

12 Reasons Why Support for the RVG Bible Continues to Grow Despite the Complaints of Calvin George

by Manny Rodriguez
Feb. 15, 2008

“But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.” Ac 5:39

One of the most outspoken opponents to the Reina Valera Gomez Spanish Bible is a Missionary in Puerto Rico named Calvin George. He has written 2 books and many articles on the Internet in defense of the Critical Text corruption that is found in modern revisions of the Spanish Bible, especially the 1960 edition of the Reina Valera Bible. (hereafter RV) For several years he has publicly opposed any attempt to rid the Spanish Bible of the Alexandrian Critical Text. One article in particular is entitled Over 20 Reasons Why I Cannot Endorse The Reina Valera Gomez.¹

Dr. Humberto Gomez Sr, a Bible-believing native Mexican, who has served as a Missionary to his own people for over 30 years, devoted 8 years of his life to revising the Spanish Bible, which eventually became known as the Reina Valera Gomez Bible (hereafter RVG). The RVG is a Spanish Bible of which all traces of the corrupt Alexandrian Texts have been removed. It is in total conformity to the Received Texts. And consequently it reads parallel with the KJV. But to Calvin George, this is not a good thing. To him, it's a bad thing.

However, despite Calvin George's disapproval of the RVG, worldwide support for this Spanish Bible is growing on a daily basis.

The RVG is endorsed by Spanish-speaking brethren all over the world as it is being used of God to win souls and establish churches in Spain, Peru, Guatemala, Chile, Argentina, Costa Rica, Paraguay, Belize, the Dominican Republic, all over Mexico, and many Spanish ministries in the US. The RVG has also been endorsed by true linguistic experts such as Dr. D.A.Waite, the President and Founder of the Dean Burgon Society, and Dr. Rex Cobb, the Director of Baptist Bible Translators Institute in Bowie, TX. The RVG has also recently been adopted by Chick Publications for their Spanish literature. It has been printed by many Fundamentalist Bible printing organizations including Bearing Precious Seed, Victory Baptist Press, BEAMS Printing Ministry, and others.

During the time of this writing, I have been informed of another Fundamentalist printing press that will be printing the RVG. I have also recently been informed about a Fundamentalist Bible college of which the faculty has made the decision for the RVG to be the official Spanish Bible for their Spanish department. I also heard of another Spanish ministry in Nebraska that has actually been using the RVG for quite some time.

¹ This article and all others by Calvin George can be found at his website: www.literaturabautista.com.

I get reports like this all the time. In a church that I recently preached at, I was approached by a veteran Missionary to the Dominican Republic that expressed his desire to adopt the RVG for his ministry and personal use. I happily donated to this good man a free leather bound copy and gave him information to purchase more for his people. All this took place just during the course of this writing.

It seems like the more critics like Calvin George attempt to discredit Humberto Gomez and his collaborators, the more support for the RVG grows. I have even personally met several Missionaries and Hispanic preachers who have testified that Calvin George's material was instrumental in their decision to support and even become involved in the RVG project when they found out that it was an attempt to rid the Spanish Bible of Alexandrian Critical text error. I'm sure this was not the kind of reaction that Calvin George was aiming for in his writings, but sometimes God works in mysterious ways.

I believe one of the reasons for the increasing positive reaction to the RVG is due to the fact that throughout all the complaints of Calvin George and other critics like him, they have yet to produce one iota of evidence to demonstrate that the RVG is an inferior Bible. All of his arguments are focused against the people behind the product rather than the product itself. But sincere people are more concerned about the product. And if the product itself is proven to be good, than all the other arguments are irrelevant.

There are other reasons which we will discuss why Fundamentalists all over the world, who stand for the KJV, the Received Texts, and now the RVG, are ignoring Calvin George's refusal to endorse the RVG Spanish Bible. We really could care less because we know what Calvin George's true position on the Bible is. We know that he is not a true proponent of the KJV and Received Texts though he claims to be.

There are different approaches to defending the KJV espoused by different circles within Fundamentalism. Some emphasize the translation more than its underlying text. Some emphasize the underlying text more than the translation. But what they all have in common is that they all oppose the Alexandrian Critical texts.

Yet Calvin George, who claims to also be pro-KJV and pro-Textus Receptus, somehow thinks it's OK if corruption from Alexandrian manuscripts is incorporated in foreign language Bibles. This is a self-contradicting and peculiar position.

The remainder of this article will be devoted to exposing Calvin George's faulty position, manifesting why true Bible-believers who desire a Spanish Bible that is free of the Critical Texts are putting his arguments in File 13.

1. He tries to downplay the role of the Alexandrian Westcott & Hort texts in revisions of the Spanish Bible.

Calvin George is on record of saying:

"I believe Westcott & Hort texts can be consulted in the process of translating (such was the case in the Reina-Valera 1909 & 1960); however, it must not form the basis for a translation."²

² The Battle for the Spanish Bible by Calvin George, pg. 115

The fact is that the Westcott & Hort texts were not just consulted in the revisions of the 1909 and 1960 RV, they were implemented. The Westcott and Hort texts indeed served as the basis for many changes in passages such as Mat. 5:22, Mat. 9:13, Mat. 15:8, Mark 1:2, Luke 2:22, Luke 23:42, Eph. 3:9, I Pet. 2:2, & Rev.22:14. Over 150 more examples of deliberate departures from the Textus Receptus in the Spanish Bible can be found thoroughly documented in charts and articles at www.reinavalera.com.

In the same book that Calvin makes the above statement, he quotes Dr. Rex Cobb, a linguist who eventually became one of Humberto Gomez's collaborators in the RVG project. Calvin provides the following quote of Dr. Cobb in regards to the 1909 & 1960 revisions of the Reina Valera:

“They are not at all what I consider “corrupt” or “Alexandrian” type Bibles, although as we will see, **a few “Alexandrian” corruptions have apparently slipped into them** sometime during their history.”³

Dr. Rex Cobb has conducted studies comparing the different editions of the Reina Valera Bible to an edition of the Textus Receptus.⁴ He went from Matthew through Revelation and documented each time there was a departure from the TR. The conclusions of his collation were that the 1909 RV departed from the TR **122** times, and the 1960 RV departed **191** times. The RVG departed **0** times.

Eugene Nida himself, the organizer and overseer of the 1960 revision committee, admits to departures from the TR:

“Nevertheless in some instances where a **critical text** is so much preferred over the traditional Textus Receptus the committee did make some slight changes...”⁵

Ministers have known about these Critical Text corruptions in the Spanish Bible for many years. We contend that if Alexandrian corruption is bad in the English language, it's bad in the Spanish language, or any other language. We do not oppose the Spanish Bible. We honor Cassiodoro de Reina and Cipriano de Valera for their initiative and courage to provide God's words into the Spanish language despite the opposition of the Catholic church.⁶ The Spanish Inquisition was in full swing in their day. So whatever flaws that may be found in their noble work are excused as honest mistakes when considering the difficult circumstances that they suffered during their work. What we oppose is the deliberate insertion of more Alexandrian corruption into the Spanish Bible as was done in 1862, 1909, and 1960. In all of his writings, Calvin George never takes a stand against the Critical Text. Instead, he strives to justify the Westcott & Hort corruption in modern revisions of the Spanish Bible. But true Fundamentalist Bible-believers refuse to accept the Alexandrian Critical Text with or without Calvin George's approval.

2. He is double-standard in his protest against the use of the KJV in revising the Spanish Bible.

Calvin George disputes the following words of Dr. Gomez as spoken at the Spanish

³ The Battle for the Spanish Bible by Calvin George, pg. 32

⁴ <http://www.rvg.bz/spanishbibleversecomparrisonbyrexcobb.pdf>

⁵ The Bible Translator, Vol.12, No.3, 1961, pg. 113

⁶ See my article entitled A Brief Historical Account of the Spanish Bible at www.4thesaviour.com.

Bible Conference in Matamoros, Mexico in the last week of November 2007:

“But the Standard to follow has to be the King James. This I say in public and I am not ashamed of this. 100%”

Now here is Calvin George’s complaint against that statement:

“What is bad about this? It would be as erroneous as declaring that for the English Bible ‘The standard to follow would be the Bible in Spanish!’”⁷

Is this a reasonable argument that we should take seriously? To be honest with you, I am not so sure Calvin George takes himself seriously. Because if it is so “erroneous” to use the English KJV in revising the Spanish Bible, why isn’t Calvin complaining about the English Bibles that the 1960 revision committee used in revising the same Spanish Bible that he defends?

