

The Discerner

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

A QUARTERLY EXPOSING
UNBIBLICAL TEACHING & MOVEMENTS

Volume 40, Number 3

July • August • September 2020

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:

With This Issue	3
The Devil's Two Goals <i>by Peter Ditzel</i>	4
The Eye, Vision, and the Argument From Design <i>by Steve Lagoon</i>	10
The Cost of Contending for The Faith <i>by Dr. William McCarrell</i>	20
Bible Quiz	29



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

The Discerner

A Christian Apologetics & Counter-
Cult Ministry

Volume 40, Number 2

July • August • September 2020

Religion Analysis Service

Board Members

Rev. Steve Lagoon: President

Rick Dack, Vice President

Steve Devore: Treasurer, Office Manager

Dave Brittain

Scott Harvath

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. James Walker

Don Veinot

Dr. Ron Rhodes

Robert Bowman

M. Kurt Goedelman

The Discerner editorial team is
Steve Lagoon, Steve Devore, and
Doug Steiner



Additional printed copies of *The Discerner* are usually available. To request a printed issue(s), please make sure all names are correct and addresses current. Call 1-800-562-9153, email info@ras.org, or write:

RAS Discerner Request
PO BOX 206
Chaska MN 55318

For online RAS information, personal assistance requests, view all *Discerner* articles from 1947 forward, or to subscribe to a free digital PDF *Discerner* subscription, visit ras.org.

The use, reprint, or modification of an article by *The Discerner* editorial staff does not automatically promote endorsement of all teachings and works by the author.

WITH THIS ISSUE

To our discerning reader:

Thanks for your prayers and support of this ministry in what has been a very challenging year for all of us in many different ways!

With this in mind, I think you will find this issue of *The Discerner* is loaded with content that will encourage and strengthen your Christian faith and walk.

Our first article is by Peter Ditzel and is titled “*The Devil’s Two Goals*”. Ditzel explains how Satan operates to destroy the Kingdom of God. But of course, greater is He that is in us than the devil who is in the world! (Ephesians 2:2; 1 Peter 5:8; 1 John 4:4)

The second article is about the growing evidence regarding “*The Argument From Design*” (The Teleological Argument). In this scientifically based paper, I call attention to the powerful and miraculous workings of the human eye and vision. It is difficult to understand how anyone can still believe that the intricacies of our marvelous ability to see all happened by chance! It must be admitted that human vision screams for and is concrete proof that an Intelligent Designer created all life.

Finally, how are we to act – and what should we expect - during these stressful and difficult times?

Our final article is a modernized reprint of the classic 1957 *Discerner* paper titled “The Cost of Contending for the Faith”. Written by the great pastor William McCarrell, it reminds us of the historical as well as present challenges in living for Christ in a world bent against Him and His people. We hope it gives you additional inspiration, courage, and hope for whatever lies ahead.

Lastly, take some time to ponder possible answers in our Quarterly Bible Quiz. This time the topic is ‘God and Philosophers.’ How well will you do?

In closing, let’s remind ourselves of the following: “Jesus said unto him [us!], Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself” (Matthew 22:37–39).

“For we walk by faith, not by sight.” (2 Corinthians 5:7)

Blessings in Christ,

Steve Lagoon

President, Religion Analysis Service

THE DEVIL’S TWO GOALS

by Peter Ditzel

We have a tendency to blame the devil for everything from unemployment to accidents, wars, maybe even pandemics. But the Bible indicates the devil is really working on only two goals to achieve his one overall plan. These two goals are like ‘the claws of a pincer movement’, which are designed to achieve the devil’s sole objective.

But don’t worry! The devil doesn’t have a chance in hell of succeeding, because Jesus has already defeated him (John 12:31, 16:11; Colossians 2:15; Hebrews 2:14; 1 John 3:8). But, like a snake that continues to whip around after its head is cut off, he’s still trying. So, Satan can cause problems for those who aren’t aware of his tactics. Therefore, it helps us to know what the devil’s two goals are so we can recognize them and not become discouraged. Let’s take a look.

The Devil’s First Goal: To Keep People from Finding the Gospel

The devil tries to keep people from finding the Gospel through Counterfeiting and Disinformation, Confusion, and Distraction.

A. Counterfeiting and Disinformation

The devil causes false preachers to preach appealing, false gospels. Paul warns, “Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;” (1 Timothy 4:1, KJV).

Paul also wrote to the Galatians (1:6–8), “I marvel that you are so quickly deserting him who called you in the grace of Christ to a different ‘good news’; and there isn’t another ‘good news.’ Only there are some who trouble you, and want to pervert the Good News of Christ. But even though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach

to you any ‘good news’ other than that which we preached to you, let him be cursed.”

Pulpits, books, radio, television, and the internet etc. are defiled by the siren songs of false gospels: prosperity, grace plus works, moralism, sanctification by law-keeping, social justice, nationalism, New Age spirituality, conditional grace, Lordship salvation, and Dominionism—to name just a few. Satan, the devil, is the author of this disinformation and/or fake news. He has designed these counterfeit gospels to fool people and keep them from finding the true Gospel of Jesus’ death on the Cross through which He has redeemed to God all who believe in Him.

B. Confusion

The devil causes people who claim to be Christians to behave in unloving ways that cause people to stumble. Instead of being lights illuminating the Gospel and living as examples of God’s liberating love, Christians have become known for pointing out sin and trying to enact and enforce laws against it.

For example, those who claim ‘the Christian name’ march for or against gun ownership, protest quarantine restrictions, argue for or against heterosexuality, and thus expend their energies in a myriad of political and social causes. Sadly, they have seemingly forgotten that God has already “delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of his love; in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins” (Colossians 1:13–14).

Preachers confuse those looking for the Gospel by associating their message with a particular brand of politics or social activity. All of this is confusion, and it plays right into the hands of the devil.

C. Distraction

When churches put so much of their effort and message into politics, economics, prosperity, emotional well-being, entertaining music, and so forth, they distract people from the Gospel. This is of the devil.

