

Historical or Futurist?

WHICH?

Revelation and Roman Catholicism

A STUDY IN SCRIPTURE AND HISTORY

BY

HENRY BUCHANAN

1928

MELBOURNE

Historical or Futurist?

FOREWORD

With a strong and growing conviction that the times require a fresh emphasis to be placed on what is known as the Historical or Protestant interpretation of the predictive prophecies, of Daniel, Paul and the Revelation, is the reason for issuing this book. In the pages following, the writer sets forth a number of salient proofs in support of that line of interpretation. It is inevitable in such a presentation that there will be conflict of opposing beliefs; the element of controversy cannot be eliminated; but the hope is expressed that it will be clearly apparent that the writer's principal object is, by the mass of evidence produced, to prove on which side the truth is to be found. A mere wordy, argumentative victory is not desired-that is worthless-but a victory which rests on facts. It is an apostolic admonition to "prove all things." In our courts of Law it is the weight of evidence presented which is the determining factor in all the matters which are brought there for settlement, and that same principle is just as valid here. Out of the large number of those interested in the study of Prophecy it is surprising how few take the trouble to analyze the conclusions of the many who write on these themes. One is compelled to say of many such writers that Fancy more than Fact is the controlling influence. This is a pronounced feature of Futurist writers. It was once objected against the statements of a certain Frenchman that facts were against him. His reply was, "So much the worse for the facts." The answer was clever; but the facts remained as immovable as before. The writer submits that the Historical method has an evidential value which easily gives it the premier place amongst all the systems of Prophetic exposition. If those who read this book will carefully consider the evidence of Scripture and History herein submitted, the verdict should be proven, and the consequent result accepted.

Professor Machen recently affirmed (as against the modernists' idea) "that Christianity was not Philosophy, but History. The center and core of all the Bible is history. Everything else that the Bible contains is fitted into an Historical framework, and leads up to an Historical climax. The Bible is primarily a record of events." Indeed, Christianity is the only truly Historical religion. These words have a direct application to our theme, for it is specially true of all Bible prophecy that it is "fitted into an Historical framework." To pursue a hair-splitting, fanciful, spiritualizing method, with predictive truths, can only lead to confusion and contradiction.

The great scholars who compiled the "Critical commentary" in the introduction to the Book of Revelation have this, and it deserves reaffirming: "The Futurist School is open to this great objection. It would leave the Church unprovided with prophetic guidance or support under her fiery trials for 1700 or 1800 years. Now God has said: 'Surely He will do nothing, but He reveals His secrets unto His servants the prophets.' The Jews had a succession of prophets, who guided them with the light of prophecy; what their prophets were to them that the Apocalyptic Scriptures have been and are to us."

The writer believes that this is the only way of solving the contradictory positions existing between Historicists and Futurists. The difficulty has to be faced of equally sincere followers of Jesus, truly regenerated by His Holy Spirit-each seeking Divine guidance as to the meaning of these truths-with love in their hearts, and yet holding diametrically opposite conclusions. Does the Holy Spirit lead us in opposite directions? Surely not. If one company of believers diligently collate all the known historic facts bearing on some prophecy, and another company pursue the method of spiritualizing the material of the Word and almost ignore history, then anything like comprehensive agreement cannot possibly be reached. Only let known historic facts have their rightful place in guiding us to conclusions, and a great advance towards unanimity will be made. Further, our understanding and reception of truth is always governed by our capacity to receive. All believers have not the same capacity of judgment. Note 1. Corinthians 7: 8, etc. Let us also bear in mind the inevitable confusion which results from an independent study, say, of the Book of the Revelation-a method pursued by many. Our thoughts and conclusions must be compared and checked by the other related portions of the Word. This will ensure harmony of results. Except where otherwise specified, Bible quotations are from the RV.

With a sincere desire that the Holy Spirit may be pleased to grant his wondrous illumination to what has been attempted in these pages, the writer sends it forth in the name of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory for ever and ever.

Reviews by Well-Known Personalities.

Prom Reverend Robert Kelly, Methodist Minister, Ivanhoe, Victoria-

"Historical or Futurist: Revelation and Romanism: A Study in Scripture and History," by Mr.

Historical or Futurist?

Henry Buchanan, is a powerful defense of the "Historical or Protestant" interpretation of the prophecies of Daniel, Paul, and the Revelation. The author arranges his numerous facts in an orderly and impressive way, and reasons clearly upon them. His exposition has ample support from men of high scholarship, past and present, and deserves consideration, especially in the light of contemporary developments in the ecclesiastical world. The only view of prophecy that stands in serious competition with it is that known as the "Futurist." This is examined by the writer, and his readers are left to form their own conclusions. To the Protestant mind this book should act as a tonic in days like these, when so many are of opinion that it does no matter what a man believes. August 11th, 1928.

From Reverend William H. Scurr, Chief President, Victorian Protestant Federation:-

"Oh! That mine enemy would write a book," sighed the harassed old Hebrew, probably because he felt sure that thus would his enemy dig his own grave. But my friend-Mr. H. Buchanan-has written a book which will certainly not kill him, or his already clean reputation, and will, I opine, render a very distinct service to all that is most vital and lofty in our British and religious life to-day. I have read Mr. Buchanan's production with great attention and interest, and for certain information it conveys, and its appeal to all that is deepest and best in so many of us at the present crisis in our national and spiritual life, I think it not only a most timely, but most valuable, contribution, in the reading of which all who have the opportunity to do so will be exceedingly enriched. Perhaps to those who are not accustomed nor much interested at first, in the reading of the prophetic interpretations which form the basis of Mr. Buchanan's argument, I may be permitted to suggest that they begin their reading of the book at Part II, and, turn later with greater interest to the study of the Author's thoughtful and painstaking premises. Right heartily do I commend this production to the serious attention of Protestant readers and loyal subjects in the British Empire. Melbourne, 14th August, 1928.

From Honorable W. H. Edgar, M.L.C., Victoria:-

The book by Mr. Henry Buchanan, entitled "Historical or Futurist Which? Revelation and Romanism: A Study in Scripture and History," is timely, and emphasizes a great truth. The writer seeks to prove that the Papacy fulfils the Scripture predictions respecting the Antichrist. Every Protestant and All prophetic students should read the book.

Reverend A. McCallum, DD, Melbourne, writes:-

Mr. Henry Buchanan has written a book entitled "Historical or Futurist; Revelation and Romanism." The latter part of the volume is devoted to an examination of the position of the Church of Rome as related to New Testament predictions, and is worthy of careful study and thought.

From Chief Secretary, Victorian Protestant Federation:-

Mr. H. Buchanan has given me the privilege of reading the manuscript of his book, "The Historical or Futurist: Revelation and Romanism." Whilst I am not an adherent of this type of interpretation, I have been very much impressed with the collection of most valuable and interesting Protestant information that the author has put forward in this work. There is a great amount of information that should be of extreme value to those who are definitely Protestant, and who are desirous of knowing something authoritative concerning Papal claims, and as a book of reference and information this is worthy of a place in anyone's library.

From "Keswick Quarterly," Melbourne:-

This interesting book, by Mr. Henry Buchanan, of Melbourne, is a study of the Scripture prophecies relating to the Second Coming of Christ. It is written from the standpoint of the "Historical" school of interpretation of these prophecies, as its sub-title indicates. The author believes it is worse than useless to ignore history in the study of prophecy. In the first part of the work, one of the fundamental positions taken is that there is a real organic relation between the basic prophecies in Daniel and the Book of Revelation, with an intimate inter-relation with those in 2nd Thessalonians 2 and the 1st and 2nd Epistles of John. There is a chapter on the three recognized lines of prophetic interpretation-the Preterist, the Futurist, and the Historical-briefly outlining the teachings of each; and another chapter deals with some of the guiding principles of interpretation, well worthy of careful consideration. In Part 2 the writer identifies Romanism with the great Scripture prophecies relating to the apostasy and the Antichrist. A great deal of historical evidence is brought to bear upon the subject in support of this view. He has also some very

Historical or Futurist?

interesting and instructive remarks on the meaning of the term Antichrist, and holds it to be of the first importance to get a correct definition of this name. The work gives evidence of a very careful study of both Scripture and History, and is a thoughtful presentation of the whole subject. The author deprecates controversy between the two conflicting schools of thought, since both are looking for the pre-millennial Advent of the Lord. His work is written under the deep conviction that a fresh emphasis should be placed upon the historical evidence in support of the identification of Romanism with the Antichrist of Scripture. The book will be welcomed by students of this vital subject, and should be read by all who would more fully realize the significance of the days in which we live.

NOTE-Those readers who are more interested in the Protestant portion of the book than the Prophetic are advised to read Part II. first.

HISTORICAL OR FUTURIST

Prophecy has been well defined as "History written in advance!" It is worse than useless to ignore History in the study of Prophecy. History in the main is but the record of what the Omniscient Spirit of God has sketched in bold outline-sometimes filling in with marvelous accuracy many details-centuries in advance. As the author of "Romance of Bible Chronology" has well said: "If we believe in the universal sovereignty of God in any real sense at all, we must admit that He retains in His own hands and controls by His own power the destiny of men and nations," and so predictive prophecy displays in advance God's purposes from first to last. "Nations may rise and nations fall, God's changeless purpose rules them all." God's Word makes special claims in this direction, thus Isaiah 41:21, 22: "Produce your cause, said the Lord. . . . Let them bring them forth and declare unto us what shall happen: declare you the former things what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or show us things for to come" (RV) ; also 44: 7: . . . and the things that are coming and that shall come to pass let them declare." Thus the Bible issues its own imperial challenge. Jesus Himself also said, John 8:19 (Weymouth translation): "From this time forward I tell you things before they happen, in order that when they do happen you may believe that I am He." Thus He affirmed that the fulfillment of His own predictions would bear their own unique testimony to His Deity. The hallmark of God's Holy Spirit is deeply impressed on the predictive statements of the Bible. We can gauge the immense value of Prophecy by the long-continued and desperate assaults which have been made upon it by its enemies. All the efforts to get rid of or explain away the predictive portions of the Bible have failed, and must continue to fail. Perhaps no better answer has ever been given than that of Frederick the Great's chaplain to his Royal Master's challenge: "Give me a short proof that the Bible is true." "The Jews, sire," and the very strength of that reply lies in the indisputable fact that this wonderful race are to-day a standing proof that what God said-through Moses-would befall them has come to pass, and all the objectors in the world cannot subvert or destroy that "miracle of history" -the Jews.

Many persons dismiss prophetic truth as a visionary and unpractical thing, so out of touch with their progressive, matter of fact conception of the world of mankind and events that they have no time for it; and yet its issues are of the highest practical value.

It is a fact that God has spoken-spoken of things that were to take place, whole millenniums away-and many of the events foretold have already come to pass. This is indisputable. As one has put it: "The key of human history fits the lock of Divine prophecy." There is no proof that the Bible is the Revelation of Almighty God so convincing as that of fulfilled prophecy for never did any prophecy come by human will, but men sent by God spoke as they were impelled (or driven) by the Holy Spirit" (2 Peter 1:21). Thus men who were God-impelled-under Divine compulsion-driven by the Holy Spirit-were chosen of God to write these wonderful records. We do well to take heed to them; "they are truly a light in a dark place."

The destructive school of Bible critics boldly assert there is no such thing in the Scriptures as foretelling events, affirming that all such seeming instances were written after the events had taken place. Their purpose is easy to see. It is to reduce the Bible to an ordinary human level by eliminating the supernatural altogether. But, as a once celebrated Hebrew professor of Oxford, Dr. Pusey, said in defense of Prophecy: "The writer, were he not Daniel, must have lied on a frightful scale, ascribing to God prophecies which were never uttered and miracles which are assumed never to have been wrought. In a word, the whole book would be one lie in the name of God." But the stainless character of Daniel, and the

Historical or Futurist?

testimony borne to Him long after by Jesus Himself, are a sufficient answer to such a possibility.

VARIOUS INTERPRETATIONS OF PROPHETIC TRUTH

Seeing that the Prophecies cover such long periods of time, and that the language employed is largely figurative and symbolic, it is really a foregone conclusion that various interpretations of their meaning would inevitably arise. All scientific inquiry is attended with like conditions-and so we find it to be in the realm of Prophecy. Time, however, becomes a great revealer of its meanings. Much in the beginning is hazy and uncertain, but the passing centuries make the position clearer and clearer. The evident fulfillment, too, of some prophecies helps us better to understand what is yet to come, and guides us in all our further inquiries and expectations. In order to grasp the whole position properly we must take into account the principal schools (as they are called) of Prophetic interpretation. Some believers disown all relation with any school, merely saying that they study the Bible for themselves, and that is enough for them. So far so good, but to those who know it is easy, after all, to tell where such persons stand. Consciously or otherwise, they have adopted views, thoughts, conclusions upon this or that aspect of the matter, which classifies them at once as disciples of one school or another. Simon Peter, when challenged for the third time as being a follower of the Nazarene, denied, and was met by the awkward difficulty: "Thy speech betrays you." He hadn't thought of that, and in like fashion our speech reveals our position in this matter.

There are three recognized lines of interpretation, known as the Preterist, the Futurist and the Historical, with many shades of difference attaching to some of them. The great central truth of Christ's coming again has a prominent place in the two last, and is of importance only to the Futurist and Historical. The Preterist practically regards Prophecy as a closed book since the destruction of Jerusalem, AD 70. The liberal theologians and the hostile critics generally favor and teach this view. The Futurists are at the opposite pole to the Preterists. The Futurists are so named, not because Christ's coming is still future (the Historical also hold this), but because they put the, whole of the events in the Revelation from about the sixth chapter onwards into a brief period of some 312 years at the end of the age. They also regard the Antichrist as an individual person yet to arise. The Plymouth Brethren-as a body-are Futurists, and a large number of believers in all the churches as well. One striking aspect of the Futurist position is that being future, History is regarded as of little importance; in fact, really doesn't count with them, and consequently there is plenty of room for speculation. Imagination plays an important part in Futurist expositions, and Prophecy is subjected to a spiritualizing process, or strange contradiction, often to a baldly literal explanation. The most amazing fact about both of these schools, Preterist and Futurist-is, that each of them were started by Jesuits-those past masters in the art of deceit and Satanic cunning. This one fact ought to make them suspect. Is it credible that such an organization as the Jesuits, with such a dreadful record, could possibly be, trusted to set forth the true exposition of any Scripture? And yet the sad fact is that very many believers to-day are actually following the lead of those who have accepted as truth a system of interpretation fathered by the agents of Satan. This cannot be right, and it is high time Futurists re-examined the foundation of some of their beliefs respecting Prophetic truth, and realize their responsibility in thus following the Jesuits. The Historical, or Protestant, or continuous History method of explaining Prophecy is by far the oldest. It can be traced from the second century AD right down to the present. A long line of witnesses from the early Church Fathers-the leaders of the Reformation and the noble army of martyrs-were in turn expositors and defenders of this line of interpretation. The Futurist is, by comparison, but of yesterday. The main feature of the Historical method is tracing in History from century to century the progressive fulfillment of what was once future.

The Historic process is continuous. The, Futurist creates a great gap-a kind of silent space in time-and then makes a sudden plunge near the end, when the major portion is to be fulfilled. A simple illustration of the application of the Historic method can be seen in relation to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. The Savior clearly predicted this-Luke 19:43, 44. There is nothing in the New Testament to show whether this has ever been fulfilled or not. History supplies the evidence that it has been fulfilled. The Romans under Titus became God's instruments to bring to pass the words of Jesus. We place the prediction alongside the Historic facts, and if they closely agree (as in this they do) we conclude that such evidence is sufficient to justify us in believing-there is the fulfillment. Futurism largely ignores the wonderful correspondence between certain prophecies and History, and persists in looking ahead for events

Historical or Futurist?

which have already come to pass. How are they to know that the events they are still expecting will fulfil the predictions, except by the correspondence between event and prediction? If such proofs of past fulfillment are insufficient for them now, how will precisely the same kind of evidence be any more conclusive later on? Can they give a satisfactory answer to this question?

SOME GUIDING PRINCIPLES IN INTERPRETATION

One important basic principle of interpretation enunciated by a great writer on Prophecy is to note carefully all those predictions which are Divinely interpreted. (Thus in Daniel 2:45 we read: "The dream is certain and the interpretation thereof sure." There are five such in Daniel and two in Revelation-whether this number seven is designed we cannot say.) All our conclusions must harmonize with those Divinely-given interpretations. If they do not, we must revise our conclusions, for any disagreement is a sure proof that we are wrong. Many who study Prophecy do not trouble to make these comparisons at all. If we follow this rule we shall be saved from serious error. A second rule which will help greatly to secure the best results is to constantly use for Textual purposes, along with, the Authorized Version-the Revised-Weymouth's or another good translation. To select some examples as reasons for this practice. Take the phrase "end of the world," which is in both Authorized and Revised versions. As is now well known to scholars, it should be "end of the age," or consummation, or "close of the age." It is not the end of the material world, or cosmos, but the termination of a certain definite period of time-a finishing up period. This is an important distinction. Another example is in the epistles of Timothy. In the Authorized Version, 1 Timothy 4: 1, we have "latter times"; 2 Timothy 3: 1, "last days." Revised Version renders the first as "later times," the second as "last days." Weymouth renders the first as "later times," the second as "last days." Now "latter" and "last" are much nearer together in point of time than "later" and "last," and the greater difference between later and last will be found to harmonize with the two distinct sets of conditions belonging to each period. Quite a number of teachers fail to note this distinction, and create confusion by making both lots of conditions fall in the last times, which they do not. These distinctions have a real value.