Here are the words of Dr. Jose Flores, who was one of the consultants of the 1960 revision committee. He reveals:

“One principle added to the first list of the RV 1960 revision committee was that wherever the RV (1909) Version has departed from the Textus Receptus to follow a better text we did not return to the Receptus. Point 12 of the working principles states: **in cases where there is a doubt over the correct translation of the original, we consulted preferentially The English Revised Version of 1885, The American Standard Version of 1901, The Revised Standard Version of 1946,** and the International Critical Commentary.”⁸

Why isn’t Calvin George criticizing the 1960 revisers for incorporating Alexandrian-based **English** Bibles into the Spanish Bible? Why is it OK for the 1960 revisers to utilize the RSV and ASV in the Spanish Bible, but it’s not OK for Dr. Gomez to use the KJV? Why does he **ONLY** complain about Dr. Humberto Gomez and the RVG? This is bias. This is hypocritical. This is double-standard.

3. He does not believe that the inspired, inerrant, infallible, perfect word of God exists today.

Whether you believe that the inspired, inerrant, infallible, perfect words of God exist in the KJV, or its underlying Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek words as they stand in the Received Texts, or both, all proponents of the KJV agree that God’s perfect word exists today. We believe this because Ps. 12:6-7 and other passages are very plain about God’s promise to preserve his pure words forever. As the late Jack Hyles proclaimed:

“My Bible does not say that God has preserved the thoughts for us. My Bible does not say that God preserved the doctrine for us. My Bible does not say that God has preserved certain truths for us. My Bible says that the words of God are perfectly pure and will be preserved forever! Since today is part of forever, that means somewhere in this world there must be the very words of God.”⁹

⁷ <http://www.literaturabautista.com/node/565> Note: The English version of this article has been removed.

⁸ El Texto Del Nuevo Testamento, CLIE 1977, by Dr. Jose Flores pg. 323

⁹ The Need For An Every Word Bible by Jack Hyles, pg. 13

But Calvin George disagrees. He does not believe God's perfect word exists today.

To Calvin George, referring to the KJV as the perfect word of God is a bad thing. He complains:

"In a conference in the church of Pastor Phil Stringer in Chicago in March of 2007, Humberto Gomez declared the same, adding that he believes that the Bible in English is perfect."¹⁰

Calvin George is outraged at this statement because he believes "it is possible for the current KJV...to contain human error."¹¹ He explains:

"I do not believe in assigning terms to a translation that should only be reserved for the original autographs (such as inspired, perfect, inerrant, infallible)."¹²

But the problem is that the original autographs are gone. Therefore, passages such as Ps. 12:6-7 and others that promise the preservation of God's words must be null and void if Calvin George's position is true. With Calvin's position, the only way to approach the doctrine of the preservation of the scriptures is to conclude that what God preserved for us today is not inspired, inerrant, infallible, and perfect. Therefore, there is really no final authority that exists today.

If Calvin George believes there is a final authority for Bible translation anywhere, he has yet to identify for his readers what that standard is. What text? Which edition? I have asked him this on several occasions. He has yet to answer them. Until Calvin answers such questions, his complaints against Bro. Gomez's proposed standard or anyone else's, should not be taken seriously.

When asked whether he believed the KJV was the perfect word of God, he said:

"The KJV is perfect in its practical authority for English speakers, but otherwise **it is not perfect to the full extent of the meaning of the word**, but by faith I consider it to be trustworthy, reliable, and dependable, just as I consider my Spanish Bible to be."¹³

Calvin George may not believe that the KJV is perfect "to the full extent of the meaning of the word" but I beg to differ. As a Bible-believer, I make no apologies for believing that what God has preserved for us IS perfect to the full extent of the meaning of the word, and every one of those perfect, infallible, inerrant, inspired words can be found accurately translated for us in the English language in the KJV and in Spanish in the RVG. I cannot say the same for the NIV, ASV, RSV, etc because due to their Critical

¹⁰ <http://www.literaturabautista.com/node/565> Note: At the time of this writing, Calvin George has taken down the English version of this article in which he complains about the use of the King James Bible in the revision of the Spanish Bible.

¹¹ The Battle for the Spanish Bible by Calvin George, pg. 114

¹² This is what he said in our correspondence at:

<http://www.fundamentalforums.com/showthread.php?t=22289&highlight=spanish+bible+textus+receptus&page=3>

¹³ Ibid.

Text basis they omit words, phrases, verses, and sometimes even entire series of verses such as the last 12 verses of Mark. And again, some of the same type of Critical Text corruption can be found in revisions of the Spanish Bible such as the RV 1960. I am not saying that God's pure words are not contained in modern editions of the Spanish RV. They are. But the fact is that the Spanish RV, which was originally TR-based, has been mixed with some Alexandrian corruption; the same kind that we oppose in modern English versions such as the NIV, RSV, TEV, etc. And so there has been a need to eradicate such corruption once and for all in the Spanish Bible.

Calvin George offers the typical explanation for his denial of the existence of a perfect Bible today:

“The KJV is reliable and trustworthy, but only God can produce something perfect.”¹⁴

But we've heard this argument over and over again from proponents of the Alexandrian Critical Texts. Basically their whole argument is that God cannot produce a perfect and infallible Bible *through men* because men are imperfect and fallible. But these naysayers never stop to think about the fact that God used an imperfect and fallible human being named Mary to produce the perfect, sinless, Son of God! If God can use an imperfect human to produce his perfect Son, why couldn't he use imperfect humans to produce his perfect word? I believe with God all things are possible. I don't believe we ought to limit the Holy One of Israel. So when God promised to preserve his pure words in Ps. 12:6-7, I believe he did exactly that. I don't think his pure words are imperfect words. So simple logic and faith lead me to believe that based on his promises, the pure and perfect words of God must be available today, despite the faithlessness of the Alexandrian Critical Text sympathizers.

4. He defends omissions in the Bible.

In Mat. 5:22, the 1960 RV omits the important words “sin razon” (without reason). This is the same thing the NIV, ASV, RSV, TEV, NWT, and other Critical Text based bibles do when in English they omit the words “without a cause” in the same verse.

Calvin George attempts to justify this omission:

“The common complaint against Mat. 5:22 is the lack of the phrase “without a cause” which in Greek is one single 4-letter word. I have noticed that there is precedent in at least one TR-based New Testament (Tyndale 1534) for the reading of the 1960. That the lack of one word in this verse would make Jesus a sinner as some allege because he got angry at the moneychangers seems highly absurd. The Bible states that it's possible to be angry and not sin (Eph. 4:26).”¹⁵

Bro. George mentions here that the Greek basis for “without a cause” is one single 4-letter word. (The word in Greek is “eike”) He implies that the omission of one small word is not really all that important. The problem is that Pro. 30:5 says “**Every** word of God is pure”. The Bible also says in Mat. 4:4 that “Man shall not live by bread alone, but

¹⁴ <http://www.fundamentalforums.com/showthread.php?t=22289&highlight=spanish+bible>

¹⁵ From an article by Calvin George entitled Refutation of 38 Objections to the Common Spanish Bible from a Proponent of the new Gomez Spanish Bible.

by **every word** that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” Be it a 4-letter word, a 3-letter word, or a 2-letter word, if it is the word of God, *it needs to be in there!* I want a Bible that has EVERY word of God. I don’t want anything missing no matter how small it is.

5. He tries to defend the Critical Text with the flimsiest amount of “evidence”.

Calvin George has devised a very peculiar method of defending the Critical Text in the Spanish Bibles. He tries to defend such corruption by appealing to occasional flaws that can be found in old TR-based Bibles prior to the KJV.

For example, in 1 Pet. 2:2 the KJV says “As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby”. The Spanish 1960 RV does the same thing that the NIV, ASV, RSV, TEV, and the NWT of the Jehovah’s Witnesses do by adding to the end of this verse the words “unto salvation” (para salvacion), thus it reads “that ye may grow **unto salvation**”. This Critical Text addition causes the passage to teach the heresy of Progressive Salvation, which goes against passages like Rom. 10:10-13 and Acts 16:31 that state that salvation is instantaneous once a person calls upon the Lord Jesus Christ by faith.

