin taught. I am prepared to show that you, and Calvin, as far as the divine foreknowledge of God is concerned, have nothing to do with the biblical teaching on this subject. You use the Bible, but you do not teach what it teaches. I have presented some of my biblical beliefs in the aforementioned series, and you have done nothing, yet, to show that I am in error. When you do, I will consider what you say in the light of the Bible. Until then, you have said nothing but what we already know: you do not agree with me.

#396 | 2007-01-18 15:36:33 | Greg Stafford

WHITE'S January 17, 2007 BLOG, PART 2:

Appealing to "Duane Magnani" of all people as precedent for exposing the Witnesses' understanding of God's foreknowledge is about as credible as referencing The Potter's Freedom! Neither Magnani nor you have done any damage to the Witnesses' presentation of the Bible's teaching on this subject. I do not even believe you did a very good job of refuting Geisler! Mostly you did the very things you accused him of, and you simply claimed passages as supportive of your view when they actually, absolutely refute it. I mean, you did say that John 6:37 "teaches 'extreme Calvinism'" (The Potter's Freedom [TPF], page 27), didn't you? That's about as credible as saying that "God" in 1 Corinthians 15:28 refers to the Trinity! They are two different subjects, but you commit the same type of exegetical mistake.

Response to Dr. James White

Of course, you "passionately" criticize Geisler for giving "barely one short paragraph" on John 6:37 (which is exactly what you gave my entire Part Three), comparing the extent of his commentary to "Calvinists [who] are known for writing entire books on short passages of Scripture, and preaching entire series of sermons on just a few verses" (TPF, page 27). But that's just the problem, James, you Calvinists get yourselves so far away from the text that you no longer recognize or remember what it said in the first place! That's what causes you and Morey, and others, to trampoline from "before the foundation of the world" to "from all eternity" (Morey) or as you expressed it in relation to Ephesians 1:4, "before the foundation of the world, before creation itself" (TPF, page 176).

I like it much better when you show confidence "that the Word is so clear, so plain, and so compelling, that the mere presentation of its truths is sufficient for the child of God" (TPF, page 29). Ever consider that Geisler may have felt the same way when he wrote what he wrote about John 6:37, James? Of course, this would not make for very good "entire series of sermons," would it? Either way, Geisler was on the right track in what he said about John 6:37, but not completely accurate. Rather than say that "'whoever' chooses to come will be saved (Rom. 10:13)," I would say that all whom the Father chooses will come to the Son, but only those who choose to "believe" by choosing to feed off of the life-giving, figurative "flesh" and "blood" of Christ will have "everlasting life" (John 6:47, 53-58, 65). Jesus will never 'drive away' such persons, but some choose of their own free will not to believe, even after being allowed by the Father to come to him (verse 66). Others, like Peter, choose to believe and stay with Jesus (verses 67-68).

#395 | 2007-01-18 15:34:43 | Greg Stafford

JAMES WHITE'S 1-17-2007 BLOG, PART 3:

Getting back to your 1-17-2007 Blog, I am not sure why you could not complement your "brief notation" with some measure of rebuttal, regardless of what is your primary focus at present. I did not say to Gene Cook and Dr. Morey, "Well, you know, we're supposed to be talking about the Trinity. I am not focused on the foreknowledge of God right now." Forgive me for asking, James, but surely you cannot be held to any less of an expectation than me, given the extent of your knowledge and accomplishments, can you?

Richard Rawe asked your ministry about debates on several topics, actually, from blood, to false prophecy, to the Trinity. I never asked him to specifically inquire of you, but of anyone who would be interested in hearing from or debating with one associated with Jehovah's Witnesses, namely, me. It was only after this whole thing got going with Morey that he moved on to a discussion with your people about the foreknowledge of God and Calvinism. I am not sure why this is confusing for you, or surprising, at all.

I am also not sure why you keep characterizing my radio discussion with Dr. Morey as a "debate." I do not characterize it that way, though it was an unplanned debate of sorts, that's for sure. But no one is claiming that it was some kind of structured debate. That is, in fact, what we're trying to schedule! It is for just that event that the IN MEDIO series on "The Knowledge of God and the Will of Man" has been prepared! Again, I suspect you are minimizing again, trying to take something bad (Morey's appearance on the show) and make it look not so bad by questioning whether it was something that it was not, as if that's what people say that it was, when no one is!