As time is a central factor in all prophecy, there is another text of Scripture which is constantly perverted to a wrong use, viz., 2 Peter 3:8, "that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." These words are frequently used to prove that God counts a thousand years as one day, or, conversely, one day as a thousand years. If that were true, we could never be sure of any time statement in the Bible. The true meaning of the text could not be better expressed than by a certain translator thus: "The writer of this Letter is here arguing for the simple fidelity with which the Almighty always fulfils His promises. It matters not whether the time previously specified for their accomplishment is long (a thousand years) or short (a single day), in either case His promptitude and punctuality is the same. The popular idea that the verse means that if God has said that an event will happen in a thousand years time it may take us by surprise and happen to-morrow, or that if He has said that it will take place to-morrow it may not take place for a thousand years yet to come, refutes itself when expressed in plain language. Is not this a very important distinction? It is necessary also to remember that there is a true organic relation between the various portions of Prophecy. This is specially so of Daniel and the Revelation-one is a natural sequel to the other-really 1st and 2nd part. To study Daniel and Revelation independently of each other, as many do, can only end in confusion. 2 Thessalonians, Chapter 2, and portions of John's 1st and 2nd Epistles, are also closely inter-related with Daniel and Revelation. Another important point is to carefully consider the nature and meaning of the figures and symbols employed-much is expressed by them, and it is incumbent upon us to try and understand what they mean. Attention to these guiding principles will help greatly to a true understanding.

AN ORDER OF STUDY OUTLINED

In order to get a true perspective of the whole Prophetic position-a comprehensive outlook, a truly balanced, harmonious View-we must begin with the Book of Daniel. As has been pointed out, Daniel occupies a transition stage from Jewish to Gentile conditions. The Book of Daniel is concerned mainly with a fore view and forecast of dominion by Gentile powers. During the whole currency of these governing

Historical or Futurist?

forces, Israel-the Jew-is dispossessed wholly of regnant power. It is a sad and painful history for the last 2500 years fully bears this out. The Anglo-Israelites -so called-however, deny this, but their denial doesn't alter the great fact one iota. Between the 2nd and 5th Chapters of Daniel there is such a close correspondence and similarity of details that the mass of Bible students generally agree that they deal with, and set forth the same facts (a real identity), but from different viewpoints. The first vision was given to Nebuchadnezzar. Accustomed as he and his compeers were to carved images of men and beasts of exaggerated size it was fitting that the symbol chosen should be a great image of a man. Very probably this image-vision suggested to him the great image of gold which he afterwards set up on the plain of Dura. The head of gold was Nebuchadnezzar, and it is easy to believe that such a symbol made a strong appeal to his pride and vain glory. Nebuchadnezzar was an autocrat. His decisions were beyond any court of human appeal. The awful power of life and death was his - "whom he would he slew and whom he would he kept alive." This autocrat's rule had gold as its symbol of value, and very beautifully is it written in Psalm 21:3-evidently of the Anointed one - "thou sets a crown of pure gold on his head." Unquestionably, the Divine ideal of human government is an Autocracy, but such power in the hands of a man is full of danger.

No man has ever lived who was fit to be entrusted with such a responsibility, but One is coming-the Divine Autocrat-Son of God and yet Son of Man, who will rule over this sin-blighted world in absolute righteousness- "the blessed and only Potentate." "Autocracy or Democracy is hopeless unless it rests on a Theocracy." This image gives a continuous, unbroken view-a full-length portrait, so to speak-of human government. Beginning with gold - the great unit of value-there follow in order silver, brass, iron, and, finally, an inferior element mixing with the iron. A falling value is registered at each change. Not only does the sterling value decline, but also the tensile strength, for the last is a mixture that doesn't hold together-"partly strong and partly brittle or "broken." Degeneracy is clearly foreshadowed in the whole symbolism of the Image.

This dream vision gives no support at all to the upward goal idea of the evolutionary. To judge by the eagerly expressed hopes of such, they start with the clay (indeed, in one direction much lower). God, however, begins a little lower than the angels and they finish with the gold, but this is only the topsy-turvydom characteristic of the wrong dream-school -they have inverted God's order. The chronology of the Image of human rule begins with the gold, not with the clay. It is a true parable, anyway, of man. God started our race on a pure gold basis, "very good," but God's pure currency became mixed with the low grade alloy of sin, and because of this man has never been able to regain his normal place. Since sin came in man has never touched the 100 per cent. Mark-he has fallen much below par. Not only of Israel, but of us all, is it true, Lamentations 5:16 - "The Crown is fallen from our head; woe unto us, for we have sinned." Sin has discrowned our race. Quite recently our Empire returned to the gold standard, and in the Sinless One we too will be restored to the long-lost gold standard of God. This is guaranteed, "we shall be like Him."

The interpretation declared that the second kingdom would be inferior to the first-Babylon-and so it was. The Kings of the Medes and Persians were limited by their own laws. Other aspects will be noted when considering the vision of Chapter vii., but of the mixture at the end we need to give a special place of consideration

"His legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay (RV)" and the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron." There is no doubt, then, that the legs, of iron represented the fourth kingdom, and the fourth, was the, Roman. A recent writer referring to the fourth empire makes the astounding statement that the Roman Empire has no true claim to be the fourth kingdom of Daniel's vision. He says: "The traditional belief that Rome is the fourth prophetic empire has similarly galvanized the mind and outlook of Roman Catholic and Protestant alike. Yet the interpretation calls for stern challenge, and there is an increasing revolt against the persistency with which this view is being presented. So Rome adumbrates the fourth, but lacking certain vital elements it is difficult to see how it could be the fourth empire of prophecy." And - then, like Futurists usually do, he gives the reins to his 'imagination, and freely speculates as to what form the fourth may take in the future. If all that has been written about the Roman Empire-very specially Gibbon's "Decline and Fall" -are not enough to prove the absolute identity of -the fourth kingdom with the Roman, then it seems impossible to prove anything from History. Ed. Gibbon, who held no brief for Prophecy, describes it as the "Iron Kingdom," and most accurately did the Romans themselves -testify to the truth of the prophecy. Futurists interpret -the two legs to mean the division which for a while existed at Rome and Constantinople. This division, however, was but a parenthesis in the history of Rome, but more than this, the third kingdom had a portion of the legs also-the thighs, and Futurists do not contend for duality there why not? Similarly "the breast and arms" of the second would demand a triplicate

Historical or Futurist?

explanation, but it was at first dual, then singular. Further still, nothing in history is more certain than that Rome was for a considerable time a mighty unit of power. Thus Gibbon writes: "The empire of the Romans filled the world, and when that empire fell into the hands of a single person the world became a safe and dreary prison for his enemies." This fact of a unity destroys completely the idea of the legs, symbolizing the temporary division between East and West. These things serve to show us that in our interpretation we must preserve the natural harmony of the image symbolism. We must not make artificial distinctions. Many Futurists do. To repeat, verse 33- "his feet part of iron and part of clay"; verse 42- "and as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay." The latter verse appears to definitely limit the clay to the toes. The first (v. 33) does not contradict the latter, because the toes are part of the feet. This being so, the clay element comes into the chronology of the Image in its last days. On the other hand, after the statement (v. 41) of the feet and toes, it says . . . "It shall be a divided kingdom. It reads as if it were the intrusion of the clay that would make it a divided kingdom.

The vision of the 7th chapter, however, very clearly sets forth a tenfold division after the unity of the fourth was broken, and this fact history bears unqualified witness to. Taking all the known facts into account, especially the chronology of the Image, the tenfold division came in at a much earlier stage (i.e., AD 476, and the end is not yet) than the intrusion of the clay. Further, the tenfold division was a splitting up of the empire-the unit-into separate, portions, distinct from each other. While the clay does not set forth separation, but a mixture with the iron-a union. These reasons appear to justify us in regarding the clay as representing a factor symbolizing something quite apart from the tenfold division. One fact not sufficiently noted is that the iron remains in the mixture to the end. The clay-a much weaker element ' is mixed with it, but does not truly blend with the iron. The Word says of this mixture, "there shall be in it of the strength of the iron." The iron element is the continued legacy of the Imperial or Kingly power of old Rome-the fourth kingdom. Among the many forms which human government has assumed none so accurately represents the Divine forecast of the delay as Modern Democracy-the rule of the people, by the people, and for the people." It is popular to boast of its superiority over all other forms of government. A prominent preacher in New York recently said: "If Christ were here to-day He would be an ardent champion of Democracy." If that were true what becomes of His Omniscience? Its main plank, however, is its greatest weakness. The assumption by Democracy of the supreme, right of the people to rule is a champion delusion. Nothing, in the history of Democracy proclaimed its inherent weakness so much as when it openly confessed that the votes of the men were insufficient, and must be supplemented by those of the women. The principal result of this addition was only to multiply the very same elements that existed before. Lord Birkenhead recently said in an article: "The incursion of women into industry and politics has failed. The extension of votes to women has made small difference, in the world, and has not in the least justified the vehement arguments made by the woman suffragists before the war." For 100,000 average women are neither better nor worse than 100,000 average men. Genesis 5:2- "and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created" -the very same basic nature. Beyond question, Democracy as a real power is here, and if the contentions advanced be true that the "clay" symbolizes that power, then there is no escape from the conclusion that its manifest presence and activity in the world to-day is a strong proof we are in the last days of Gentile supremacy. We also have the "iron" element, representing what is left of Imperial or Kingly rule mixed with-closely related to-intimately associated with Democratic systems-but not truly blending with them. Democracy's advance guard, indeed, being bent on the destruction not only of all forms of Imperialism, but of every form of control-Divine as well as human-Democracy, wherever it is in the ascendant, is fast turning human government to fluid conditions. Its lack of stability is only too evident. Its main characteristics are crude, cheap experiments, constant change and pagan ideals. The Word, however, encourages us amid the welter and confusion (even while imperfect systems of human control last) with the fact that the stiffening element of the "Iron" will remain in the mixture to the end, thus giving a measure of stability somewhere in the world to some peoples or kingdoms. And just here it is fitting to express the strong hope of the writer that our British Empire by the grace of God may be the great contributing factor to that end. Not without a purpose in the overruling Providence of God has our Empire been entrusted with the Mandate over Palestine and Jewish interests, and Britain has no better guarantee of security as a nation to the very end than (in the face of all her foes) to administer that mandate as a solemn trust from God-Isaiah 60:12: "For that nation and kingdom that will not serve thee (i.e., Israel) shall perish." Our national security depends very much on our attitude to God's chosen race; let us not fail in this trust.

Another Futurist fallacy is connected with the 10 toes of the Image. First, that the number 10 is a fixed invariable number. The Futurist today is keenly watching for the appearing (or reappearing) of the 10. The twin ' vision of the four beasts definitely says 10 horns, but another little horn came up amongst the 10,

Historical or Futurist?

which made 11; but 3 of the original 10 fell, which, of course, left 8. This proves that to take the 10 toes as expressing a rigid, fixed, invariable quantity will not stand. Another error-previously noted-springing out of making the two legs stand for the Eastern and Western divisions, is in placing five of the kingdoms in the East and five in the West, to correspond with the toes on each foot; but the image cannot stand on such a footing as this. The late Reverend David Baron relates the incident of a certain brother given to dogmatic hair-splitting on Prophetic subjects. After several years of absence, a friend met him and inquired how he was getting on. "Splendidly," he said. "We are having most glorious times. In the weekly Bible reading which I am conducting we have been feasting for the last three months on Daniel's ten toes." Of course, he meant the toes of the image. What a bony feast they had, and to have lasted for three months. Was this brother a Futurist or Historicist? Verse 43: "And whereas thou saw the iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men, but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron does not mingle with clay." It is not easy to determine clearly to whom the pronoun "they" refers. It appears to belong to those Kings, i.e., who represent the "iron," for, in the next verse we read, "And in the days of those Kings," etc. If so, the "mingling with the seed of men" would agree with the fact already noted of the close inter-relation and association of Democratic institutions with Imperial forces, and yet do. not hold or cleave to each other. There is also another aspect which has come to the front since the termination of the Great War. The League of Nations, which represents the greatest and most powerful combination of the governing powers of the world in the history of mankind, has held many gatherings at Geneva, Washington, Genoa and other places and the failure to agree on some crucial points, notably "Disarmament," has been the great outstanding result of all their deliberations. It has been true so far of them, "they do not cleave to one another." The "Round Table," England, writing of the Locarno Pact, of its advantages and its drawbacks, said: "In the great field of Europe, at any rate, the attempt to obtain unity seems to have now been abandoned as hopeless," and this is still true in 1928. Lloyd George said: "Disarmament was the acid test of the real value of Locarno." A recent declaration is that of Dr. Mott-a great optimist. In his Melbourne address he said "that internationally the world was in a state of mistrust, irritation, and want of basic unity." Lack of cohesion-notwithstanding, all the protestations in favor of unity and brotherhood-is the outstanding result of all the efforts of the "League of Nations," and on the authority of the Infallible Book we can say it will continue to the end, "but they shall not cleave one to another even as iron does not mingle with clay." As this feature has only come into existence since the termination of the Great War, it has more than ordinary significance. It deserves careful consideration.

Verse 44: "And in the days of those kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom." This statement is evidently connected with the terminal days of the "image" (i.e., of human rule). We have here the fact of a plurality of kings, just preceding the setting up of the eternal kingdom of God. There is absolutely no doubt at all that from the break up of the Roman Empire as a mighty unit of power, into a number of separate kingdoms, no other single kingdom has ruled the world. Modern Europe, with its centuries old divisions, still occupies the territory which of old formed the Roman Empire; Charlemagne, Napoleon, the Kaiser, all tried to reunite the fragments again into one great world-empire, and failed. But what these earthly potentates could not do God is going to do in the person of His Son. But the fact of a plurality of kings in existence when God intervenes creates an insuperable difficulty in accepting the Futurist program, of one all dominating personality, at the end-to wit, the Antichrist. The Futurist is looking for the appearing of a bold, defiant, blasphemous, infidel personality, almost outclassing Satan himself, who is to reign supreme in the world for some 311 years at the end. How can this come to pass, when the Vision declares of the then existing condition that they do not cleave one to another. How can supreme control exist alongside of disunity in the powers that be? If it be argued that disunited parts can mutually surrender their separate rights, and agree to accept the supreme headship of such a one as the Antichrist, we concede such a possibility; but, then, such a condition could no longer represent "the days of those Kings," but that King-one only. It is impossible for two such contradictory things to co-exist together. One final, insuperable objection is that only four-no more, no less-world empires were to be, and they have been. To, have a reigning Antichrist, such as portrayed, would mean a fifth universal man-made empire, and that is absolutely barred.

The fifth is Divine-that of "the Son of Man and the Saints" -not Antichrist-and will last for ever. Because the 10 toes are the extremity of the "Image," the Futurist is looking ahead for the tenfold division, and in order to get that division he expects a revived Roman Empire first. This only brings us up against the same difficulty-a fifth empire-for to expect a revived Roman Empire is a direct admission that a Roman Empire has already existed, else there could be no revival. Another fatal objection against the 10 toes representing the tenfold division is that the 10 horns spring out of the head of the Beast (Dan. 7:20), not the

Historical or Futurist?

toes. The “toes” are terminal, and the chronological facts are dead against the toes being the 10 Kings. The 10 toes are necessary to complete the natural symbolism of the image of a man, and there is no Bible authority for interpreting the 10 toes as the 10 Kings. Beside the image-vision clearly symbolizing the fact of “Degeneracy,” it also sets forth the great truth that government by man is of strictly limited duration. With this Divine Revelation before us, we cannot say of human rule as it has been from early times “is now and ever shall be.” God has fixed a time limit to the rule of man. As it was said of Belshazzar: “God hath numbered thy kingdom and brought it to an end,” so of all human rule. Its days are numbered, and God Himself will end it-not man. “O long expected day begin; dawn on these realms of woe and sin.”

DANIEL CHAPTER 7

And now let us consider the Twin vision of the Four Beasts-Daniel Chapter 7; the four great world empires. A great Gentile ruler received the image vision; a great God fearing ruling statesman, Daniel, this one. The principal, outstanding features common to both are-

- (a) A fourfold division-four metals, four beasts.
- (b) Degeneracy. From Gold to Iron and Clay. From a Lion with Eagle’s wings; the King of Beasts and Birds to a composite mixture of flesh and metals, a creature unknown to the animal kingdom.
- (c) The same characteristics ascribed to the fourth kingdom and the fourth beast.
- (d) A divided condition, common to the fourth kingdom and the fourth beast.
- (e) Removal, and ultimate destruction, overtakes both.
- (f) In each case they are followed by the universal and everlasting kingdom of the Son of Man and the Saints.