Calvin George says that this erroneous addition to the word of God is OK because it can also be found in italics in the 1539 Great Bible and the 1568 Bishops Bible.¹⁶ Never mind that questionable passages such as these were the very reasons why God raised up the KJV translators to produce yet another English Bible. Obviously, these TR-based English Bibles prior to 1611 were good, but due to a few flaws they were not good enough in God’s opinion. Using flaws in the English Bibles prior to the KJV to justify flaws in modern revisions of the Spanish Bible is a step backwards, not forwards. Such “evidence” is flimsy, pathetic, and even hypocritical.

It is hypocritical for Calvin George to insist that TR-based English Bibles can be used to justify Critical Text error in the Spanish Bible, but the KJV, a TR-based English Bible, cannot be used to correct Alexandrian error in the Spanish Bible. Calvin will appeal to TR-based Bibles for his cause, but he is absolutely silent about the incorporation of the corrupt ASV and RSV in the 1960 RV. What is wrong with this picture?

Another example of Calvin George’s use of flimsy evidence is his use of the “Peshitta” for the “vindicating” of Critical Text passages.

He claims that the Peshitta contains some of the same kind of Critical Text passages that exist in the RV 1960. But those of us who know a little about the Peshitta don’t take his argument here seriously. Because we know that he is not being very open about the version of “the Peshitta” he is using. For someone that makes a big deal about the idea that “the Textus Receptus” is a “vague” term since there are actually several different editions of Greek texts referred to as TR,¹⁷ you would think he would be more specific

¹⁶ [A Refutation of 38 Objections to the Common Spanish Bible from a Proponent of the New Gomez Spanish Bible](#) by Calvin George

¹⁷ In correspondence on a public Internet forum known as the Fundamental Fighting Forums, Calvin George said to me “to say ‘the’ **Textus Receptus** can be very vague”. Also on pg. 115 of [The Battle For the Spanish Bible](#), he says, “I realize this point is somewhat ambiguous, because there are many editions of the **Textus Receptus**.”

in identifying for his readers that the edition of “the Peshitta” he is using is actually *an English translation of a **revised** text*.

The original Peshitta is a 2nd century Syriac translation of the scriptures. It is regarded as a very pure version of God's word having been the product of Apostolic Christianity. This translation is a valuable piece of manuscript evidence because of its antiquity. It is generally agreed amongst scholars from both sides of the fence that the Peshitta supports the type of text found in the Received Texts. However, since the 2nd century there have been several revisions of the Peshitta. Some of these revisions have been **corruptions** in which the Alexandrian manuscripts have been incorporated.¹⁸

In 1846, the Peshitta was translated into English by a man named James Murdock.¹⁹ Such a translation I'm sure can prove to be very valuable for English speakers to get an idea of the type of scriptures the early Christians were reading in the Syriac language. But considering the several revisions that the Peshitta has been through since the Apostolic age, and considering that some of those revisions have been corruptions, I would not rely solely on a **19th century English translation** of a revised version of the Peshitta for the vindication of any verse of scripture in another language. When authors who defend the KJV mention the Peshitta in their lists of manuscripts that support the KJV, they are not advocating the inerrancy of every edition of such manuscripts. They are informing the reader that such manuscripts contain evidence that point to the type of text that is represented in the Received Texts. When determining what renderings in these manuscripts are erroneous or not, all the evidence must be considered, not just the basis of one manuscript that is included within the Traditional text family. And so it is most likely that Bro. George is using error to supposedly “vindicate” yet more error. That is not good scholarship. Bro. George is not using an actual copy of the 2nd century Peshitta for his “vindications”.

¹⁸ From pg. 29 of Forever Settled by Jack Moorman under the heading THE REVISIONS AND CORRUPTION OF PESHITTA “The Peshitta originally omitted the Apocrypha, but these were later added from the Septuagint. It is also said that it was originally without Chronicles (Kenyon). It was one of the very best early versions of the Old Testament, and was clearly God's Word for a large number of people in the world of that day. Corruptions did not enter the text until the middle of the third century, when Origen moved from Alexandria to Caesarea. Further corruptions took place during the time of Eusebius and Pamphilus (260 - 340) and at the time of the revisions known as the Philoxenian (508), the Harclean (616) and the Jerusalem Syriac (c 6th century). (Based on Ruckman). At the end of the first quarter of the 5th century, a schism broke in the Syriac Church, with the result that Nestorius and his followers withdrew eastwards. Nestorius was expelled from the bishopric of Constantinople in 431 and he took with him the Peshitta Bible. Following the destruction of their school at Edessa in 489, the Nestorians fled to Persia and established a new school at Nisibis. The two branches of the Church kept their own Bible texts. It is said that the Eastern branch of the text underwent fewer revisions, because of the more isolated location of the Church (R. Gunner). Regarding the above mentioned revisions. The Jerusalem Syriac was made from the LXX, a few fragments remain. Philoxenus of Mabbug commissioned the translation of the entire Bible from the LXX, again only a few fragments remain. Another Syriac version of the OT was made by Paul, Bishop of Tella in Mesopotamia in 617. It is based on the 5th column of Origen's Hexapla, with notes and readings given from the other columns of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotian. It was known as the Syro-Hexaplaric Version. (R. Gunner). There is dispute as to whether the Philoxenian Syriac Version was reissued by Thomas of Heraclea (known as the Harclean Syriac) or whether this was an entirely new version (R. Gunner in New Bible Dictionary).”

¹⁹ The following link has an online version of Murdock's English translation of the Peshitta with some background information. <http://www.aramaicpeshitta.com/AramaicNTtools/Murdock/murdock.htm>

If Calvin had a vast collection of manuscripts that also supported the rendering in question he *might* be able to build a case depending on the validity of the other manuscripts. But he doesn't. In his writings, **almost every single "vindication" he provides rests solely on the basis of ONE manuscript** despite the thousands of manuscripts within the Traditional text family that say otherwise! He admits it himself:

"In many cases multiple sources could be used to vindicate a Spanish Bible reading. In most cases, however, **I went on to the next problem passage after finding a single source.**"²⁰

If that is all the "evidence" that Bro. Calvin can come up with to support the Critical Text renderings in the 1960 RV, that is just plain pathetic.

6. He justifies the digression of the word 'Hell' in the Spanish Bible.

The KJV renders the word 'hell' 54 times. The RVG agrees with the KJV by also rendering it 54 times. The 1865 Mora and Pratt revision of the RV Spanish Bible renders it 42 times. The 1909 Antigua revision renders it 32 times. And the RV 1960 renders it a mere 13 times! In key passages, the revisers leave the Greek transliterations 'hades' and 'gehenna' in the text without translating them. There has never been any doubt in Fundamentalists mind that the refusal to translate 'hell' in the English Bibles was a mark of the influence of Modernism. And Fundamentalists have always stood against such influence, especially when such influence bears its mark in our English bibles. However, when it comes to the Spanish Bible, Calvin George insists we turn a blind eye.

Calvin George wrote an article entitled Why the word hell appears less often in the Spanish Bible than in the KJV. I urge everyone to read this article for themselves. This article will reveal just how desperate he is to justify corruption in the RV 1960. He is willing to defend the indefensible. He insists that the 1960 revisers' motives were simply to leave it up to the reader to interpret the word 'hades' in the Spanish Bible, as if that should be considered acceptable. His whole argument is that the message of hell is kept intact in the vivid descriptions and characteristics of hell that are found in the context of the passages despite the lack of the word 'hell'. He explains that the descriptions of hell are so clear that there should be no doubt in the readers mind the place the word 'hades' is referring to is 'hell'. But I say that if it is so obvious that the context of the passage is describing hell, THAN WHAT IS SO HARD ABOUT TRANSLATING THE WORD 'HELL' SINCE IT IS SO OBVIOUS?! This was a no-brainer for the KJV translators. Why was it so difficult for the 1960 RV revision committee?

7. He speaks favorably of the apostate Eugene Nida.

Eugene Nida is the former Executive Secretary of the American Bible Society. He was highly involved in the making of the RV 1960.²¹ Although he did not participate in voting matters, he didn't need to since his role was not only to choose the men for the committee, and organize the procedures, but to also supervise the revision committee. Calvin George speaks favorably of Eugene Nida in his book The History of the 1960 Reina Valera Bible by trying to prove that Nida was a lot more conservative than

²⁰ Explanations for Problem Passages in the Spanish Bible by Calvin George

²¹ The Bible Translator, article Reina Valera Spanish Revision of 1960 by Eugene Nida, pg. 115-116 Note: This article by Nida himself lays out the details of just how involved he was with the Revision Committee.

