

The Discerner

the voice of... **Religion Analysis Service**

A QUARTERLY EXPOSING
UNBIBLICAL TEACHING & MOVEMENTS

Volume 36, Number 1

January • February • March 2016

Eckankar

Confucianism

Hare Krishna

Freemasons

Jehovah's Witnesses

Humanism

Jainism

Judaism

Neopaganism

MOONIES

Universalism

Wicca

Islam

Hinduism
Exposed!

MORMONS

BAHA'I FAITH

Buddhism

Scientology

Satanism

In This Edition:

Dear Reader.....	2
<i>by Larry Sutherland</i>	
With This Issue	3
The Testimony of Larry Sutherland: From Atheism to the Mission Field!, Part 1 <i>by Larry Sutherland</i>	4
Hyperdispensationalism.....	9
<i>by Dr. William BeVier</i>	
Movie Reviews: "The Young Messiah" and "Risen"	13
<i>by Rick Dack</i>	
The Distant Starlight Problem.....	16
<i>by Steve Lagoon</i>	
Jehovah's Witnesses, War, and Neutrality.....	19
<i>by Steve Lagoon</i>	
QUIZ:	30



*"Hereby know we the spirit of truth
and the spirit of error" 1 John 4:6*

The Discerner

Volume 36, Number 1
January • February • December 2016

Religion Analysis Service

Board Members

Rev. Steve Lagoon: President
Rev. Laurence J. Sutherland: Vice-President
and Editor of "The Discerner,"
Steve Devore: Treasurer, Office Manager
Scott Harvath
George Welshons
Rick Dack
Doug Steiner

PO Box 206

Chaska, MN 55318

612-331-3342 / 1-800-562-9153

FAX 612-331-3342

info@ras.org <http://www.ras.org>

Published Quarterly

Price \$10.00 for 4 issues

Foreign subscriptions \$14.00

Religion Analysis Service

Board of Reference

Dr. Norman Geisler

Dr. James Walker

Don Veinot

Dr. Ron Rhodes

Robert Bowman

M. Kurt Goedelman



DEAR READER

In our last issue, we asked our readers to pray for our long-time editor, Larry Sutherland as he battles health issues. Since then, he has had a birthday and is now 86. Happy Birthday Larry!

We would ask you to continue to pray for Larry and his wife Shirley as the health battles continues. Indeed, Larry informed the board of Religion Analysis Service at our annual meeting that health issues are requiring him to step back his work load on the Discerner.

As of April 1, 2016 Larry will be resigning as editor after 16 years of dedicated service to the Lord and this ministry of biblical truth. We are sad to note this change. Nevertheless, Larry has agreed to stay on with us as Editor Emeritus and we look forward to his continuing contribution to each new issue of the Discerner.

Again, thank-you to Larry and Shirley and God bless you!

Steve Lagoon

WITH THIS ISSUE

As we promised in our last issue, we are excited to present the first of two installments relating the testimony of our editor Larry Sutherland. You will enjoy hearing how God took this teen-age atheist who doubted the existence of God and turned him into a missionary reaching people for Christ all over Eastern Europe.

We are excited to publish an article written by our former and beloved president of Religion Analysis Service, Dr. William BeVier, on the subject of *Hyperdispensationalism*. Somehow, this article had slipped through the cracks and was never published. Dr. BeVier wrote this piece in 2009, but it is well-researched and helpful at the present time.

Our board member Rick Dack provides us with two informative reviews of programs with biblical themes helping us to sort through the good and bad that Hollywood produces in these types of films.

Also in this issue, we have an article that will be of interest to Young Earth Creationist, who are regularly challenged to explain the apparently millions and billions of years of time required for light to get to earth from such distant stars.

Our final article is an about the Jehovah's Witnesses and their views on war, military service, and neutrality. It is a thorough and well-documented refutation of the Watchtower's position on these issues.

Finally, don't forget to take our quiz on cultic groups and the religious books they are associated with.

We hope you enjoy this issue. We welcome your comments and questions. Let us know if there is any topic you would like us to research in the pages of the Discerner.

Steve Lagoon

THE TESTIMONY OF LARRY SUTHERLAND: FROM ATHEISM TO THE MISSION FIELD!

by Dr. Larry Sutherland

I have been asked by the Religion Analysis Service board to elaborate on my life of faith in my last time as editor of *The Discerner*. In 2004 the RAS Board wanted me to become its new editor succeeding Dr. William BeVier who retired after 25 years of service. At that time I submitted a brief synopsis of my background. With this article I will fill in more extensively some of the salient events in my journey. May these notes encourage and strengthen readers to trust the Lord to do His will as He uses us to study and proclaim His wonderful Word.

The first part of my story concerns itself with my conversion and early experiences in growing in faith and learning to witness for Jesus Christ. Dr. Wayne Detzler, a colleague of mine from the German Bible Institute in Seeheim, Germany in the 1960's, requested permission to write up my testimony for his journalism course at the Indiana State University.

From there the text went to Scripture Press and then published in the *Power* magazine under the title: "An Atheist Who Prayed." Detzler's writing is a graphic account of those youthful days and the events that brought me to consider Jesus Christ and His great salvation. For that reason I am including several paragraphs of Detzler's descriptive wording. I have made just a few corrections and additions to make the story even more accurate and detailed.

Conversion and First Steps of Faith

The whine of our tractor-mounted buzz saw pierced the nippy fall air. From the forest came an echo. With autumn leaves lending their colorful background, my two teen-aged brothers and I enjoyed cutting firewood. It felt great to be outdoors and to feel so close to nature.

Henry, owner of a nearby resort, had gathered a pile of big birch logs, which we sliced into stove-sized lengths with the buzz saw. Our little family business provided double dividends: neighbors didn't have to cut wood by hand anymore, and we earned welcome cash for our family. Nine children could consume mountains of food, especially when several were teen-age boys.

I had come of age as a workman, and Dad put me in charge of the tractor and my two brothers. Also helping us was John, a man hired by my dad. Slowly the stack of logs shrunk.

As John reached routinely for another log, a convulsive cry drowned out the saw's din. Henry lay writhing on the ground. He had backed into the blade, and the saw had hurled his mangled body to the ground. One arm was completely severed, a leg was badly mutilated, and a gaping gash ran up his back. The ground was bathed in blood.

"God," I screamed. "God! Don't let John die!" My mind was a tangle of panic and prayer.

"Water," John's pained plea penetrated my confusion. "Give me some water! I'm thirsty." One of us grabbed the water bucket standing nearby.

John's strong remaining arm shot out, and he dumped the bucket all over his face.

"God, don't let John die," I prayed as we tried to reach a doctor. Sure, I claimed to be an atheist. Religion had always seemed unnecessary. I could achieve everything I wanted by hard work. Now I was crying almost involuntarily, "God, don't let him die." In those unforgettable moments I realized that God was there.