Part One: Introducing the Issues

#394 | 2007-01-18 15:32:56 | Greg Stafford

JAMES' 1-17-2007 BLOG, PART 4:

Then there's your ongoing reaction to my "passionate denunciations of Reformed theology." Please, James, don't overreact on purpose so that you can minimize, again. Reformed theology is false, just like the Trinity is false, just like your use of "LORD" or even "Yahweh" for the name of the God of the Hebrew Bible is false. So don't single out my "passion" against any one false teaching, as if my passion is somehow extremely or excitedly connected with one and not the others. Believe me; I am just as passionate about disassociating one false teaching from the Bible as I am the rest of them, even if I find that one of my own teachings is false.

Your assessment of the Downs-Stafford-White-Rawe communications misses one salient fact: My email to you and to Mr. Downs dated October 7, 2006. I will cite the to-and-from text and then the relevant part of the email:

BEGIN QUOTE OF 10-07-2006 EMAIL>>>

From Greg Stafford <greustafford@verizon.net>
Date 2006/10/07 Sat PM 06:13:27 PDT
To Jeff Downs <jeff@rctr.org>
CC mail@aomin.org
Subject Re: Debate Topics

Jeff and James:

(Note: I am sending this to AOMIN's mail email, as it is the only email I have for James. If you have a better one, Jeff, please either share it with me or forward this to Dr. White.)

...

James, if you would like to work something up in the way of a debate in the California/Arizona areas, I think I can make myself available at pretty much any time. Obviously, a radio show would be the best option for anything in the next 3-4 months, again unless it's in California or possibly Arizona. Then I can do one as we did before. Otherwise, traveling to Pennsylvania will take some planning, more along the lines of 6-8 months, and that kind of travel would have to be considered with my family first before committing, here.

On a related note, since I have become active again in these areas in February of this year I actually sent Phil Fleishmann of the Bible Answer Man an open invitation to appear on that show to represent my and Jehovah's Witnesses' views with any member of their staff, or with you or with Robert M. Bowman, Jr., the two whom I referenced as having debated in the past. I have not heard back from him, but obviously I would be available for a show like that and I am in the Southern California area so I can be with you live or on the phone.

#393 | 2007-01-18 15:30:56 | Greg Stafford

JAMES WHITE'S January 17, 2007 BLOG, PART 5:

James, no rush in getting back to me. Consider the possibilities, and if something along the lines

Response to Dr. James White

of what I have suggested can be arranged, just let me know what is possible and when. I will then get back to you promptly and we can surely make it happen, before or after the Morey debate. Until then, I will resume my interest in Morey and remain content with the knowledge that you are interested in a debate on these same subjects, at a time and a place yet to be determined.

Thank you both.

Greg

END EMAIL QUOTE<<<

Thus, it was with absolute shock that I read on your 1-17-2007 Blog: "I told Rich Pierce that I would be waiting for Mr. Stafford's e-mail. Surely he has my address. I have never gotten any response." So much for you waiting for me, James. I have been patiently waiting for you for over three months now. By all means take your time, and address your priorities. Just don't misrepresent who's been waiting for whom.

As for being "outside [my] ... research on this one," James, my research involves the Bible. As long as you plan on debating what it teaches, I think I will be on the right side of my field of study. If you think that TPF is any match for Watchtower teaching on this subject, you are wrong. They may emphasize some of the wrongs things in this area, but they have consistently provided the biblical teaching regarding the knowledge of God and the will of man. You can call anything "odd" that you want, James, but an argument that does not make. The Bible's teachings here are clear. What remains to be made clearer is where you, and Reformed theologians like you, fail to adhere to the Bible. Jehovah's Witnesses should have been more active and open in exposing you and others who teach as you do, but we can change that.