Then let us note what is different in these two visions. The “Image” presents mainly the external features of human rule, and, saving the fourth, does not reveal the nature and character of Gentile rule. The visions of the vii. set forth very strongly the real character of Gentile rule. Wild beasts-not tame ones-cruel, rapacious, bloodthirsty, destructive. These are the emblems divinely chosen. Looking back over the 25 centuries of Gentile supremacy, how deeply is the record stained with blood. Devastating, cruel, savage wars, with short periods of peace between, which have often proved to be only breathing spaces, to prepare for a fresh onslaught; and our 20th century has continued the same dark story. During the Great War many believed that it was a war to end war, and since its termination efforts to secure conditions of universal and permanent peace have been unremitting, but we are obliged to confess that the signs are not hopeful, even with the results of the Locarno Conference and later ones before us; neither of the visions warrant us to expect the dawn of the day of peace. Unregenerate human nature in authority is powerless to bring it to pass. “Can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit?” “What we call good government is good only by comparison with such as is worse.” Incidentally our Lord bore testimony in Pilate’s judgment hall to the warring, nature of all earthly kingdoms when He said: “If My, Kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight,” etc. The ending of war is a Divine prerogative. Psalm 46:9 is proof. But that part of the Vision which claims the most attention, and upon which the emphasis rests, is, the fourth Beast and the 11 horns which came out of its head. The great importance of this development can be, judged by the lengthy description and explanation given, especially of the “little horn.” That this “little horn” is of a God opposing character is clear from its expressed attitude of hostility to the saints, and just here the Futurist program again cannot be made to harmonize with the vision-Verse 21: “I beheld and the same horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them.” Verse 22: “Until the Ancient of Days came,” etc. This little horn Futurists identify with the yet future Antichrist. They also affirm that the church (i.e., the saints) will have been caught up before Antichrist is manifested. If so; how can war be made against the saints when they are all gone? It is an impossible situation. Perhaps the difficulty is solved by having two classes of saints, though the Bible appears rigid on the point of but one kind. At this stage we may digress in order to

Historical or Futurist?

show the organic relation between Daniel and Revelation.

REVELATION CHAPTER 13

In Revelation Chapter 13, a wild beast comes up out of the sea. In Daniel 7 the four beasts also came up from the great sea, i.e., the Mediterranean.* In Rev. this beast has special identification marks, viz., resembling a leopard, bear and lion, but mentioned in the reverse order to Daniel 7. When John received the Vision, the first three beasts had already ended their history, and the fourth-the Roman-was then in authority. Of this there can be no reasonable doubt at all. Luke 2:1 and John 11:48 are evidence. The Beast of Revelation 13 had ten horns, the same as Daniel's fourth Beast, but with an additional detail of seven heads. The fact that in Rev. the leopard comes first instead of third, as in Daniel 7, is because the leopard kingdom was next in order of time to the Roman-the fourth. When Daniel had his vision the first had begun; when John received his vision the fourth had begun its career, so the reversal of Daniel's order links Daniel's third Beast with that of Revelation, and becomes a proof that this one seen by John was the same as Daniel's fourth and last. The chronological order in Daniel is the forward view, because unfulfilled. That of Revelation 13 is the backward view, because three-fourths fulfilled. Another point of close contact between Daniel's fourth Beast and that of Revelation 13 is in the matter of power, authority, etc. Daniel 7: "And shall devour the whole earth and shall tread it down"; Revelation: "And the dragon gave him his power and his throne and great authority" - Weymouth translation - "and his wide dominion."

Sir Isaac Newton, the celebrated astronomer, was also, a deep student of the Prophecies. He lived some 200 years ago. His thoughts on the Book of Daniel and Revelation are interesting and valuable. On the vision of the Four Beasts he said:-

(1) "The two wings on the Lion denoted the two kingdoms of Babylonia and Media, the latter of which overthrew the Assyrian Empire. In the image vision Babylon was represented by the head of gold; in the other vision both are represented by the two wings."

(2) "The Bear represented, at first, the Medes and Persians-raised itself up one side. At first the Persians were under the Medes, but afterwards rose above them. Three ribs were in his mouth -the Kingdoms of Sardes, Babylon and Egypt, which were conquered by it!"

(3) "Of the Leopard's four heads-This kingdom suffered a fourfold division amongst Alexander's four generals-

- (a) Cassander over Macedon, Greece and Epirus.
- (b) Lysimachus over Thrace and Bithynia.
- (c) Ptolemy Lagus over Egypt, Lybia, Arabia, Collsyrina and Palestine.
- (d) Selencus Nicator over Syria.

It was also said of the four heads or horns of this third Beast, Chap 8, verse 8, that they were "towards the four winds of heaven." In Chap. vii., v. 6, of the third Beast, that besides the four heads it had "four wings of a fowl." Locality or direction is clearly figured by the "four winds of heaven," and "wings" in the other naturally relate to the "winds," for winds have no purpose but in relation to the air. On the words, Chapter 7:12, "and as for the rest of the beasts" (i.e., the first three), "their dominion was taken away, yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time." Newton remarks: "All four Beasts are still alive, though the dominion of the three first be taken away, thus-

- (a) The nations of Chaldea and Assyria are still the first Beast.
- (b) Media and Persia the second Beast.
- (c) Macedon, Greece, Thrace, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt the third.
- (d) And those of Europe on this side Greece are still the fourth.

Again of the fourth beast a different ending is predicted than of the other three-Chapter 7, verse

Historical or Futurist?

11: "I beheld even till the beast was slain and his body destroyed, and he was given to be burned with fire." Another proof of organic relationship to be noted here, between Daniel And Revelation 18:8- "And she shall be utterly burned with fire" (v. 9), "and the kings of the earth when they look upon the smoke of her burning." (v. 18) as they looked upon the smoke of her burning."

Newton makes a distinction in the symbolism between the two visions of the Bear and Leopard and the Ram and He Coat, which are interesting. "The Ram represents the Kingdoms of the Medes and Persians from the beginning of the four empires. The Goat represents the Kingdom of the Greeks to the end of them. By this, he says, the times of all the four empires are again described. "The Kingdom of Persia arose when Cyrus conquered Babylon-revolted from Darius, the Mede, and beat him at Pasargadae; thus Persia rose above the Medes-this was the horn that came up last-Chapter 8, verse 3.

"The horn which came up first was the Kingdom of the Medes, dating from the time Cyaxares and Nebuchadnezzar overthrew Niniveh and shared the empire of the Assyrians between them. The empires of Media and Babylon were contemporary. They rose up together by the fall of the Assyrian Empire. The Prophecy of the four Beasts begins with one of them-the Ram and He Goat with the other."

THE FOURTH KINGDOM

Then., despite the apparent incongruity of using wild beasts as emblems of human government, we find how these very symbols have been in use more or less until now. The British Empire has a Lion; sometimes joined with a fabled creature, a Unicorn. Russia for long had a Bear, Germany an Eagle, Austria a double-headed Eagle. France at one time had three Frogs on its banner. Another fabulous creature, the Dragon, was used as the ensign of Pagan Rome. In later times an Eagle was used. Thus unwittingly have Gentile kingdoms perpetuated these divinely chosen symbols, and bear witness unconsciously to their fitness and truthfulness. The first three kingdoms are named - conjecture has no place-and the fourth, though unnamed, is easily recognized as the Roman. History gives its certain answer, and proves the Divine forecast true, no reversal or displacement. A well-known Greek tradition existed which divided the world into four ages: first the golden, then silver, the next bronze, and the last iron, and their thought was that the men of their own age were living under the last one. That tradition was in agreement with the Divine forecast, excepting that the Greeks lived under the third-the bronze-not the iron period. Each of these empires in turn ruled the then known world. They began their history with Judah's fall, 25 centuries ago, and will last only till Judah's restoration is accomplished. This century has brought that day of restoration visibly nearer when the prophet's words will be realized: "Say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God, Thy God, reigns."

There remains for our consideration more in detail the tenfold division of the fourth kingdom, already referred to. What is the testimony of history? Did the Roman Empire experience such a division? There is but one answer. Yes. Moreover, that divided state still exists. Modern Europe bears its unequivocal testimony to that great fact-and yet Futurists ignore the historic fulfillment, and are sure it is still to come. The fiction of a revived Roman Empire. The 10 horns were 10 kings or kingdoms. The 10 horns came up first-no evidence that they came up simultaneously. There is nothing to tell us either how long after the "little horn" -the eleventh-rose up. Of necessity some definite interval must have elapsed. History witnesses that the 10 came into existence after one another. No distinction is made between any of the 10 kings as to position, territory, or the like, but of the 'little horn' a sharp difference is made - "and he shall be diverse from the former." Being a "horn," he shared with the 10 in some form of governing, controlling or reigning power. The fact stated, v. 26 "They shall take away his dominion," proves this. The adjective "little" seems to be related to the matter of having less territory than the others, because in other directions the little horn is given a specific, clear-cut, distinctive and foremost place - "a mouth that spoke great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows," and the human element is emphasized in this 'little horn' by its having "eyes like the eyes of a man." Personality is evidently an attribute of this horn. Though "little" -as indicated yet exercising such enormous power that it "plucked up by the roots" three of the original 10. 'This proves that it must have been closely and actively related to these Kingdoms contemporaneous with them and used its power to destroy them. On the other hand, this horn "makes war with the saints" and "wears out the saints of the Most High."

Historical or Futurist?

WAR AGAINST THE SAINTS

To make war on the Saints cannot possibly mean territorial aggression, or for any of the reasons which usually cause war between Kingdoms and Nations. In Psalm 16: 3: "As for the Saints that are in the earth they are the excellent in whom is all my delight." Psalm 106:15: "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints."

Many other portions of God's Word demonstrate how dear to God are all His saints. To make war on God's saints means war in the realm of the spiritual. So this little horn fills a dual position, and this double character becomes fully evident, as we shall see later in the Revelation.

A very important fact in relation to the "little horn" is that a lengthy tenure of life is given to it-not a brief 3-21 years, as Futurists assert. That its life began during the existence and early history of the 10 is clearly proved, because it uprooted three of them; that is evident.

That there can be only one division of the fourth empire is clear from the vision. There is no hint whatever of 'another to come-the fiction of Futurism, and as already noted a Plurality-not a single form of power, exist at the terminus of Gentile rule, and that this "little horn" has first its dominion taken away, in order to consume and to destroy it unto the end," and that that end here does not just mean its end, but the end of Gentile rule also, is clear from verse 11 (conjoined with last words of previous verse): "I beheld at that time because of the voice, great words which the horn spoke." The history of the "little horn," it is clear, lasts until the crisis end, of human rule, and it began its career amongst the ten. No single human life could possibly cover such an interval of time. A dynastic succession alone can bridge such a long period. We shall see later that this position agrees perfectly with 2 Thessalonians 2. and Revelation.

THE SEVENTIETH WEEK

As the scope of this first part of the Book is practically limited to 2 and 7th chapters of Daniel, little has been said about the 70 weeks of that (excepting some necessary reference to Chapter 9). However, it is essential that something be said in, addition, about the 70 weeks, in Daniel Chapter 9. One of the most extraordinary creations of the Futurist school is that of the 70th week. They cut off the 70th week from the 69, and without a shred of evidence transfer it to about 3.5, years before the end of the age-a veritable, orphan week, all on its own. The unsolvable problem is how one can take a week belonging consecutively to a period 2000 years ago and make room for it 20 centuries later. Is a blank space created in the course of time for this orphan week to fill? If not, then somewhere near the end the ordinary "week" would need to be duplicated. Would not the ordinary "week" that would arrive inevitably, at that future date, suffice for the operations of Antichrist? There is no need whatever to bring a week on such a long journey. Let us consider the vision-"70 weeks are determined or decreed" for specific purposes. The critical com. translates "cut out" (i.e.) from the course of time. Sir Isaac Newton translation: "70 weeks are cut out upon" a phrase in Hebrew taken from a practice of numbering by cutting notches. It does not say 69 weeks are cut out; it is one whole the 70 weeks. Further it says that after the expiry of the 69 weeks "the anointed one" was to be cut off and on the "year-day" principle-a principle which has been actually proved true by Futurists from this very passage. Messiah was cut off in this 70th consecutive week. This 70th week, beyond all doubt, is sacred to that central fact of Christianity-the atoning death on Calvary of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. It belongs to Christ, not Antichrist. Much more could be added, but this must suffice.

ZECHARIAH CHAPTER 14

Of the closing events, connected with the vision's, of the 2nd and 7th chapters, the removal or destruction of all Gentile rule, to make room for that Kingdom which shall never pass away-Futurists and Historicists are in pretty close agreement. We are both looking for the coming of that great event when "the stone cut out of the mountain with out hands" will smite the image of world-powers on its feet-in its last days-and that stone which the builders rejected shall become so great as to fill the whole earth. "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth; in that day shall the Lord be one and His name one." -Zechariah 14:9. "For He must reign till He hath put all His enemies under His feet." It's impending-it's imperative-it's inevitable. When the clock of the ages strikes the hour He will arrive. 'The unbelieving, unrepentant,

Historical or Futurist?

unready will be saying in their hearts, "What has become of that long-promised crisis in this world's history? Many generations have talked about it, surely it must be long overdue-so long it must be dead. Their favorite argument is the alleged rigid uniformity of all things that have been and are. Forgetful or "willfully blind" of the solemn declaration of the Infallible Word of God that there have been great crises which have broken in upon this uniformity and made it a wholly unreliable thing to depend on. The "same word" affirms that another world crisis will accompany the Return of our Lord Jesus Christ. As to the time question, the best answer is furnished by the marvelous accuracy of all the movements of the heavenly bodies. The question of early or late, in any of God's "time promises" cannot be entertained. It is only scoffers who raise the question "What has become of His promised return?" (Weymouth) It is the wicked, evil servant who says in his heart- "My Master is a long time in coming" (Weymouth). Reverend Martin Anstey has written - "It is nowhere affirmed that he will come soon, but it everywhere affirmed that He may come at any moment." 'Soon' measures the distance between the present moment and the day of His return. 'Quickly' indicates the suddenness of His coming and measures the interval between His setting out and His arrival!" "For yet a very little while, he that comes shall come and shall not tarry." -Hebrews 10: 37.

The "Eucharistic Procession" in Sydney in September is designed to impress the members of the Roman Catholic Church (and others besides) with the immense importance and central position the Mass holds in her religious system.

Every idolatrous religion-and Rome is such-makes its appeal through the avenue of the senses. Rome knows the great value of the spectacular and has used it to the full in the past; and now in the noonday light of the 20th century brings out afresh-for adoration and homage-her idol-god of flour and water that a mouse can eat and not suffer for it.

How far removed from all that is essentially Christian this Eucharistic idol procession is can be seen and understood even by the humblest believer in Jesus. Instead of a gigantic, spectacular procession of a wafer-god paraded through the city streets "we see Jesus, Who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor." Hebrews 11:9 (A.V.), And "behold He is alive for evermore."

REVELATION AND ROMANISM

In the previous pages, one of the fundamental positions taken is that there is a real organic relation between the basic prophecies in Daniel and the Book of the Revelation, with an intimate inter-relation with 2 Thessalonians 2 and the 1st and 2nd epistles of John. Over and above that also is the fact that the Bible itself is an organic whole, and therefore all its parts must, of necessity, be harmoniously related to each other part in some way or another. The bringing together here of the words "Revelation and Romanism" in direct relation to one another is (to begin with) an assumption that the vast ecclesiastical organism known by the general terms Romanism, Roman Catholicism, the Papacy, is clearly foretold in Prophecy, especially in the last book-Revelation-is here avowed and accepted by the writer. To, focus the great mass of evidence on this point and endeavor to prove the truth of this position so that conviction may be produced in the minds of the readers is the objective of the writer.

Besides the fact of "organic relation" already noted, there is also the fact of a progressive unfolding of the truth-a fuller statement of the various portions-an increasing measure of light, as the centuries roll on. This is particularly so with the Prophetic or Predictive parts. The necessity of this becomes apparent as we think of it. This being so, we naturally expect to find in the later revelations fuller information, and we do. The earlier revelation is in the nature of a comprehensive outline only-the later, is mainly filling in the outline with details, and thus making the picture complete. In any retrospect, in this second part, as far as the prophecy of Daniel is concerned, we will deal only with the 4th Beast and its Horns, especially and particularly with the eleventh. We have already presented the evidence that Daniel's 4th Beast and that of Revelation 13 are the same. Now, in chapter 17, the same Beast appears again with marked additional details. The Beast of Revelation 13 had 10 horns with crowns and 7 heads with names of blasphemy. In chapter 17, the Beast there has also 7 heads and 10 horns and names of blasphemy. It cannot be that these are mere coincidences. Words are not used in the Scriptures in any careless, haphazard, purposeless fashion. Mere duplication is also ruled out, as well as any form of exaggeration. These 10 horns and 7 heads etc., are identification marks used by the Holy Spirit so that we may-know who or what is

Historical or Futurist?

described by these symbols.