These counterfeits and distractions can be stumbling blocks, for a time, even to the elect, and those who are the devil’s tools will answer for it:

...certainly I tell you, unless you turn, and become as little children, you will in no way enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Whoever therefore humbles himself as this little child, the same

is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven. Whoever receives one such little child in my name receives me, but whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to stumble, it would be better for him that a huge millstone should be hung around his neck, and that he should be sunk in the depths of the sea. Woe to the world because of occasions of stumbling! For it must be that the occasions come, but woe to that person through whom the occasion comes! (Matthew 18:3–7)

We have a duty to expose false teaching. For example:

“Now I beg you, brothers, look out for [skopeō—look at, direct attention to, mark] those who are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which you learned, and turn away from them. For those who are such don’t serve our Lord, Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by their smooth and flattering speech, they deceive the hearts of the innocent.” (Romans 16:17–18)

We have no reason to fear that the devil will succeed in keeping God’s elect from salvation. They may stumble for a while, but everyone whom God determined in eternity would be saved, everyone for whom Christ died, will find the Gospel and believe.

“All those whom the Father gives me will come to me. He who comes to me I will in no way throw out. For I have come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me. This is the will of my Father who sent me, that of all he has given to me I should lose nothing, but should raise him up at the last day.” (John 6:37–39)

The Devil’s Second Goal: Use Guilt to Discourage Believers

The devil is the accuser of the brethren (Revelation 12:10). Yet, a hallmark of the Gospel is that Jesus has freed us from the law (Romans 7:4–6; Galatians 5:1), from sin (Romans 6:14–18), and from guilt and condemnation (John 5:24). The Gospel teaches that it is impossible for a believer to be guilty (Romans 8:1; 1 John 3:9). The devil’s way to get around this is through the heresy of legalism, and he has been doing this for centuries.

By deceiving believers into thinking they are still under law, the devil throws them into discouragement. By causing them to look at themselves compared to the law, Satan makes them see sin rather than the righteousness of Christ. This false weight of sin hinders them in their Christian race.

The reality, of course, is that since we are free from the law, from sin, and from guilt and condemnation, we are free from the devil's accusations: "We know that whoever is born of God doesn't sin, but he who was born of God keeps himself, and the evil one doesn't touch him" (1 John 5:18). All he can do is confuse us for a time into thinking we are guilty of sin. But we are not guilty and never can be because our righteousness is Jesus' righteousness:

Therefore let us also, seeing we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside every weight and the sin which so easily entangles us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking to Jesus, the author and perfecter of faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising its shame, and has sat down at the right hand of the throne of God. (Hebrews 12:1–2)

When God looks upon us, He doesn't see sin. He sees the righteousness of Jesus Christ. The devil likes us to forget what Jesus has done with so great a price accomplished for us on The Cross.

"There is therefore now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus" (Romans 8:1), who don't walk according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit.

The Devil's Overall Plan

What then is the devil's overall plan? Why is he trying to hide the Gospel from the elect and discourage the brothers with accusations? To find out, let's look at his history.

In the Garden of Eden, the serpent deceived Eve with the lie that disobeying God would not lead to death. By doing this, he tempted Eve—and through her, Adam—to sin and thus brought condemnation upon all humanity (Genesis 3:1–19). The devil also wanted to get Job to sin (Job 1:11; 2:4–5). The devil even tried to get Jesus to sin (Matthew 4:1–11)! The devil did get Judas Iscariot to sin so that he would betray Jesus.

The common thread is that the devil is always acting against God's plan, and he wants as many others to act against God's plan too—although Satan (who does not know everything like God), is unwittingly really part of God's plan.

The devil's design is to overturn the work of Jesus Christ—to defeat the Gospel. It is a hopeless cause—but try it he does, because Satan wants everyone to spend eternity with him in the Lake of Fire. Since he has no hope of redemption (Hebrews 2:16), he doesn't want anyone

else to be redeemed. But let's not worry about the devil. He goes about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour (1 Peter 5:8), but only those not covered by the blood of Christ can ever really fall to him.

We might think the devil is smart. But because of his own pride and corruption (Isaiah 14:12–14), Satan focused on himself rather than God's plan. He then thought he could thwart God's plan by getting Adam and Eve to sin. But this played right into God's hand, because God already had planned for Jesus to be the Savior of man and mankind (1 Peter 1:20). The devil was also God's pawn with Job because God wanted to test Job. The devil tried to get Jesus to do his bidding in the wilderness, but, in fact, this revealed Jesus' superiority to Satan. Satan thought he could stop God's plan by using Judas Iscariot to get Jesus killed, but Jesus' crucifixion was pivotal to God's Plan for saving humanity. The devil is in a similar position to Joseph's brothers: "As for you, you meant evil against me, but God meant it for good, to bring to pass, as it is today, to save many people alive." (Genesis 50:20)

The devil wants to stop God from saving humanity. To do this, he used God's law to unjustly accuse people of sin. When Jesus came, Satan didn't fully understand why, but he got Him killed. He now knows that God used The Cross to save His people, so the devil tries to throw a fog over the Gospel with false messages to keep God's elect from finding the Good News of salvation through Jesus Christ. And when people still find it and believe, the devil tries to turn even believers from their trust in Christ by tempting them to look at themselves in comparison to the law.

The Bible tells us to "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." (James 4:7b) We can do this by making sure that we are speaking a clear Gospel message and exposing false gospels. And we must always be sure that we have our eyes fixed upon Jesus Christ and hear only Him: "While he was still speaking, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them. Behold, a voice came out of the cloud, saying, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Listen to him.'... Lifting up their eyes, they saw no one, except Jesus alone" (Matthew 17:5, 8).

We have no reason to ever be discouraged. For Our Lord has said, "All authority has been given to me in heaven and on earth.... Behold, I am with you always, even to the end of the age. Amen." (Matthew 28:18b, 20b)

by Peter Ditzel. © Peter Ditzel. Source: wordofhisgrace.org

Peter Ditzel is the Director of “Word of His Grace Ministries”. His website and original article (originally accessed June 2020) is located at <https://www.wordofhisgrace.org/wp/devil-two-goals/#more-2776>. We thank him for sharing this work with us! For the benefit of RAS readers, minor changes have been made to the original.

