

## PRESCOTT

I hope we shall be able to keep in mind constantly the vital principle that is to underlie this whole question, that is the mediatorial work of Christ is carried forward in order that He may minister unto us personally the power of His endless life. He is to minister Himself to us as our life. That is the way that the vital bond of union is established and maintained between Him and us. He is the Head of the church. Believers are His body. We must not take this as a theoretical doctrine that Christ is the Head of the church, but we must enter into that as an experience. If we are His body we must be united with the head by a union of life. To sever the living connection of the head to the body is to bring death, even though you put the head back on and try to make a mechanical connection. There might then appear to be a connection, if you have once severed the head, both head and body become dead. All our efforts then at righteousness will be in vain. So that I desire that that thought should be kept clearly in mind. This is the vital principal of it. This is the real thing, not as a mere theory as to the mediatorship of Christ, but an experience of the mediation of his own life, and that without that mediation and without that life we are dead, and are absolutely unable to reveal the righteous character of God as revealed in the person of his son. Now let us read again, if you will.

Heb. 1:11: "They shall perish; but thou continuest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment."

That brings before us the contrast -- now note the contrast between the things that are made, they perish. "Thou continuest".

is the revised version. I like that word there. Now

2 Pet. 3: 3-7: "Knowing this first, that in the last days mockers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for, from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they wilfully forget, that there were heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water and amidst water, by the word of God; by which means the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens that now are, and the earth, by the same word have been stored up for fire, being reserved against the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men.

Now note hastily the contrasts: They shall perish; Thou continest. Now in second Peter the basis of the scoffing in the last days is on this fact, that is demonstrated by a current science. Things continue. Now the scripture says they shall perish, science says they continue, they have continued from the beginning, and all things continue as they were from the creation and they will go on that way. That is the testimony of a false science as against the scripture. The scripture says, This they wilfully forget -- not simply are willingly ignorant of it, but they wilfully forget, because God has given a demonstration that when sin is in the world it has its effect upon nature, that we must remember that the world that then was perished because of the sin of the men in the world. Now the next demonstration perishing of the world will be the judgment and destruction of ungodly men. There is that connection between man and the dominion given him. The world was given him in the

first place, and when man lost his place he lost his dominion. Nature suffered as a consequence of the sin of man, as God said before the flood that the imagination of man's hearts was only evil continually, and that brought destruction upon the world, and the world that then was perished. Men say that there was no catastrophe such as that, although the evidences of it are before our eyes, and new evidences have been discovered recently, as you know.

Now that connection between man and things; human science leaving ~~him out~~ Christ out of the question, leaving him out as the mediator by whom and in whom all things were created. They go on leaving him out, and they say All things continue. The Bible makes that a connection between sin and the world, that because of the sin of man the world suffers, and man was overthrown in the flood, and the world perished with him because of sin. The same thing will come again because of sin.

Now the issue today is whether things will continue just under impersonal law, or whether the things that now are, the world that now is, will perish, and a new heavens and a new earth be created through the mediation of this same Son, and whether man that is in the world now will perish with the world, or whether accepting the mediation of this Son they will be created new in Jesus Christ. That is the whole question that faces us now, a very practical and real question. The whole question of today is, Shall we reform the world without Christ, shall we restore the world, make this world a good place to live in, and present a world of righteousness without Christ? We see that apart from Christ, and his eternal life ministering to us, we perish. There

is no reformation for the world, on account of sin. The world will come to an end, there will be another catastrophe like the first one, man will come to an end unless he accepts this eternal life ministered to him through the mediation of the Son of God. Now shall we read, carrying on this thought.

Heb. 7:15, 16: "And what we say is yet more abundantly evident, if after the likeness of Melchizedek there ariseth another priest, who hath been made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life: "

Now he has been speaking about the priesthood, and the contrast between the Levitical priesthood and the Melchizedek priesthood, and that in Christ is the priesthood after the order of man. Now he says, What we say is yet more abundantly evident -- what has gone before as between the Melchizedek priesthood and the Levitical priesthood -- is yet more abundantly evident -- comes out with much greater plainness -- if after the likeness of Melchizedek there ariseth another priest. Here is the demonstration, as it were, of the sort of theory that he has been advancing in the person of Christ. We have the demonstration of what he has been setting forth in order to contrast the Levitical priesthood from the Melchizedek priesthood. "And what we say is yet more abundantly evident" if we face the actual fact that after the rise of Melchizedek there does really arise another priest who had been made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. See the contrast? The Levitical priesthood was after the law of the carnal commandment. If they descended according to the flesh and could prove their genealogy, then they became priests, but not in this case. We

have no genealogy in this case, he is without father, without mother, without beginning of days or end of life. He is made priest, he is able to exercise this office of the priesthood, to minister to us this life, because he is made priest after the power of an endless life.