Thirty endless minutes dragged by before the doctor came. Soon John had been gently placed in the physician's car and sped to the hospital nine miles away. After two more desperate hours, John died.

Less than a month later, catastrophe struck again. My nine-year-old sister Jan became ill. The doctor's diagnosis was the dreadedcrippler, polio. Again my thoughts turned to God. He just had to do something. "Don't let her die," I prayed, "God, help her!" Once more I was talking to the One whose existence I had denied.

My sister lived, and shortly after her recovery a sheet metal worker, Chet Arnhold, from Grand Rapids came and invited us to come to his Sunday School.

Over a period of two years he taxied us to the Sunday School. At age 17, my spiritual searching climaxed. Finally I came to the point where I humbly prayed: "God, if what Chet tells me is true, if You can wipe out my past and give me a new life, do it."

That was April 1947. When a Canadian evangelist of Slavic extraction, Mr. Ewaka, came to our rural Sunday School a few

months later, I went forward as a demonstration of my faith in Christ. Ewaka's message on Zachaeus (Luke 19) anchored this decision.

Actually, that afternoon in April 1947 was the fruit of many influences. During the first 16 years of my life, my family seldom attended Sunday School or church services. But when I was 12, Mother presented us kids with a Bible for Christmas and we started reading the Bible. Like with any other book, we began at the beginning, in Genesis. It was interesting enough to read about creation and Adam and Eve, but when we came to the long lists of names (chapter 5) I lost interest. There was simply no one around to suggest that starting with a book like Mark's or John's Gospel in the New Testament would have been much more interesting and helpful.

Thinking back to when I was still 15 years of age, I remember telling a hired man that I didn't believe in the existence of God. Of course, I had not studied the issue much though I did read books from Aldous Huxley and Bertrand Russell, who espoused atheistic viewpoints.

A popular religious radio broadcast during the 1940's was the "Old-Fashioned Revival Hour." Sometimes when the speaker, Dr. Charles E. Fuller, talked about the need for Jesus Christ, I was visibly moved. This puzzled my parents.

Before I became a Christian, I was confused over the discrepancy between what believers in Christ claimed and what they did. There seemed to be a gap between religion and reality, and I had concluded therefore that God must not exist. As I looked at so-called Christians, I did not see any difference between them and pagans. There was a lot of 'talk' but little 'walk.'

John's death and my sister's sickness drove me to reexamine atheism.

Maybe there was a kernel of truth in Christianity. One thing kept bothering me; why was I neither injured, nor made lame, nor killed? Why was I spared?

These events in my young years of life influenced me strongly to faith in Jesus Christ as my personal Lord and Savior.

The Sunday School proved to be a balm in Gilead for our wounded, troubled souls. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, loves us and had died on the cross for our sins! We needed this message. Chet urged me to read and study the New Testament.

As I read my Bible and prayed regularly, other teen-age friends noticed a change in my habits. I began to talk and witness about Christ to others.

My language cleaned up, and so did my actions. Second Corinthians 5:17 became a reality in my life—I was indeed a new creature (‘creation’) in Christ. In my senior year in high school the Lord spoke to me through His Word that I should give Him my life and become His servant, perhaps as a missionary (2 Corinthians 5:15). The Grace Bible Chapel in Grand Rapids, which our family now attended regularly, often invited missionaries to speak. They reported exciting developments in exotic-sounding spots stimulating my interest in a missionary career. Then I decided to attend Oak Hills Bible Institute in Bemidji, Minnesota. I was accepted and enrolled as a student in October 1948.

Early Missions Study and Service

For a long time my dad (Pa) did not honor my newfound faith because I would confront him about his drinking, what this was doing to our family, and how Christ could change his life too. Despite his misgivings about my choices, I do believe, however, that he was proud to be the father of a high school Valedictorian (of my graduating class from Grand Rapids High School in 1948). However, my decision to attend the fledgling Oak Hills Christian Training School in Bemidji Minnesota bothered him. “Why don’t you go to the University of Minnesota, study engineering, and be someone?” After I became a minister, I believe, he accepted my choice of vocation as God’s will for me. Later dad came to faith in Christ and repented of his family negligence because of alcoholism.

I attended Oak Hills for three years, graduating with a diploma in 1951. Here I learned how to preach and teach the Bible to jail prisoners, Native American (Indians at Red Lake/ Ponemah, Redby, Ebro, and Minerva), Norwegian and Sweedish farmers, and church “folk’ at Mentor.

And, while a student at Oak Hills, I met Shirley Cooper, another student learning to play the piano. The Lord led us together in marriage on January 2, 1953. Hoping to expand our liberal arts training, we traveled as an extended ‘honeymoon’ westward to Seattle. While I studied at Seattle Pacific College (now University), Shirley completed nurse’s training. Shirley received her RN status in 1957 and I completed my MA degree in Biblical Studies in 1958. Thereupon we traveled back to Minnesota where I pastored the Mildred Bible Chapel in Backus from 1958 to April 1960. I was ordained to the Christian ministry in 1959.

During these years we realized the desperate need for missionaries in Europe, and we applied to and were accepted by the Greater Europe Mission in 1959. It was satisfying to be assigned to West Germany because I and our two-year-old son Philip sailed for Germany about the USS United States in April 1960. Then followed crash courses at Goethe Institutes in Blaubeuren and Rothenburg an der Tauber to polish up my school German.

Summer vacations have been spent in leading the German Bible Institute's extensive camp program. About 200 German children and teen-agers come every year to the wooded campus in Germany's balmy "Bergstrasse" region. Many of them have committed their lives to Jesus Christ, as I did over 20 years ago.

The conclusion of Larry Sutherland's testimony of service to the Lord will appear in our next issue.

HYPERDISPENSATIONALISM (AKA ULTRADISPENSATIONALISM)

by Dr. William BeVier

Various theological systems or schools have been evident in Protestantism for centuries. For example, Covenant Theology (attributed to John Calvin), Arminianism (attributed to Jacob Arminius), Dispensationalism (attributed to John Darby and popularized by C. I. Scofield), and more recently, Hyperdispensationalism (generally attributed first to E. W. Bullinger, 1837–1913).

This article deals only with Hyperdispensationalism in its current form. As with Judaism, Islam, and even with Protestantism, Hyperdispensationalism exists in different interpretations or ‘denominations.’ What is true of one Hyperdispensationalist may not be true of another. For example, some reject both water baptism and the Lord’s Supper for this age or dispensation, other reject water baptism, but practice the Lord’s Supper. Some do not go as far in their interpretation of Scripture as Bullinger did, e.g., believe in soul sleep and annihilation of unbelievers, but others ‘out Bullinger’ Bullinger by reaching other conclusions. This makes for an extreme and a moderate type of Hyperdispensationalism.