Fundamentalists give him credit for. Yet the accomplishments of Nida's life speak otherwise.

Eugene Nida is an enemy of the Textus Receptus and is probably more responsible for popularizing the corrupt Critical Texts than any other proponent of the Alexandrian manuscripts in the 20th century.²² Nida's disdain for the KJV is manifested when in an interview he stated that "as long as people had the King James Version people didn't think."²³

Eugene Nida is the one that "initiated, organized, and administered" the making of the United Bible Society's first edition of the Alexandrian-based Critical Greek New Testament which was published in 1966.²⁴

Eugene Nida is also the man responsible for reconciling the United Bible Society with the Vatican of Rome. The Eugene Nida Institute For Biblical Scholarship claims that a milestone in his life was when he became a "Key figure in forging UBS/Vatican agreement to undertake hundreds of interconfessional Bible translation projects worldwide, using functional equivalence principles."²⁵ Thanks to Nida's efforts, the UBS is now an official member of the ecumenical World Council of Churches.²⁶ Due to copyright laws, every time someone purchases a RV 1960, a percentage of the proceeds go directly to the UBS. Some preachers have tried to downplay this fact with the excuse that the percentage is so small it is insignificant, but personally I don't want a dime of my income to go to the support of an organization that is apostate, pro-Catholic, and ecumenical. Considering the popularity that the RV 1960 has enjoyed for many years since its inception, it is a sad commentary that Fundamentalists are not unanimously outraged that a percentage of their finances are going to the support of a liberal, apostate, modernist, pro-Catholic, ecumenical organization.

The 1960 RV is not the only Spanish Bible that Nida has been involved in. He was also involved in the supervision of the committee for the Version Popular, which is the Spanish equivalent of the Good News For Modern Man. Concerning this committee, Nida states:

"It was a great experience to see how Latin American Roman Catholics and Protestants could work together so creatively. Perhaps the most gratifying aspect of this program was to see how the Roman Catholic participants was even more sensitive to possible adverse reactions of Protestants than even the Protestant members of the team had been."²⁷

²² For a more thorough critique of Nida's apostasy I encourage the reader to read [Unholy Hands on God's Holy Book](#) by David Cloud which can be read online at www.wayoflife.org. Other articles by Cloud on the same topic concerning Nida can be found on that website.

²³ From an online interview of Nida entitled [Meaning Full Translations](#) which can be found at <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2002/october7/2.46.html?start=1>

²⁴ UBS Greek New Testament, 1966, Preface pg. vi

²⁵ From a Brief Biography of Eugene Nida at <http://www.nidainstitute.org/vslItemDisplay.dsp&objectID=0920A817-28AA-4D6F-9B9F70012FE3A462&method=display>

²⁶ www.oikoumene.org

²⁷ [Fascinated by Languages](#), by Eugene Nida, pg. 136

Since when was it a gratifying thing for a supposedly conservative Christian to witness and oversee Catholics and Protestants working together? Our Christian forefathers who were martyred for their faith at the hands of the murderous Catholic inquisitors would roll over in their grave at the thought.

Calvin is quick to point out in his writings that most of Nida's apostacizing is documented after the publishing of the RV 1960. So we are to believe that before 1960 Nida was really a conservative but then one day after 1960 Nida all of a sudden decided to turn liberal and ecumenical. That is absurd. Nida's apostacizing did not take place overnight.

1Jo 2:19 says, "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us."

That Calvin George would speak favorably of an apostate like Eugene Nida, is a manifestation of which side he is on.

8. His arguments support the Modernistic ideas of Dynamic Equivalence and Concept Inspiration.

Eugene Nida is known as "the father of dynamic equivalency". Dynamic Equivalency, also known as Functional Equivalence, is the method of Bible translating popularized by Nida which puts an emphasis on translating the thought, message, or idea of the passage rather than the actual words. This method of translating is in opposition to Formal Equivalence, the method the KJV translators employed in which they literally translated the words themselves. Nida's method has been employed in many perverted translations such as the NIV and the Good News For Modern Man (aka Today's English Version). In fact Nida wrote a book praising and promoting the Good News bible.²⁸

Nida is on record of saying that strict adherence to translating the actual words of the Bible rather than the message is "word worship".²⁹ He believes that the words of scripture "are in a sense nothing in and of themselves".³⁰ Furthermore, he explains:

"There is no magic, however, in the words of the Scriptures; the power is in their message - perhaps too much power for some persons."³¹

But to stray from translating the words to instead translating the message behind the words goes against the clear commandments of the Bible against altering, subtracting, or adding to God's words in Deut. 4:2, Pro. 30:6, and Rev. 22:19.

Concerning Eugene Nida's method of Dynamic Equivalence, Dr. Jack Moorman, an avid defender of the Received Texts, says:

²⁸ Good News for Everyone by Eugene Nida

²⁹ From an online interview of Nida entitled Meaning Full Translations which can be found at <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2002/october7/2.46.html?start=1>

³⁰ Message and Mission by Nida, pg. 225

³¹ Good News For Everyone by Nida, pg. 116

“Virtually all recent translations and the Bible Societies' work generally has been to a large extent influenced by Dynamic Equivalence. It has made Eugene Nida the most influential person in the field. **The theory is grounded in theological liberalism.** It strips the Bible of its doctrinal content. It dishonours God by implying He is unable to speak absolutely to all generations and cultures. And to quote the verdict that a literary critic gave the New International Version, it makes the Bible "formica flat."³²

The theological liberalism that Dr. Moorman is referring to is the modernistic idea known as Conceptual Inspiration. This idea is in opposition to the primary fundamental of the faith known as Verbal Inspiration of the scriptures. Verbal Inspiration is the belief that God inspired the very words of the scriptures themselves (Pro. 30:6, “Every word of God is pure...”) The view held by the Modernists and Liberals is Conceptual Inspiration, which is the view that what God inspired was not the words but rather the message, ideas, thoughts, philosophies, or concepts behind the words.

Whether Calvin George realizes it or not, his arguments lend to such Modernistic inventions as Dynamic Equivalence and Conceptual Inspiration as will be clearly demonstrated in the following quotations. Calvin George complains that one of the “common mistakes people make in their judgment of the Spanish Bible issue” is:

“Failing to realize that one foreign Bible sometimes translates the meaning, while the other translates the actual words.”³³

Also he states:

“In the Spanish Bibles through 1909 there was an intention to render the Hebrew text literally, while beginning with the 1960 revision it was decided to convey the actual meaning and not the actual word.”³⁴

But God did not promise to preserve the meaning behind the words. He promised to preserve his words.

Ps 12:6-7 The **words of the LORD are pure words**: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep **them**, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.

Pr 22:20 Have not I written to thee excellent things in counsels and knowledge, That I might make thee know **the certainty of the words of truth**; that thou mightest answer **the words of truth** to them that send unto thee?

Mt 4:4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but **by every word** that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

God is concerned about us receiving his words, not someone's interpretation of what the message behind the words might be. Dynamic Equivalence and Concept Inspiration are dangerous views because it makes man the authority rather than God's words. In

³² <http://www.feasite.org/Tracts/fbedark2.htm>

³³ The Battle for the Spanish Bible, by Calvin George, pg. 111-112

³⁴ Ibid. pg. 20-21

Calvin George's zeal to justify the Critical Text in modern revisions of the Spanish Bible, he has managed to support a dangerous, modernistic, and liberal position that diminishes the authority of God's words.

Adopting such dangerous views will skew one's ability to discern obvious differences. Several times in the same book Calvin makes the following argument:

"The words are different yet the meaning is the same."³⁵

Although I'm sure Eugene Nida would be proud of Calvin George's approach to defending error in the RV 1960, I beg to differ.

When the KJV says in Job 2:9 "**curse** God and die" but the RV 1909 says "**bless** God and die", they are not the same.

When the KJV says in Isa. 9:3 "Thou hast multiplied the nation, and **not** increased the joy" but the RV 1960 says "Thou hast multiplied the nation and increased the joy", they are not the same.

When the KJV says in II Sam. 21:19 "Elhanan...slew **the brother** of Goliath the Gittite" but the RV 1960 says "Elhanan...slew Goliath the Gittite", they are not the same.