The same marks are used in chapter 12. Moreover, chapter 17 is Divinely interpreted for us, and that settles the meaning of the symbols used there, and like symbols elsewhere, must agree. So much has been written on this chapter that it does not seem necessary to repeat the well-known points of the Historical, or (as may now be added) Protestant school of interpreters. For many centuries such have regarded the 17th and 18th chapters as the Divine description of the Church of Rome in all its varied relationships and coming doom. Many fail, or refuse to see the intimate correspondence-Historicists are often blamed for accepting merely fancied resemblance for actual correspondences. Doubtless this has been done by some who have given a place of first importance to truths of secondary value. But, in this matter, the correspondences are so many and actual that there is no need to trade on fancied resemblance. Chapter 17, verse 18, very definitely fixes the locality of the great city represented by the harlot. There was only one city which reigned over the Kings of the earth when John had the vision-Rome-symbolized by the woman. In St. John's age Rome was known as the Queen of Nations-The Eternal City-The Mistress of the World.

Another definite proof furnished by the angel interpreter is that the "7 heads are 7 mountains on which the woman sits." Each of these hills had its particular name in St. John's time, and are still identifiable. Rome was called the seven-hilled city. One of these hills, "The Aventine," was mentioned in the Press quite recently in relation to opposers of Mussolini. And the principal Latin poets for some 500 years referred to Rome as the seven-hilled city-Virgil and Horace being amongst them. Coins are regarded as one of the best evidences of the times when they were struck, and of any event they serve to commemorate. Imperial medals of that age, still to be seen (see illustrations), bear their silent testimony to the Divine forecast, for they actually represent Rome as a woman seated on 7 hills. Is this only a coincidence? Then we read that this Woman had a name written on her forehead. "Mystery, Babylon the Great," etc., or as Weymouth translation, "I am a symbol of great Babylon, etc." Bishop Wordsworth gives a number of striking parallels between Babylon, oil the Euphrates, and Rome, which could not be mere coincidences.

One of the most remarkable testimonies of identity between Rome and the Babylon, of the Apocalypse, comes from the Church of Rome itself. Four of her principal Cardinal writers, viz., Baronius, Bellarmine, Bossuet and Manning, freely admit that Rome is Babylon, but they deftly turn the edge of the admission by trying to prove that it means Rome Pagan, or Rome as a city, not Rome Papal. Some R.C. historians say: "Rome Pagan was the bloody persecutor of Saints, and for this was punished by the Vandals and Goths: but not until a century after Rome Pagan had become Christian that she was invaded and her final fall took place when she had been nearly 150 years a professedly Christian city." "It is confessed by all," says Baronius, that Rome is signified in the Apocalypse by the name of Babylon." Bossuet says, "The features are so marked that it is easy to decipher Rome under the figure of 'Babylon,'" and Bellarmine says, "St. John, in the Apocalypse, calls Rome 'Babylon.'"

These admissions, at least, show that the charge of prejudice against Protestant interpreters in this matter are without any true foundation. Then in chapter 17 recurs again that charge of war against the saints in a more direct form-the most terrible indictment of all-verse 6: "And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Weymouth translation: "And I saw the woman drinking her self drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the witnesses of Jesus." And of this great city, Babylon, in chapter 18, verse 24, after a minute description of her doom, we read, "And in her was found the blood of prophets and saints." And so the little horn in Daniel 7 is linked, indubitably, with Revelation 13:17 and 18. But to complete the Divine portraiture, we ask: Has Rome Papal actually been guilty of such ruthless war? Alas! That we should be compelled to say yes. It has been carefully computed, that between 50 and 60 million of the Witnesses of Jesus suffered martyrdom at her hands, and so ruthlessly, relentlessly and completely, did she do this cruel work that she made the proud boast in the noontide of her power, that not a single heretic was left-all had been silenced as far as she knew.

Lecky, the great Rationalist historian, has said, "That the Church of Rome has shed more innocent blood than any other institution that has ever existed among mankind." It can be affirmed, with the utmost certainty, that only one power has done this, and that one is Rome Papal-and the verdict has long ago been registered in heaven against her-Guilty before God. In this matter Rome again bears witness against herself, for after the dreadful massacre of the French Protestants, or Huguenots, on St. Bartholomew's Day, in France, Pope Gregory XIII caused a medal to be struck to commemorate that event in 1572. On the obverse side is the portrait of Gregory, on the reverse is the figure of an Angel, representing Papal Rome, with a

Historical or Futurist?

sword in one hand and crucifix in the other, offering these Protestants the alternative of one or the other. There is also a medal struck by Pope Paul II, 1469, on the Papal crusades against the followers of John Huss in Bohemia. On the reverse, side is inscribed "The pious Shepherd (i.e., the Pope) wages war only against wild beasts." The New Testament describes these so-called wild beasts as The Witnesses of Jesus.

A specimen of this medal is in the British Museum. Not alone this, but a Te Deum was celebrated and Gregory thanked God for such a glorious success on St. Bartholomew's Day. A mean calculation is that some forty thousand perished in that awful slaughter in France. Again the colors-scarlet and purple-are no mere accidental marks. How is it that the well-known distinction of her cardinals (out of whom her Popes are chosen) is the Red Hat with the 15 scarlet tassels; cloaks and stockings are also scarlet. The inner color of the Pope's cloak is scarlet; the carpet he treads on, and a large part of the uniform of the Pope's bodyguard is scarlet. In the great church of St. Paul's (Rome) the Portraits of all the Popes for centuries are painted on the interior walls-a reliable witness counted 109 of them clad in scarlet robes. Purple, as well as Scarlet, are the official colors of the Church of Rome. At important services in St. Peter's, Rome, one may see the officiating, priests in purple, scarlet and cloth of gold.

One of the Popes, Paul III, made it penal for anyone but the Cardinals to wear hats of scarlet. As a truly up-to-date proof on the matter of the scarlet color we have the following news item in connection with the great Chicago Eucharistic Congress, vide "Argus," 24/06/1926:- "Cardinal Bonzano and the other cardinals were seated under a canopy on the right side of the altar clad in robes of Red." Still true to type as ever. At the same gathering, 62,000 children sang praises "to Christ, their Eucharistic King." A special train of seven cars, painted cardinal red, was also run for the cardinals, etc. Then, as to the woman being "decked with gold and precious stones and pearls," chapter 17:4. A Papal Chamberlain, 1903, supplies this list relating to the Pope's "enthronements." The three crowns, or Tiara, as it is called, are decorated with 32 rubies, 19 emeralds, 11 sapphires, 529 diamonds and 252 pearls. This writer does not mention gold. But the "Bambino," one of Rome's principal Images-supposed to represent Christ himself-a doll some three feet high, is thus described: "From head to foot it is one mass of dazzling jewelry, gold chains, strings of pearls and diamond bracelets and rings, etc." This idol of Rome is a great source of revenue to the Church.

For the present, we need not deal further with the Book of Revelation, but reference to it will be necessary later.

The great dividing line between the Futurist and Historical schools of interpretation is over the question of Who is the Antichrist? As previously noted, the Futurist is looking for the appearing of the "Man of Sin," or Antichrist in the future. The Historical takes the position, "he has appeared centuries ago and is still in existence has had his day of greatest power, and that the process of decay is well advanced." An important point to be remembered is that Antichrist bears a specific relation to the Second Advent of our Lord Jesus Christ. Our actual attitude or relation to His coming is influenced not a little by whichever of these two positions we hold as will appear. In 1 Thessalonians frequent reference is made to our Lord's appearing, and there seems to be sufficient reason for believing that those Thessalonians Christians regarded that coming as quite near. In the second epistle the Apostle warns them against being troubled or unsettled in mind about the nearness of that event - "That the day of the Lord is now present," or (Weymouth), "That the day of the Lord is now here!" "Let no man beguile you," or (Weymouth), "Let no one in any way deceive you," and the Apostle goes on to say that that event or day of the Lord-the same day as in 1 Thessalonians, v. 2-could not come except another event preceded it, viz., "the falling away" or the Apostasy-Weymouth translation- "Let no one in any way deceive you, for that day cannot come without the coming of the Apostasy first, and the appearing of the Man of Sin, etc."

The Apostle shows clearly that between the first and second advents of Christ (not after) a rival to, or an Antichrist, would appear. A clear cut distinction is thus made between the Historical and the Futurist position. Paul explicitly declares that the Apostasy and the revelation of the "Man of Sin" precede not follow-the revelation of Jesus from heaven. The Historical position harmonizes with this, for it accepts as true that the Apostasy has already come-but the Futurist lands himself in a difficulty, because he expects the Lord at any time, and yet he affirms Antichrist has not yet come. The Futurist position would be consistent if (though denying that Antichrist has already come) he were yet looking for him before the coming of Jesus-not otherwise. The order is first Antichrist then Christ. In 2 Thessalonians 2nd chapter we have the character portrait of a personality, so striking and wonderful that by the general consent of Bible students he is regarded as the Antichrist, viz., "He that opposes and exalts himself against all that is called God."

Before going further, we must try to arrive at a true understanding of the meaning of the term Antichrist. It is of the first importance to get a correct definition of the name. In the first place this name is

Historical or Futurist?

only found in the 1st and 2nd epistles of John. The definition given us of “the (RV) not any Antichrist” (also Weymouth) is, “he that denies (Weymouth disowns) the Father and the Son.” In Titus 1:16, “They profess that they know God; but by their works they deny (or disown) Him.” Also, in Jude’s epistle of certain ones “turning the grace of our God . . . and denying (or disowning) our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ.” Here we learn that to deny or disown means flat contradiction between profession and works in relation to, God and Christ. This clears the way for saying that the prefix “Anti” does not of necessity mean against or antagonistic to Christ. The Futurist narrows the meaning of the term down to against or antagonism to, and this one meaning is really the foundation on which they build their conception of the character of the Antichrist. We have already noted the Scripture which show that to deny or disown does not necessarily mean open, violent antagonism to God at all. We can be against God without direct antagonism-as for example – “He that is not with me is against me”; thus even a passive, negative attitude is truly against Him or Antichrist.

Archbishop Trench, in his Synonyms of the New Testament, explains that the Greek preposition “Anti” in composition “has both forces, meaning sometimes substitution, sometimes opposition, and occasionally in the same word, will have both meanings. The name itself does not decide the matter, but leaves it to be settled by other considerations.”

Bishop Westcott, on The Epistles of St. John, Affirms that the name means far more than simply “an adversary of Christ.” Professor Law, of Toronto, defines Antichrist as “one who, in the guise of Christ, opposes Christ.” One Bible Dictionary defines, “As a Rival or counter ‘Christ.’” One scholar, evangelical, says: “It is most important to remember that ‘Antichrist’ cannot mean simply and solely an enemy to Christ; it can only mean either a Vice-Christ or a false, ‘opposing Christ, or both’; a professed Christian, but, in reality, an Apostate. Outside of the professing Christian Church there originates no Antichrist in the Biblical sense of the term-Antichrist is not an Atheist or an infidel.”

This statement is fully supported by the text. The Apostle writes of the many Antichrists who had already appeared-that they had come from within the Church. “They went out from us, but they were not of us.” - 1 John 2:19. Weymouth translates rest of verse: “But they left us, that it might be manifest that professed believers do not all belong to us.”

Now, as the many Antichrists in Apostolic times had come from within the Church, we have good reason to expect the Antichrist to arise from the same source. The Futurist is looking for someone who never had any relationship with the Christian Church. In this matter the Futurist parts company with clear Scripture analogy. Even Satan was once, an angel dwelling in light, consequently it is easy to believe that the Man of Sin should be one who has a professed relationship with the Church of God on earth. Judas Iscariot was one of the 12 Apostles, yet he became the base betrayer of the Christ. The worst enemies of the Church have always been (and still are) those who have worked from the inside. Hence the deep significance of the Savior’s warning, “Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep’s clothing” - as wolves they would be rejected. None of the following describe the Antichrist as an infidel, viz., Bishops Ellicott, Westcott, Professor Swete, a Praetorist, Expositor’s Greek Testament, Hasting’s Bible Dictionaries (the greater and the less), and Murray’s Bible Dictionary. “To be looking for an infidel is to be looking for that which is not foretold.” The true meaning is not one who is against or violently opposes, but “in the place, of,” “instead of” a Vice-Christ. Once more (unintentionally, perhaps) Rome herself furnishes us with one of the best descriptions. Cardinal Manning’s definition of the Antichrist is: “A supplanter of the true Messiah, and therefore an Antichrist in the sense of substituting himself in the place of the true,” and this, we respectfully submit, is the true meaning-one who usurps the place, position, honor, glory and majesty, which belong by sovereign right to Christ alone.

To complete this part of the evidence we have the well-known Latin titles of the successive occupants of the Papal Throne for many centuries. Vicarius generalis Dei in terris, or, Vicarius Filii Dei-The Vicar-general of God on earth, or, The Vicar of the Son of God-the Vice-Christ. An excellent summary, showing the Classical and Biblical usage of the prefix “Anti,” is to be found in Baron Porcellis’ work – “The Antichrist!”

Bishop Elliott, one of the greatest of prophetic writers: “I must particularly beg the reader to bear in mind that the word cannot with etymological propriety mean simply a person opposed to Christ; but either a Vice-Christ, or Counter-Christ, or both.”

An excellent comment on its force and significance is furnished by the Romanist’s appellation: “Not simply an enemy to the Pope, but of a hostile, self-substituted, usurping Pope; one occupying the proper Pope’s place, receiving his honors and exercising his functions.” Sufficient evidence has now been given to make clear the real meaning of the term.

Historical or Futurist?

And now to return to a detailed study of 2 Thessalonians 2. In this chapter we are dealing with a prophecy which forecasts and foretells the rise, dominion, and ultimate destruction of a self-exalting, widely influential, blasphemous power styled the “Man of Sin,” the “Son of Perdition,” identical with the “little horn” of Daniel vii, and the Antichrist of St. John’s epistles. Thus the picture is a composite one. Only by bringing all these portions together can we get an accurate, truly, balanced view of the whole question. Archbishop Trench points out that all expositors of weight (Crotius alone excepted) are agreed that the great adversary described by St. Paul is identical with the Antichrist described by St. John. There is only one power known to history in which all these Divine predictions meet-find their exact counterpart-and that is the Roman Apostasy. The 1st verse links the coming of the Lord and our being gathered to meet Him, with the day of the Lord. He warns them against any pretended revelation or message which affirmed that that day was immediately imminent. Some try to make a distinction in time between the day of the Lord and the coming of the Lord, but with no evidence to support.

If the day of the Lord (1 Thessalonians 5:2) were a separate event from the “coming,” what force would there be in the statement that they “were not in darkness,” that that day should overtake them as a thief? If all the believers were gone before that day came, how could it possibly overtake them? The real point of the admonition is that the same day overtakes both, but in an entirely different fashion-a surprise to one, but not to the other. In the same way the warning not to be troubled or unsettled as to the nearness of the day of the Lord could have no possible application to the believers if they were already gone. Endless confusion has arisen through making Antichrist appear during an interval of time between the coming of the Lord and the day of the Lord. There is only one Second Coming. Verse 3, A.V., has clearly been much improved by subsequent translations. Instead of the indefinite “a falling away,” it is “the falling away,” or still better, as Weymouth, “the Apostasy.” It was not any departure, but some notable departure, from Apostolic teaching and practice. Apostasy has to do with those who profess the faith. A purely infidel, pagan or heathen system could not thus be described. The “falling away” must mean from a previously higher condition, and in God’s Word has always to do with a moral or spiritual condition or both.

Almost the last message of Paul was a warning of this coming peril, 1 Timothy 4:1: “But the Spirit said expressly that in later times (not ‘latter,’ as in A.V.) some shall fall away from the faith, etc.” Also in 2 Peter 2:1: “. . . as among you also there shall be false teachers, who shall privately bring in destructive heresies, etc.” Weymouth, in next clause, “disowning even the Sovereign Lord who has redeemed them.”

As the Epistles to the Thessalonians were written some 12 years or so earlier than those to Timothy, in which the later times falling away is mentioned, we see the progressive character of this departure from apostolic standards clearly marked. Someone has well said: “There was Apostasy first in heaven, angels sinned and fell; second: Man in Paradise sinned and fell; third: the Jews, apostatized from God, fell and were scattered; fourth and last: Apostasy in the Church of Jesus Christ, fallen from its lofty place of purity and simplicity.” In verse 7, we are told “the Mystery of lawlessness was then working” (Weymouth adds) “in secret.”

The ever-present, constant tendency of our sinful nature is to depart from the Living God. The most notable falling away or Apostasy from Apostolic teaching and practice is that which began in Rome. The letters to the seven churches in Asia prove how early in the history of the infant Church decline began. Church history verifies this abundantly. Gradually, stealthily, and with ever-increasing power, corrupt teaching and practices were introduced into the early Church. How sadly prophetic were the words of Paul to the elders at Ephesus, Acts 20:29, 30 – “I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing, the flock, and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things,” etc.

