

Should a Witness disagree with the organization publicly?

ADDENDUM

Although the examples I previously noted didn't truly lend to there being some sort of congregation-wide disputing among individuals, it seems evident that the entirety of the congregation at Antioch had become aware of the disputing between Paul, Barnabas and the men sent from Judea, and probably were present when much of the disputing took place, as Paul liked to teach in the synagogues. The fact that said disputes were very public would seem to demonstrate that at times it is appropriate to do so--in this case, it was over a doctrinal teaching that came out of Jerusalem itself, meant to establish an older "light," so to speak. Paul would have none of that incorrect teaching, as the Scriptures demonstrate. Was he disrespectful? No. Did he, by his vocally disagreeing with the new "light" demonstrate that he wanted the authority over the congregation that others had? Nowhere do we find even a hint of such motive on Paul's part. But he DID take a stand for Truth and the Law of the Christ.

If only Witnesses who notice an error in a teaching could act in the same manner as Paul and Barnabas and not suffer being cast from the "synagogues," yet how encouraging it is to have to suffer such for the sake of the Christ, knowing that we are being punished for doing righteousness.

Those who take a firm stand for Truth are called rebellious, lacking faith, desiring the authority that Jehovah has granted to the Slave class... all of which never EVER address the issue that is raised-- only the so-called motive and character of the person that is raising the debate. Can you imagine Paul being treated in such a manner?

Interestingly, when a man who had been healed by Christ was brought before the Pharisees for questioning, he, too, began to question them in turn, and their response was similar to that that a questioning Witness receives today when brought before local elders or even those higher in authority within the organization:

*In answer, they said to him: "You were altogether born in sins, and yet ARE YOU TEACHING US?" And they threw him out. (John 9:34)

On a more somber note, I had hoped that although I ended up being banned from Touchstone, that at least the issues I had begun to raise would be addressed, because even with me removed from the equation, the issues themselves stand. Instead, as the man above, a Jew, was treated, so was I, and then the rest of the efforts by the moderators at Touchstone have been spent in responding to why they banned me, rather than tackling the things that are FAR MORE IMPORTANT than talking about me.

Here are some scriptural examples of the congregation itself being involved in disputes that you may want to consider:

2 Samuel 19:9,10 Here, the entire congregation became involved in a dispute, going so far as to bring the matter to the head of the nation. Today, as more and more Witnesses come forward to reveal their mistreatment and mishandled cases at the hands of those taking the lead, going so far as to bring the matter to the head of the nation of Jehovah's Witnesses, it will become more and more difficult to simply cast them out as those (wishing to usurp authority).

Luke 21:12-15 Can it really be said that Verse 15 holds true when a Witness that questions a teaching is banned from a site or cast from the congregation as though the organization was being persecuted by an apostate or opposer? Rather, the verse says that Jesus would give them a response that no opposer, no apostate could resist or dispute.

Luke 22:24 This clearly was not a private debating, for Jesus was very much aware of it and subsequently addressed it. Again, is this how disputes are handled today by our organization? Rather, those that the organization feel are wrong are thrown from the "synagogues" unless they come around to the organization's opinion, which runs contrary to Jesus' counsel that his followers would not "lord" authority over others. It is additionally interesting that just as Jesus referred to those who "lord" authority as speaking of themselves as "Benefactors," so, too, today, the Slave class insists that they "lord" their authority over us for our own good.

John 3:25 Here again we have an example of those in a non-authority disputing a teaching AMONG THEMSELVES before finally bringing the matter to John to set matters straight. This is clearly in agreement with the principles in my post regarding the validity of the Two-Witness Rule that the organization essentially (hides) behind rather than taking action to mete out justice.

Acts 6:8-15 Yet again, we see an example of fellow Jews entering into a dispute with another Jew, namely Stephen. But, just as Jesus promised at Luke 21:15, Stephen had the Truth on his side, and the fellow Jews that had hoped to prove him wrong could do no such thing. Angry that they couldn't win the dispute, they brought him before the Pharisees, and the result of the matter was that Stephen was put to death. Similarly, when a Witness (fellow Jew) becomes involved in a dispute with a number of fellow Witnesses, and he has the Truth on his side, and the fellow Witnesses cannot prove him wrong, they seek to do away with him, going so far as to disfellowship him, which is similar to death from the viewpoint of Jehovah's Witnesses.

While I could also provide additional examples, I hope that these, on their own, can adequately demonstrate that there is an allowance for disputes even within the ranks of Jehovah's modern-day nation as it was in times past, and that there are additional similarities to the examples Jehovah preserved for us, both in the way that our brothers and sisters might respond to our sincere questions, and in the Pharasaic appeal to authority as though nobody else has the right to inform them on any matter or teaching.

I will be more than happy to continue this discussion with anyone that wishes to do so.

Humbly contributed for your perusal,
Timothy

Time tells all Truth...