THE EYE, VISION, AND THE ARGUMENT FROM DESIGN

by Steve Lagoon

One of the amazing claims of modern life is the notion that all life is a result of random and purposeless processes. Life, like everything else—it just happened!

But this view is increasingly difficult to maintain in the light of advancing scientific knowledge.

It used to be thought that William Paley's Teleological Argument, aka The Argument From Design, was dead and buried, a victim of Enlightenment thinkers like David Hume and Immanuel Kant.

But science itself has revived the power and popularity of The Teleological Argument. For example, Michael Behe's *Darwin's Black Box*¹ provided multiple examples where advancing science at the microbiological level is revealing intricacies that have challenged old assumptions about the ability of evolutionary processes to produce the diversity of life present in the world.

But as always, one of the chief arguments in support of The Argument From Design—beginning with William Paley himself—was the sophistication of the eye and human vision.

Paley himself believed that 'the example of the human eye' is a testimonial to the creation of God and is not explainable by natural processes. He said, "Sturmius held that the examination of the eye was a cure for atheism."² In another place, Paley wrote:

Were there no example in the world of contrivance except that of the eye, it would be alone sufficient to support the conclusion which we draw from it, as to the necessity of an intelligent creator. It could never be got rid of because it could not be accounted for by any other supposition, which did not contradict all the principles we possess of knowledge.³

1 Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, New York (The Free Press, 1996).

2 William Paley, *The Watch and the Human Eye*, 427.

3 William Paley, *Natural Theology*, Frederick Ferré, (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963) p. 44, as quoted by William H. Halverson, *A Concise Introduction to Philosophy*, Third Edition, New York (Random House, 1976), 137.

Attack on the Design of the Eye as attacks on the Idea of a Designer

Considerations regarding the process of vision and the workings of the human eye powerfully support Paley's claim. This, no doubt, is why the design of human vision has fallen under attack from arrogant skeptics and ardent evolutionists.

Further, and in light of the amazing complexity of the human eye, it is amazing to hear skeptics argue that human vision is poorly designed (called Dysteleology).⁴ Wikipedia describes this line of reasoning:

The argument from poor design, also known as the *dysteleological argument*, is an argument against the existence of a creator God, based on the reasoning that an omnipotent and omnibenevolent God would not create organisms with the perceived suboptimal designs that can be seen in nature . . . The term 'incompetent design', a play on 'intelligent design', has been coined by Donald Wise of the University of Massachusetts Amherst to describe aspects of nature that are currently flawed in design.⁵

Victor Stenger noted the same trend:

Some evolutionists have tried to counter the Paley claim with what might be called the argument from bad design, pointing out all the ways that a competent engineer could improve upon what nature has given us.⁶

Brash Dysteleological Assessments

As one example of a Dysteleological Argument, consider how David Steele ridiculed creationist accounts of origins by claiming that if God designed the human body, He was somewhat of a bungler—getting some things right, and others not so good:

However, this is to look at only half the evidence relevant to the design hypothesis. We also have to consider those many aspects of living organisms which appear, from a design point of view, to be botched or incompetent.⁷

4 *Signs of Intelligence: Understanding Intelligent Design*, Edited by William A. Demski & James M. Kushiner, Grand Rapids MI (Brazos Press, 2001), 11.

5 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Argument_from_poor_design, retrieved July 1, 2019.

6 Victor J. Stenger, *God: The Failed Hypothesis, How Science Shows That God Does Not Exist*, Amherst New York (Prometheus Books, 2007), 68–69.

7 David Ramsay Steele, *Atheism Explained: From Folly to Philosophy*, Chicago and La Salle, IL (Open Court Publishing Company, 2008), 51.

In arriving at a design, designers also have to take into account not only a specific part, but how that part impacts the overall design and functionality of the creation. As William Demski explained:

Indeed, there is no such thing as perfect design. Real designers strive for *constrained optimization* . . . Henry Petroski, an engineer and historian at Duke University, aptly remarks in *Invention by Design*: ‘All design involves conflicting objectives and hence compromise, and the best designs will always be those that come up with the best compromise.’ Constrained optimization is the art of compromise between conflicting objectives.⁸

I am of the opinion that those who suggest weakness(es) in nature’s designs should perhaps tread more humbly before casting their aspersions. It just might be their ignorance of the totality of the system that is weak rather than the design itself.

Is the human eye poorly designed? The “problem” of the inverted retina.

One of the favorite targets of atheists and skeptics for claims of bad design is interestingly enough the human eye. David Steele pressed home his criticism of the idea that God designed the human eye:

The human body is an exhibition of engineering disasters. The routing of the optic nerve through the front of the retina, so that there is a ‘blind spot’ in each eye...⁹

That the retina is wrongly “wired”—resulting in a blind spot in human vision—is a frequent criticism of skeptics.

Creationist Peter Gurney provided a response to criticisms of ‘the design of the human eye’:

Although it would appear at first sight that the inverted arrangement of the retina has disadvantages and is inefficient, in reality these objections amount to little. Even evolutionists concede that the inverted retina serves those creatures that possess it, very well; it affords them superb visual acuity. We have reviewed the necessity for this arrangement, which turns on the nature of the photoreceptors.

8 William A. Demski, Introduction, *Signs of Intelligence: Understanding Intelligent Design*, Edited by William A. Demski & James M. Kushiner, Grand Rapids MI (Brazos Press, 2001), 9.

9 David Ramsay Steele, *Atheism Explained*, 51.

Light at various wavelengths is capable of very damaging effects on biological machinery. The retina, besides being an extremely sophisticated transducer and image processor, is clearly designed to withstand the toxic and heating effects of light. The eye is well equipped to protect the retina against radiation we normally encounter in everyday life. Besides the almost complete exclusion of ultraviolet radiation by the cornea and the lens together, the retina itself is endowed with a number of additional mechanisms to protect against such damage: The retinal pigment epithelium produces substances which combat the damaging chemical by-products of light radiation. The retinal pigment epithelium plays an essential part sustaining the photoreceptors. This includes recycling and metabolising their products, thereby renewing them in the face of continual wear from light bombardment. The central retina is permeated with xanthophyll pigment, which filters and absorbs short-wavelength visible light.