I could go on and on with such examples. But the point is that both readings cannot be right. I don't care how much Calvin George tries to spin things, one must be correct while the other is incorrect. I know what synonyms are. And I understand that languages are different and not everything can always translate the same in a literal word for word manner. But that is not what we are dealing with here. We are dealing with textual error. In these regards, Dr. Mickey Carter was right when he said, "Things that are different are not the same."

9. He falsely accuses the RVG of being the product of "Ruckmanism"

Calvin George claims:

"As documented, the Spanish RVG Bible is a product of the influence of Ruckmanism. The acceptance of this Bible is a step towards legitimizing Ruckmanism. Ruckmanism has been dividing American Fundamentalism for over 40 years. We must not allow Ruckmanism to penetrate and divide Spanish-speaking fundamentalism!"³⁶

Wow! Accepting the RVG is legitimizing "Ruckmanism"? Where does he get these fascinating ideas?

This is Calvin George's ace in the hole. When all else fails, he pulls out *the Ruckman card*. According to him, anyone that has anything to do with the controversial Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, is a "Ruckmanite" that should be shunned. In his article entitled Over 20 Reasons Why I Cannot Endorse the Reina Valera Gomez, he lists several points to try to prove that the RVG is the product of "Ruckmanism".

³⁵ Ibid. pg. 24, 25, 26, 27

³⁶ Over 20 Reasons Why I Cannot Endorse the Reina Valera Gomez by Calvin George

The first point is the following header: A Ruckmanite plants a seed of doubt in Bro. Gomez's heart. This so called "Ruckmanite" is the late Pastor Jack Wood. It was this man who pointed out to Bro. Gomez many years ago that his 1909 Spanish Bible was in disagreement with the KJV concerning Dan. 3:25.³⁷ Bro. Wood served as the Pastor of Shady Acres Baptist Church in Houston, TX for many years. He was known as a very candid preacher of the Gospel, with an unmistakable compassion for sinners, and a heart for Missions. He was a friend to the late Bro. Lester Roloff. But it is his association with Dr. Ruckman that Calvin George makes a big deal about. Because Bro. Wood was a guest speaker at Dr. Ruckman's church on several occasions, Calvin labels Bro. Wood a "Ruckmanite".

But what about other churches that Bro. Wood has preached in? I happen to know that Bro. Wood has preached in many Spanish-speaking Independent Baptist Churches that use the RV 1960. Many of the Spanish-speaking Pastors of these churches are promoted in El Fundamentalista magazine, a publication that promotes the 1960 RV. In fact, some of these Hispanic preachers are promoted on Calvin George's website several times a year in the Conference Announcement Spanish section. Bro. Wood was highly respected amongst some of today's Hispanic fundamentalist leaders. Jack Wood was a preacher high in demand for many conferences held by Mexican Pastors. These Hispanic preachers will testify that Bro. Wood was a great influence to them. His love for the Mexican people was undeniable. He even referred to himself as being a "white Mexican". I guess these Hispanic preachers that use the RV 1960, who held Pastor Jack Wood in such high esteem (and still do), should also be labeled "Ruckmanites" due to their close association with him. Perhaps Calvin George should also be labeled a Ruckmanite for promoting these same preachers on his website.

Another point in Calvin's article is that Bro. Humberto Gomez's home church is a "Ruckmanite" church. Bro. Gomez's home church is Charity Baptist Church in Beaver Creek, OH. It was formerly pastored by Dr. Greg Estep. It is now pastored by Dr. Tom Gresham. Calvin considers this church to be a "Ruckmanite" church because they have had Dr. Ruckman as a guest speaker in the past. Also, in the church's Bible institute they use a couple of Dr. Ruckman's books as textbooks. So basically, any type of connection to Ruckman whatsoever is a call for suspicion and caution, according to Calvin George. This tactic is known as guilt-by-association.

I find humorous what one individual said on an Internet forum in mockery of Calvin George's guilt-by-association logic:

"The Spanish RVG Gomez Bible has connections to "Hylesism". The home church of Humberto Gomez has been Charity Baptist Church of Beaver Creek (formerly Dayton), OH for over twenty years. This Church has a Bible institute that uses, as textbooks, works by Jack Hyles (Church Manual) and John R. Rice (The Home) and Jeff Owens (Character). These are all men who would have nothing whatsoever to do with Ruckman or Ruckmanism, but have all been associated with Elmer Fernandez at some time. Calvin George has been associated with Elmer Fernandez, particularly with regard to the Spanish Bible

³⁷ In the 1909 and 1960 RV, Dan. 3:25 reads "a hijo de los dioses" (a son of the gods) as opposed to the KJV which reads "the Son of God". The RVG has "al Hijo de Dios" (the Son of God).

issue. Therefore there is an unmistakable connection between Calvin George and the RV Gomez.”³⁸

The point is that you can take Calvin’s guilt-by-association logic just about anywhere you want to in order to “prove” whatever point you want to make. This is flawed logic.

Calvin George *claims* to have the “conviction” of **only** using the KJV when speaking in English-speaking churches. But isn’t that a characteristic of the very same “Ruckmanism” that he is terrified of? For all the things he may be in disagreement with concerning the views of Dr. Ruckman and “Ruckmanites”, he is in perfect agreement with them at least on that particular item. So why don’t we just apply Bro. George’s logic and label him as “Calvin George the Ruckmanite”?

The desire for Bibles to be free of Critical Text error was around long before Dr. Ruckman was even born. The complaint made by Jack Wood concerning Dan. 3:25 was also being made before Dr. Ruckman was born. The truth is that Dr. Peter S. Ruckman had nothing to do with the making of the RVG. Dr. Ruckman has never even made any kind of public statement for or against the RVG. I wonder if Dr. Ruckman has ever even seen a copy of the RVG. In fact, to my knowledge, none of the main collaborators that aided in the RVG product were trained by Dr. Ruckman. The Bible-believers that collaborated with Bro. Gomez in the revision come from many different circles within Fundamentalism. But even if there are any collaborators with some type of connection to Dr. Ruckman, to claim that this Bible is the “product of the influence of Ruckmanism” is a lie made for the intention of polarizing good brethren in favor of the RVG. It is also a scare tactic to discourage anyone who might want to consider the RVG.

I like what Dr. Phil Stringer said at a meeting I attended. He said, “A Ruckmanite is something the opponents call you when they are losing the argument.”

10. He devises conspiracy theories and then accuses the reviser of betraying the Spanish people based off of a theory.

“Caridad” is the Spanish word for “charity”. The RVG has this word “caridad” in 1 Cor. 13 and other passages instead of “amor” (Spanish word for “love”). Concerning the incorporation of the Spanish word for “charity” into the RVG, Calvin George says:

“In correspondence with Humberto Gómez on February 9, 2005, he mentioned to me that his revision would have *amor* (love) instead of *caridad* (charity) in 1 Corinthians 13. He further stated that even though both terms were correct, in the Hispanic world the term *caridad* represented “Catholic culture.” He added that someone whom I would label a Ruckmanite bitterly attacked him over this in a letter. However, in the most recent RVG edition I have in my possession, it was changed to *caridad*, which has been confirmed by Gómez. I think a group with a lot of influence blackmailed him by threatening not to endorse or print his translation if he didn't remove *amor* and replace it with the exact word the English Bible used. What else could explain his inclusion of a term he admitted represented Catholic culture? In my opinion, his decision to change to a term in his Bible that he himself confessed was “closely related to Catholicism” in Hispanic culture was an act of betrayal against his Hispanic brethren in order to

³⁸ <http://www.fundamentalforums.com/showthread.php?t=4359&page=2>

please those who lean towards a Ruckmanite philosophy regarding foreign language Bibles and are funding his project."³⁹

First off, if Bro. Gomez betrayed us by incorporating the word "caridad" than so did Cipriano de Valera since "caridad" is also found in the original 1602 Spanish Bible. What group that leaned "towards a Ruckmanite philosophy" blackmailed Valera into using that word in 1582 - 1602? I guess "Ruckmanism" existed over 400 years ago, over 3 centuries before Dr. Peter S. Ruckman was born. What a phenomenon! Valera must have been a "Ruckmanite" according to Calvin George's logic.

Secondly, since when did we as Fundamentalists allow the Catholic church to dictate to us what words are "Catholic" or not? What ever happened to teaching people the Bible and explaining to them the true definition of words? I say we teach our people what the word is because the word "caridad" (charity) does not belong to the Catholic church. I attended a Spanish-speaking church not too long ago of which the Hispanic Pastor, who was preaching from the RV 1960, was speaking about the subject of love (amor). Several references to the word "charity" (caridad) as a synonym of "love" (amor) were made and the people didn't have a problem with it at all. Such problems are wiped away when the people are diligently taught the truth.