All Hyperdispensationalist agree that the present church age did not begin at Pentecost as recorded in Acts 2. They agree the complete revelation by God is to be found only in Paul’s Prison Epistles, e.g., Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. Philemon is obviously another epistle Paul wrote during his first imprisonment in Rome, but in makes no reference to ‘the mystery,’ so it is largely ignored in their teaching.

Hyperdispensationalist believe that a Jewish church began at Pentecost, but that the Gentile church did not begin until after Paul’s conversion, the ‘Apostle to the Gentiles.’ They differ among themselves where this is to be found in Acts 9; 13; or 28. The Jewish church is not considered to be the same as the Body of Christ mentioned in Paul’s writings. (However, most Dispensationalists acknowledge that saved Jews are found in the ‘Gentile church,’ after all, Paul was a Jew).

The word ‘dispensation’ is found several times in the King James translation of the Bible. It can be translated for the Greek word *oikonomeo* meaning age, stewardship, economy, etc.

Most Hyperdispensationalist stress that the ‘mystery’ stated by Paul in Eph. 3:3 and Col. 2:2 (that Jews and Gentiles are now one in the Body of Christ) is God’s final revelation and demotes the ‘dispensation of grace’ for the present age. They see only a ‘Jewish church’ existing prior to the conversion of Paul. In effect this leads to two churches (a Jewish one beginning on the Day of Pentecost, Acts 2) and a Jew-Gentile church, the Body of Christ, beginning at Acts 9; 13; or 28 (When Paul stated his ministry to the Gentiles). But Christ stated in MT. 16:18 He would build his Church, singular, only one.

Most Hyperdispensationalist are true, Biblical Christians as far a personal salvation is concerned. What they say and write are frequently true. It is what they don’t say or don’t believe that leaves biblical questions.

As some limit the ‘mystery’ to Ephesians and Colossians, it raises questions about their interpretation of Scripture. Discounting that the term ‘mystery’ is used 17 times in the KJV New Testament, it should be noted that Paul mentions the mystery in Rom. 16 a full 25 years before he wrote Ephesians and Colossians which indicates it was known previously.

Further, a comparison of Peter’s sermons in Acts and Paul’s sermons recorded in Acts indicates they preached the same gospel to Jews and Gentiles, which Paul defines in 1 Cor. 15:1–4, the for sins, burial, resurrection, and appearance to witnesses of Christ [the burial confirming the death; the witnesses confirming the resurrection].

To limit God’s present message to the world today as being only in Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians ignores the fact that Peter in II Peter 3:15–16 recommends us to all of Paul’s epistles. Further, the Apostle John wrote his gospel, all three epistles, and the book of Revelation after Paul’s martyrdom. God was still giving revelation after Paul.

The Berean Bible Society (takes its name from Acts 17:10–11), now head quartered in Wisconsin with Paul M. Sadler as president and publisher of the Berean Searchlight, in their Doctrinal Statement on their web site reject both the Lord’s Supper and water baptism for this dispensation. But Paul did water baptize some Gentiles (Acts 16:33; 1 Cor. 1:13–17). The Lord’s Supper is detailed in 1 Cor. 11 (as well as being presented in John’s gospel).

To limit the New Testament for today to three or four Prison Epistles is to leave no reference to the Rapture of the Church (1 Cor. 15; 1 Thess 4) and to give no assurance of the restoration of the nation of Israel in the Promised Land (Rom 9–11; Rev.). For these reasons, some Hyperdispensationalists have become more ‘moderate; than such as E. W. Bullinger, J. C. O’Hair, and Cornelius Stam. It is of interest that O’Hair and Stam were once early members of the I.F.C.A. (which holds to traditional Dispensationalism), and that Charles F. Baker, a founder of a hyperdispensational school, was a graduate of Dallas Theological Seminary.

Mentioning schools, an early Hyperdispensational school was Milwaukee Bible Institute founded by Stam and Baker in 1943. It is now Grace Bible College located in Grand Rapids, MI and has accreditation with the North Central Association of Higher Education.

The current president of the Berean Bible Society is Paul M. Sadler. He is author of several published books, e.g., *Exploring the Unsearchable Riches of Christ*, subtitled ‘The Key That Unlocks The Sacred Secret’(1993). He also conducts seminars and conferences across the country.

A prominent and popular current exponent of Hyperdispensationalism is Les Feldick. He declares himself a ‘laymen’ and an Oklahoma cattle rancher. He has produced hundreds of radio tapes and videos which are available to the public on line. His radio programs are on several stations and he conducts Bible conferences in churches, private homes, and public buildings. To bring up his name on the internet produces over 400 entries. He is a good communication in a popular, homey style. I have heard several of his tapes, watched several of his videos, and heard him in person a number of times. Again, it should be noted much of what he says is biblically true, but it is what he doesn’t say which is troubling in the light of the entire Bible. For example, I don’t remember him ever mentioning the Lord’ Supper or water baptism, or even joining a local church of believers.

It was the Apostle Paul who told the Ephesians elders (before writing the Ephesians epistle) that he ‘kept back nothing that was profitable unto you . . .’ (Acts 20:20) and it was the Apostle Peter who wrote of Paul ‘in all his epistles’ speaking in them of as in the ‘other Scriptures’ (2 Pet. 3:15).

Permit me to close this article by referring to some personal experiences. I was a young man in the late 1940’s when I was

called into the ministry. I was assigned as student pastor to a small Presbyterian church in Everton MO. We had services only on Sunday mornings and in midweek. I and several other young people began attending Grace Bible Church in Springfield MO on Sunday evenings. In this church was a woman who invited us to her apartment for a Friday evening Bible study. This woman had attended Bible conferences throughout the country. One of her favorite teachers was Lewis Sperry Chafer of Dallas Seminary. It was through her suggestion that several of us purchased Scofield Reference Bibles and were exposed to historic Dispensationalism. However, she became aware of the Berean Searchlight publication and the writings of J.C. O'Hair and Cornelius Stam. She began to teach us her new-found truth, which was hyperdispensationalism. This went on for some time until a professor from Dallas Seminary conducted a Bible conference in Grace Bible Church. He became aware of the teaching we were receiving from the woman. He took several of us aside and called attention to some of the errors of this system of Bible study.

In time I enrolled in Dallas Seminary. I also completed a master's thesis at Southern Methodist University on the life and ministry of C.I. Scofield. Today I'm a traditional Dispensationalist (not 'progressive') and concerning hyperdispensationalism, I've 'been there, done that.'

MOVIE REVIEWS

by Rick Dack

The Young Messiah: Will Christians Take this Film as Gospel or Fiction?