The photoreceptors thus need to be in intimate contact with the retinal pigment epithelium, which is opaque. The retinal pigment epithelium, in turn, needs to be in intimate contact with the choroid (also opaque) both to satisfy its nutritional requirements and to prevent (by means of the heat sink effect of its massive blood flow) overheating of the retina from focused light.

If the human retina were ‘wired’ the other way around (the verted configuration), as evolutionists such as Dawkins propose, these two opaque layers would have to be interposed in the path of light to the photoreceptors, which would leave them in darkness!

Thus, I suggest that the need for protection against light-induced damage, which a verted retina in our natural environment could not provide to the same degree, is a major, if not *the* major reason for the existence of the inverted configuration of the retina.¹⁰

Jonathan Sarfati, also responded to the critical assessment of the eye’s design, particularly to those made by the evolutionist Kenneth Miller on a special PBS program:

Miller raised the old canard of the backwardly wired vertebrate retina, as he has done elsewhere. The [PBS] narrator even

¹⁰ Peter W. V. Gurney, *Is Our ‘Inverted’ Retina Really ‘Bad Design’?*, *The Journal of Creation*, April 1999, <https://creation.com/is-our-inverted-retina-really-bad-design>

claimed that the eye's 'nerves interfere with images,' and that the so-called 'blind spot' is a serious problem . . . It would be nice if anti-creationists actually learned something about the eye before making such claims . . . In fact, any engineer who designed something remotely as good as the eye would probably win the Nobel Prize! If Miller and the PBS producers disagree, then I challenge them to design a better eye (color perception, resolution, coping with range of light intensity, night vision as well as day vision, etc.)! And this must be done under the constraints of embryonic development . . . Someone who does know about eye design is the ophthalmologist Dr. George Marshall, who said: "The idea that the eye is wired backward comes from a lack of knowledge of eye function and anatomy." He explained that the nerves could not go behind the eye, because that space is reserved for the choroid, which provides the rich blood supply needed for the very metabolically active retinal pigment epithelium (RPE). This is necessary to regenerate the photoreceptors, and to absorb excess heat. So it is necessary for the nerves to go in front instead. The claim on the program that they interfere with the image is blatantly false, because the nerves are virtually transparent because of their small size and also having about the same refractive index as the surrounding vitreous humor. In fact, what limits the eye's resolution is the diffraction of light waves at the pupil (proportional to the wavelength to the pupil's size), so alleged improvements of the retina would make no difference . . . Some evolutionists claim that the cephalad eye is somehow 'right,' i.e., with nerves behind the receptor, and the [PBS] program showed photographs of these creatures (e.g., octopus, squid) during this segment. But no one who has actually bothered to study these eyes could make such claims with integrity. In fact, cephalopods don't see as well as humans, and the octopus eye structure is totally different and much simpler. It's more like 'a compound eye with a single lens.'¹¹

New Research defending design of the human eye and vision

New research is casting further doubt on the accepted wisdom concerning design flaws in the human eye. For instance, in a *Scientific American Magazine* article by Erez Rebak, and although written from an evolutionary viewpoint, it nevertheless dispels with the notion of bad design in the human eye, and in particular the so-called problem of the inverted retina:

¹¹ Jonathan Sarfati, *Refuting Evolution 2: What PBS and the Scientific Community Don't Want You to Know*, Green Forest AZ (Master Books, Inc., 2002), 117-120.

The human eye is optimized to have good color vision at day and high sensitivity at night. But until recently it seemed as if the cells in the retina were wired the wrong way round, with light travelling through a mass of neurons before it reaches the light-detecting rod and cone cells. New research presented at a meeting of the American Physical Society has uncovered a remarkable vision-enhancing function for this puzzling structure.

About a century ago, the fine structure of the retina was discovered. The retina is the light-sensitive part of the eye, lining the inside of the eyeball. The back of the retina contains cones to sense the colors red, green and blue. Spread among the cones are rods, which are much more light-sensitive than cones, but which are color-blind.

Before arriving at the cones and rods, light must traverse the full thickness of the retina, with its layers of neurons and cell nuclei. These neurons process the image information and transmit it to the brain, but until recently it has not been clear why these cells lie in front of the cones and rods, not behind them. This is a long-standing puzzle, even more so since the same structure, of neurons before light detectors, exists in all vertebrates, showing evolutionary stability.

Researchers in Leipzig found that glial cells, which also span the retinal depth and connect to the cones, have an interesting attribute. These cells are essential for metabolism, but they are also denser than other cells in the retina. In the transparent retina, this higher density (and corresponding refractive index) means that glial cells can guide light, just like fiber-optic cables.

In view of this, my colleague Amichai Labin and I built a model of the retina, and showed that the directional of glial cells helps increase the clarity of human vision. But we also noticed something rather curious: the colors that best passed through the glial cells were green to red, which the eye needs most for daytime vision. The eye usually receives too much blue—and thus has fewer blue-sensitive cones.

Further computer simulations showed that green and red are concentrated five to ten times more by the glial cells, and into their respective cones, than blue light. Instead, excess blue light gets scattered to the surrounding rods.

This surprising result of the simulation now needed an experimental proof. With colleagues at the Technion Medical School, we tested how light crosses guinea pig retinas. Like humans, these animals are active during the day and their retinal structure has been well-characterized, which allowed us to simulate their eyes just as we had done for humans. Then we passed light through their retinas and, at the same time, scanned them with a microscope in three dimensions. This we did for 27 colors in the visible spectrum.

The result was easy to notice: in each layer of the retina we saw that the light was not scattered evenly, but concentrated in a few spots. These spots were continued from layer to layer, thus creating elongated columns of light leading from the entrance of the retina down to the cones at the detection layer. Light was concentrated in these columns up to ten times, compared to the average intensity.

