"Doug Batchelor – Truth and Choice or Poison Devils..." posted 2/2/20 by SDA Burgas. The program was originally "Bible Answers Live" and was, if I understand it correctly, first posted on Facebook. Doug Batchelor and Jean Ross were the hosts.

Starting around 16:20 there was a call from Carlos in New Jersey who had a question about a YouTube video by Walter Veith titled "The Battle of the Bibles" in which Walter said, "he uh presents all of the Bible translations have missing passages except for the King James Version." The question was should those versions be used for ministry purposes such as video presentations, etc. Doug says Jean Ross and Walter Veith are both from South Africa and are friends and Doug claims to have "great respect" for Walter but wants to "respectfully disagree that uh that it's wrong or unethical to use any other translation." Doug then says the "King James is a masterpiece but ah it is certainly, it's not flawless as a translation." Doug goes on to say some places in the King James Version (KJV) are hard to understand and that in some places it's "mispunctuated." Peter speaking of the epistles of Paul in 2 Peter 3:16 said there were some things "hard to be understood" but didn't go making independent edits of Paul's epistles.

Jean Ross chimes in and talks about "the original manuscripts" and admits some verses are missing in the new translations. Imagine that; they may have learned a little since the earlier YouTube video in which Doug said there were "no" missing verses. Jean also claims that those verses aren't missing in the New King James Version (NKJV).

These guys have hardly a clue. It is true some verses in the KJV are hard to understand but it's also true you shouldn't make something easier to read by putting in something YOU think is better especially when it's wrong. The KJV is NOT mispunctuated. The rules for punctuation and spelling hadn't been standardized when the KJV was written. The KJV punctuation is correct for the time in which it was written. Doug claims the KJV isn't a "flawless" translation which means he believes it has some error. The fact is Doug doesn't believe ANY bible is free from all error and he believes that HE is authorized to tell you what God really meant. Funny thing; I've never heard Doug voice any criticism for his bible of choice, the NKJV, even though when reading from it he at times changes what it says.

Regarding the "missing verses;" Doug thinks they're missing in the new translations and not in the NKJV. They are indeed missing in some new translations but some of the new translations will have them but put them in brackets to indicate they don't really belong there. Guess what? The NKJV Andrews Study Bible has marginal readings for those verses indicating they're not in such and such a manuscript thus implying they are to be doubted as having validity. The whole agenda is to cast doubt on the real Word of God and to substitute the opinion of a minister, priest or scholar for what the real Word of God says.

Doug concludes the discussion by saying "the Word of God is perfect." That is from a man who doesn't believe ANY bible is perfect. I ask, is that ethical? Doug needs to review the ENGLISH definition of "perfect."

SatanIsDead.com InfallibleBible.com AdventistsToday.com SabbathSchoolGuide.com