Bible scholars know little about the early life of Jesus, but that hasn't stopped filmmakers from blending fact with fiction. The upcoming March 11th release of *The Young Messiah* is no exception; yet it's unfair to paint all productions with this brush. *The Jesus Film* (1979) and some portions of *Jesus of Nazareth* (1977) accurately depict the angelic visitation to Mary as well as Jesus' three-day temple court experience (Luke 2:41–50). After Jerusalem, the Bible tells us little about Jesus until the age of thirty (See Luke 2:51–52).

The Young Messiah, based upon Anne Rice's novel, *Christ the Lord: Out of Egypt*, is a fictional account of Jesus' life (age seven), the uncovering of secrets about his Messianic identity and his re-introduction into Israeli society. But there are obvious scriptural, archaeological, and chronological problems one must address. It is known, according to the Jewish historian Josephus, that King Herod the Great died in 4 B.C.E. and that Jesus was born no earlier than 6 B.C.E. Prior to his death the paranoid Herod orders the "Massacre of the Innocents" (Matthew 2:13–18) targeting males two years and younger in Bethlehem and surrounding areas. Jesus' family flees to Egypt and then are told to return to Israel after the king's death via dreams (Matthew 2:13, 19–20). This would place Jesus at age two or less not seven.

In addition to bad chronology other cinematic Bible myths may include:

- Jesus accidentally killing a bully and resurrecting him.
- Joseph's prior marriage and son before Jesus' birth.
- Joseph's non-sexual, emotionally cold relationship with Mary (contradicts Mark 6:3, Matthew 13:55–56).
- The family struggle in telling Jesus about his true Messianic identity.
- Jesus and his family are almost trampled in Jerusalem during a Passover riot.

- Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, is killed by Roman soldiers.

Will you go see *The Young Messiah* even if it's fiction?

Risen the Movie: Does it Pass the Bible Test?

“I think we got it right,” stated Joseph Fiennes, a few days after the release of the film *Risen* (February 11, 2016). Fiennes plays Clavius, a Roman soldier turned investigator ordered by Pontius Pilate to find Jesus' body—the fourth movie on this theme. The first was *The Inquiry* (1987), then *Resurrection* (1998) followed ten years later by *The Final Inquiry* with Dolph Lundgren (Drago from *Rocky IV*). Drago?

Unfortunately, *Risen* doesn't hold up to scriptural and archaeological integrity. Bible film endorsements from well-known Christian leaders since 2006 (*The Nativity Story*) has been problematic. Mary's pregnancy questioned by her father (Did she sleep with a Herodian soldier?) and Lazarus' resurrection with a kiss to the head (Son of God) is acceptable content to some, but it's not Bible. The following examples from *Risen* are scripturally problematic:

- Barabbas dying in battle (hours after being released by Pilate?).
- The crucifixion scenes (location, Jewish purity laws).
- Clavius' (Roman) compassion towards the family of Jesus at Golgotha is fiction.
- “It is finished” are the only words of Jesus from the cross.
- The tomb in *Risen* is not first century (no corpse tunnel etc.).
- Two inebriated soldiers guard Jesus' tomb.
- The burial clothes of Jesus are strewn (not biblical—John 20:6, 7).
- Bartholomew, supposedly depicting joyfulness, embodies a mentally ill quality.
- Jesus' appearance to Thomas and the other disciples.
- Mary Magdalene is referred to as a prostitute three times (not biblical, see Mark 16:1, Luke 8:2).
- Caiaphas wants Jesus' body burned.

On the positive side, Joseph Fiennes is believable as Clavius, Jesus (Cliff Curtis) displays a subtle self-confidence and the elderly cemetery woman (Clair Agius) interrogated by Clavius gives an emotionally “kind” performance.

Before seeing ‘Risen’ Christians should read the Gospel accounts surrounding Easter, its participants and its aftermath, then put the film to the Bible test. *Risen* is entertaining (its goal) but not necessarily biblical.

Better Protrayals of Christ in Movies

If you are wishing for a better portrayal of Christ, check out *The Gospel of John* (2003) and *The Jesus Film* (1979) on DVD. These films are good tools in educating your family about the life, death and resurrection of Jesus.

Rick Dack is a board member of Religion Analysis Service, as well, as the director of Defending the Bible International. You can reach him at defendingthebible@usfamily.net, or through RAS.

THE DISTANT STARLIGHT PROBLEM

by Steve Lagoon

Question:

How can those who believe in a young earth explain the fact that it takes millions of years for the light from stars to travel across the universe to reach the earth. Some claim that God not only created the stars, but He created the light travelling from the stars to earth at the same time. But how can you escape the claim that such a scenario would involve deception since the light that the alleged Adam would see in the Garden of Eden never in fact came from a star?

Answer:

This question is often referred to as the “Distant Star Problem,” yet it is only thought to be a problem for those who adhere to Young Earth Creationism. While we do not claim that the Young Earth position is the only one possible for conservative, Bible-believing Christians (some gap and reconstruction theorist support an old earth), *Religion Analysis Service* has always been a supporter of Young Earth Creationism.

What is interesting is that Young Earth Creationists do not agree amongst themselves on how to answer the supposed Distant Star Problem. Personally, I have always accepted the explanation that God created the streams of light from the stars to earth at the same time He created the stars themselves as the best solution.

That is why I was surprised recently when reading Young Earth Creationist Jonathan Sarfati’s (associated with Answers in Genesis or AIG) book *Refuting Compromise* in which he discussed the Distant Star Problem. He rejects the apparent age answer in favor of theoretical ways in which time can travel at faster than the speed of light in certain conditions (i.e. black holes, white holes etc):

Some older creationists works proposed that God may have created the light in transit, and Ross harps on at this as if it is still mainstream creationist thinking . . . But AIG long ago pointed out the problems with this idea. It would entail that we would be seeing light from heavenly bodies that don’t really exist . . . This, in effect, suggests that God is a deceiver.”¹

1 Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Compromise: A Biblical and Scientific Refutation of ‘Progressive Creationism,’* Green Forest AZ (Master Books, 2004) 189–190. See the similar discussion by the Answers in Genesis team in *“The Revised & Expanded Answers Book,* Don Batten Editor, Green Forest AZ (Master Books, 1990) Chapter Five.

Now I have immense respect for Jonathan Sarfati, but I must disagree on this minor point. First, it only makes sense that when God created the world, and the universe, He created mature and fully functioning systems. He didn't create Adam as a baby and wait for him to grow into adulthood. He made a fully-formed man with apparent age. This reality cannot be escaped for those who take the Bible as God literal word.

But Sarfati argues:

This is very different from creating Adam as fully grown, looking like a 20-year old, say, although he was really only a few minutes old . . . There is no deception, because God has told us that He created Adam from the dust, not by growing from an infant. But God has also told us that the stars are real, and they are signs (Gen. 1:14), not just apparitions from light waves.²

Dr. Sarfati's argument only makes sense if the stars are not real, but that is not at all what traditional Young Earth Creationists asserted. Rather, they argued that God made the whole complete system at creation including the stars and the light travelling from them to the earth, all at the same time.