Little by little the Bishops sought and increased their secular power-visions of earthly splendor and glory, began -to influence the Church more than the risen and glorified Lord. As then, so now, the growth of the material and visible is always at the expense of the unseen and spiritual. The early Church slowly, but surely, lost sight of her heavenly calling and absent Lord. By the sixth century the Church as a whole had become most corrupt, and as time went on and the power of the Popes increased, the moral and spiritual darkness of Europe became so dense and far-reaching that this period is actually known in secular history as the -Middle or Dark Ages. The Dark Ages were the consequence of Europe being at the feet of Rome. The use of so many candles in Roman ceremonials has always been an unconscious confession of their need of more light.

No apostasy or falling away has yet overtaken the Church of God on earth which can compare at all with that which began and still has its center in Rome. The Futurist while freely admitting that Roman teaching is anti-Christian, discounts the magnitude of the Roman Apostasy-regarding it, indeed, as a

Historical or Futurist?

comparatively trifling thing compared with the depths of iniquity the coming Antichrist will yet-sound. That perilous or grievous times are to overtake the world and the Church in the last days is clearly revealed. These, however, are a distinctly later and separate departure, and possessing different characteristics than this one we are specially considering. Then we read “and the Man of Sin be revealed-the son of Perdition.” From the use of the singular number “Man of Sin, Son of Perdition,” many have quite naturally concluded that one person-an individual life-is meant. The early Church thought this, and so a succession of persons like the Popes could not possibly be intended. Such a conclusion, however, is not warranted. In 2 Timothy 3:17 we read “That the man of God may be complete, etc.” The, “singular” is used here in a purely collective sense. It does not mean one solitary man of God, but any one of or the whole company of believers. So also “the perfect man,” “the righteous man,” and similar expressions. The High Priest was spoken of as an individual, but there was a long succession of them, and the then living one was always spoken of as the High Priest. He filled an office that death did not annul. Then if we take the “time” element we have a clear example of a long period of time covered, apparently, by only four persons, viz., in Daniel – “these great beasts which are four are four kings which shall arise,” etc. But we know that some 55 kings, covering a period of about 900 years, were actually embraced in that brief statement. These four kings were used as representatively filling up that long interval. Cardinal Manning uses the very same principle when he says, “From the time, the Emperors vacated Rome no sovereign has reigned in Rome except the Vicar (note his use of the singular noun) of Jesus Christ,” and yet as a matter of fact there have been some, 250 of these Vicars.” The occupants of the “Holy See” have been many, but they all represented the one official position. Similarly, we say, “The King never dies.”

In second Epistle of John, verse 7, we read: “For many deceivers are gone forth into the world, even they that confess not that Jesus Christ comes in the flesh. This is the deceiver and the Antichrist.” This verse reveals another phase of this truth, but specifically is a proof that St. John did not use the word Antichrist of a single person. “Many deceivers” are used collectively to set forth the deceiver and the Antichrist. He affirms that the “many” is the deceiver (singular) and the Antichrist. Enough has been cited to warrant us in concluding that this “man of sin” stands in a representative capacity-not as a solitary personage. A closer study of the descriptive terms used “Lawless one,” “Son of perdition” - is deeply suggestive of Rome. In Daniel’s vision of the four great world empires which were to fill up the whole interval of time from then until the setting up of the fifth-the Divine Kingdom-it is predicted of that little horn “and he shall think to change the times and the law and a mouth speaking great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows.” The attributes of personality are clearly indicated here speech especially-exerting also a greater power than the other 10 (i.e.), “more stout than his fellows.” This is true .of the Papacy as of no other kingdom of power. Let us consider some of the evidence. “In all things that I list my will is to stand for reason, for I am able by the law to dispense above the law and of wrong to make justice in correcting laws and changing them. Wherefore no marvel if it be in my power to change time and times to-alter and abrogate laws to dispense with all things-yes, with the precepts of Christ. (Pope Nicholas.) Pope Silvester. His sentence makes a law. He is able to abolish laws, both civil and canon.” “The Pope does whatever he likes; even things unlawful, and is more than God.” “Papa solutus est omni lege humana.” The Pope is exempt from all human law.” Cardinal Manning, speaking for the Pope, said: “I am liberated from all civil subjection.” “I am the subject of no prince-the subject of no one on earth.” If all these utterances are not striking examples of lawlessness, it seems impossible to find them anywhere. Many more such could be quoted, but these are sufficient. The other phrase, “Son of perdition,” is only found beside in John’s Gospel, Chapter 17. There it is used directly by the Master Himself of Judas Iscariot-one of the Apostolic, and, not an infidel or a pagan, but a professed follower of Jesus; a traitor at heart, even using the sign of affection to betray his Master into the hands of His enemies. Now as Jesus described Judas as the Son of Perdition-a man who had sustained such a close relation to Himself-it is not difficult to see how such a description fits a so-called Vicar of Christ-professed followers of Jesus and also successors of the Apostles-not of the pagan gods of Imperial Rome, but of the Son of God. Yet in doctrine, teaching, example and claims, giving the lie direct to all their profession. “They profess that they know God, but by their works they deny (or disown) Him.”

Now we come to the consideration of what is unquestionably the most arresting part of the chapter. “He that opposes and exalts himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sits in the temple, of God-setting himself forth as God.” Weymouth translation – “Who sets himself against and exalts himself above every so called god or object of worship, and goes the length of” taking his seat in the very temple of God, giving it out that Le himself is God.”

In relation, to the Pope being seated on the High Altar, it is of special interest to read the words

Historical or Futurist?

Ezekiel 28: 1 and 2 (RV): “The word of the Lord came again unto me, saying, ‘Son of Man, say unto the prince of Tyre, thus said the Lord God. Because your heart is lifted up and thou has said, I am a god, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas; yet thou art man and not God, though thou did set your heart as the heart of God.’” Though addressed to the Prince of Tyre, they fit the Papacy most, wonderfully.

Not without deep significance do we read Hebrews 12:2 (R.V.) of Jesus: . . . “And hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God,” or as Weymouth: . . . “And afterwards seated Himself-where he still sits-at the right hand of the throne of God.” In the light of these words does not the Pope’s enthronement act of “being seated” look very much like usurpation of Divine honor?

We have already seen how God can be opposed, denied or disowned other than by violent open antagonism. The Popes have not been guilty of that form; but they are verily guilty of opposing God by claiming Divine prerogatives, Divine titles, Divine honors, and actually the very supremacy of God Himself. The self-exalting, blasphemous, utterances and Divine claims of the long line of Popes have no parallel in human history. They stand absolutely alone. Of the Beast in Revelation 13, as of the “little horn” in Daniel--a mouth speaking great things,” and in Revelation the, further addition of “blasphemies.” Jesus when He said to the sick of the palsy – “Thy sins be forgiven thee,” Mathew 9, and in John 10, “I and my Father are one,” was accused of blasphemy. The Jews took up stones to stone Him. They said. “For a good work we stone Thee not but for blasphemy; and because that thou being a man makes thyself God.” As one has written of this, “Jesus and His. Father were one, therefore the charge of blasphemy was vain; the Pope and God are not one, therefore the charge of blasphemy is true. He that “says (and this is the Papal claim), I am the sole, last, supreme judge of what is right and wrong, blasphemes.”

The evidence connecting the Papacy (i.e., the whole succession of the Popes) with this Divine portraiture is so clear, so long continued, of such volume and magnitude, that. Protestant interpreters can safely challenge any one to, overturn their position. The mass of testimony is so great that it is difficult to limit the space it legitimately demands. First, as to the titles bestowed upon and accepted by the many occupants of the so-called “Holy See.” “Our Lord God the Pope, King of Kings and Lord of Lords.” “The same is the dominion of God and the Pope.” “To believe, that our Lord God the Pope might not decree as He (i.e., God) decreed it were a matter of heresy.” “The power of the Pope is greater than all created power, and extends itself to things celestial, terrestrial and infernal.” Pius IX in 1871, receiving from a Belgian deputation a handsome tiara, said: “You offer me gifts-a tiara, a symbol of my threefold dignity in heaven, on earth and in purgatory.” And in perfect agreement with this three-crowned tiara its symbolism-when the Pope is crowned in St. Peter’s at Rome these words are used in Latin: “Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns, and know that thou art the, father of Princes and Kings, the ruler of the terrestrial orb, the Vicar of our Savior Jesus Christ, to whom is, honor and glory for ever and ever.”

In all these and subsequent utterances note how persistent, how imperious is the special claim they make to be in the place of God and Christ-Vice-God and Vice-Christ. Pope Leo X had a medal struck, upon which he is represented and named as “the Lion of the tribe of Judah.” “With his indulgences as the Lamb of God he (the Pope) took away the sins of the world.” In 1468, of Paul II, who “is exalted not only to a human principality, but to a Divine, not only to be the Lord of mortals but of angels, not only to judge the living, but the dead, not only on earth, but in heaven, exalted by the supreme God and in, His place!” The medals of Gregory XIII so identify him with Christ they represent him as saying: “Come unto me all you that are weary,” etc. In the 17th century the titles “Vice-God-Father of Kings, Light of the World,” as well as the common one of “Supreme Pontiff,” were frequently used. Pius IX said: “I am the voice for the unworthy I am nevertheless the Vicar of Christ, and this voice which now sounds in your ears is the voice of Him Whom I represent on earth. He that is with me is with God.” In 1439 Pope Euerenius allowed himself to be addressed thus: “As I think of thy majesty fear overtakes me, for I am dust and ashes before thee, God on earth-for thou art God on earth and Christ.”

“The Pope can do all things God can do.” Think of it. Leo XIII in his apostolic letter, June 20, 1894, said of himself: “We hold the place of Almighty God on earth.” His successor, Pius X, said: “The Pope is Jesus Christ Himself, hidden under the veil of the flesh-all must be subject to him.” As a final example of these blasphemous Papal claims pushed surely to the utter most limit, consider this extract from the Italian paper, “Civiltà Cattolica,” edited by the Jesuits, therefore authoritative – “The Pope is not a power among men to be venerated like another, but he is a power altogether divine. He is the propounder and teacher of the law of the Lord in the whole universe-He is supreme leader of the nations to guide them in the ways of eternal salvation-He is the common father and universal guardian of the whole human species in the name of God. The treasures of Revelation, the treasures of righteousness, the treasures of supernatural graces upon earth, have been deposited by God in the hands of one man, who is the sole

Historical or Futurist?

dispenser and keeper of them. This man is the Pope. This is evidently implied in his designation-the Vicar of Christ; for if he holds the place of Christ upon earth that means that he continues the work of Christ in the world, and is in respect of us what Christ would be were He here below Himself visibly governing the Church.” What a testimony all these are to the facts of usurpation-substitution awful, daring blasphemy. and they bear solemn witness of the truth of the words – “that opposes and exalts against all that is called God,” etc.

No pagan or infidel system has ever made such monstrous, daring assumptions as the Papacy has done. The Futurist can imagine the most fiendish incarnation of wickedness possible-still to come; he cannot go beyond what the Popes in their corporate succession have already done in disowning God. No one can possibly arise in the future who can claim to be more or greater than God. “So that he sits in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God.” We have been considering the mass of claims spoken and written, but we have yet to consider the fact of these claims made real--actual-by the doing of them-the embodiment of these claims in the actions-the practice, through many centuries of the Papacy. Just here it is necessary to consider the expression “the temple of God,” because the Futurist, in keeping with his demand of a coming single person, requires the rebuilding of the literal Temple in Jerusalem in which this infidel Antichrist-leagued with the Jews-will take his seat. Is this view admissible? One authority affirms that in the “Acts” the Jewish temple is mentioned 25 times, the Greek word used being *iepor*, never *vaos*. In 2 Thessalonians, the word is *vaos*. Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustine say the Apostle meant the Christian Church, as in 1 Corinthians 3: 16, 17. It is clear from the use of the word in Acts 7:48, and Corinthians, just quoted, that we cannot restrict the Naos or Sanctuary of God to buildings. St. Peter’s in Rome is a professedly Christian Church building, not a Pagan temple and in this building, dedicated for the worship of God, magnificent ceremonies take place, especially on-the occasion of the installation of a new Pope. This particular ceremony is known as “The adoration of” the Pope.” In this building, dedicated for Christian worship, are enacted scenes which exactly correspond to the, inspired record. Picart, the Roman historian of Papal ceremonies, actually describes the fulfillment of the words of 2 Thessalonians when he says: “The cardinal-deacon clothes His Holiness in a white garment, who in the language of Scripture is to preside in the “temple of the Lord.” Is this only a coincidence? Picart gives minute details connected with the election and coronation of a Pope. He mentions five separate adorations of the Popes-he takes his seal, at each. Dr. Sheehan, Bishop of Waterford in 1909, said of the Pope: “On that Papal Throne sat one who exercised the authority of the Great God Himself, and who really and truly was the representative of God.”

Dr. Horton, of England, in 1899, referring to the ceremony of installing. a new Pope, declared that the function seemed to have been invented to prove the truth of this 4th verse, so striking is the correspondence. The Pope Elect takes his seat on the High Altar; he cannot get a higher place in the sanctuary of St. Peter’s. Note he does not stand; he sits on the High Altar” so that he sits,” etc. The assembled cardinals and bishops, etc., prostrate themselves before him; they yield to him Divine honors; he accepts them as his right, and thus he verily takes the place of God. In the -Melbourne “Argus” of August 11th, 1903), when Pius X was duly enthroned in St. Peter’s, a cable message appeared, a portion of which ran: “50,000 persons witnessed this function. The Pope entered the basilica amid a flourish of silver trumpets and the acclamations of the vast congregation assembled. Then after signing for silence the Pope pronounced a benediction on the multitude kneeling before him. The Pope then ascended the throne and when he was seated received the act of obedience from the High Church dignitaries in the order of their rank. The cardinals kissed his feet, knees and face; the bishops his foot and knees, and the lesser dignitaries his foot only. The new Pope then celebrated Mass, and at the moment of elevation a blare of silver trumpets resounded from the top cupola of the chapel, the troops and people kneeling meanwhile.” In Brown and Fausset’s Critical Commentary on Revelation 17 we read: “Kneeling and kissing are the worship meant by St. John’s word nine times used in respect to the rival of God. Gr. “*proskunein*” -A Papal coin, 1679, has inscribed on it the blasphemous, legend – “*Quem creant adorant*”. (Whom they create they adore).

With all these facts before us and these are but a small portion, it is clear they (i.e., the Popes) have fulfilled the predictions beyond any doubt whatever.

Verse 5, “Remember you not that when I was yet with you I told you these things,” or as Weymouth, “I used to tell you all this.” Here we have proof that they were already acquainted with this matter, because the Apostle had given them the information by word of mouth, and such knowledge had the same value as the written epistles-note verse 15, also 1st Epistle John 2, verse 18, “and as you heard that Antichrist comes,” or as Weymouth, “and as you once heard that there was to be Antichrist.” What the Apostle had told them, verbally, would be a message heard. “And now you know that which restrains to the end that he may be revealed in his own season,” or “his appointed time.” Evidently, then, these

Historical or Futurist?

Thessalonians knew what Paul meant by the restraining or hindering power. Let us note carefully the Apostle did not say they knew who the Man of Sin was, but they knew that which restrains. Weymouth translation "what restrains" or "holds back." It is to be noted also, verse 6, what withheld or restrained, is neuter gender. We cannot find anything in any of the Epistles as to what or who this restraining force was. And yet those Thessalonians knew. Why did he tell them verbally and not by -epistle? We believe valid reasons can be given. The Futurist is sure that the Holy Spirit is that which hinders the revelation of the Man of Sin. This hindering power finally goes (verse 7). If this is the Holy Spirit-and the Holy Spirit is sovereign-why is it said "taken out of the way" -Weymouth translation, "is removed."

Does not this look more like forcible departure than the voluntary action of one who is sovereign in power? Such language does not agree with the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit, and the writer cannot find such words used of the Spirit of God anywhere in the Word. Again, Jesus, in the great commission to His disciples, Matthew 28: 19, 20, explicitly declares that He would be with them always until the end of the Age. If Jesus is here till the end, then the Holy Spirit must be, here also. Bishop Wordsworth on this point remarks: "The Antichrist could not appear until the hindering power were removed. Jesus cannot appear until the "falling away" has taken place, so if the Holy Spirit is the restraining power, and He must be taken out of the way before the Man of Sin be revealed, then we should be without the presence of the Spirit during the whole period of Antichrist's reign, and yet the end of the Age would not have arrived." The Futurist admits there is no Holy Spirit here during the reign of Anti Christ that is no difficulty to him; but the "age," he must admit, has not ended, and Jesus said He would be here until the close or end of the Age, and 31, years-before the end is not the end. The Historical does not present this difficult problem.