Even more interesting was the fact that the colors that were best guided by the glial cells matched nicely with the colors of the cones. The cones are not as sensitive as the rods, so this additional light allowed them to function better—even under lower light levels. Meanwhile, the bluer light, that was not well-captured in the glial cells, was scattered onto the rods in its vicinity.

These results mean that the retina of the eye has been optimized so that the sizes and densities of glial cells match the colors to which the eye is sensitive (which is in itself an optimization process suited to our needs). This optimization is such that color vision during the day is enhanced, while night-time vision suffers very little. The effect also works best when the pupils are contracted at high illumination, further adding to the clarity of our color vision.¹²

The amazing eye during childhood growth

Steven Rose described another amazing aspect of human vision related to the growing child:

Consider the problem of seeing and of making sense of the world we observe, processes subserved by eye and brain. The retina of

¹² Erez Rebak, *The Purpose of Our Eyes' Strange Wiring Is Unveiled: The reverse-wiring of the eyeball has long been a mystery, but new research shows a remarkable structural purpose: increasing and sharpening our color vision*, Scientific American, March 15, 2015, <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-purpose-of-our-eyes-strange-wiring-is-unveiled> [Note: American spelling substituted at times for ease of reading.]

the eye is connected via a series of neural staging posts to the visual cortex at the back of the brain. A baby is born with most of these connections in place, but during the first years of life the eye and the brain both grow, at different rates. This means that the connections between the ear and brain have continually to be broken and remade.¹³

Again, it seems incredible that such intricate designs and functions could have resulted from random unguided processes. It screams, rather, for an intelligent designer!

The amazing complexity of the Bio-chemical Functionality of human vision

Finally, consider Michael Behe's description of the chemical complexities involved in human vision from a micro-biological-chemical perspective. As we read about the complex biological and chemical reactions and interactions necessary for human vision, let us *not* ask whether evolution is a *possible* explanation for the process of vision. Rather, let us ask the more reasonable question as to how *likely or probable* it is that such complexity is the result of random forces:

When light first strikes the retina a photon interacts with a molecule called 11-cis-retinal, which rearranges within picoseconds to *trans-retinal* . . . The change in the shape of the retinal molecule forces a change in the shape of the proteins rhodopsin, to which the retinal is tightly bound. The protein's metamorphosis alters its behavior. Now called metarhodopsin II, the protein sticks to another protein, called transducin. Before bumping into metarhodopsin II, transducin had tightly bound a small molecule called GDP. But when transducin interacts with metarhodopsin II, the GDP falls off, and a molecule called GTP binds to transducin . . . GTP-transducin-metarhodopsin II now binds to a protein called phosphodiesterase, located in the inner membrane of the cell. When attached to metarhodopsin II and its entourage, the phosphodiesterase acquires the chemical ability to 'cut' a molecule called cGMP . . . Initially there are a lot of cGMP molecules in the cell, but the phosphodiesterase lowers its concentration, just as a pulled plug lowers the water level in a bathtub.

¹³ Steven Rose, *Escaping Evolutionary Psychology*, chapter in Alas, *Poor Darwin: Arguments Against Evolutionary Psychology*, edited by Hilary Rose & Steven Rose, New York (Harmony Books, 2000), 310.

Another membrane protein that binds cGMP is called an ion channel. It acts as a gateway that regulates the number of sodium ions in a cell...Normally the ion channel allows sodium flow into the cell, while a separate protein actively pumps them out again. The dual action of the ion channel and pump keeps the level of sodium ions in the cell within a narrow range. When the amount of cGMP is reduced because of cleavage by the phosphodiesterase, the ion channel closes, causing the cellular concentration of positively charged sodium ions to be reduced. This causes an imbalance of charge across the cell membrane that, finally, causes a current to be transmitted down the optic nerve to the brain. The result, when interpreted by the brain, is vision.

If the reactions above were the only ones that operated in the cell, the supply of 11-cis-retinal, cGMP, and sodium ions would quickly be depleted. Something has to turn off the proteins that were turned on and restore the cell to its original state. Several mechanisms do this. First, in the dark the ion channel . . . also lets calcium ions into the cell. The calcium is pumped back out by a different protein so that a constant calcium concentration is maintained. When cGMP levels fall, shutting down the ion channel, calcium ion concentration decreases, too. The phosphodiesterase enzyme, which destroys cGMP, slows down at lower calcium concentration. Second, a protein called guanylate cyclase begins to resynthesize cGMP when calcium levels start to fall. Third, while all this is going on, metarhodopsin II is chemically modified by an enzyme called rhodopsin kinase. The modified rhodopsin then binds to a protein known as arrestin, which prevents the rhodopsin from activating more transducin. So the cell contains mechanisms to limit the amplified signal started by a single photon.

Trans-retinal eventually falls off of rhodopsin and must be reconverted to 11-cis-retinal and again bound by rhodopsin to get back to the starting point for another visual cycle. To accomplish this, trans-retinal is first chemically modified by an enzyme to trans-retinol—a form containing two more hydrogen atoms. A second enzyme then converts the molecule to 11-cis-retinol. Finally, a third enzyme removes the previously added hydrogen atoms to form 11-cis-retinal, a cycle is complete.¹⁴

It seems simply incredible that this cascade of effects that produces our amazing vision is the result of random chance. The foregoing should put to rest arguments claiming poor design in the human eye

14 Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, New York (The Free Press, 1996), 18–21.

and powerfully support the Argument From Design and the biblical account of creation.

William Paley was right. Considering the amazing process of human vision should be a cure for atheism!

THE COST OF CONTENDING FOR THE FAITH

By Dr. William McCarrell

First published in The Discerner July-September 1957

Contending is Biblical

“Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong. Let all that ye do be done in love” (1 Corinthians 16: 13, 14 R.V.).

No one can reasonably question that the Bible exhorts, even commands, saved ones to contend for all Bible truth and the faith once delivered unto the saints.

God’s Word literally teems with admonitions and directives as to His people doing so. The oft-quoted: “Beloved . . . I . . . exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints” (Jude 3), merely helps climax a stream of similar teaching extending from Genesis through Revelation.