As for who is the busier, I will put that up for debate itself, anytime! However, as I wrote to you in my October 7, 2006, email, I am not rushing you, and neither is Richard Rawe. I suppose he simply thought that someone who has "written, spoken, and debated, extensively," like you have on these subjects, would need little preparation. Frankly, James, we Witnesses have been trying to help those lost in Reformed theology for years, and we are quite prepared for all that you have done in your efforts to promote your views. You just need the Bible James, and nothing but the Bible. Again, whether you want to debate today, tomorrow, next week, or next year, please let me know.

The Bible's teachings will not change between now and then.

#392 | 2007-01-18 15:27:10 | Greg Stafford

JAMES WHITE'S 1-17-2007 BLOG, PART 6:

As for the kind of structured, live debate that you describe, I have some familiarity with it. I am not trying to suggest anything differently than what you here describe, for such a debate. But no one has so limited the proposed debate between us to that kind of production, which, again, I do support. So if you want to put the others types of debate on hold until you and I are able to put the right things in place, fine. Just don't think I am trying to do anything else. But that's not the only type of debate that has been presented, so please try to be sure you are not criticizing efforts to make less involved debates happen more quickly, when you talk about such things.

Take all the time you want, James. I applaud your preparation and your scholarly efforts, that is, when they actually are reflected in what you do. But if you are going to snipe at me from your

Part One: Introducing the Issues

Blog, then don't get so upset at me when I respond on my Chat, or elsewhere. If you want to criticize me now, then I'm probably going to respond now. If you want to wait until later to criticize me, then I will wait until later to respond to you. After all, you don't see me taking shots directly at you or TPF in my responses to Morey, do you?

I will continue to wait for you to respond to my October 7, 2006, email. You and your staff were gracious to me in arranging our last debate, so, our theological differences aside, I am sure when the time is right we can make things work on this subject, too, for the benefit of those listening. Until then, I wish you and your family well and may the words of Jehovah be remembered: Isaiah 30:1-2 (NWT)

"Woe to the stubborn sons," is the utterance of Jehovah, "[those disposed] to carry out counsel, but not that from me; and to pour out a libation, but not with my spirit, in order to add sin to sin; those who are setting out to go down to Egypt and who have not inquired of my own mouth, to take shelter in the stronghold of Phar' aoh and to take refuge in the shadow of Egypt!"

#400 | 2007-01-19 17:13:14 | Greg Stafford

James White's January 19, 2007, Blog, Part 1:

Here I will respond to White's items 1) - 5) from his January 19, 2007, Blog entitled "A Brief Response to Stafford." I will consider the rest of what he wrote later this evening.

James, on October 7, 2006, when I wrote that email to you and to Jeff Downs, I got the email address from your web site. If you have email addresses for your ministry on your site, but not an email of your own listed (at least not that I could find), then that's your problem. But your problems do not end there on this issue.

In his January 19, 2007, Blog James says,

QUOTE JAMES:

mail@aomin.org is not a valid e-mail address. Period. It has never been used by me, it is not my personal e-mail, or anything else. In fact, it has not been in use since, as far as we can tell, the late 90s, and then it was not my e-mail, but a generic e-mail. It is currently not even in use, and, would not have even gotten into an accessible, let alone read, e-mail box in October of 2006. END JAMES BLOG QUOTE.

Yet, according to the google archive, as of January 12th, 2007, this year, that email address was still listed on his website. You can see this, a dated archive, at <http://209.85.165.104/search?q=cache:8nrWhg2...o min.org/proschat.html+mail%40aomin.org&hl=en&gl=us&ct=clnk&cd=1>

#399 | 2007-01-19 17:10:49 | Greg Stafford

James White's 1-19-2007, Blog, Part 2:

You can see that the date recorded at the top is Jan 12, 2007 23:27:20 GMT.

Response to Dr. James White

What is also interesting is that said email address suddenly no longer exists on this page on James' site!

<http://www.aomin.org/proschat.html>

James, I think you've been caught fooling around with your web site at my expense. Either way, I clearly used the available email on your site when I wrote to you on October 7, 2006, and, yes, please respond to that and explain why your page has been so recently revised if, in your words, the email address in question "has not been in use since ... the late 90s." Things aren't adding up, my friend, and the email I sent never came back "undelivered," either.