To revert again to the fact that these Thessalonians, knew what this power was that held back-and we note again the entire absence of any information in the Word on the matter. Church tradition is not as a rule considered very reliable. Now if there are any such traditions in existence containing information on this point, their existence would be quite easily accounted for, and, indeed, looked for, in the light of the Apostolic declaration. Is there any such evidence? There is. There is abundant proof that the general belief and understanding of the early Church was that the UNITY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE was that hindering power. Nine (9) of the early Fathers are witnesses of this. One of these, Tertullian, in the 2nd century said: "What is this restraining power?" "What but the Roman state," and Tertullian also said that "the Christians used to pray for the continuance of the Roman Empire, because they believed when it broke up they would have a bad time." Jerome (5th century) said: "When the Roman Empire is to be destroyed ten kings will divide, and then the Man of Sin will venture to take his seat in the Temple of God!" This early expositor was evidently in the "Historical" line. Chrysostom said: "As Rome succeeded. Greece so Antichrist is to succeed Rome." A recent writer, Baron Porcelli, says on this point: "This heathen imperial power (Rome) was swayed by, and centered in, a series of single persons-the Caesars-in succession. History exactly corresponds with the prophecy. The beginning of the removal of the restraint was when Constantine removed the seat of power from the seven-hilled city to Constantinople.

When the last Western Emperor was forced to abdicate in AD 476, then Rome was no longer the seat of Imperial secular power, and at this juncture in history the Bishops of Rome began to put forth their claims. This exactly, corresponds with 'the' various predictions, for the "little horn" did not appear until after the unity of the Roman Empire was destroyed. Dean Milman in his "History of Latin Christianity" writes - "The removal of the seat of empire from Rome . . . allowed the Papal authorities to grow up and develop its secret strength. Gibbon - "Decline and Fall of Roman Empire": . . . "after the loss of her (Rome's) legions and provinces, the genius and fortune of the Popes again restored the supremacy of Rome." A R.C. writer: "The removal of the Emperors to Constantinople gave rise to the greatness of the Popes," and this explains the strange enigma expressed in Revelation 17:11: "And the beast that was and is not is himself also an eighth and is of the seven; and he goes into perdition."

This-the fourth beast of Daniel-the Roman Empire, which was and is not, had passed away, but a new form of power sprang out of the ruins of the Empire -out of its 10 kingdom divisions-and became the eighth head-the Papacy-and so to quote the Bishop of Durham: "The Church of Rome carries into the modern world the old tremendous note of Imperial dominion. Hobbes' often quoted description of the Papacy as "no other than the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof- is, not less true as an account of its historical origin than as an explanation of its destructive temper and method." And strangely enough, Dean Inge has incisively expressed the same great fact thus: "The history of Catholicism as an institution is not part of the history of religion-it is the last volume of the history of the Roman Empire."

Before citing further proof on this point let us return -to the matter of these early Church beliefs.

Historical or Futurist?

We have evidence, clear enough, that the belief existed that the Antichrist would appear, after the dissolution of the Roman Empire. The strange thing is to account for such a belief. It was contrary to the nature of things then. Rome was the Eternal City. Much of its coinage bore the words in Latin- "Rome is eternal." The current belief of the Empire was that it would last forever, and its unquestioned power none could withstand. From whence sprang this -belief among those Christians that this mighty, universal empire was to break up, suffer division? Such a fate was the most unlikely of all events to happen. Does not the existence of this early belief afford the strongest presumptive evidence that it had a relation to what Paul says he, told them? Surely this is a reasonable explanation. Can a better one be suggested? Further, that which seemed at that time utterly impossible actually came to pass. The, iron Empire of Rome broke up into a number of kingdoms. Ed. Gibbon's classic, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," sets forth in detail its passing away. Hallam, the historian of the Middle Ages, writes: "Before the conclusion of the 5th century the mighty fabric of empire which valor and policy had founded upon the seven hills of Rome, was finally, overthrown in all the west of Europe by' the barbarous nations from the north."

But if the unity of the Roman Empire-and not the Holy Spirit were the restraining---power, why did not the Apostle say so? And not leave the solution of the mystery to traditional authority? For the obvious reason that for anyone at that time-especially the, Christians-to have openly asserted the possibility, nay, the certainty, of the dissolution of the fourth Empire, would have been to court certain death. While the early Christians willingly faced death for Jesus' sake, yet they were under no Divine obligation to risk their lives for a matter, like this; hence the wisdom of a veiled reference such as we find in the chapter. On the other hand, if the Holy Spirit were the restraining power, there would be no need at all for such secrecy. The Apostle in dealing with the, manifold operations of the Holy Spirit shows no reserve or secrecy whatever. To return again to the removal of the hindrance. It is certain that Imperial Rome passed away, and it is equally certain that from out of the divided conditions which resulted a new form of power arose-a power filling a dual role, and answering in all its characteristics exactly to that of the "little horn" - the personality of 2 Thessalonians, St. John's Antichrist, and specially and minutely of Revelation 17. Roman Catholic writers and historians themselves providing the strongest proofs. Thus one writes - "The Popes mounted the throne voided by the Caesars." Cardinal Manning- "The possession of the Pontiffs commences with the abandonment of Rome by the Emperors." It may be noted here that there were some 64 Emperors from Paul to AD 476.

"Those who survey with a curious eye the revolutions of mankind may observe that the gardens and circus of Nero on the Vatican, which were polluted with the blood of the first Christians, have been rendered still more famous by the triumph and by the abuse of the persecuted religion."

"On the same spot a temple, which far surpasses the ancient glories of the capital, has been since erected by the Christian Pontiffs, who, deriving their claim of universal dominion from a humble fisherman of Galilee, have succeeded to the throne of the Caesars, given laws to the barbarian conquerors of Rome, and extended their spiritual jurisdiction from the coast of the Baltic to the shores of the Pacific Ocean (Chapter 16)."

This quotation from Gibbon's "Decline and Fall" is a wonderful testimony to the rise of the Papacy, its dual character, and its world-spread influence and power, and so again the testimony is true, "and the Beast that was not is himself also an eighth." "The waters which thou saw where the harlot sits are peoples, and multitudes and nations, and tongues." - Revelation 17:15.

Cardinal Newman, an eminent Roman authority, bears unconscious witness - "While Apostles were on earth there was the display of neither Bishop nor Pope." "In course of time the power of the Pope displayed itself." Again: "The Imperial Power of the Roman Empire availed for keeping back the power of the Papacy." This one is wonderful, viz.: The withholding power mentioned in 2 Thessalonians was the Roman Empire." I grant this, for all the ancient writers so speak of it." And again he says: "When the Imperial Power had been removed to Constantinople then the Roman See came into a position of sovereignty." "The Papacy began to form as soon as the Empire relaxed and further developments took place when that Empire fell."

Cardinal Manning in his "Temporal Power" says: "For 1200 years the Bishops of Rome have reigned as temporal princes." These are surely unprejudiced testimonies to the truth of one phase of the Papal power-the temporal. We have traced so far the revelation of the "Lawless One" rise and dominion-which emerged from the ruins of Imperial Rome.

The numerous points of agreement between the prophetic portrait and the Papacy are so striking that one is almost compelled to accept this as the only true solution, and yet Futurists ignore it. Verse 7 affirms that "lawlessness" was already working-Weymouth says "in secret" - when the Apostle wrote. Then

Historical or Futurist?

verse 8, the revelation of the lawless one. The Futurist position is very difficult here. He expects the revelation, rise and dominion of the Lawless One to occupy just a few brief years near the end. If that 'be true, then the mystery has been working for more than 1800 years, and must still be working secretly, seeing that he has not (according to them) yet appeared. To be actually described as working then (i.e., when the Apostle wrote, which means some form of activity), and not yet manifested, seems extraordinary. The simple fact of being in secret operation in Apostolic times, and in existence when Christ comes, cannot possibly be made to square with the period of one human life. Then we read: "Whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of His mouth and bring to naught by the manifestation of His coming." Weymouth: "sweep away with the tempest of His anger." Literally "breath of His mouth" – "utterly overwhelm by the awful splendor of His coming." These words appear to justify us in regarding Antichrist's destruction as being accomplished in two separate stages. First, consume or slay, and, finally, complete destruction at His coming. Here we find agreement again with what is predicted of the little horn-Daniel 7:26. Remembering union of the temporal and the spiritual in the Papacy, we have in this passage a double form of dissolution indicated- "But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it unto the end."

The loss of dominion seems to be related to the temporal side. At this point it is of interest to quote a passage from a book, "Papal Sovereignty," by G. O. Nations, an American lawyer – "Some confusion and misunderstanding have arisen from the unfortunate terminology used by many writers on the loss to the Papacy of the Pontifical State. Many authors refer to that event as terminating the temporal power of the Pope, though the same authors recognize temporal sovereignty in him after that loss. It would be more precise to refer to the incorporation of the Papal State or States into the Kingdom of Italy as divesting the Pope of his territorial dominion rather than divesting him of temporal power. In order to grasp the real situation and the thought present in the minds of these authors due allowance should be made for this apparent looseness of terminology." Now seeing that this writer makes no reference at all to Prophecy or the Bible, the distinction he makes, and the clear evidence he adduces in his book support it, it seems a most wonderful confirmation of the words "they shall take away his dominion." The "Times" summary of events in 1870 contains this: "Within the same year the Papacy has assumed the highest spiritual exaltation to which it could aspire, and lost the temporal sovereignty which it had held for 1200 years." Just previously we noted the indication of a double form of dissolution-very possibly the whole of that verse 27 may refer to the temporal side of the "little horn's" power. But that of Thessalonians 2, "Breath of His mouth" (A.V.), Spirit of His "mouth," etc., are evidently related to the Spiritual side. What do we understand by Spirit or Breath of His mouth?

The Prophet Hosea, writing of Ephraim and Judah – "I have slain them by the words of my mouth." Of the Redeemer in Isaiah and he hath made my mouth like a sharp sword." In Revelation, "I will fight or make war against them with the sword of my mouth," or as Weymouth, "with the sword which is in my mouth." Jesus said: "The words I have spoken unto, you are spirit and are life." "The sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God."

The first deadly blow to the spiritual pretensions and claims of the Papacy was by the spirit or breath of His mouth-the word of God at the Reformation. Rome reeled under the mighty impact of the Living Word. As then, so now, the most potent force against all that is false and unholy is that same sword of the spirit. Rome hates nothing so much as God's Word. She fears and opposes its influence always and everywhere. All her professions of reverence and regard for the Book are mere lying subterfuges in face of the fact of her constant, undying, centuries old antagonism to its open, unfettered use. "The entrance of Thy word gives light." Rome hates the light of God, and so she persistently blocks access to the Book. The people who take to the Bible uniformly desert Rome. The use of that Divine Revelation means enlightenment, progress, moral elevation, virility, true freedom, power. Horace Greeley, of the New York "Tribune," once said a fine thing (in substance): "It is impossible to mentally or socially enslave a Bible-reading people." The prime cause of so many wretched slaves today not of Rome only but outside her pale-members of an effete, spineless Protestantism-is their almost entire disregard and ignorance of the Bible. This Book is "an acid test of the merely ephemeral, but it is a genuine preservative of what ought to endure."

The process of consumption by the Spirit of His mouth has been going on ever since the Reformation, though to the superficial observer it does not appear to be so. We cannot tell in what special way the Spirit of God may continue the process of attrition, but the final result is inevitable-utter destruction-and of Babylon, that great city the seven-hilled city of Rome-Revelation 18:7: "and she shall be utterly burned with fire; for strong is the Lord God which judged her." The Futurist views the destruction of

Historical or Futurist?

Antichrist as being accomplished by one fell blow at the Advent of Jesus. Viewed just in its very final aspect, there is agreement between Futurist and Historicist, but the Futurist appears not to take account of the previous consuming process, and of necessity such a process must be a gradual one-not sudden.

The falling stone in the image vision cannot symbolize a slow process, rather does it correspond to the suddenness of Christ's coming; but the twin vision of Daniel 7 conveys the previous gradual decay and wastage of power. Accompanying the revelation or appearing of the Lawless One, there are also confirmation of his claims in the form of "signs and lying wonders" or "wonders of falsehood." Weymouth translation: "The appearing of the Lawless One will be attended by various miracles and tokens and delusive marvels, for so Satan works and for this reason, God sends them a misleading influence, or as RV, 'a working of error,' that they may believe the lie not any or "a" lie, but the lie.

During the period of His incarnation on earth Jesus did miracles or signs-these signs were the attestation of His being the Son of God. "The very works that I do bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me." So the "Lawless One" has his counterfeit miracles, signs, tokens, marvels, to support his claims, so numerous that even to name them would make an amazing list.

Lord MacCaulay has said of the Roman Church, "that among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind it occupies the foremost place." Ed. Gibbon, "Decline and Fall" - "In the long period of 1200 years which elapsed between the reign of Constantine and the Reformation, the worship of saints and relics corrupted the pure and perfect simplicity of the Christian model."

H. Ward Beecher wrote: "Now, when I call the system of the Roman hierarchy a stupendous fraud I mean that it is a system devised by Satan for this very end." Newman, while in the Church of England, 1834, wrote of 'Its craft, its falsehoods, its deceitful deeds and lying wonders.'

Adam Smith ("Wealth of Nations"): "The Church of Rome is the most formidable combination that ever was formed against the authority and security of civil government, as well as against the liberty, reason and happiness of mankind." Many others have borne similar testimony. Nothing but the unfathomed subtlety, deceit and craftiness of Satan himself could have produced a religion-political system like the Papacy. So wonderful an imitation of the Truth, and yet so completely at variance with the very spirit and genius of Christianity. Using the ceremonials and religious rites of heathen pagan cults, and dressing, them up in Christian symbols and terms. A thin veneer of Christian observances on top, but Pagan as ever underneath. Such is the marvel, to be a counterfeit, and yet by its LIKENESS to the truth, deceive, oppress and enslave so many millions of the human race. One of its agencies-horrible perversion of the truth that it has made such a title its own- "The Order or Society of Jesus," otherwise the Jesuits (the order of Satan it really is), has so generally impressed the world by its subtlety, cunning, lies, duplicity, treachery, and underground, activities, that its very name has been adapted to express all these and more Jesuit. With such a "working of error," energized by Satan himself, the outcome is of necessity "lying wonders," and the proof of such is simply overwhelming. Some of these "wonders of falsehood" are here enumerated. Rome has traded with these for centuries for the purpose of money gain. The relics of the "Cross," if collected together, would suffice for a good-sized building. Not a great many years ago there were 20 well-known gowns of the Virgin Mary and 70 veils, each said to be the true one. 12 heads of John the Baptist, in pretty good condition, besides numerous fragments of his one skull, and seven extra jaws, each held in reverence in different parts of Europe. St. Peter had 16 bodies distributed at different shrines. What a queer problem to settle as to which of them he lived in when he is said to have been in Rome. Almost the last relic imported into Europe was the lance which pierced the Savior's side. It was presented to Pope Innocent the Eighth in 1492. Despite the fact that this sacred relic already existed in Nuremberg and other places, its value as a miracle worker was in no way affected, and it is included amongst the principal relics at St. Peter's.

The editor of "Present Truth," London, Mr. A. S. Maxwell, under the title of "What I Saw in Rome-Cultivated Superstition-The Worship of Rags and Bones," says -In the Church of St. Mark's, Venice, he saw these relics, for which he paid 20 lire:-

Two thorns from the crown of thorns.

Some of the blood of Christ in a vial.

A nail from the Cross.

Lock of Mary's hair.

The base of the column to which Christ was tied when scourged.

A piece of the Scepter placed in His Hands by the soldiers.

Historical or Futurist?

Some of the stones thrown at Stephen.
A bone of Paul's leg.
A finger of Mark's.
A bone of Matthew's leg.
A tooth of Mark's.
A bone of Phillip's leg.
A ring of Mark's.
A bone of Peter's leg.
A hand of Luke.
The head of the Apostle James.
The head of Titus.
A piece of Stephen's backbone.

In the Church of St. John Lateran, which ranks in importance next to St. Peter's, Mr. Maxwell says he saw the following extraordinary collection of relics:-

A finger of St. Helena.
A bone of St. Mark.
Veil of St. Cecilia.
Part of the robe of St. Francis.
The wrist of Jehoshaphat.
Part of vestment of John.
A lock of Mary's hair.
Drinking cup of John the Evangelist.
A rib of Thomas Aquinas.
Part of the robe of Joseph.
The entrails of Cardinal Barbarigo.
Part of the shroud of Christ, with blood stains on it.
Several pieces of the Cross.
A large section of the table on which the Last Supper was eaten.
Part of the sponge which was dipped in the vinegar.
Part of the towel which He used to wipe the disciples' feet.
Some more thorns from the Crown of Thorns.

There were also-

Aaron's Rod, which Moses used at the Red Sea, and wonderful, after such a lapse of time, some of the barley loaves and small fishes when the 5000 were fed.

The worship of old bones is a prominent feature of the Catholic religion in Rome.

In the church of "Quo Vadis," on the Appian Way, they were shown a block of marble with the impressions of Peter's naked feet. How Peter's naked feet ever came to make such deep marks in a block of marble is not explained. In the Mamertine Prison they say Peter as well as Paul was imprisoned. Strange Paul didn't say anything about Peter being there with him, but an iron grating is over the hard rock where Peter's head was banged by the soldiers, and like his feet on the marble, another deep impression was made. A further impression of another kind is evidently made, for scores kiss the bars as they pass. Finally, Mr. Maxwell regards as the climax of these superstitious practices that of the unending stream of those who climb the 28 steps of the Santa Scala, or holy stairs, to gain the plenary indulgence granted by Pope Pius X., February 26, 1908, for those in purgatory. They go up on their knees-when the spot is reached where the stains of the blood of Christ are supposed to be seen, they kiss the covering glass, then put their donations in the box. It seemed almost impossible to believe that such things could still be done in the 20th century. In imagination we saw Luther climbing those same stairs centuries ago, and heard the words which changed his life and started the Reformation - "The just shall live by faith."