Practically every God-pleasing servant described in the Bible so contended. The line that pleased God from Abel to Noah so served God. The flood was God’s judgment upon the opposition. Moses devoted forty years in a stupendous endeavor to counteract unbelief by leading Israel into obedience to God’s revealed truth. Joshua’s final exhortation (Joshua 24) was an endeavor to keep Israel and its coming generations obeying (contending for) God’s Word.

Three hundred years of Israel’s history is covered in the Book of Judges. Seven great apostasies occur and each time those who honor God and are used of God as Judges were so blessed because they battled for maintenance of Bible truth through the obedience of God’s people. The ten tribes of Israel (II Kings 17) went into captivity under Assyria because of failure in this respect. Two tribes of Judah later went into captivity under Babylon for the same reason.

Elijah’s ministry revolved about contending for the faith, God’s revealed truth. Practically every outstanding prophet in the Old Testament is there for similar reason.

Christ certainly contended for the faith (Matthew 23). The apostles sacrificed their lives to do so. Paul’s final (death-chamber) message to Timothy can be outlined around the theme of contending for the faith. The four chapters of II Timothy set forth 175 helps for Christians to so live, witness and serve as to counteract apostasy. John’s being

exiled to the Isle of Patmos was caused by his contending for the faith. Revelation, the consummation book of the Bible, teems with instructions, exhortations and demonstrations to strengthen such contending.

Contending By Bible Characters

Abel contended at the cost of his life. Elijah was pursued, fed by ravens, and forced to share the widow's meagre fare while his life hung in balance because he contended for God's truth versus Baalism. Jeremiah, the weeping prophet, was imprisoned and suffered attempts upon his life through starvation, being cast into a pit of quicksand, and in other ways because he contended for the faith. Contending caused Daniel's three companions to be cast into the burning fiery furnace. Daniel was placed in the lions' den for the same reason. In summing up contending for the faith (God's truth) by Old Testament characters, Scripture states:

“And what shall I more say? for the time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae, *of* David also, and of Samuel, and of the prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to fight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: and others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and *in* dens and caves of the earth” (Hebrews 11: 32–38).

Jesus Christ was crucified, not by common people who heard him gladly, neither by publicans, nor the woman out of whom he cast seven demons, nor by the thief saved on Golgotha, but by the unsaved, apostate religious leaders of His day because He was God's truth (John 14:6) and contended for it by teaching, ministry and life.

The majority of the apostles paid for their contending by martyrdom. As one example, Stephen was stoned to death (Acts 7:54–60). Had they not contended for God's revealed truth, their experience would have been far different. Had they not contended for God's revealed

truth, their experience would have been far different. The price the Apostle Paul paid was to be misunderstood, misrepresented, slandered, threatened with continuous riots, starvation, imprisonments, receiving of hundreds of stripes, beatings with rods, being stoned, perils on every hand, attempts upon his life, being made the offscouring of society, and martyrdom by beheading. He suffered the loss of all things because he contended earnestly for the faith once delivered unto the saints.

The 144,000 Tribulation saints, and possibly numberless others, will die for the same reason during the Tribulation under the Antichrist. Moses and Elijah, brought back from the saved world in order to contend for the faith once delivered, will be put to death by the Antichrist and their bodies lie in the streets of Jerusalem (Revelation 11).¹ This summary partially describes the price exacted for contending for the faith.

Contending Throughout Church History

At the close of the first century all Apostles but John had died as martyrs. Then followed the second and third centuries, during which the Roman Empire endeavored to abolish Christianity with violence. Many outstanding instances of suffering, martyrdom and victory occurred. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, before being burned at the stake, was offered release, if he would recant. He replied, "Eighty and six years have I served Him, and He has done me nothing but good. Why should I deny Him now?" About 98 A.D. Simian, Bishop of Jerusalem, was crucified. About 115 A.D. Ignatius was cast to the lions. Justin Martyr was martyred in Rome. History tells of the terrible suffering of Pontius, a lad sixteen years of age; also of Blandina, a maiden slave, who, after being tortured from morning

1 RAS Editorial Notes:

[1] It is *not* universally held that the 144,000 tribulation saints "die". Many believe the 144,000 are "sealed" (Revelation 7:4) and thus protected from death during the Tribulation period; they will then meet the Lord at His Second Coming/Return to Earth (Revelation 14:1). For example, one commentator writes: "The 144,000 are clearly Jewish believers, not members of some twentieth-century Gentile cult. These Jewish saints are saved during the early part of the Tribulation. The seal on their foreheads brands them as belonging to God and guarantees that they will be preserved alive during the ensuing seven years." William MacDonald, *Believer's Bible Commentary* (Thomas Nelson Publishers: Nashville, 1995), 2364.

[2] It is also *not* universally held (although popular in some theological circles) that the two returning witnesses (cf. Revelation 11:3–12) are in fact Moses and Elijah. Possibilities run the gamut from some thinking they are Enoch and Elijah (both never died in the Bible) to others saying Bible readers should not think they are past men but future witnesses for God.

until evening and asked to recant, replied, "A Christian cannot recognize sin."

Christ foretold ten days of suffering which was marvelously fulfilled (Revelation 2:10). A day can mean twenty-four hours, a number of years, such as "Abraham's day," or a thousand years, such as the "day of the Lord." Before the close of the third century ten attempts to blot out Christianity with violence were made. These attempts were associated with officially-issued edicts. These edicts continually attempted to force Christians to worship and place the State before Christ. Penalties for failure to obey varied. Christians refusing to obey edicts were threatened with loss of citizenship rights, confiscation of property, imprisonment, torture, and martyrdom. Millions suffered, rather than disobey God's Word. In Nero's reign, Christians were wrongly blamed for the burning of Rome. Covered with animals' skins, they were tortured to death by dogs. They were crucified. They were tarred and set afire as lamp posts to light the way for Nero's chariots.