For example, in 1990, Duane Gish, of the Institute for creation Research wrote:

When God created the stars, He also could easily have created the stream of light between the stars and the earth. Thus, Adam and Eve could "see" each star and know exactly where it was in the sky on the very first night when they looked up into the sky. You might say that the light beam coming to earth from each star serves as a "pointer" to tell us where each star is.³

This seems the easiest understanding and Ockham's razor encourages us to pay serious attention to the easiest explanation. I simply don't see how this answer for the Distant Star Problem is any guiltier of deception than the apparent age of Adam and Eve when they were created.

Robert E. Kofahl agrees:

Did not God create things with a false appearance of age?
Isn't that deceptive? Answer: The Garden of Eden was filled

2 Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Compromise: A Biblical and Scientific Refutation of 'Progressive Creationism,'* Green Forest AZ (Master Books, 2004) 190.

3 Duane T. Gish, *The Amazing Story of Creation from Science and the Bible*, El Cajon CA (Institute for Creation Research, 1990) 13.

with false appearances of age, it is true—full grown trees, plants, animals, and entire biosphere. In fact, Adam and Eve themselves were created as adults from the beginning of their existence. But this is not deceptive, since God has told us what he did, and we need but believe what He tells us.⁴

Kofahl's last point is most important. God has told us in the Bible what he did. Anyone who thinks through the creation account in Genesis could reasonably conclude that there was apparent age, not only in Adam, and in the tall trees, but in the entire mature ecosystem that God created.

In such a mature and fully-functioning universe, the first humans could take advantage of the stellar objects of God's creation:

“And God said, ‘Let there be lights in the expanse of the sky to separate day from night, and let them serve as signs to mark the seasons and days and years’”(Genesis 1:14).

In other words, this fully-functioning universe with the stars, and the light from them, was created so that man could benefit from them from the beginning. There is no deception; Genesis spills the beans.

⁴ Robert E. Kofahl, *Handy Dandy Evolution Refuter*, Revised and Expanded, San Diego (Beta Books, 1977, 1980) 130.

JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES, WAR, AND NEUTRALITY, PART 1

by Steve Lagoon

Introduction

In this article we will examine the views of the Jehovah's Witnesses concerning the relationship Christians should have with the governments ruling in the country they preside. More specifically, should Christians support their country by serving in the military, or in some other governmental capacity (city councilman, mayor, senator, representative etc)? We will begin by outlining the Watchtower position, and then examine them in the light of earlier Watchtower history, and conclude by analyzing their position biblically.

Watchtower Position of Government Service and War

Jehovah's Witnesses teach that the proper biblical position for Christians is to remain neutral in relation to the affairs of the secular governments of the world, believing that their only loyalty can be to the theocracy of Jehovah's government. For instance, the *Watchtower* states: "Jesus' disciples obey his command to be 'no part of the world' by remaining strictly neutral in political matters." (John 17:16).¹

Yes, the Watchtower affirms that Christians should be law-abiding citizens of the country they abide in, yet, they teach that they must obey the higher laws of Jehovah and resist if called to serve their government, particularly in the matter of war:

Neutrality Definition: The position of those who do not take sides with or give support to either of two or more contending parties. It is a fact of ancient and modern-day history that in every nation and under all circumstances true Christians have endeavored to maintain complete neutrality as to conflicts between factions of the world. They do not interfere with what others do about sharing in patriotic ceremonies, serving in the armed forces, joining a political party, running for a political office, or voting. But they themselves worship only Jehovah, the God of the Bible; they have dedicated their lives unreservedly to him and give their full support to his Kingdom.²

1 JW.org, About Us, <https://www.jw.org/en/jehovahs-witnesses/faq/why-dont-you-go-to-war/>, 2015.

2 *Reasoning from the Scriptures*, Brooklyn New York (Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, 1985, 1989) 269–270. Let it be noted that the Watchtower describes its position as **Neutrality**. It is interesting that the Watchtower book *"Life Everlasting—in the Freedom of the Sons of God"*, 1966, p. 296 states: "The word '**Neutrality**' is not found in the Bible." Let us remember that the Watchtower regularly criticizes the doctrine of the Trinity because the word is not in the Bible: "It is worth noting that the word '**Trinity**' never occurs in the Bible" (*What Does the Bible Really Teach?*

The Watchtower *position* is clear and without exceptions: “This means that the wars being fought in the earth today do not have God’s approval, no matter how noble the cause may appear to be.”³ This blanket condemnation of war is in distinct opposition to the theory of the just war (more on that later) and would require the difficult conclusion that it was wrong for the allies to fight in World War II to stop Hitler and his holocaust.

The irony is that while Jehovah’s Witnesses refused to join that fight, they also condemned the heroic efforts of the allies fighting to stop Hitler in order to save his many victims including the Jehovah’s Witnesses in the concentration camps.

One prominent argument often put forward by Jehovah’s Witnesses for opposing Christian involvement in war is:

The Christian congregation, on the other hand, has no borders, and its members can be found in all lands. So if Christ’s followers in one country were to join in warfare against another country, they would be fighting against fellow believers—their spiritual brothers and sisters—whom they are commanded to love and even die for.—Matthew 5:44; John 15:12.⁴

We will address this objection in due order, but it shows the very real concerns that Jehovah’s Witnesses would have if they had to fight in wars, and possibly find themselves in just a a scenario. Indeed, we can think of the American Civil War (1861–1865) in which “brother fought brother” and in which both sides were predominantly from the same Christian denominations.

Indeed, Jehovah’s Witnesses are well-known for their conscientious objection status during time of war:

An examination of the historical facts shows that not only have Jehovah’s Witnesses refused to put on military uniforms and take up arms but, during the past half century and more, they have also declined to do noncombatant service or to accept other work assignments as a substitute for military service. Why? Because they have studied God’s requirements and then made a personal, conscientious decision.⁵

Brooklyn New York (Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc., 2005) 202. Here the Watchtower reveals its inconsistency and bias.

3 *Watchtower*, 11/2015.

4 *Awake*, August 2011, p. 22.

5 *United in Worship of the Only True God*, Brooklyn New York (Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, 1983)166.