I don't have a problem with "caridad" either. Just like I don't have a problem with the word "verbo" in Juan 1:1 just because it is also found in the Latin Vulgate of which its equivalent is "Verbum".⁴⁰ Some suggest that it should be changed to "Palabra" instead of "Verbo" on the basis that "Verbo" is "Catholic". But I disagree. Not everything that is Latin is Catholic. Not everything that is Latin is corrupt. Much of the Spanish language derived from Latin. The use of the word "Verbo" instead of "Palabra" is an attempt to render a masculine word (Verbo) in reference to Jesus Christ instead of a feminine word (Palabra) because to keep the feminine word "Palabra" would force the text to have to stay consistent with a feminine rendering, according to the rules of grammar, and would thus have Jesus referred to as "ella" (her) in Juan 1:2,3,& 4 instead of "el" (him). So I think Verbo is better than Palabra on the grounds of grammar. But the point is, that I don't feel we should let the Catholic church intimidate us as to what words should be acceptable. I think we should appreciate the words of the Spanish language, or any other language, for what they are and say *"To blazes with the Catholic church!"*

10. He labels those who stand against corrupt Alexandrian bibles as "extremists".

At a Bible Conference in Mexico, Pastor Tom Gresham and Dr. D.A.Waite made statements to the effect that Bibles that contain Critical Text corruption such as the NIV, ASV, RSV, TEV, NWT, etc contain poison. But Calvin George disagrees with referring to Critical Text corruption as poisonous. He complains:

³⁹ Over 20 Reasons Why I Cannot Endorse the Reina Valera Gomez by Calvin George

⁴⁰ Most readers automatically assume whenever they read of "the Latin Vulgate" that it must always be in reference to the corrupt Vulgate of Jerome. But this is not always the case. The Old Latin of the early Waldenses were also referred to as "the Latin Vulgate" for many years before Jerome produced his revision. Also, Erasmus had translated his own Latin NT as did Beza. It is common knowledge that the KJV translators used the Greek NT of both Erasmus and Beza. Therefore, with that in mind it is highly probable that the Latin versions they collated may have also been that of Erasmus and Beza and not just that of Jerome.

“Think about how extreme this idea is that was presented at the conference! Since Missionary Humberto Gomez’ pastor believes any English Bible other than the KJV is poison, he must believe an English-speaker cannot be saved except through the KJV. Can poison save? I personally do not use or endorse a Bible in English other than the KJV, but that will not stop me from stating that the idea of labeling a non-KJV Bible as “poison” is outrageous and extreme! I believe this group that is providing this new Spanish Bible has shown themselves many times to be on the extreme. Be careful.”⁴¹

He also adds the following sentiment:

“I’m truly saddened that Dr. Waite, who has dedicated his life to the noble cause of defending the KJV, has gradually become more extreme in recent years.”⁴²

According to Calvin George, standing against Critical Text corruption is “extreme” and “outrageous”. But the fact that there is enough truth in corrupt bibles to save an individual does not justify the corruption. The truth is that the corruptions in the NIV, ASV, RSV, TEV, NWT, etc are indeed poisonous! Pastors Tom Gresham and Dr. Waite were absolutely right. Corruption is poison! And we do not want this poisonous Critical Text corruption in ANY Bible in ANY language. That Calvin George would object to this manifests which side he’s on.

One man in particular that Calvin George loves to make a big deal about is Carlos Donate. Carlos Donate has been in the ministry for over 20 years. He has served as a faithful missionary in Guatemala for 18 years. He has established 5 local churches and a Bible Institute on that field. He is responsible for training many other church planters and preachers all throughout Latin America. Bro. Donate also served as the Director of the Spanish Department at Dr. Mickey Carter’s ministry during an 8-month furlough. Bro. Donate is a very learned man with a workable knowledge of Hebrew and Greek having been trained at Hyles-Anderson College. He is a very eloquent Spanish-speaker. And he is one of the collaborators that have aided Bro. Gomez in the RVG project. This Hispanic Missionary has been a pioneer in the Spanish Bible issue.

Calvin George labels this man as an “extremist”. He complains:

“In his RVG conference in November 2007, Pastor Gomez identified Carlos Donate (who had stated that the Reina-Valera 1960 came from the sewers of hell) as one of his “main collaborators” in the RVG project. Missionary Carlos Donate was not collaborating with Pastor Gomez at the time of the 2005 DBS speech, but Pastor Gomez knew in advance exactly how controversial Missionary Carlos Donate was, and yet eventually allowed him to become one of his “main collaborators.””⁴³

What Calvin George probably doesn’t know is that Carlos Donate was the speaker for the Sunday morning service at the aforementioned Bible Conference in Mexico. To the date of this writing, the recording of this message has not been made available yet because Dr. Waite and his wife who recorded most of the conference had to leave

⁴¹ Critique of the Gomez Spanish Bible Conference in November of 2007 by Calvin George

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid.

Saturday morning before Bro. Donate spoke. (I am currently working on making the rest of the conference available that Dr. Waite and his wife were not able to record.)

In Bro. Donate's message, he gave his testimony of his relationship to the Spanish Bible issue. He talked about how he has been pushing for revision for many years, even before Dr. Gomez became involved. He explained that he eventually became so entrenched with this issue that he did make some mistakes in his efforts to promote the revising of the Spanish Bible. He admitted to having said some things that were harsh and controversial at times. But he also explained that since then, he has adjusted his attitude. He said he is now more focused on promoting unity. He also credited Bro. Gomez for influencing him through his testimony to have a more gracious spirit while remaining firm in his convictions.

In the past, Bro. Gomez has publicly protested against those who have gone overboard in their stance on this issue, as seen in his following words:

"There has been attacks left and right concerning the Spanish Bible. I heard some American missionary say so much bad stuff about the Spanish Bible, that the Spanish-speaking brethren will never hear him and will never listen to him. And they will never come to terms with the truth. I heard some American missionary say that the Reina-Valera Bible comes from hell. Yeah, I'm pretty sure they're gonna convince the Mexicans that they need a revision! No way! ... No wonder why the Mexican brethren in all the Spanish world are up in arms against everything that smells of revision, that smells American! ... I'm paying a price for the people that have done such a thing. Sometimes when you hear the name Humberto Gomez some people immediately will identify me with these people."⁴⁴

There are definitely those who have gone overboard on this issue. (The same could be said for both sides of the fence as will be seen in the next point.) But Bro. Gomez has not been one of them. From the very beginning, Bro. Gomez's approach to this difficult issue has been one of reconciliation and a call for unity amongst Hispanic fundamentalism (but not at the expense of truth). The fact that Bro. Donate has joined Bro. Gomez in his efforts of Bible revision should be demonstrative to all of his desire to also be a part of such an approach. In regards to Bro. Donate himself, here is what Bro. Gomez says:

"Mike Lemma, a staunch defender of the RV 1960. Carlos Donate, a staunch opponent of the RV 1960. Both, ended up intensely participating in the revision of the Holy Scriptures. Revision of the Antigua 1909 RVG. Both love and preach the RVG. Both are friends of Bro. Gomez. Past grievances can be forgotten; God can give us the grace of reconciliation. We can forgive, and we must forgive. The work of God should be bigger than our egos."⁴⁵

Yes Carlos Donate may have said some controversial things in the past, but his motive was for the revising of a Spanish Bible that had been infiltrated by the Alexandrian Critical Text. He has adopted a more gracious approach to this whole issue since then. What mature Christian cannot look back on their life and say that if they had it to do over

⁴⁴ From a message delivered by Dr. Humberto Gomez at a 2005 DBS meeting. A recording can be found at www.deanburgonsociety.org.

⁴⁵ www.reinavalera Gomez.com Front page

again, they probably would not have been as harsh and reckless in their zeal for the truth? If Bro. Gomez can forgive those who have been controversial, why shouldn't we? Is Bro. Gomez wrong for forgiving others? Should Carlos Donate be blacklisted forever for past controversial statements? I don't think so.