The ten definite official attempts to blot out Christianity with violence occurred under the following Emperors:

Nero	64 A.D.
Domitian	81 A.D.
Trajan	98 A.D.
Adrian	177 A.D.
Severus	193 A.D.
Maximin	235 A.D.
Decius	249 A.D.
Valerian	254 A.D.
Amelius	270 A.D.
Diocletian	284 A.D.

At times Christians were killed until weapons dulled. So many were destroyed by ferocious lions that at times these animals, filled with human blood and flesh, refused to continue attack. Christians, before packed amphitheatres and surrounded by roaring lions, went to death with triumphant praying, singing, and testimony. Others were known to arise in balconies, declare faith in Christ, and ask the privilege of dying for Him. Their requests were granted at times by their being tossed over balconies into the arena. While millions died as martyrs, greater numbers, affected by Christian faithfulness and testimony even in death, were saved.

It is written that a king, commanding a Christian to recant and give up Christ, said, "If you don't, I will banish you." The man smilingly

answered, “You cannot banish me from Christ; He says, ‘I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee’.” The king then angrily said, “I will confiscate your property.” The Christian replied, “My treasures are laid up on high; you cannot get them.” The king, in greater anger, said, “I will kill you.” The Christian answered, “I have been dead with Christ to this world for forty years. My life is ‘hid with Christ in God’; you cannot touch it.” “What can you do with such a fanatic?” asked the king.

Christians who yielded and denied their faith in Christ were called “Lapsi”; Christians standing firm for Christ were called “Confessors”; Christians who died were called “Martyrs”.

Historic account of the rise and development of the Roman Catholic system which developed in the dark ages and climaxed in the 15th Century is saturated with instances of Christians contending for the faith at fearful price. The history of the Waldensians, Moravians, Huguenots of France, the Scotch Covenanters, contents of Foxe’s “Book of Martyrs”, historic description of the work of John Knox, John Huss—Ridgley—Cranmer being burned at the stake, Wyclife, Hugh Latimer, Calvin, Luther, Zwingli, Melancthon, “The Life of William Penn”, partially record the price paid for contending for the faith. These accounts are evidence that such contending is always accompanied by a price that tests. It determines success in God’s sight. During the above-mentioned centuries, Islam, now Moslemism, arose. Its method of advance and fearful progress was chiefly through sword. Millions of Christians died for their faith.

*“They met the tyrant’s brandish’d steel,
The lion’s gory mane;
They bowed their necks, the death to feel:
Who follows in their train?”²*

Present day Contending

A much-used pastor in Chicago dropped into my study. In agony he covered his face with his hands. He said, “What can I do? My work is undermined in all directions.” Apostate denominational leadership had used paid secretaries to infiltrate his congregation and cause trouble by spreading untruthful accusations and impressions.

The writer knows a splendidly educated, talented and successful pastor being forced from his church for loyalty to the faith.

2 Taken from the third stanza of Reginald Huber’s hymn, *The Son of God Goes Forth to War* (1812). Usually sung to the melody “All Saints New” (1872) by Henry C. Cutler. In public domain.

Another acquaintance was demoted from his position as a Presbyterian preacher and his denominational standing. The congregation, after paying for a property, is battling today in highest courts of the land to guard it from being confiscated because of their stand for the faith.

The Broad Street Church of Philadelphia, with my friend Merrill MacPherson as pastor, stood for Bible convictions in 1936. Coming to worship one Sunday morning they found the key turned in the door and the congregation locked out on the street. The splendid, now functioning, Church of the Open Door in Philadelphia was organized by the locked-out group.³

Dr. Laird of Wilmington, Delaware, sacrificed his ministerial standing, pension, parsonage, and the pastorate of a church of unusual strength (which was delighted with his ministry) through inconsistent action of denominational leadership. All was caused by his standing for his conscientious loyalty to God's Word.

Another pastor friend in Wisconsin was forced out for the same reason. Sacrifice of building and parsonage was the price he paid.

Another ministerial friend was used to place Bible preachers in twenty-eight pulpits in a northern state. Because of his stand for the faith he was prosecuted, demoted, his ministerial standing sacrificed. Friends believe his unexpected death was caused by the treatment received.

A brother of close acquaintance in Michigan, the father of five children, sacrificed salary, parsonage, and pastorate to contend for the faith. God has signally honored him and his work.

1957 church history in America and other countries can produce hundreds, possibly thousands, of instances of congregations, Christians, and preachers who are paying a testing, severe price for obedience to God's Word. But, thank God, the country is also saturated with instances in which God has richly blessed and is effectively using those who triumph in the test, pay the price, and stand.

The writer sat beside a basketball coach at a Wheaton College game. He heard a player who had played in a losing game say to the coach, "Coach, I am not asking your opinion as to whether I played well or not, I only want to know, do you feel I did my best— fought hard?" The coach encouragingly replied, "Yes, son, you did your best." The

3 This lockout took place June 10, 1936. Past history as well as current events of this church can be viewed at <https://cod.org/index.php/our-history>.

boy was comforted, thus helped. Saved ones will be judged for their works when Jesus comes. Everyone will be examined as to whether or not he has so witnessed, lived, and served as to hear Christ say, “. . . Well done . . . good and faithful servant . . . enter thou into the joy of thy Lord” (Matthew 25:21).

Contending Price

The price of contending is paid in proportion that separation from apostasy is practised. Spurgeon said, “The most effective testimony against apostasy is separation from it.”⁴ This is God’s Bible method in contending for the faith. Paying the price of contending will call for reconciliation to:

1. Sacrificing popularity.
2. Willingness to be unpopular.
3. Willingness to be misunderstood, misrepresented, wrongly accused, slandered.
4. Willingness to be criticized, belittled, and mocked.
5. Willingness to be classed as backward, lacking in education and learning.
6. Loss of prestige, pulpit and platform opportunities.
7. Possible sacrifice of pastoring a church.
8. Being branded as non-cooperative, even a trouble-maker.
9. Advancement in pastoral position and otherwise sacrificed.
10. Sacrifice of income and material comforts.
11. Sacrifice of pension, insurance schemes, material security.
12. Severance of fellowship with life-long friends, especially in the religious realm.
13. Testing in maintaining a Christ-honoring spirit of patience, prayer and spiritual love toward Christians who are biblically uninformed or dull, cold, compromising, even backslidden in their Christian state, also with apostates and subtle sinful apostate opposition.