So much so, that Jehovah's Witnesses have served long prison sentences rather than obeying the call to military service. Penton describes the situation during World War I:

As indicated earlier, Russell and the Bible Students were strongly opposed to participation in the war . . . As a result, Bible Student men who refused to serve as combatants when conscripted for military service often underwent imprisonment and brutal treatment, and in a few cases were executed.⁶

Alfs states that due to their stand against war in World War II:

Some 4,300 of Jehovah's Witnesses wound up in prison as violators of the Selective Service Act (composing just shy of $\frac{3}{4}$ of all convicted violators of the draft who were conscientiously opposed to the war!).⁷

Further, the Watchtower has been at the forefront in the legal battle for conscientious objector status rights, fighting many notable cases before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Neutrality and Political Service

As we have seen, this neutrality the Watchtower advocates goes beyond merely refusing to serve in the military, but extends to any governmental or political activity at all. Rather than support any particular country, Jehovah's Witnesses teach that they must be neutral to the world's affairs. For instance, the Watchtower states: "But, since Jesus said that his disciples would be "no part of the world," Jehovah's Witnesses take no part whatsoever in political activities."⁸

This neutrality is necessary because Jehovah's Witnesses believe that the governments of this world are under satanic control. This neutrality means that Jehovah's Witnesses do not vote in elections nor do they serve in government positions.

Patriotic Activities

Neither do they participate in patriotic activities: "So then, while others salute and pledge allegiance, our children stand quietly during

6 M. James Penton, *Apocalypse Delayed: The Story of Jehovah's Witnesses*, Second Edition, Toronto (University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 1997) 55.

7 Matthew Alfs, *The Evocative Religion of the Jehovah's Witnesses: An Analysis of a Present-Day Phenomenon*, Minneapolis MN (Old Theology Book House, 1991) 81.

8 *United in Worship of the Only True God*, Brooklyn New York (Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, 1983) 166.

the flag salute ceremony.”⁹ Indeed, the Watchtower believes such acts are idolatrous:

Flag salute. Jehovah’s Witnesses believe that bowing down to a flag or saluting it, often in conjunction with an anthem, is a religious act that ascribes salvation, not to God, but to the State or to its leaders.¹⁰

Earlier Watchtower Views on Governmental Relations

Now that we have briefly surveyed the Watchtower’s position on a Christian’s proper relationship to secular governments, it will be quite instructive to examine the early history of Jehovah’s Witnesses concerning these matters. What we shall find is that the current Watchtower position has changed from its original position, and that despite the image the Watchtower so often presents, the organization has not remained faithful to its neutrality position.

The Early Watchtower position on War

It is clear that Charles Taze Russell’s view of involvement in war underwent a change as reflected in the pages of the *Watchtower*. He seems always to have counseled against both actively seeking to serve in the military (which he saw as a diversion from service to the true Watchtower theocracy) and from killing during military service (for reasons that are unclear).

Nevertheless, on the question of how to respond if drafted into the military by one’s country, the *Watchtower* initially approved of it and then later opposed it. So in 1898, commenting on the question of how to respond if one were drafted into military service the *Watchtower* stated:

Question. I was surprised to note your advice to any who might be drafted into the army. Would not your advice seem like compromising to avoid trouble? *Answer.* It is proper to avoid trouble in a proper manner. It is proper to compromise when no principle is involved, as in the case mentioned. *Notice that there is no command in the Scriptures against military service.* Obedience to a draft would remind us of our Lord’s words, “If any man compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.” *The government may compel marching or drilling, but cannot compel you to kill the foe. You need not be a good marksman.*¹¹

⁹ *School and Jehovah’s Witnesses*, New York (Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, 1983) 16.

¹⁰ *Keep Yourselves in God’s Love*, Brooklyn New York (Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, 2008, 2014), Appendix: *Flag Salute, Voting, and Civilian Service*.

¹¹ *Watchtower* August 1, 1898, reprints 2345 (Italics are not in original)

The Watchtower held the same position five years later:

*Obedience to the laws of the land might at some time oblige us to bear arms, and in such event it would be our duty to go into the army, if unable in any legal and proper manner to obtain exemption, but it would not be our duty to volunteer. We are soldiers in another army, which battles not with carnal weapons, and whose contests are from an entirely different standpoint and in an entirely different spirit. There could be nothing against our consciences in going into the army. Wherever we would go we could take the Lord with us, the Captain of our salvation, and wherever we would go we could find opportunities to serve him and his cause. If it came to the point of battling we above all others need have no fear of death, but we, assuredly, would be obliged to draw the line when commanded to fire, and we could not, in harmony with the divine program, fire upon a fellow-creature with the intention of taking his life. If we fired we should be obliged to fire either into the air or into the ground.*¹²

However, at the outbreak of America's involvement in World War I, the *Watchtower's* position, while still under Russell's leadership, was undergoing a transformation to a position in complete opposition to military service, including any type of alternative service, even if drafted:

THE CHRISTIAN'S PROPER ATTITUDE Meanwhile, where do the true followers of Christ stand, and what is their duty? Bible students more and more are awakening to a realization of what the present war is, and are conscientiously inquiring respecting their own responsibility . . . In SCRIPTURE STUDIES, Vol. VI., we have set forth a suggestion that the followers of Christ seek by every proper means to avoid participation in war. We there suggested the possibility, but that in the event of conscription the Lord's followers should use all their influence toward obtaining positions in the Hospital Corps or in the Provision Department of the Army, rather than in the actual warfare. We suggested further that if it were impossible to avoid going into the trenches, it would still not be necessary to violate the Divine requirement, 'Thou shalt do no murder.' We have been wondering since if the course we have suggested is the best one. We wonder if such a course would not mean compromise. We reflect that to become a member of the army and to put on the military uniform implies the duties and obligations of a soldier as recognized and accepted. A protest made to an officer would

¹² *Watchtower* April 15, 1903, reprints 3179-3180

be insignificant—the public in general would not know of it. Would not the Christian be really out of his place under such conditions?

‘But,’ someone replies, ‘if one were to refuse the uniform and the military service he would be shot.’ We reply that if the presentation were properly made there might be some kind of exoneration; but if not, would it be any worse to be shot because of loyalty to the Prince of Peace and refusal to disobey His order than to be shot while under the banner of these earthly kings and apparently giving them support and, in appearance at least, compromising the teachings of our Heavenly King? Of the two deaths we would prefer the former—prefer to die because of faithfulness to our Heavenly King. Certainly the one dying for his loyalty to the principles of the Lord’s teachings would accomplish far more by his death than would the one dying in the trenches.¹³

So, while it is couched in cautious and legally self-protective terms, the new *Watchtower* position was that neither performing military service when drafted, nor engaging in alternative or non-combatant service was viewed as ethical for Jehovah’s Witnesses. As a consequence, when America entered World War I in 1917, it resulted in much suffering for Jehovah’s Witnesses (Bible Students) who tried to be faithful to the whims of Russell’s teachings. Matthew Alfs reports:

These men [Jehovah’s Witnesses who had been drafted into the military] were usually summarily convicted and imprisoned. The sentences for both classes of draft-refusing religious objectors (i.e., those not exempted and thus liable for combatant service; those exempted but assigned to non-combatant service) were inordinately severe, ranging as high as 50 years! Over 125 objectors actually received life sentences, and a few death sentences were even handed down, though these were later commuted.¹⁴