Bro. Donate has admitted to adopting a different approach to the Spanish Bible issue. The fact is that all of the statements by Carlos Donate that Calvin complains about in his articles were made before Bro. Donate became involved with the RVG project. Bro. Donate was involved with a different Bible project at the time that he made such controversial statements. All of those statements have nothing to do with Bro. Gomez and the RVG project. But Calvin George wants to broad-brush it all into the same picture. I trust that objective readers can see right through Calvin's agenda here.

12. He is not against extremism when it is exhibited against those who support the RVG.

Dr. Mickey Carter has been the Pastor of Landmark Baptist Church in Haines City, FL for over 35 years. His church runs an average of over 1000 attendees every Sunday. He is the author of a book defending the KJV and the Received Texts entitled Things That Are Different Are Not the Same. He is also the President of Landmark Baptist College. As such, Dr. Carter has been responsible for the training of many solid Bible-believing Pastors, Missionaries, and church workers all over the world.

For many years, Dr. Carter has openly stood against the corrupt Critical Texts in the English Bible. It was only inevitable that he would likewise stand against the same Alexandrian corruption in the Spanish Bible as soon as he was informed of such. Because of Dr. Carter's consistent stand, he has suffered the loss of many dear Spanish brethren who once were a part of his ministry. These people were turned against him by disgruntled staff workers who refused to conform to Dr. Carter's wish to be consistent to his ministry's position on the Received Texts and against the Alexandrian Critical Texts. Because of this Dr. Carter was falsely charged with racism against his Hispanic student body. This charge required him to go through unnecessary investigation procedures with immigration services (of which the case was dismissed due to lack of evidence).⁴⁶

Dr. Carter and his associates were also falsely accused of opposing the United Bible Societies because they were supposedly angry that the copyrights for the RV 1960 belonged to the UBS instead of them and that really Dr. Carter and his people had an agenda to produce their own copyrighted Bible to gain monetary profit from.⁴⁷ Of course, this asinine accusation has been proven false as Landmark never had such a plan.⁴⁸ Blatant lies such as this demonstrate how unethical and how far some radical supporters of the 1960 RV have gone to try to discredit the faithful testimony of men like Dr. Carter.

Due to their consistent stand against the influence of the Alexandrian Critical Texts in the Spanish Bibles, Dr. Carter and his people have been publicly labeled as racists, American Imperialists, Nazi Baptists, pious Hitlerites, dysfunctional preachers, and the

⁴⁶ The Elephant in the Living Room edited by Dr. Mickey Carter, pg. 11-12

⁴⁷ Ibid, pg. 176

⁴⁸ Ibid.

Arian race of Christianity.⁴⁹ All this slander came from those who radically support the 1960 RV. *Yet we are the ones that Calvin George considers "extremists"!*

Calvin George talks a lot about ethics in his writings. But has he ever openly denounced the false accusations and verbal abuse that Dr. Mickey Carter and his people suffered for their faithful stand on the Bible? Of course not. Instead Calvin contributes more fuel on the fire by labeling Dr. Carter as "an extremely controversial figure". (Again, notice who he ascribes "extremism" to.) Calvin's plea for ethics is totally one-sided. Calvin publicly insists that Bro. Humberto Gomez should withdraw fellowship from Dr. Carter since he is to be considered an "extremely controversial figure". (Dr. Carter supports the RVG.) But true Bible-believers who understand what is going on could care less who Calvin George insists we should or should not fellowship with. Any man that is willing to stand for the truth at the expense of popularity is to be commended in my book.

In Conclusion

Calvin George is not a true King James Bible proponent. Plain and simple. He claims to have the conviction of only using the KJV in English when he is speaking in English-speaking churches. But his decision to "only use" the KJV is obviously one of convenience and not conviction. It is convenient for a Missionary who wants the financial support of pro-KJV churches to "only use" a KJV. But the fact that he defends the exact same Critical Text errors that are found in the NIV, ASV, RSV, NWT, etc manifest his true colors. A true Bible-believer does not oppose an effort to eradicate corrupt Alexandrian readings from the Spanish Bible.

Now he is entitled to his opinions no matter how wrong they are. He can claim to be whatever he wants to. But he is living in a dream world if he thinks those of us who have read his material will be deceived into thinking he also is a true KJV proponent after seeing how much effort he puts into defending the Critical Texts and opposing those who truly stand for the KJV and the Received Texts.

Something that is interesting to me is that Calvin George works so hard to attack the credibility of men that he could not hold a candle to when it comes to ministry accomplishments and intellectual credentials. Bro. Humberto Gomez was preaching and establishing Spanish-speaking churches when Calvin was still learning how to walk. Dr. Mickey Carter was teaching College level courses on the history of the Bible when Calvin was still in grade school. Bro. Carlos Donate was studying Greek and Hebrew when Calvin was still learning how to read and write. And Dr. D.A.Waite was teaching Greek and Hebrew decades before Calvin was born. Calvin's accomplishments pale in comparison to these men. I am not saying that these men are above criticism. They are fallible human beings like anyone else. And they make mistakes like anyone else. But when someone makes it his life's purpose to challenge the credibility of so many accomplished men of God, it is only fair for Calvin George to be subjected to the same scrutiny. And so far, we have seen that Calvin George's position consist of faulty logic, scare tactics, stereotyping, modernistic tendencies, Alexandrian support, flimsy "scholarship", conspiracy theories, and double-standards.

Calvin George claims that his motive for standing against revision of the Spanish Bible is because he fears it will cause division amongst Spanish Fundamentalism and hinder

⁴⁹ Ibid. pgs.24, 173-178

revival. But since when did the pure words of God in any language become a threat to real revival? That notion is insane. History has proven that the pure words of God can only help to initiate, intensify, and increase revival.

I have corresponded some with Calvin George in the past and have personally met him on one occasion at a Missions Conference in South Carolina. In all of my correspondence with him I have been nothing but respectful and cordial to him. But I get the impression from Calvin George that he is a man that takes himself a little too seriously. He has publicly issued to me the following warning:

“I told you that you can be my friend when you move to the area, but there were conditions about not going overboard. You are pushing it, brother. You should stop and think about how provocative and divisive your position is.”⁵⁰

My brethren, I wish to be friends with everyone. But I am a realist. I know that it is impossible to please everyone. If I have to compromise my convictions on what I know is right concerning the word of God, then there are some friendships I will just have to live without. I have several friends who use the RV 1960. I harbor no animosity toward them. We get along just fine though we disagree on some things. That's what mature Christians do. I realize that this has been a confusing and difficult issue for everyone so I am willing to let time manifest the truth while remaining firm in what I know is right. I do not count Calvin George as an enemy but as a brother in Christ. But if he decides to treat me otherwise, I will leave that matter between him and his conscience. I really could care less either way. I highly doubt that I will lose any sleep over Calvin George's lack of friendship and approval.

My position is that the Alexandrian Critical Texts are corrupt. I do not wish for my English or Spanish Bible to contain such corruption. In the RVG, I have a Spanish Bible of which all traces of Alexandrian corruption have been removed. Thus, I have a Spanish Bible that is in line with the Received Texts and consequently reads parallel with the KJV. That is good enough for me. I am satisfied. While critics like Calvin George continue to concoct new ways to attack the credibility of those associated with the RVG, I intend to go forward in my obligations to win souls and edify saints using a Bible in both English and Spanish that is free of Westcott & Hort Alexandrian Critical Text corruption. The approval or disapproval of man is immaterial to me.

I have read all of Calvin George's material, some of it several times. I have thoroughly considered his arguments. My assessment of the whole matter is that Calvin George's arguments amount to **nothing**. Support for the RVG is growing on a worldwide scale and on a daily basis regardless.

There is much more I can say. But in this treatise, I only want to reveal why Calvin George's lack of support for the RVG is not being taken seriously by true proponents of the KJV and the Received Texts all over the world. Bible-believers who stand for the KJV would never be influenced by those who defend the Alexandrian Critical Text corruption in the modern English versions. Why should we heed to more of the same in regards to the Spanish Bible? If Alexandrian Critical Text corruption is wrong for the English Bible, it's wrong for the Spanish Bible and any other foreign language translation.