4 Reference unknown.

14. Testing as to patiently waiting for God to honor biblical witnessing, living and service.

15. Determination to obey God's Word though all others disobey; to be true to Christ whether one's stand is ever justified before mankind or not.

16. Trust the outcome to the faithfulness of a faithful God.

17. Witness, live, and serve in the light of Christ's coming Bema Seat judgment for works (1 Corinthians 3:11–15).

18. By God's grace continually practice the courage of Athanasius, who while contending for the Deity of Christ and the Trinity of the Godhead through resisting the Arian Unitarian error of early Christian centuries, refused to compromise though appealed to do so by Emperor Theodosius. Theodosius, in bitterness of spirit, said, "Do you not realize that all the world is against you?" Athanasius, realizing that the foundations of Christianity were at stake in the controversy concerning Bible truth and the Christian faith, replied to the Emperor, "Then I am against all the world."

19. A contending price will be continuous vigilance.

20. It will call for such Bible study as to enable one to know God's truth; discern error; and expose subtle, destructive teachings. Such a stand will demand a consistent, sacrificial life in order to strengthen the message.

A most effective means of counteracting apostasy and contending for the faith is an exemplary life, also the building of a constructive Christian work. Opposition cannot meet nor overcome such procedure. Such procedure is impossible apart from an unselfish spirit, service not motivated by income, personal gain, nor future security. Such contending demands service saturated with prayer, teaching of God's Word, witnessing for Christ, and bulwarked by Holy Spirit controlled life and service. These were the God given and enabled methods of the Church in the Book of Acts. They will never be improved upon.

Contending Encouragement

The writer exchanged religious popularity for belittlement and scoffing in order to contend for the faith. Refusing denominational income help, his ministry began with an income (not guaranteed) of \$5.00 a week. Well known townspeople referred to him as a "nut", "ignoramus".

His ordination was opposed by state and national denominational leaders. The work he has pastored for 45 years began with two men keeping the church open to maintain a little Sunday School. The building was minus proper sidewalks; clapboards and shingles were loose; it had not been painted for twelve years; plaster was off some of the lathing in the auditorium. What joy was experienced in paying the price! What happy compensation today!

While speaking to one of the best known Bible Institute presidents and pastors of this country, I reminded him that if men such as he and myself preached God's Word to God's people and then would not pay the price involved in obeying God's Word as to separation from apostasy, that God would set us on the shelf. He agreed. I furthermore reminded that both of us in our younger ministerial days knew men who were giants for God but became pygmies because after they had taught God's people as mentioned above, they would not pay the price involved in popularity, prestige, platform and pulpit opportunities, offerings and salary to contend for the faith once delivered unto the saints. He again agreed.

The greatest Christian servant from among mankind, the Apostle Paul, when facing earthly departure, said, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith" (2 Timothy 4:7). May every saved one realize that such testimony is impossible apart from contending for the faith once delivered unto the saints (Jude 3). May they, by appropriating Christ's all sufficient grace (2 Corinthians 12:9), so live and serve their Saviour as to merit such testimony.

QUIZ: GOD AND THE PHILOSOPHERS

1. Which philosopher denied the existence of the material world?
When asked if things remain when we are not seeing them, this same philosopher argued that God's perpetual gaze remains upon them.
 - a. Bishop George Berkeley
 - b. Madame Helen Blavatsky
 - c. John Locke
 - d. Sir Rick Dack
2. This skeptical philosopher said that 'if he was wrong and God did exist, he would tell God "I'm terribly sorry, but you didn't give us enough evidence."
 - a. Carl Sagan
 - b. Stephen Hawking
 - c. Bertrand Russell
 - d. Charles Taze Russell
3. This philosopher coined the term "metaphysics" and taught there is an "unmoved mover" to account for all motion.
 - a. Plato
 - b. Aristotle
 - c. Zeno
 - d. Aristarchus
4. This philosopher was given the death sentence for atheism yet proclaimed, "Men of Athens, I honor and love you; but, I shall obey God rather than you."
 - a. Plato
 - b. Philip of Macedon
 - c. Philip of 66
 - d. Socrates

5. Which philosopher was known for arguing against the possibility of miracles, and said 'the only way you could accept a miracle is if it took a greater miracle to deny a lesser miracle'?
- a. Voltaire
 - b. England Dan and John-Ford Coley
 - c. David Hume
 - d. Ludwig Wittgenstein
6. Which philosopher argued in favor of his ethics called 'The Categorical Imperative' (we should only do what we wish all men would do)? He denied the traditional arguments for God's existence in favor of an ethically based one.
- a. Immanuel Kant
 - b. David Hume
 - c. Thomas Hobbes
 - d. Arthur Schopenhauer
7. This atheistic philosopher argued that God-belief was "the opium of the masses."
- a. Friedrich Engels
 - b. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel
 - c. Karl Marx
 - d. Groucho Marx
8. Which philosopher said, "The function of prayer is not to influence God, but rather to change the nature of the one who prays."?
- a. Søren Kierkegaard
 - b. Baruch Spinoza
 - c. John Stuart Mill
 - d. Jeremy Bentham
9. Which philosopher declared, "God is dead and we have killed him."?
- a. Vladimir Lennon
 - b. Friedrich Nietzsche
 - c. Jean Paul Sarte
 - d. Ludwig Feurbach

10. Which philosopher promulgated the so-called “five ways” or “proofs” for the existence of God and wrote his Magnum Opus titled “Summa Theologica”?

- a. Thomas Aquinas
- b. William of Ockham
- c. Duns Scotus
- d. Peter Lombard

Answers:

1. a; 2. c; 3. b; 4. d; 5. c; 6. a; 7. c; 8. a; 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 September 2020, 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

Important—If your mailing label
reads September 2020, your sub-
scription has expired with this issue.
Please renew now!

non-profit org
U.S. Postage
Paid
Chaska, MN
Permit No. 171