Heb. 7:23-25: "And they indeed have been made priests many in number, because that by death they are hindered from continuing; but he, because he abideth for ever, hath his priesthood unchangeable. Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

Now you will observe that the whole question of the efficacy of this priesthood turns upon these statements. He has a priesthood unchangeable. Why? Because the typical priests, they count not continue by reason of death, but he, because he continues, "Thou continuest" Heb. 1:11, because he continues forever, his priesthood does not pass to another, and therefore he is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. And he says in Revelation, I am he that liveth and became dead, and behold I am, living forever more. Because he ever liveth to make intercession for us. If we take up the time to dwell upon the practical side of it, that there is the question of having an intercessor who ever liveth, who is able to save to the uttermost, because he is not a priest simply after the flesh, but because of his eternity, there is where our very hope of salvation rests, because he is able to minister eternal life to us, and that eternal life is not separate from himself. He ministers himself to us,

we eat his flesh and drink his blood. You note the connection there, and you remember the next, "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." That is the explanation of our eating his flesh. He explains that that is accomplished by eating his words. "They are spirit and life. There must be this union between him and us. He must continually minister this to us. Our only hope is to be ministered to of this new covenant. If he does not minister to us as he did to his apostles on the day of pentecost, we are not ministers of the new covenant. Our labor will be simply as the power of the flesh. When we receive the ministry of the Spirit, it is because our High Priest ever liveth and ministers his life. That life is not apart from himself. All we have learned about the truths of personality centers in this idea, that it is ministered in his spirit, in his life, in himself.

Now we must pass to another phase of this question. I want to come directly to this question: ~~of the old taking away of this priesthood, and this ministry accomplished for us~~ What will taking away this priesthood and this ministry accomplish for us? And how has it been taken away? We must address ourselves very directly to that. We have seen the vital meaning of this question in relation to our Christian experience and all that we do to establish the kingdom of God. Here arises, as we have seen, a rebellion, an effort to institute another kingdom for the kingdom of God to be established, an antichrist. That rebellion is led by Lucifer the invisible king of Babylon. It is a continuous effort. He strikes at the very vital point. You don't have to spend much time trying to find out what killed a man, if you

learn that his head was taken off. If you learn that first thing, you will be satisfied. It is the same thing here. This enemy takes off the head and puts on another head, so that he appears to have a head, but there is no vital union between the apparent head and the body, and therefore there is no living power, and the body is dead. That is what we want to see. How does this enemy work when we come right to the vital thing? We may spend much time over what the papacy has done, and that may all be well enough, but we must not lose sight of this fact, that the all-important thing that the papacy has done is to make take off the head from the body, and put on another head. When you have done that, all the rest is subordinate. We may inquire as a matter of interest, and investigate, but it is something like the lawyer that appeared in court and said, "Your honor, one of my witness is absent. I have several reasons for his absence, one is, He is dead." "Never mind about the others," replied the judge.

When the papacy has taken off his head and put on another human head, you do not need to inquire as to whether he has done any damage or not. That is striking at the central thing.

Now when we make the message against the beast and his image, ~~what~~ what shall we do. It will not do any good to repair merely a finger or repair a hand until after the head is put back. When you have put the head on again, then you can attend to the rest if you want to; but the first thing to do is to strike at the vital thing. Our message against the beast and his image centers right here, and that is to give Christ the place that belongs to him. When we are preaching the person of Christ, as we have been doing here, we are preaching against the papacy, even though we do not mention the papacy, for the papacy cannot stand before that. The vital thing is to give Christ his place as the living head of the church. That is brought out through his ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. Therefore in this message against the beast and his image, we must bring that out clearly.