⁵⁰ <http://www.fundamentalforums.com/showthread.php?t=22289&highlight=spanish+bible>

Gal 4:16 *Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?* (KJV)

Manny Rodriguez
Missionary to Puerto Rico
www.4thesaviour.com

- Feel free to send any questions or comments to the writer of this article at mannyisback@yahoo.com.
 - Information to purchase your own copy of the Spanish RVG Bible can be found at www.rvg.bz.
 - The Parallel RVG/KJV is coming soon! Stay updated at www.reinavalera.com and www.4thesaviour.com.
 - Read Dr. D.A.Waite's endorsement of the RVG and Dr. Rex Cobb's Comparison Chart of the Reina Valera Bibles at:

http://www.biblefortoday.org/ForeignBibles/spanish_bible.asp
 - Read why one Mexican Pastor switched from the 1960 RV to the RVG at <http://www.interbiblia.com/rvgenglish.htm>
-

Testimonies and Endorsements From Around The World

"Everything started when I began to read the book The Transmission Of The Text Of The New Testament And Our Bibles Of Today by Rudolf Ebertshäuser. For years I used the RV 1960 and was very content but when I was reading this book I found out that the RV 1960 does not follow the Textus Receptus faithfully but rather there are verses that lean upon the Critical Text. I would ask myself "how is it possible that for years no one has told me anything?" I have been in different churches yet no one has ever said anything to me referring to this subject.

I started searching through the Internet and I found websites referring to this subject. First I enquired the 1909 RV and even though it is a Bible more faithful than the 1960 RV, I found words difficult to comprehend because of their antiquity. I continued searching and I was sent an 1865 RV. This version I liked very much because it was faithful to the Received Text, but it also had words of the antiquated Castilian. I consulted this with brethren in other churches and they told me that for the time being outside of the 1909 and 1865 there were no other revisions. Before giving up, I continued searching and I found another revision edited in Columbia SEVA. I contacted them to get a Bible but they told me that it was too expensive to send them by mail so I left that for the moment. But I tried one more time and this time I finally found the RVG on the website www.rices4peru.com. I downloaded it and I was comparing it with e-sword. I compared the well-known verses like Luke 2:22, Dan. 3:25, II Kings 10:25, I Cor. 10:9, Heb. 10:34, and many others that the RV 1960 (without understanding the intention) changed. In what I have been able to prove, the RVG follows the Textus

Receptus faithfully. We Spanish-speaking Christians were in need of a Bible faithful to the Castilian. This is my commentary from Spain. Greetings."

Vicente Martin Delgado
Preacher in Spain

"We have used the RVG in our churches and Bible Institute for more than 2 years. We have found it to be the most accurate translation available in Spanish... I am proud to endorse the revision by Bro. Gomez."

Tim Urling
Missionary in Mexico
www.2EveryCreature.com

"Soon after being saved in 1983 I had the blessing of going to an Independent Baptist Fellowship meeting where I was first made aware that there was not an accurate Spanish Bible. This fact is not a mystery to anyone. For seventeen years I have looked and compared Spanish Bibles looking for an accurate version where I didn't have to apologize or explain away obvious errors. For almost two years, I have had the blessing of having in my hand the Reina Valera Gomez and can now state, without a doubt, that we have an accurate and reliable Bible in Spanish likened unto the KJV."

Joe A. Martinez
17 year vet. Missionary in Argentina

"I just have recently became good friends with Bro Humberto Gomez through the Spanish Bible "RVG". I was using the 1865 Spanish bible until I found many errors. I did not have peace in my heart using this bible. The 1865 really attacks The word "Hell" Infierno in the old testament... I started to study the issue every day for almost 2 years. I am convinced that the RVG "Gomez" is the Word of God for the Spanish speaking people. God has blessed Greatly!! We have been in Paraguay now almost 2 years many souls are receiving Christ and we are starting a second work. The Holy Spirit is testifying to this Bible. The Christians here are accepting the RVG as the Word of God. They Read it, believe it, love it. Amen Glory to God!"

Mike Wilps
Missionary in Paraguay
www.paraguay4christ.com

"It is a privilege to be the first missionary outside of the continental US to receive and use the SRV2004 (RVG). I pray that many others will see the benefits of this Bible and begin using it in their ministry."

Don Rich
Missionary in Peru
<http://www.rich2peru.com>

"On August 13, a group of students from Champion Baptist College and I flew to Costa Rica. The Lord blessed us with some consecrated young people who were a great blessing to the work, passing out tracts, witnessing, singing etc. Since the middle of August we have seen some 28 people saved, more than 35 new people have attended services and at least 18 people have come 2 or more times already. We have elected to use the newly published revision of the 1909 Bible produced by Bro. Humberto Gomez. We are using it in the John and Romans edition we pass out, as well as for preaching and public reading. We are thankful for a printed Bible that is faithful to the Received Text and praise the Lord for the good reception it has had so far. "

Elson Portugal
Missionary to Costa Rica

*"I would say that time, not argument, will be the determining factor as to the credibility and acceptance of the RVG project.I have polled many hispanic preacher around the world who welcome it with open arms. In February of this year, he (**Bro. Gomez**) was given the opportunity to speak before a congress of hispanic fundamentalist leaders from USA, Mexico, Central and South America representing not just Baptists, but old time Methodists, Missionary Alliance, Bible Presbyterian, and Bible churches as well. This group has stood firmly for the 1909 Antigua ever since UBS began promoting W&H in the early 1950's. After the first presentation was given by Dr Gomez, the first reaction was one of caution, but after the week progressed, the delegates had an opportunity to compare verses from RVG (2nd edition) and 1909 and the overwhelming approval and support for the RVG was made known to all by the group's leader. Not only that, but the leading Christian radio station in Guatemala has now publicly endorsed it, and is promoting it daily."*

Carlos Donate
18 yr vet. Missionary in Guatemala

"I have been a missionary in the country of Peru since 2002. I have with great interest studied the matter of the Spanish Bible. I firmly believe that one day I will stand before Almighty God and give an account for my decisions in the ministry as well as my personal life. As a result I have studied since arriving in Peru, the issue of the Spanish Bible. I have read every book that I could get my hands on, I have done in depth studies and comparisons of many Spanish Bibles, I have studied the History of the Spanish Bible, and firmly believe that the Reina Valera Gómez is the most accurate and very best Bible that can be used for the Spanish speaking world. The beauty and purity of the Spanish language has been maintained, as well as a strict adherence to the Textus Receptus and Masoretic texts that the King James Bible is based on. Please visit my web site to see some charts that I have put together: www.reinavalera.com.

Shane D. Rice
Missionary in Peru
<http://www.rices4peru.com>

"I was ignorant to the reality of the Bible versions in English as well as Spanish. Now I stand for the perfect and preserved Words of the KJB and the RVG, brother, let me tell you, IT IS PERFECT! I praise the Lord for what he has done, giving me his perfect words in Spanish!"

Nelson Giménez
Preacher in Paraguay

"I bought a Bible with the King James English on one page and the Reina-Valera 1960 on the other page. I very quickly started finding NIV-type readings in the Spanish. I next ordered a 1909 Reina-Valera, but after checking a few proof texts, I found some of the same NIV-type readings. I eventually ordered an 1865 Reina-Valera, but there were still many readings in this Bible that I did not agree with. Then, a few months ago, I discovered the RVG. I checked verse after verse after verse, and I must say that I breathed a sigh of relief as I found what I believe to be the closest Spanish Bible to the King James."

Robert W. Thurman
Predicando La Verdad Ministries
Cleveland, Tennessee

"It has been demonstrated to our satisfaction that every mistake we have ever been shown in any of the Spanish versions has been corrected in the RVG revision. It is our prayer that the Lord would sanction this revision with a great revival throughout the Hispanic world."

Pastor Tim Fellure
Victory Baptist Church
Milton, FL
www.vbcmilton.org

"With the RVG Bible I see the opportunity to reconcile fundamentalism in Spanish with the fundamentalism in English. With the RVG Bible I see the opportunity to have our Bible printed in our print shops and freely distributed. In the RVG Bible I see a Bible that reconciled the Reina Valera Bibles with the Received Text and Masoretic text, as well as the Authorized Version in English. This is a Bible without the influence of corrupt Egyptian manuscripts and the gnostic texts that are becoming so prominent in our world today.

Fundamental Brethren, I encourage you to study the diabolic influences in our modern Bibles. It is time for us to unite in the battle against Bibles that have been affected by the enemy. The Reina Valera Gomez does not have verses that are affected by corrupt manuscripts, and in its entirety is the Word of God. Read it, study it, and discover it for yourself. We must unite at once, Spanish speaking fundamentalists as well as English speaking fundamentalists in our labor to reach the world with the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Ulises Velázquez Galindo
Missionary in Mexico
www.interbiblia.com