How you can possibly think that an email exchange we had in 2003, around the time of our debate, even suggests that I would still have your address is beyond me. Sorry, James, but I have not done much where you're concerned since that debate, and I did not keep your email. What, do you honestly think I would send your ministry and email, using the only email I could find on your site, CC Jeff Downs, and in that same email note that I do not have any other email for your but the one listed, and that if Jeff had another one for you ask that he please send my email to that address, but not actually use an email from 2003 that you think I should still have?

I'm not sure why you think Richard Rawe would know whose email addresses I have, other than that you are relying on what Rich Pierce told you, which is fine. But what Rich Pierce told Richard Rawe is neither here nor there, James. Richard Rawe probably assumed I had the email address that was listed on your site (until [mysteriously] recently, that is).

I will get to the rest of James' 1-19-2007 Blog, and anything else James writes concerning this issue between now and then, later tonight.

Greg Stafford

#401 | 2007-01-19 21:27:01 | Greg Stafford

All,

Sorry for the bad google link below, showing that White's AOMIN site had the email address I used but that he claimed was not used since the 90s. Here is the correct google link:

<http://209.85.165.104/search?q=cache:8nrWhg2...>

Here is also one for MSN:

<http://cc.msnsnscache.com/cache.aspx?q=5124232...>

Greg

#404 | 2007-01-20 04:38:59 | Mark Davis  | Ranking 10 | I am a Witness Yes | Question Description The email was changed

Greg, you're absolutely right. The website archive.org has references of this website up to Sept. '05, and that does contain the email address.

http://web.archive.org/web/*/http://www.aomin.org/proschat.html

I haven't always agreed with Dr. White but I've always listened to his viewpoint with respect. To

Part One: Introducing the Issues

be honest, the implication of this sudden change on his website in relation to his discussion with you is somewhat shocking and disturbing. I hope he has a good explanation.

Regards,
Mark Davis.

#406 | 2007-01-20 07:31:49 | Greg Stafford

Response to item 6) of White's 1-19-07, Blog, "A Brief Response to Stafford," Part 1 (items 1-5 of his Blog are responded to in msg #s 399 and 400, [above]):

James, what you do not understand is I am not asking you to provide a 'multi-part article,' or a 'full discussion,' or even to spend a "great deal of time responding." You are magnifying the situation into something that it's not, again, just so you can minimize! This appears to be a favorite tactic of yours, but it only works if someone like me does not unwind your knotted version of events.

All that I asked of you was that you not offer a paragraph's worth of nothing. If you are going snipe at someone from your Blog, then you should at least have, as I said, one example of what you're talking about, especially when you say such things as "amazing forms of argumentation," "lengths to which he [me] will go," and the like, which you did say about my entire Part Three, or possibly even about the entire series. Either way, it was not an appropriate criticism and one certainly deserving of a response by me. You simply didn't like having even one worthless paragraph of yours exposed. Get a thicker skin, James.

#405 | 2007-01-20 07:21:15 | Greg Stafford

Response to White's 1-19-07, Blog, item 6), Part 2:

Writing one paragraph responding to a book's comment on one verse (Geisler) or one paragraph responding to an online article of about 18 pages (you) are hardly sufficient responses if the paragraphs do not contain any substantive argumentation or examples of what is being discussed. Now, while Geisler's paragraph did contain some argumentation, yours did not! So, you're right: they are not very comparable! But, as I pointed out, even in TPF you remark about the clarity of merely presenting the Word of God, but without giving Geisler that same opportunity. You missed the whole point of my remarks.

If you will actually read the email of October 7, 2006, James, you will know why I have not directly followed up with you, though Richard has with your ministry (!), namely:

QUOTE 10/7/2006 EMAIL TO AOMIN AND DOWNS:

James, no rush in getting back to me. Consider the possibilities, and if something along the lines of what I have suggested can be arranged, just let me know what is possible and when. I will then get back to you promptly and we can surely make it happen, before or after the Morey debate. Until then, I will resume my interest in Morey and remain content with the knowledge that you are interested in a debate on these same subjects, at a time and a place yet to be determined.

END.