Now, in the 8th chapter of Daniel, where it speaks of the taking away of the daily sacrifice, or in the Revised Version, the ~~continual burnt offering~~ continual burnt offering, the words sacrifice and offering are supplied, according to the meaning that the translators attached to the chapter. The whole question of ~~what~~ the meaning of the chapter depends upon what word is supplied there. They supplied the word offering in the Authorized, and ~~the~~ burnt offering in the Revised, because that accorded with their interpretation of the prophecy.

we

When, ~~you~~ come to ask about that, we must look to see from the Bible the meaning attached to the word here translated, daily in the authorized version and continual in the revised version. Let

us turn back to the typical service and see how this word is used in the sanctuary service. When we are going to interpret this word in a prophecy dealing with the sanctuary, we must find the meaning of this word as used in the scripture in connection with the sanctuary. Now let us read the following texts:

Exodus 29:38 and 42: "Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar; two lambs of the first year day by day continually.... This shall be a continual burnt offering throughout your generations, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, before the Lord: where I will meet you, to speak there unto thee."

Ex. 29:45, 46: "And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God. And they shall know that I am the Lord their God, that brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them: I am the Lord their God."

You see here that the first continual is used in connection with the burnt offering, and it is interesting to note that right in connection with that it is one of the means through which they are brought into personal fellowship with God, so that they shall know that he is their god that brought them out of the land of Egypt. He is Jehovah, their God.

Ex. 30:1, 7, 8: "And thou shalt make an altar to burn incense upon: of shittim wood shalt thou make it. . . . And Aaron shall burn thereon sweet incense every morning: when he dresseth the lamps, he shall burn incense upon it. And when Aaron lighteth the lamps at even, he shall burn incense upon it; a perpetual incense before the Lord throughout your generations."

The word here translated perpetual is that same word that is translated continual in the 29th chapter.

Num. 4:7: "And upon the table of shewbread they shall spread a cloth of blue, and put thereon the dishes, and the spoons, and the bowls, and covers to cover withal; and the continual bread shall be thereon."

Now we have the three things,--continual burnt offering, continual incense, and continual shewbread.

2 Chron. 2:4: "Behold, I build an house to the name of the Lord my God, to dedicate it to him, and to burn before him sweet incense, and for the continual shewbread, and for the burnt offerings morning and evening, on the sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the solemn feasts of the Lord our God. This is an ordinance for ever to Israel."

This scripture sums up the three and shows that when Solomon would describe the temple and the service that was to be conducted in it, he said it was for three things,--the burnt offering, the incense offering, and the shewbread. Those are spoken of as the continual burnt offering, the continual incense offering, and the continual shewbread. They sum up the service of the temple.

Now let us turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews. That was the type. Now let us come to the antitype. Heb. 10:4: "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." That was a typical service merely, but it was a copy or a shadow, a type of the good things to come. Of course there was at that time a real gospel set forth, not in the things themselves, but in what they represented. But the people allowed their minds to be so blinded that they put the shadow in the place of the substance. Then they lost their religion. It was because of that that they rejected Christ when He came in person,--they had lost Him out of their service.

BPP

10

7-16

Heb. 9:26: "For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

The typical service would not avail. He puts away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Then he is the one foreshadowed in those continual offerings of every kind. They are the types of the One who continues. There is the foundation of the whole question,—"thou continuest." It is impossible that the blood of mere animals ~~and~~ should take away sin. Only that endless life can do it. It is only through Him who continues, who conquers death, that we can continue. Shall we have a continuous life, or shall it come to an end? I called attention yesterday to the fact that every prophecy concerning Babylon sets a limit. It is brought to an end. It is only in union with Him that we may continue as long as He continues. Separate from Him, we will come to an end just as Babylon does.

Heb. 10:1: "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect." In connection with that, read the 12th verse of the 10th chapter: "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;" The phrase that is here translated "for ever" is exactly the phrase that is in the first verse, and is translated "continually." He offered himself, manifested himself, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself; "after he had offered one sacrifice for sins continually." That is to say, the blood of bulls and goats was simply typical. They were continual because they typified the real sacrifice. He offered one sacrifice, the giving of His life on the cross. There you find the climax of it; but the giving of His life to us is continuous

BPF

-11-

7-16  
218

That is the only way we can continue in Him,--He manifest~~that~~  
~~that~~ ministers that life to us, and that sacrifice is a contin-  
ual sacrifice.

Now the 14th verse of the 10th chapter: "For by one offering he  
hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." There is that  
same phrase again.

C.P.BOLLMAN: When you say "that sacrifice," you refer to His  
sacrifice?