Then we have the yearly miracle in Rome known the "Liquefaction of the Blood of St. Januarius." The alleged miracles at Lourdes in France, and many others which might be specified. If all these do not constitute a mass of "lying wonders" - "wonders of falsehood" - then it is impossible to find them

Historical or Futurist?

anywhere, and, greatest wonder of all, made to belong to and be an integral part of that Church whose Head is the Truth—Our Lord Jesus Christ.

But in addition to all these “wonders of falsehood” there must be something very special intended by the words “that they may believe THE LIE.” Out of the great mass of falsehoods some one thing is specifically singled out as “the lie.” Is there in this professedly Christian but really Pagan religious system an article of belief—something that is regarded by them as of first importance, which can be truthfully described as “the lie?” Beyond question, yes, The Sacrifice of the Mass. In all Rome’s ritual the Mass is the part most frequently observed. In the Mass the officiating priest, after the recital of four words in Latin—“This is my Body” - affirms and teaches that the wafer made of flour and water and the wine are immediately changed into the real, actual flesh and blood of Christ. It is then called the “host,” and is adored with the same, adoration as belongs to God only. And, further, it is offered up to God as a true, propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead. The following dialogue sets forth the real meaning of the Mass with unmistakable clearness and certainty, and the writer believes that few Protestants know that the Mass involves the awful travesty of putting Christ to death on their altars.

THE MEANING OF THE ROMISH MASS

(The writer, who contributes this article to the Boston ‘Watchword and Truth,’ explains that in the autumn of 1904 he entered the Roman Cathedral at Westminster, then in course of completion, and chanced to meet a priest, who permitted himself, in a most friendly way, to be questioned about the doctrine of transubstantiation, in which he was genuinely concerned.-Ed.)

“I believe it is the teaching of your Church,” the dialogue began, “that after the words of consecration uttered by the priest the substance of the wafer bread undergoes an absolute change, and becomes substantially the very body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, an invisible miracle takes place, so that under the outward forms of bread and wine it is Christ Himself Who is present at your altars?” “That is so,” he replied.

“You do really and truly believe,” I continued, “that the very same Christ who lived on this earth 1800 years ago, and died upon a cross on Calvary, is present in person on the altar after the wafer has undergone the process of consecration by a priest—that the priest really holds Christ Himself in his hands?”

“Yes,” the priest answered, “we touch and handle Him, just as I am touching you,” he said, placing his hand at the same moment upon my coat sleeve.

“You mean to say,” I suggested, “that Christ is present, under the form of the wafer, as truly as my arm is under the sleeve of my coat?” “Yes,” said he.

“Well,” I replied, “that is not my faith, but I am not wishing to discuss that matter now. Assuming, for the moment, it is as you affirm, and the dogma of transubstantiation to be true, the question I was wishing to ask you is this: When you have the Lord Jesus Christ upon your altars, and actually in your hands, then what do you do with him? Do you profess to put Him to death?”

His answer was “Yes.”

“You profess,” I insisted, “to slay Him, to immolate and kill Jesus Christ upon your altars?” I confess a chill went through me as I proposed the question and listened for his reply. “Crucifying the Son of God afresh.”

He gave me the impression of being taken off his guard; or, rather, Rome has no guard at this vital point of her system, or he might have evaded my question I had taken him on a high tide of feeling. Did not Rome’s colossal cathedral, in which we stood, with the most magnificent pageants of her cult, stand upon and center in the dogma of the Mass? Does not the very word by which the wafer is known after consecration, “the Host,” from the Latin *hostia*, a victim, signify one who has been immolated? Does not the term “altar” connote a victim offered in sacrifice? And what other victim suffers on Roman altars,, according to Rome’s dogma, but Christ?

But again, does not the Apostle also speak of those who “crucify the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame?” What does such language point at? And, says the same Apostle, they, do it to themselves” (Hebrews 6:6). They speak of “the adorable sacrament of our altars.” They proclaim aloud to the world (to quote their own words) “our unswerving belief in the central mystery of our religion, the fact that our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, true God and true Man, ever offers Himself” (i.e., is offered by our priests) “as a sacrifice upon the altars of our churches, and unceasingly dwells in our tabernacles.”

Historical or Futurist?

The priest had entered upon the conversation evidently under the impression that my purpose was to argue the question of transubstantiation, for to this he reverted. "We believe," he went on to say, "that the sacrifice of the Mass is the very same sacrifice as that offered on Calvary; that," said he, indicating the huge block of cold, gray stone, "is our Calvary."

"And you," I said, "that is, the priests of your Church, put Christ to death there?"

"Yes," he said; but there was, this time, a note of hesitation in his word.

I replied, "Well, I felt that the doctrine of the Mass must involve that conclusion, but was not prepared to hear it openly avowed as you have done. You remember who they were who crucified Christ?" "The Jews," he replied.

"And the Romans," I added. "Then the priests of your Church, who repeat in the Mass the very sacrifice of Calvary, are the successors to the Jews and the Romans?" Successors of Christ's murderers.

At this point he seemed to lose assurance, and began to flounder. "Oh, said he, "the Jews were the instruments." "And you," I asked, "what are you?" "Oh, but we don't put Him to death really. We haven't His glorified body-that is in heaven. We do it as far as we can."

"You do it as far as you can; you would do more if you could?" I queried. "It is a representation; it is not a reality. Why not, then, tell the people this, and say: "Good people, this ceremony of the Mass is our way of representing the death of Jesus Christ upon the Cross."

"No, no," he exclaimed, "it is a reality. We believe that after transubstantiation Christ is really upon the altar under the outward forms or the species-as we say, in propria persona."

I said again, "Whether the miracle of transubstantiation does or does not take place is not just now my point. I know your dogma asserts Christ to be really there, His flesh, bones, nerves and divinity, under the forms of bread and wine, according to the catechism of the Council of Trent, from which their own substances have disappeared. My point, I repeat once more, is, when you have Christ thus upon your Calvary, what becomes of Him? What do, you do with Him? Do you put him to death?"

Again the answer was "Yes."

"Then I affirm that upon your own showing, by your own words, your priests prove themselves the successors, not of the Apostles, as they claim to be, but the successors and representatives of the Jews and Romans."

"No, it is a representation," rejoined the priest.

"You must forgive me," I replied, "if I say you seem in a fog about this subject. A thing cannot be at once merely a representation of a reality and the reality itself. Either it is a real sacrifice of Jesus Christ that you immolate upon your altars, or it is no sacrifice at all. If YOU profess to put Jesus Christ to death in the sacrifice of the Mass, you crucify Him afresh, and thus declare yourselves the successors of those whom St. Peter himself charged with the crime of killing the Prince of Life (Acts 3:15), and St. Stephen branded as 'His betrayers and murderers.' "But," I continued, "Christ being raised from the dead dies no, more; death has no more dominion over Him; therefore, your dogma of a repeated sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is a false one."

By this time the priest had become very uncomfortable, and as I said the words, "Your position cannot stand; it must fall and Rome with it," he abruptly quitted me and hastily disappeared through a door at the back of the, tribune.

The Roman altar is a tomb-not metaphorically, but literally such. Entering the Westminster Cathedral later on, I found a workman in the act of chiseling out the tomb in the surface of the altar block, over which my conversation with the priest here recorded had taken place. This is an altar the seat and throne of death. As "a table" is for the living, so "a Roman altar" is for the dead. The flowers, candles, lights that decorate a Roman altar, the "corporale" which holds the wafer, the "pall" that covers the chalice, are all adjuncts and appendages of death.

But what, then, is really the death which takes place in the Roman Mass? We reply at once, not the death of 'Christ, not the sacrifice repeated, once offered on Calvary, as her dogmas teach and her priests pretend. "He ever lives." "He hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." "I am He that lives and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore." "What, then, is immolated and dies on Roman altars? We answer, the human intellect-man's God-given sense and intelligence. To believe in the Mass is to belie the evidence of the senses and to shock, fatally, the first principles of reason. The Confessional is the death of the conscience, the Mass the death of the understanding.

So in the Mass the priest becomes "the creator of His creator." Dr. Alphonso de Liguori, an acknowledged R.C. authority speaking of this power which the priest possesses, says, "Our wonder should be greater when we find that in obedience to the words of His priests God Himself descends on the Altar,

Historical or Futurist?

that He comes wherever they call Him and as often as they call Him and places Himself in their hands, even though they should be His enemy.” What an awful assumption is this. Liguori further affirms “that the death of Christ has been necessary to institute the priesthood, not to save the world.” Again, “If the person of the Redeemer had not as yet been in the world, the priest by pronouncing- words of consecration would produce this great Person of a Man, God.” Note this: Of Liguori’s published words, the Papacy has declared them to be without cause of censure. What the God of glory thinks of them does not trouble the Papacy.

Canon Doyle, of Ireland, in 1895 wrote thus: “The word of the priest created Jesus Christ.” “What God alone can do by His omnipotence the priest can also do.”

At Quebec, in a sermon, a priest said: “The priest reproduces Jesus Christ.”

But for unparalleled, daring and blasphemous audacity, surely this must be singular. Priest Phelan, then editor of a Popish newspaper, -in a sermon in 1915: “I never invite an angel down from Heaven to hear Mass. The only person in Heaven I ever ask, to come down here is Jesus Christ, and Him I command to come down. He has to come when I bid Him.” Such language is enough to make one shudder with fear and trembling.

Calm, dispassionate, thoughtful consideration of the evidence here adduced is more than enough to justify us in asserting, Without any qualification whatever, that the sacrifice so called of the Roman Mass is not simply a lie, but the lie, the champion lie, of any religious system in the world. The Word of God declares: “But He when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God.” (Hebrews 10:12.) Weymouth translation: “A single sacrifice of perpetual efficacy.” But in direct antagonism to God’s truth, the Roman church offers up Christ as a sacrifice for sins over and over again. Someone recently said: “It is much below the mark to say that Rome has 30,000 priests in the world. Suppose they offer one Mass a day. In ten years, in round numbers 100,000,000 Masses would be offered.” Hebrews 9:26 (Weymouth translation): . . . but as a matter of fact He has appeared once for all in order to do away with sin by the sacrifice of Himself. Behold the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world.”

“O crucified, to Thee we come,
Our hope, our refuge and our home.”

So far, we have endeavored to bring together the various predictions in Daniel, Revelation, John’s Epistles, and 2 Thessalonians. The organic unity between these portions of the Word is clearly evident, and the cumulative force of the evidence is so strong as to put the Protestant line of interpretation in an almost impregnable position. This is not an idle boast. It cannot be overturned. Let spineless Protestants and Anglo-Catholics consider. In order to a further elucidation, let us return to the point in Revelation 17, referring to the inscription on the woman’s forehead. (We have already presented the evidence proving the actual identity between Babylon and Rome), viz., the phrase, “Mother of Harlots, etc.” Even a superficial study of the Revelation shows plainly two different women. They are sharply contrasted. One, the spouse of the Lamb, or the Bride-the true church-the other, a faithless woman-the, Harlot-a faithless church. The faithful one persecuted, driven into the wilderness; the other in worldly splendor, enthroned, exerting and possessed of great power and the, bitter persecutor of the faithful one.

Consider the Scripture usage, Isaiah 1:21, “How is the faithful city become an harlot?” Jeremiah 3:1, “Thou has played the harlot with many lovers, yet return again to Me, said the Lord.” Hosea iv.: 15, “Though thou Israel play the harlot, let not Judah offend.” V. 17, “Ephraim is joined to idols; let him alone.” These clearly refer to moral and spiritual departures from the pure standard God had set. So this symbolic, faithless woman-an apostate Church-Rome, is the mother of all the spiritual harlots (i.e.) religious cults, systems, churches, which accept her standards in part or whole and deny or disown the sovereign Lord, Who bought them. Not so much by open antagonism as by substituting forbidden things or persons in the place of the only God and Savior-our Lord Jesus Christ. As of old, “Babylon (on the Euphrates) hath been a golden cup in the Lord’s hand that made all the earth drunken; the nations have drunk of her wine; therefore the nations are mad.” - Jeremiah 51:7. So, in Revelation 17:4, of the woman, Babylon, she has in her hand also a “golden cup full of abominations, even the unclean things of her fornication.” And in chapter 18 we see the result of drinking from this cup. “For by the wine of the wrath of her fornication all the nations are fallen; and the kings of the earth committed fornication with her.” The Scripture application is plainly evident. This spiritual harlotry or adultery has no relation at all to heathen religions. It has to do with professedly Christian systems only. It is an arresting fact in this connection that

Historical or Futurist?

Rome makes for herself the wholesale claim that she is “the mother and Mistress of the Churches” -so the plural form, “Harlots,” agrees with her own claim. Perhaps the most notable example of the last 100 years of Church history of Roman influence and growing conformity to the Roman Apostasy is furnished by the Anglican Church.

The Anglo-Catholics (as they are called) now form a considerable portion of that Church. This spiritual landslide began with the “Tractarian” movement under Newman and others nearly a century ago. The evil thing has worked so effectively that the grand old Church of England is now practically honeycombed with Romanism. Much less than the width of the road on Eastern Hill, Melbourne, now separates St. Peter’s and St. Patrick’s. When one thinks of the long line of magnificent evangelical scholars-some of the best who have come from the Anglican Church and shed an unfading luster upon hermen who were splendidly loyal to the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles, we marvel at the change. How are the mighty fallen. But when we think further of her martyr roll-now almost forgotten and call up the names of Archbishop Cranmer, Bishops Ridley, Hooper, Latimer, and others, who were burnt at the stake, because they would have none of Rome’s teaching, and realize that these Anglo-Catholics within the Church of England to-day have accepted a very large portion of what these martyrs died as a protest against, we are amazed beyond measure.

Anglo-Catholics are drugging themselves with the mixture out of Rome’s golden cup. Great must be the fascination of that cup. Here is an official acknowledgement of the purpose and ultimate goat of Anglo-Catholicism in the “English Church Review,” February 19th, 1884: “The thing which English Catholics have in hand at present, and are likely to have in hand as their principal work for at least one generation to come, is the restoration of the Altar, the re-establishment of the Mass in its seat of honor as the sun and center of Christian worship.” The “Eucharist” now occupies a foremost place, in nearly all Anglican Church services. The naturalness and beautiful simplicity of The Lord’s Supper has in very many Anglican Churches become a piece of refined idolatry -the receiver believing that coming to him through priestly hands there is a magical spiritual power in the bread and wine which makes him right with his past and with God. It is Romanism, pure and simple. Preaching is not a strong point with the average Anglo-Catholic cleric. He judges it more important to face the east, than to face the question of sin and its atonement-incense becomes of more value than common sense. He places great value on the priestly garments-biretta, alb, chasuble, stole, and all the other things he has stole from Rome, and he has a great liking for the scarlet color. A certain writer once said: “Put a king on a desert island, and what becomes of his majesty? Strip an average High Church cleric of all these Popish accessories, and what becomes of him? A good preacher couldn’t be made out of what is left.

“The Argus” (London) correspondent, describing the Congress of Anglo-Catholics in August, 1923, said: “The strangest vagaries of ritualists and sacerdotalists have been tolerated till hundreds of the clergy just do whatever they please-confession, lights, reservation, even the eccentricity of introducing an ass (the real article into the Church on Palm Sunday.” Possibly the animal did not feel strange in such company.

Some day the Divine call will be heard, “Come out of her, My people.” Some are already realizing the serious condition Anglo-Catholicism has reduced Anglicanism to and greatly desire a return to a purer and Scriptural ritual. But the archbishops and the bishops, like Gallio, do not seem to care. The truth is they are afraid to protest. One last word, why is the Anglican Church so anxious to imitate Rome, even in its official terms? Actually adopting the name of “Mother Superior” in its sisterhoods-and a certain number of its clergy taking vows of celibacy like the Romish priesthood, and imagining themselves thereby raised to something akin to a holier position.

Extract from an address by Rev. Dr. Charles Inwood, of Keswick fame, before annual meeting, Evangelical Union of South America, 1928:-

“I take it that by your presence here you avow your unwavering loyalty to the great principles of the Reformation, and anyone who takes an interest in the work of God in so-called Roman Catholic countries will understand what that means. I feel that in relation to this question we are living in most eventful times. Whether we like it or not, Rome today is making today a more tremendous appeal, especially to the Anglo-Saxon peoples of England and America, than she has made since the Reformation. When I think of men who profess to believe in the Articles of the Protestant Church, becoming avowed allies of the Roman Catholic Church, wolves masquerading in sheep’s clothing, I feel that England needs to wake up to the issues before us if we are going to be faithful to the trust committed to us. There are men in the Church to-day who despise the very word “Protestant.”