Alfs also relates that the same situation prevailed during World War II:

The re-declaration of the denomination’s military neutrality, at the birth of World War II, sparked another maelstrom of contention, especially upon America’s entrance into the War in December of 1941. . . . The idea had developed among Witnesses in general that alternative service would be a compromise

¹³ The *Watchtower and Herald of Christ’s Presence*, September 1, 1915, p. 260. Reprints 5755

¹⁴ Alfs, *The Evocative Religion of the Jehovah’s Witnesses*, 237.

of their neutral politico-military position and /or their vow of exclusive devotion to Jehovah. (Subsequent Watchtower literature elaborated to the extent that since alternative service was merely a replacement for combatant service it incurred the value—and consequent Divine displeasure—of the thing for which it substituted [military service].¹⁵

This stand led to continued suffering for Jehovah’s Witnesses during the period of World War II as their own history reports:

In North America too, Jehovah’s Witnesses were confronted by severe obstacles during the war. Widespread mob violence and unconstitutional application of local laws brought great pressure on the preaching work. Thousands were imprisoned because of taking their stand as Christian neutrals.¹⁶

Watchtower Compromises on Neutrality

We can certainly respect a religious group for taking a position in opposition to war. Indeed, we can admire the Jehovah’s Witnesses for remaining fairly steadfast in their opposition to any kind of governmental service out of their beliefs that secular governments are part of Satan’s system of things, and their desire to be loyal only to Jehovah. How much more can we admire their stand when it has added so much in their suffering and persecution.

But Jehovah’s Witnesses, or those considering becoming Jehovah’s Witnesses, should know that the Watchtowers teachings are not only unbiblical, but more importantly for our purposes in this article, they should also know that the Watchtower has repeatedly compromised with respect to their claims of neutrality.

The Compromises of World War I

Matthew Alfs summed up the Watchtower’s actions to placate the United States government in the face of impending actions against the organization and particularly its leaders, at the outset of World War I:

The Watch Tower Society, upon learning of the Government’s suspicions with respect to a possible propagation of anti-war sentiment on the organization’s part, proceeded in a course designed to appease the government, not oppose it. Thus, it agreed to excise the objectionable pages from *The Finished*

¹⁵ Alfs, *The Evocative Religion of the Jehovah’s Witnesses*, 75, 78.

¹⁶ *Jehovah’s Witnesses: Proclaimers of God’s Kingdom*, Brooklyn New York (Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, 1993) 456.

Mystery; it bestowed flattery upon the government calling it ‘the best government on earth’ and ‘the land divinely ‘shadowed with wings’; and it even requested the Bible Students to comply with Presidential requests concerning prayer for the speedy end and ‘glorious outcome of the war, the breaking of the shackles of autocracy . . . and the making of the world safe for the common people.’¹⁷

As part of this Watchtower effort to appease the United States government, and in complete violation of its supposed neutrality stand, Christy Harvey Darlington explains the Watchtowers cooperation in the matter of U.S. War Bonds:

The Society was encouraging its members to buy war bonds (which at the time were known as ‘Liberty Loans’) to aid the government in funding World War 1. Note the following statements found in . . . [*the Watchtower*]: ‘The people of our Association are not against the Government, nor against the Liberty Loan . . . Members of our Association who have some personal means have bought Liberty Bonds, including Tabernacle workers who are paying 25% of their monthly allowance to purchase a bond.’—*The Watchtower*, May 15, 1918, p. 152.¹⁸

Indeed, despite the Watchtowers clear rejection of patriotic actions today, nevertheless, in the pressure leading up to American involvement in World War I, the Watchtower took pains to appear quite patriotic:

The American flag was adopted as an emblem of liberty . . . The displaying of the American flag can do injury to no one . . . Recognizing that the Government of the United States has been the special refuge of Christian people from intolerable persecution; that it was founded as an asylum of religious liberty and freedom of speech, everyone in America should take pleasure in displaying the American flag—especially when requested to do so . . . Since the Bethel Home was established, in one end of the Drawing Room there has been kept a small bust of Abraham Lincoln with two American flags displayed about the bust. This is deemed entirely proper, having in mind what Mr. Lincoln did for the Government and for the people of the United States, and in this we see nothing inconsistent with a Christian’s duty.¹⁹

¹⁷ Alfs, *The Evocative Religion of the Jehovah’s Witnesses*, 19–20. Alfs quotes from the *Watchtower* of May 15, 1918

¹⁸ Christy Harvey Darlington, *An Analysis of the Watchtower’s Historical Position on War: Has the Watchtower Organization Always Been as Neutral as They Claim?* Colorado Springs CO (Witnesses for Jesus, Not Dated/ Circa 1995) 1.

¹⁹ *The Watch Tower*, May 15, 1917, 150–151, reprints 6086

Now we certainly agree with the sentiment of the quote, but the problem is that it goes directly contrary to the Jehovah's Witnesses claim of neutrality, and was done in hopes of staving off government action against the Watchtower for evading the draft.

It can be imagined that these compromises during the World War I period would later be embarrassing to the Watchtower and cause questions to many sincere Jehovah's Witnesses. And so the Watchtower needed to provide an answer to the questions. In reviewing these events for their 1959 history book *Jehovah's Witnesses in the Divine Purpose*, the Watchtower took the clever approach of essentially admitting the compromises, but twisting it into a positive since they had confessed their sins and escaped from the Babylonian captivity they had been caught in:

The Society . . . soon realized they had been held in spiritual bondage . . . There were many false doctrines and practices that had not yet been cleansed out of the organization . . . The brothers had been in Babylonish captivity at the time . . . The Witnesses had been held in fear of man, particularly the civil rulers . . . The change-over in thinking had been so striking in many ways, *from the 1870's down to 1918 that these tainted bonds of false conceptions and practices, inherited from the pagan traditions adopted by Christendom had slipped by unnoticed by the brothers.* Now from the year 1919 a glorious new outlook presented itself. *These dedicated servants began to recognize their mistakes and make a public confession of their wrongdoing in their effort to seek Jehovah's forgiveness and be restored to his favor, which they realized they had temporarily lost . . .* Another compromise was made as revealed in The Watch Tower of June 1, 1918 . . . The expression that followed in this announcement [a call for prayer for an allied victory in World War 1] did not display the proper neutrality of the Christian.²⁰

A 1972 Watchtower statement was very direct:

During World War I the dedicated, baptized International Bible Students . . . had yielded in a measure to fear of man . . . They had tried to keep free from bloodguilt by undertaking, for the most part, noncombatant service, but had not kept strict, total neutrality toward the conflicts of this world.²¹

20 *Jehovah's Witnesses in the Divine Purpose*, Brooklyn New York (Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, 1959) 91–92 (Italics not in original).