W.W.PRESCOTT: Yes. Now here are the results of it. By one  
continual ~~xx~~ offering he hath made a continual perfection. And our  
dependance is upon Him for that. That is the only way we can get  
perfection. In preparing a people for translation we must have  
this whole thing brought out. This message must be given, and  
there must be this clear foundation for it.

(PRESCOTT--Cont'd.)

Now his priesthood is a continual priesthood. His sacrifice is a continual sacrifice. His ministry is a continual ministry. All growing out of the fact that he in his own person continued. Now if you take away this, you despoil Christianity. This is the center of the whole thing. The question of perfection is here. The whole question of the Christian life is bound up in this. If you take away that which brings this you despoil him of Christianity. And that is exactly what the Papacy has done.

Now what word shall we supply in Daniel 8? Read Rom. 9:4, speaking of those who were his kinsmen in the flesh, "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises/"

Then pass on to Hebrews 9: 6: "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God." Several words ~~xxxxxxxx~~ could have been used here, but I thought of this, in connection with the tabernacle service--~~that~~ that it might be a good word to use, to say, "He took away the continual service" "the continual ministry." "Continual mediation." When you say one, we must include the other two. This ~~is~~ whole question of taking away this service, stands out. That is the fundamental idea--the continuance.

Now further: the 13th chapter of Hebrews, the 15th verse--to connect our personal experience all the time with this--(after he has gotten all through with this subject and expounded

it fully, he brings in the subject of Faith in a most prominent way.) There is no haphazard arrangement by which we have the 11th chapter six in there. It belongs there, because this whole experience is an experience of faith.

Heb. 13:15: "By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name." (That is, make confession to his name.) That is to say, our continual experience is based upon his continual ministration. Our ability to continue as Christians, our ability to continue personally is based upon the Person of him who continues, and that is based upon his word in his continual service for us. And you remember that it does not end when sin ends. I must emphasize that. We are just as dependent upon him for his mediatorial work after ~~his~~ sin is removed as before sin is removed. We can not live independently of him. He must continue as our life after he has abolished sin. We are never independent of Christ, this is setting forth in a special way his dealing with sin in order that we may continue forever with him after sin is put out of the way. Sin means death. But the same power that swallows up sin is the life by which we live through all eternity.

words

BOLLMAN: Could you give a few ~~xxxxxx~~ further to make that plain: "that Christ is a continual sacrifice." In what sense is Christ now making a sacrifice for us?

PRESCOTT: To get the connection we will start with the Incarnation. When Christ gave himself for us and took our flesh, he gave himself not only for us, but to us; and that gift will continue to all eternity. He will remain the "son of Man" to all eternity. Now he will continue to give himself

to us as our life. But that could not be in the fullest sense apart from Christ. So the whole thing centers in Christ. But the continual sacrifice goes on. It is one sacrifice for sin continually, and we shall live because he gives himself to us continually.

BOLLMAN: And did those types mean that?

PRESCOTT: Yes, I think those types involved it, but I think the emphasis was upon the work of Christ in behalf of removing sin. But the same life that he mediates-- "the power of an endless life"--he mediates for us to remove sin--that is the life that is mediated for us throughout eternity.

BOLLMAN: What is ~~the~~ the objection to the word "Sacrifice" in the text?

PRESCOTT: It is not broad enough. In history it was applied to Antiochus Epiphanes, who polluted the temple by sacrificing swine's flesh upon the altar. And they limited it in their translation to that ~~work~~ work of Antiochus Epiphanes. And they made the cleansing of the sanctuary to occur exactly 2300 literal days (Winthrop points out) to this pollution. And so they said that was what was fulfilled by this prophecy. Now ~~when~~ when we take the view that the little horn is a prophecy of the Papacy and not Antiochus Epiphanes (although he may have been in a small way a type) (the prophecy is dealing primarily with the true priest and the true sacrifice and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary)--to apply that word "sacrifice" is to make a wrong use of it to make this apply to Antiochus Epiphanes. Now we must have a term that will include not simply the continual burnt offering, but the continual

incense offering and the shewbread, which were the three great things that marked the ministry in the temple (Second Chronicles). So I think that "sacrifice" is the wrong word, and we must have a word like "ministry" or "mediation" or "service."