I thank God I am not ashamed of that word; and that my forebears were Huguenots, who gave up

Historical or Futurist?

everything-land, home, and money-in their loyalty to the truth as it is in Jesus. Therefore I would be the last man to think lightly of a word like that! However, I venture to think England is waking up. That the lesson has been learnt by many who were asleep before, partly by that memorable and triumphant Debate in the House of Commons on the Deposited Prayer Book. And perhaps even more in some quarters by the disgraceful hiding of the Report of the Malines Conversations until such a day as they expected they would have won the victory. Sure I am of this, that when England knows what Romanism really is, England will not barter her birthright of liberty for any mess of Roman pottage. I take your presence here to-night to be a pledge on your part, as it is on mine, that whatever may be before us, whatever conflicts there may be along this line, whatever assaults may be made, and whatever spirits of compromise may be seen in some quarters, we are prepared to take the same position, and to rely on the same God as Luther himself did, when he said; "Here I take my stand. I cannot go back. God help me." And God will help us if we stand firm and true to the principles of the Reformation, which are the principles of the simple Gospel of the grace of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ."

There is yet another aspect of Romanism in its relation to Politics, the State, Nation or Empire, which has legitimate claims for consideration. Let us repeat once more the great outstanding fact of the dual nature of Roman claims and its constant, ever-present activity in both, spheres ecclesiastical and national. Each Pope at his investiture with the Tiara is declared to be the "Father of Princes and the King and Ruler of the World." This is no mere empty title. The Papacy has always exercised its tremendous influence and power through its army of Jesuits and religious orders in the policy of the nations, and still does. Indeed, its underground influence has been the greatest factor in disturbing the peace of Europe for centuries. Its sinister hand had more to do with the Great War than is generally believed. The Emperor of Austria, for some years before the war, had come so deeply under the influence of the Vatican that he would not even sign a public document without first consulting the Papal Nuncio. Rome's pernicious advice-was behind Austria's scandalous treatment of unfortunate Serbia, and led to the assassination of the disreputable Archduke, and so the frightful war followed. If only the British Empire had gone down in the terrible war, how great would have been the rejoicing. at the Vatican. Another "Te Deum" Would have been sung in honor of so glorious an event. May God defeat all the machinations of the Jesuit intrigues and their pale, imitators-the Anglo-Catholics-against our Empire.

In the light of the recent twice-repeated vote in the House of Commons on the Revised Prayer Book, the following words from Bunyan's description of "Vanity Fair" remain true and really have a prophetic element in them:

"But as in other fairs some one commodity is as the chief of all the fair, so the ware of Rome and her merchandise is greatly promoted in this fair; only our English nation, with some others, have taken a dislike thereat."

After 300 years we thank God that though the interests of Rome are still greatly promoted, our English nation is still of the same mind.

For many years now there has been an increasing affinity and closer relation between the Roman Church and the official and controlling power of the Labor Party. At first sight this seems strange, for officially the Labor Party, as a Party, have no religious convictions whatever. On the religious side they are really Pagan. All religious interests to them are represented by one word-Sectarianism. Rome, on the other hand, is very religious, and yet, though "Labor" takes Good Friday and Easter time, as the principal part of the year to discuss their godless plans for making a new world out of sinful human nature, Rome (though deeply concerned in these days) never raises a solitary protest. How is it that such contradictory positions work so well together? The answer is that Rome, though professedly Christian, is, in essence, Pagan also. A truly Christian organization can never make common cause with the Papacy. But a political body which has no religious convictions is one of the best tools to subserve the interests of Romanism, and such, alas! the Labor Party at any rate, officially-has become. Let it be clearly understood, however, that the foregoing condemnation does not -mean the canonization of the capitalistic class as Saints by any means. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

Capital and Labor stand together here in the One big union of sinners. The names of many of the Leaders of Labor often show they are true to type! They find their most congenial work in promoting disaffection, unrest, suspicion, and that spirit of lawlessness against 'properly constituted authority which is still the old spirit of Rome. Hence the never-ending strikes and civil warfare. Rome in one way or another has had much to do with strikes. One of the Jesuit Fathers, speaking in Hawthorn, Victoria, some years ago, said that though the Labor Party did not give the Church all it sought, yet as a political party it helped them more than any other. And to show that this fact is recognized by the hierarchy, Dr. Mannix, as reported in

Historical or Futurist?

“Argus,” September 25, 1925, in his speech at Waterford, Ireland, said: “I have also been welcomed publicly and officially by the representatives of Labor in your midst. That I regard as a very special compliment and special honor. I have been more or less associated with their brethren on the other side of the globe, and they are in power in almost every State in Australia. I can say for them that though I did not always see eye to eye with them I always found them better friends than any others to whom I might look for support or assistance.” This proves the very intimate relation between Labor and Rome. One further quotation from Rev. Digby Berry, formerly of Victoria: “English are almost hopelessly dull, and incapable of perception as to the true character of the Papal Government. They do not seem to be aware that it is, and for a thousand years, has been a vast political organization with a mere disguise of religion thrown over it.

The evidence which has been presented on behalf of the validity and strength of the Historical interpretation, especially as it relates to Antichrist, having found its fulfillment in the Papacy, is so clear, cogent and convincing, as to amount to a demonstration of its being the true and only answer.

The Futurist is bankrupt on the evidential side. One of the worst features of that system of interpretation is that it removes from Rome all the odium and condemnation which justly rest upon her. By the Futurist method of exposition, the true character and purpose of Rome are covered over as effectively as her most ardent supporters could desire. The Protestant Church has practically ceased to witness against Rome. The Protestantism of today has become a poor, weak, spineless thing. It lacks the robust, virile character that is native to true Protestantism. Our Protestant Federations to-day, while doing some things more or less helpful to Protestantism, have left out the principal thing, viz., protest against the Doctrines of Romanism. It was this which gave birth to the very name of Protestant as we all know. Today it is almost solely the Political aspect alone which is put in the forefront. This is a serious blunder, and not until Protestant organizations of all names get back as individuals to the reading of the Bible, and become better attenders than many of them are of the public worship of God, can we get back to the position worthy of the name of Protestants. As one writer has put it – “Tremendous issues depend on the identification and recognition of this great foe, the most insidious and most formidable enemy of our Lord, of His truth, and of His Church.” And because the Futurist ignores these identification marks of the Holy Spirit, he becomes, unintentionally, a friend to the enemy instead of a foe. We urge all such who may read these pages to impartially consider and weigh carefully the proofs-Scriptural and Historical-submitted, and judge as best they may which has the greater claim to acceptance.

That Church of Rome claims that she alone is the true Church of Christ, and that outside of her communion there is no salvation; but instead of our Lord Jesus Christ being the Head, the Pope-the self-styled Vicar of Christ-is the Head.

The New Testament clearly teaches that the whole company of true believers in Christ everywhere constitute His body, of which He only is the Head. We claim for Him alone the supreme place, and in Him only is there salvation. “And in no other is the great salvation found; for, in fact, there is no second name under heaven that has been given among men through which we are to be saved.” - Acts 4: 12, Weymouth translation

Now it is utterly impossible to harmonize the claims of the New Testament and Rome. If the first of these be true, and it verily is, then the other is false. Two of the most famous of her modern leaders have narrowed the choice for us down to two simple issues. Cardinal Manning says – “The Catholic Church is either the masterpiece of Satan or the Kingdom of the Son of God.” Cardinal Newman agrees with him in saying- “Either the Church of Rome is the House of God or the house of Satan; there is, no middle ground.” Alongside of these utterances we put the Master’s words – “By their fruits you shall know them.” With this absolutely infallible standard of judgment to guide us, we have no hesitation in declaring it is neither the Kingdom of the Son of God nor the House of God. We accept the alternative position as the true one.

In what is to follow we consider mainly what is final the goal of the ages. The great outstanding event of that near objective is the close of the age and the coming in power and great glory of our Great God and Savior Jesus Christ. Our study of Daniel reveals the great fact that more than four-fifths of the events foretold in those twin visions have come and gone. Those four great empires are matters of past history. They reached their meridian glory, declined, faded like dream stuff, and passed out. The territories they occupied were located on the map of time, before they came, by the finger of God. Their character and cruelty were vividly sketched by the angelic interpreter, and in history we read how truly they answered to the Divine portraiture and verified the words – “The dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure.” Many centuries have also passed since God drove in His wedge by the barbarous nations of the north, and burst asunder the ?nee mighty empire of Rome. The German Kaiser, addressing his troops, October, 1914, said – “If we gain, and we must gain, a new Empire shall arise more splendid than the world ever saw-a

Historical or Futurist?

new Roman-German Empire, which shall rule the world and the world shall be happy.” Poor, deluded monarch, well described as the “Madman of Europe.” Like Bonaparte and Charlemagne, each of them pitted life’s military genius and power against the immovable rock of God’s, prophetic Word, and the Rock broke them up. No more man-made universal Empires-only divisions until He comes “Whose right it is to reign” and “when all kings shall fall down before Him and all nations shall serve Him.”

As we mentally tick off all the important events in our march across the centuries-which are now past history the conviction springs up (or ought to) that we must be nearing that invisible but Divinely ordained boundary line which will usher in the day of God. The day-not the “Der Tag” of German aspirations, but that day which will end the dismal failure of human government and place the once rejected Son of Man on the throne of Universal Sovereignty for ever. As more than four-fifths of this Divine program has already come to pass as predicted, the presumptive evidence in favor of the balance being fulfilled is so great as to amount to an absolute certainty. The comments of Bagshot contain these weighty words- “I have spent much of my leisure during the last few weeks in hunting down the political predictions made by wise men in the 19th century, and the result is a sad commentary on human blindness and nescience. I cannot discover any single war which was definitely foreseen except by those who had planned it; any revolutionary movement which did not take by surprise the guardians of law and order. I find Lord Salisbury declaring a united Germany to be a remote improbability. Lord Granville, Secretary for Foreign Affairs, confident that peace was never so assured as on the day before the Franco-German War broke out. I find governments and peoples constantly obsessed by groundless nightmares and wholly unconscious of the real perils that lay ahead and desperate error is the inevitable lot of human governments.”

A striking testimony, indeed, to human ignorance as to what will happen in the future. How wonderful by contrast is “the Word of God, which lives and abides for ever.”

In relation to Gentile Kingdoms, the image-vision depicts the falling of a stone, which strikes the image on its feet-its terminal day-and the whole image is represented as being broken in pieces by the impact. This stone symbolizes the coming again of the Son of God in His sudden arrival, majesty and glorious power. By a terrible perversion, the Anglo-Israelites say that the “Stone” is the British Empire. Surely no partisan of the Empire in his wildest fancy ever anticipated that Britain will finally smash up all other powers and so be supreme for ever.

How far removed from all the thinking and expectation of the world is the return of the once rejected Jesus. His first entry into this world as the Savior of mankind scarcely disturbed the activities and general life of men. But His next entry will be vastly different. How august, majestic, imperial, does the Word describe His coming again. That which overshadows and dominates everything else is the manifestation of His transcendent power and glory. So in the companion vision of the image we read “And there was given him dominion and glory and a Kingdom that all peoples, nations and languages should serve him, his dominion is an everlasting dominion and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.” - Daniel 7:14. To, the High Priest Jesus said – “Henceforth you shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power (or omnipotence), and coming on the clouds of heaven.” - Matthew 26: 64; and Revelation 1:7- “Behold he comes with the clouds. And all the tribes (or nations) of the earth shall mourn over Him,” and the truly instructed believer responds, “Even so come Lord Jesus.” This old, sin-ridden world, by its own power or initiative, can never reach God’s standard. On the governmental, as on the individual, side man has failed ignominiously to attain or to express the lofty ideals of righteousness. Failure is the monument reared to the memory of mankind by the passing centuries. In its own inarticulate fashion, with outstretched arms, many a time in its long journey has this sinful world made its silent, sad appeal for help to right the wrongs of the, ages. If it had a voice it would say, How long? How vividly the Apostle portrays the dumb but intensely expectant attitude of the whole creation, Acts 8:19, Weymouth translation – “For all creation gazing eagerly as if with outstretched neck is waiting and longing to see the manifestations of the sons of God,” and that manifestation is inseparably joined to His glorious appearing.

Every conceivable form of government has had a trial -Patriarchal; autocratic, monarchic, plutocratic, democratic. -all have failed; and still mankind believes there is yet left some way of success. France not long since furnished a striking, and deeply pathetic object-lesson of a nation looking for the competent man to lead them out of their terrible financial tangle. When the late Viviani, the French Premier, a few years ago made the proud boast-with reference to the exclusion of the name of God from the school books- “We have put out the lights of heaven” - he forgot, like Napoleon, what God can do. God can extinguish the lights of a nation. A nation can become insolvent, not only in finance, but in men fitted to lead. But the days, come when God will usher in the universal reign of the. Prince of Peace-not by the slow

Historical or Futurist?

process of evolution, but the sudden arrival of His beloved Son, the only competent ruler, the only One Who is able to bring order and perfect harmony out of the chaos, unrest and world-despair, and He is the only One competent to keep it right. It has been well said in relation to the whole world outlook-It is Christ or chaos. His reign will represent perfectly absolute, justice. and true beneficence. Ruling with the rod of iron, and yet coming “down like rain on the mown grass.” There is a wonderful passage in Ephesians 1:10, Weymouth translation – “And this is in harmony with God’s merciful purpose for the government of the world when the times are ripe for it-the purpose which He has cherished in His own mind of restoring the whole creation to find its one Head in Christ. Yes, King in Heaven and things on earth, to, find their one Head in Him.” How these words reveal the absolutely central position which the Son of God will Yet occupy. He is truly central in us already, who now accept His Lordship. But He will yet fill all things. Alas for His enemies- “they shall lick the dust.” There is no way of escape for them. “Kiss the Son lest He be angry and you perish in the way for His wrath will soon be kindled.” - Psalm 1: 12.

Silently, surely, but irrevocably, the Divine purpose moves to its declared objective. That purpose is a merciful one. Though the later and final stages mean judgment and destruction for His enemies, yet mercy is behind it all, because that purpose has for its ultimate goal, the establishment on earth of the reign of righteousness and therefore peace. It also means restoration-not reconstruction -restoring the whole creation to its lost place. How, glorious the prospect. Mankind, by treaties, compacts, secret diplomatic agreements, protocols, leagues of nations, have earnestly sought to bind into one harmonious whole the clashing, discordant affairs of the nations, but the results are disappointingly small. God only can truly unify, and He will, and this can only come to pass by a restored relationship to Christ-the Head. There is no other hope. A favorite motto of “Labor” is – “The unity of Labor is the hope of the world” -(a Satanic delusion). We often hear the word “Solidarity”. Its praises are frequently sung, “Solidarity for Ever,” but the conception of those who sing “Solidarity for Ever” is pagan in the last degree and merciless in its application.

The only cure for the wrongs and woes of mankind is Divine solidarity-solidarity for ever in the Head-in Jesus Christ. This is the predetermined plan and purpose of God from the beginning-Jesus shall reign. The world has lost its Head. That is the true explanation of this lost world. Professor Babbitt in 1920 said – “It is hard to avoid the conclusion that we are living in a world that has gone wrong on first principles.” And the very first one is obedience to God. Refusal to obey God has made a lost world. But neither men nor devils can ever defeat the final purpose of God. God will restore-not so-called restorationism-and that glorious consummation will be accomplished through the coming of the King to reign.

In all literature there is nothing to compare with the inspiring prophetic visions on record for us concerning the coming coronation day of the Son of God and Man. In all music there is nothing to surpass the grandeur, majesty, and sublime magnificence of the Hallelujah Chorus, set to the theme of “He shall reign for ever and ever, Hallelujah” and on His head were many crowns.” Symbolic of the fact that all kingly power will finally converge on the Head once crowned with thorns. Do all our hearts echo the glad refrain? – “Even so come Lord Jesus” - or are we still in bondage to the delusive hope that the problems of earth will yet be solved by the application and operation of one or other of the remedies of man, or is the incomparable figure of the Son of God growing more real, more vivid to our heart and mind? thus engulfing for ever every other hope. Only this Blessed Hope can deliver us from world-despair and make us first-class optimists. That wonderful missionary to India-Henry Martyn-wrote: “If there is one thing that refreshes my soul above all others it is that I shall behold the Redeemer gloriously triumphant at the winding up of all things.” A minister once in bondage to the Higher criticism afterwards said- “The realization of the “Blessed hope” of His coming has been the greatest single benefit that has come to me since I gave up hope of salvation by moral principle and personal effort.”

God’s Word makes it as clear as sunlight that every form of human government is destined to pass away “when the times are ripe for it.” The stone that smites the image becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth. “The world’s bridal hour advances. The mountains shall kiss the morning radiant and effulgent with the blaze of coming glory; and all the waves of the sea shall become the crystal keys of a great organ upon which the fingers of everlasting joy shall play the grand march of a world redeemed from the curse.”

“The night is long, the darkness thick, and millions yet are slaves,
And hearts in pain look up to Him Who heaped the Red Sea waves;
But o’er the plains where wronged and weak the bleeding feet have trod,