21 *Paradise Restored To Mankind—By Theocracy!* Brooklyn New York (Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, 1972) 99. See also *The Watchtower*, February 15, 1996, p. 14. "For a relatively brief span during World War 1 period, the remnant . . . compromised by not taking a clear stand for Jehovah when put under the pressure to support the warring nations."

There are several things that are amazing about this Watchtower attempt to excuse its own history. First, one can hardly blame those early Jehovah's Witnesses who accepted alternative or non-combatant service since that had been the long-standing policy and teaching of the *Watchtower* right up until the sudden change at the beginning of World War I.

Secondly, the Watchtower's explanation of this early period of its own history is as bizarre as it is incomprehensible. On the one hand, according to the Watchtower, God appointed the organization to be His Faithful and Discreet Slave as a reward for their faithfulness to Jehovah as determined by the Lord's investigation of their teachings and practices conducted from 1914 to 1917:

When did Jesus appoint the faithful slave over his domestics? To answer that, we need to go back to 1914—the beginning of the harvest season. As we learned earlier, at that time many groups claimed to be Christian. From which group would Jesus select and appoint the faithful slave? That question was answered after he and his Father came and inspected the temple, or spiritual arrangement for worship, from 1914 to the early part of 1919. (Mal. 3:1) They were pleased with a small band of loyal Bible Students who showed that their heart was with Jehovah and his Word. Of course, they needed some cleansing, but they humbly responded during a brief period of testing and refining. (Mal. 3:2–4) Those faithful Bible Students were true Christian wheat. In 1919, a time of spiritual revival, Jesus selected capable anointed brothers from among them to be the faithful and discreet slave and appointed them over his domestics.²²

On the other hand, as we have documented above, this same organization during the same time period, was judged to be in a Babylonian captivity for its many doctrinal errors and false practices. Again, according to the Watchtower's statements, their organization during the period of 1914 to 1917 was so tainted with Christendom's pagan teachings and guilty of compromise on the issue of neutrality that they were in a Babylonian captivity for which they needed to repent and be restored to Jehovah. Yet, after an investigation during the same precise period, God was so pleased with the organization that he appointed it as his faithful and discreet slave!

Let us also note that the July 2013 *Watchtower* article just quoted concludes with the statement that in 1919 "Jesus selected capable

22 *Who Really Is the Faithful and Discreet Slave?*, *Watchtower* July 2013, on line at: <https://www.jw.org/en/publications/magazines/w20130715/who-is-faithful-discreet-slave/>

anointed brothers . . . to be the faithful and discreet slave.” It seems to imply that there has been in some sense a cleaning of the house in the leadership of the organization. In reality, there was no change at all; Judge Rutherford and his team continued in control.

Raymond Franz, a former member of the Watchtower’s Governing Body notes the same issue:

If these things make them ‘unclean’—so drastically that the newly enthroned King [in 1914] was obliged to abandon them to captivity, what must one assume? Surely that they would have to be cleansed of these things before they could come out from under his disfavor and be able to return to freedom . . . Yet, inexplicably, in 1919, when they are said to have ‘returned from Babylon,’ they were still believing and practicing the identical things that are supposed to have made them unclean and which led to their captivity!²³

Herein there is a clear double-standard on the behalf of the Watchtower leadership regarding the breaking of the organization’s neutrality policies. Individual Jehovah’s Witnesses were castigated and ex-communicated from the organization for their so-called compromise of accepting alternative or non-combatant roles during the war. On the other hand, Judge Rutherford and his leadership team continued in their positions despite having orchestrated the much more serious compromise on neutrality.

23 Raymond Franz, *In Search of Christian Freedom*, Atlanta GA (Commentary Press, 1991) 147.

QUIZ: RELIGIOUS BOOKS

1. The Pearl of Great Price

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <u> </u> a. Sikhism | <u> </u> c. The Shakers |
| <u> </u> b. Mormonism | <u> </u> d. The Coasters |

2. The Upanishads

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| <u> </u> a. The Raelians | <u> </u> c. Islam |
| <u> </u> b. The Millennial Dawn | <u> </u> d. Hinduism |

3. Science and Health with the Key to the Scriptures

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| <u> </u> a. Scientology | <u> </u> c. Christian Science |
| <u> </u> b. Unity School of Christianity | <u> </u> d. Theosophy |

4. Studies in the Scriptures (Millennial Dawn Series)

- | |
|--|
| <u> </u> a. David Koresh and the Branch Davidians |
| <u> </u> b. Jehovah's Witness (International Bible Students) |
| <u> </u> c. People's Temple (Jim Jones) |
| <u> </u> d. Worldwide Church of God (Herbert W. Armstrong) |

5. The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| <u> </u> a. Elizabeth Claire Prophet | <u> </u> c. Ellen G. White |
| <u> </u> b. Emma Smith | <u> </u> d. Elaine Pagels |

6. The Shariyat-Ki-Sugmad

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <u> </u> a. The Rastafarians | <u> </u> c. The Two by Two's |
| <u> </u> b. The Christadelphians | <u> </u> d. Eckankar |

7. A Course in Miracles

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <u> </u> a. Helen Schucman | <u> </u> c. Kenneth Copeland |
| <u> </u> b. Shirley Maclaine | <u> </u> d. Gloria Copeland |

8. Zhuan Falun (Revolving the Law Wheel)

- ___ a. Aum Shinrikyo
- ___ b. Jainism
- ___ c. Falun Gong
- ___ d. Chuck Barris (the Gong Show)

9. The Kitab-I-Aqdas

- ___ a. Hare Krishna
- ___ b. The Bahai's
- ___ c. The Hello's
- ___ d. Witness Lee

10. Exposition of the Divine Principle

- ___ a. The Unification Church
- ___ b. The Church of Division
- ___ c. The Church of Multiplication
- ___ d. The Church of PI

Answers:

1, b; 2, d; 3, c; 4, b; 5, c; 6, d; 7, a; 8, c; 9, b; 10, a

Personal Notes on the Articles:

Please feel free to email us at info@ras.org if you have any questions or comments.

SUBSCRIBERS

If your mailing label reads March 2016 and is Vol. 36, No. 1, your subscription expires with this issue. Please renew your subscription soon. Renewals cost \$10.00 per year in the U.S. Foreign subscriptions cost extra to cover the additional postage.

Come visit Religion Analysis Service on the World Wide Web!
Our URL is: <http://www.ras.org> • Our e-mail address is: info@ras.org

RELIGION ANALYSIS SERVICE, INC.
PO BOX 206
CHASKA, MN 55318-0206
ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

NON-PROFIT ORG
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
TWIN CITIES, MN
PERMIT NO. 90795

Important – If your mailing label
reads Mar 2016, your subscription
has expired with this issue. Please
renew now!

*Religion Analysis Service appreciates
the generous gifts of our supporters that
make our ministry for biblical truth
possible!*