Response to Dr. James White

Of course, we've since seen that the email for AOMIN I used was valid, did not return undelivered, and that you or someone on your staff removed the email from your site probably (we'll soon see as the pages on the google and MSN crawler's are refreshed) at the same time you tried to deny it was used since the 90s. Thus, there is an apparent attempt by you to deceive others at my expense, and to cover yourself about why you have failed to respond.

You can make all the excuses you want, James. You can revise your web site, you can claim you did not get this or know that, but you have no excuse any more. So, go ahead, spend all the time you want with Open Theists or anyone else you want. But when you want to talk about Jehovah God, the biblical teaching regarding his knowledge and purpose, his name and identity, or the free will of man, you know how to get in touch with me. You want an online debate? Fine, You want a radio discussion? Plan it. You want a formal, audience debate like we had before? All the better. But please stop trying to deceive others about emails, web sites, and about what I write.

Greg

#407 | 2007-01-20 08:47:22 | Greg Stafford

Mark,

Yes, it is disturbing. However, perhaps there is an explanation White can offer for it. We'll see...

Greg

#408 | 2007-01-20 11:39:36 | Greg Stafford

You know, I try to be a nice guy about someone (James White) misrepresenting me and acting as if I used an email address that he claimed they (AOMIN) did not use since the 90s, when in fact they have had that email on their site as recently as 1-14-07, only to have it removed (now admitted graciously by Mark Bainter of AOMIN) simultaneously with James' claim that I used an email address they have not used, again, since the 90s.

James, don't you get it? I sent an email on 10-7-06 to an address listed on your site. You claimed I used an email not used since the 90s. The email was on your site right up to the point of your accusation against me about using a defunct email, yet it is then removed without a word and without you, James, acknowledging that I used an email that was in fact on his site and available for use.

James, just keep 'shaking your head in disbelief.' Maybe some common sense will fall into place and you'll realize that you misspoke. You should simply admit that I sent an email to an address that was on your site (until just days ago, that is!), you did not get it, but you appreciate me bringing it to your attention now, and let's move on to what matters most. I would be happy if you could just follow Mark Bainter's lead and disposition.

If you can't do that, James, and if you continue to take cheap shots at me over something you caused, then you're only tainting any meaningful debate that might follow over subjects of importance. I can't help it if you did not know the emails on your own web site, and that your

Part One: Introducing the Issues

staff did not advise of its presence, even after they removed it. By acting the way you are, and trying to turn the tables on me, you're making yourself and your entire ministry look ridiculous, when I know you and them to be more than that.

Please, again, can you just acknowledge that you misstated what was true regarding the emails available for use on your site so we can plan for better things? If you do that, I'll gladly overlook the recent revisions that coincided with your attack on me, and we can be done with it.

Fair enough?

Greg

#409 | 2007-01-20 11:09:09 | Diane  | Ranking 10 | I am a Witness in heart condition

Having read what is written here, *and* having gone to White's website, I am not sure why the charge of dishonesty is bantied about from either gentleman.

It seems (to me) to either be a case of posturing for the simple sake of posturing, or setting the foundation for an adhominem argument pending future "debates".

Duelling blogs leads to a condition akin to tennis neck.

I have enjoyed the articles you have posted, and I look forward to reading JWD 3rd Edition when it is available. I hope your true Brothers share both my enjoyment and my anticipation of *your* insights as a true worthy JW scholar.

Kind regards, Diane

#410 | 2007-01-20 11:47:37 | Greg Stafford

Diane,

Thank you for your kind remarks.

I have not accused White of dishonesty. I am confused and somewhat concerned about his comments, and they potentially could (or could have) involved dishonesty, but I did not advance that conclusively. I merely expressed concern over his accusations and the revisions to his site that accompanied them.

In fact, I have been quite open to hearing an explanation from him about it. I am satisfied with Mr. Bainter's explanation, and I don't know why White had to eclipse it with his remarks, in his Blog. Had he just posted Bainter's remarks, without further attacking me, I think everyone would feel a lot better about what happened. But he does not seem to want to let go of something he caused, and that has been shown to be false, namely, what emails were available for use on his site.

Greg