Now passing on: I want to read a Scripture in Isaiah 60: 11th verse (just to connect these verses, because in this way we get the Bible definition and Bible interpretation)— Speaking of Jerusalem: "Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; for they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought." I see that scripture to say that "continually" is ~~equivalent~~ equivalent in scripture to "day and night." They shall be open continually. They shall not be shut day nor night. You see that idea carried over into the book of Revelation. Revelation 7:15. He is inquiring "Who are these?" And the answer is "They are they that washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb. . . and serve him ~~continually~~ day and night." They serve him continually in his temple. Again, the 22nd chapter, 3 verses: "And there shall be no more curse; but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall ~~serve him~~ serve him." The purpose of Christ's continual service is that we may serve him continually. He ministers his life to us in this continual mediation in order that we may bring back that life to him in continual service. Serve him day and night.

So when we come to the end of the story, his servants shall serve him day and night continually. The ability to serve him continually comes out of his continual service for us. What he gives to us he expects us to give back to him afterwards. He gives us his life. We give it back to him in service.



We face a situation where the Pope has changed the Law, and taken away the power to keep the law, substituting a fleshly power to keep the Law. Our message faces that situation. Now to meet the crisis we must undo that work. We must get the people back to the Lord himself, and we must give back the Law of God as God enacted it and Christ, magnified it.

Yesterday when our attention was called to the fact that the Papacy changed ~~the~~ only one commandment, while the French Revolution did away with all.

W W PRESCOTT: I should say that the prophecy says the papacy shall think to change the law, not the fourth commandment. It has changed the fourth commandment all right, but it has changed the whole law. How? It has taken God's law and re-enacted it as the papal law. That is the actual sign of rebellion. Some of you may remember that historical instance in Ireland when they did away with the acts of Parliament and then re-enacted it themselves. The papacy has done the same thing with the whole law. It has set aside the law as God's law, and re-enacted it as the papal law. Therefore in the papal church you accept the papal interpretation of the law, you accept the papal proclamation of the law. When you have met that proclamation, you accept it a papal message from the law. Well, now, we must restore the law of God as interpreted by Christ. We must restore the dealing with that law as revealed in the scriptures. We must restore to the people the means of obeying that law, or else we are not giving this message to the world. The message is not to denounce the beast and his image. The most effective way is to set forth Christ for all he is to the world. When I saw that Catholic woman come forward with the rest on Sabbath morning, when she hadn't heard a single sermon on the papacy or on the seventh of Daniel, or one that denounced the papacy -- but she saw Christ in such light that it overshadowed all she had ever heard from the priest, and she came to it. The most effective way to preach a sermon against the beast and his image is to put back the right foundation -- no other foundation can any man lay than is laid -- and you have overthrown the whole thing. Give Christ his place. But in order to do this we have got to

follow him clear through his work, and you find the climax right here in his ministry, his continual mediation. Now I will read something:

"We maintain: —

"1. That the objective point of this prophecy is the little horn, and that the other symbols are introduced merely to locate the time and place of this power."

Now you compare the prophecy. Every prophecy in Daniel, Daniel 2, Daniel 7, and Daniel 8 at the end, they set forth the setting up of the kingdom of God. We don't find the end of the eighth chapter in the eighth chapter. But now in the seventh and the eighth and the eleventh chapters of Daniel, you have set before you the working of the enemy of God to prevent the fulfillment of that second chapter, the setting up of the fifth kingdom. In the second chapter the objective point is the fifth kingdom. In the others it is to show the power that would interfere with the fulfillment of the second chapter, how Babylon tried to interfere with it right there, when Nebuchadnezzar set up the image all of gold, which was typical of himself. Modern Babylon has attempted to do the same thing. The prophecies of Daniel show that is the purpose and work of ancient Babylon, ~~suggested later~~ under the leadership of the invisible king of Babylon, when the effort to establish the kingdom of God was made by the ancient people of God; and this will be reproduced on a much larger scale in the modern spiritual Babylon as against the modern people of God.

"2. That while the fourth beast with the ten horns together with the little horn, in the seventh chapter of Daniel, represents

pagan and papal Rome, with special emphasis on the political aspect of the latter power, the little horn of the eighth chapter represents both pagan and papal Rome, with special emphasis on the ecclesiastical aspect of the latter power.

"3. That the leading feature of this vision is the taking away of "the continual burnt offering," and the treading down of the sanctuary and the host.

"4. That this prophecy when correctly interpreted will be found to be a complement ~~to~~ of the prophecy of the seventh chapter, and that the two prophecies taken together show how completely the papal power or modern Babylon has reproduced the work of ancient Babylon in opposing the establishment of the kingdom of God and in the attempt to set up a rival kingdom.

"5. That in the priesthood of the papal church and its sacrifice of the mass will be found the fulfillment of the central features of this prophecy.

"6. That the parallel between ancient Babylon and modern Babylon will be found very complete and exact, the chief difference being that ancient Babylon was a professedly pagan power in open opposition to the God and religion of Jerusalem, while modern Babylon carries on its work of opposition under the pretense of fulfilling the typical service found in the Jewish system, and of working for the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth.

"We proceed now to a somewhat particular consideration of these six propositions.

"1. The general purpose of the prophecies of Daniel is to make known the divine program for this world, culminating in the establishment of the everlasting kingdom of God, together with a

foreview of the supreme effort of the god of this world to defeat this program by setting up another kingdom in opposition to the kingdom of God, under the pretense of establishing God's kingdom. The exposure of this treasonable plan is found in the prophecies of the seventh and eighth chapters of Daniel, in each of which it is necessary to introduce several symbols in order to locate definitely the power which would fulfill these specifications, not only in the nature of its working, but also in the time and place. The first symbol of the eighth chapter, the ram with the two horns, defined to represent "the kings of Media and Persia" (verse 20), covers the time to 331 BC, when the rough goat, declared to represent "the king of Greece" (verse 21), came upon the scene of action. The breaking of the notable horn (the sudden death of Alexander the Great), and the division of his empire into four parts "toward the four winds of heaven," covering the time until out of one of the four horns "came forth a little horn," brings us down the stream of time to the sovereignty of the Roman kingdom, which was established 168 BC. Thus in the briefest sketch of history we are brought to the work of the little horn, which is then described more fully, in harmony with the idea that the chief purpose of this prophecy is to set forth the action of this little horn.

3. In the prophecy of the eighth chapter of Daniel, the power to which attention is directed after the division of Greece into four kingdoms is represented, not by an independent symbol as in the seventh chapter, but by a horn which comes out of one of the horns of the goat. This shows clearly that, while this symbol represents the next great power after Greece, it represents

it in a different way than is done in the seventh chapter. The key to the explanation of this difference is found in the fact that the fourth beast, with its ten horns and the little horn arising later, represents Rome pagan and Rome papal as a political power, while the little horn of Daniel 8 represents Rome pagan and Rome papal as an ecclesiastical power. . . .

\*Furthermore, there is a peculiar fitness in using a single symbol to represent the ecclesiastical phase of both pagan Rome and papal Rome or modern Babylon, inasmuch as a direct and easy connection can be made between the religion of ancient Babylon and the religion of papal Rome or modern Babylon, pagan Rome itself serving as the channel for this connection. The following extract fully justifies this view: --

\*"On the overthrow of Babylon by the Persians, who nourished a traditional hatred for its idolatry, the Chaldean priesthood fled to Pergamos, in Asia Minor, and made it the headquarters of their religion. Hence Christ in his charge to the church in that city speaks of it as being "where Satan's seat is." The last pontiff king of Pergamos was Attalus III, who at his death bequeathed his dominions and authority to the Roman people, 133 BC, and from that time the two lines of Pontifex Maximus were merged in the Roman one. Therefore, when Julius Caesar was elected Pontifex Maximus, he assumed to himself the divinity claimed by the pontiff kings of Chaldea, and declared himself "Venus gen-etrix," or born of Venus; and from henceforth the emperors of Rome received divine honors. . . . But just as pagan Rome was the true offspring and successor of Babylon, so is papal Rome the true offspring and successor of pagan Rome. When paganism was nominally

abolished in the Roman Empire, the head of the pagan hierarchy was also suppressed. Some of the Christian emperors did indeed accept the title of Pontifex Maximus, while others, refusing it themselves, appointed a pagan priest, until the reign of Gratian, who, refusing to do either, abolished the office, AD 376. Two years afterwards, however, fearing that religion might become disorganized, he offered the title and office to Damasus, bishop of Rome. . . . This bishop, less scrupulous than the emperor, accepted the office, and from that time until now the title has been held by the popes of Rome, from whom, and through whom, the whole hierarchy of Western Christendom have received their ordination. So also the honors and powers attached to the title, the dominion of the civilized world, previously wielded by the pontiff emperors of pagan Rome, passed to the pontiffs and hierarchy of papal Rome, who for centuries imposed their will upon kings, and held the nations in thralldom. . . . Hence we see that there was good reason for entitling the seven-hilled city of papal Rome, "Babylon Roma" or "Babylon the Great." Moreover, although the actual city of Rome is the center and seat of that vast organization which for centuries ruled "over the kings of the earth," and over "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues," yet "The great city" includes all, in every place, who can claim to be its citizens, all who are subject to its laws and ordinances, who bow to its authority, or are morally identified with it; just as the citizens of pagan Rome includes multitudes who had never seen Rome but who claimed to be its citizens, bowed to its laws and authority and were entitled to its privileges." -- "The False Christ,"

"3. We will now present some considerations to show that the leading feature of this vision is the taking away of the "continual burnt offering" and the treading down of the sanctuary and the host.

"In the inquiry made in verse 13, this vision is declared to be 'the vision concerning the continual burnt offering, and the transgression that maketh desolate, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot.' In the answer to this inquiry it is stated that at the end of a given period 'then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.' By this question and the answer given to it the central idea of the vision is clearly indicated. The emphasis is placed not upon the exploits of the Medo-Persians, nor upon the remarkable campaign of Alexander the Great, nor upon the crushing power of the iron monarchy of pagan Rome, but upon the work of the little horn in its attitude of antagonism toward the host and the sanctuary. This is further emphasized in verse 11, from which we learn that the little horn, or papal Rome, has taken away 'the continual burnt offering' from Christ, the Prince of the host, and cast down the place of his sanctuary. Surely there is abundant proof to show that the burden of the vision is the sanctuary and the perversion of its service.

"4. The general purpose of the visions of the seventh and eighth chapters of Daniel is to sound a warning concerning the rise of a power which would antagonize the purpose of God already announced (Dan 2:44) to establish his everlasting kingdom in the earth. In these two visions the same power is described, but in the former its kingly power is emphasized, in the latter its priestly power. From the description of this same power given by

the apostle Paul (2 Thess. 2:3,4), we learn that 'the man of sin' will take his place in the temple of God, 'setting himself forth as God.' This furnishes a key to the correct interpretation of the vision of the eighth chapter of Daniel, with its emphasis upon the sanctuary and its services.

As the power with which we are now dealing works in opposition to the plan of God to establish his righteousness in the earth, through the agency of his Son, who is set forth in the Scripture as both king and priest (Zech. 6:13), it follows that this anti-Christian agent of evil would appear in the role both of king and of priest. In the vision of the seventh chapter the kingly idea predominates. The divine interpreter of the vision declared that after the ten kings should arise out of the fourth kingdom 'another [king] shall arise after them,' and it was further declared that this eleventh king 'shall put down three kings.' In the vision of the eighth chapter the priestly side of this power is put forward. The taking away of the continual burnt offering, the casting down and treading underfoot of the sanctuary, indicate such an interference with the mediatorial work of the gospel system as typified in the earthly sanctuary and its services, as could be accomplished only by one assuming priestly functions. It is thus clear that these two visions are the complements of each other, and that taken together they furnish a complete description of that papal power which has assumed both political and spiritual rule over the earth.

"That the Papacy, or modern Babylon, is the spiritual counterpart of ancient Babylon, and that, therefore, the outline of the history of ancient Babylon as furnished by the prophet Daniel

will apply to this modern Babylon, is clearly indicated in the Scriptures. Note the following parallels: The Lord gave ancient Jerusalem into the hands of ancient Babylon (Dan. 7:25). The vessels of the sanctuary at Jerusalem fell into the hands of ancient Babylon (Dan. 1:2), and were used by Babylon's last king in the worship of the false gods (Dan. 5:3, 4; so also the people of God and the sanctuary service were given over to modern Babylon (Dan. 8:13, R.V.), indicating the same sacrilegious perversion of sacred things. Ancient Babylon attempted to enforce its decree of the burning of dissenters (Dan. 3:15); so also the Pope, or modern Babylon, has persecuted heretics. The description of the downfall of ancient Babylon as found in the fiftieth and fifty-first chapters of Jeremiah, and especially the final sentence upon Babylon (Jer. 51:64), corresponds exactly to the description of the downfall of modern Babylon found in the eighteenth chapter of Revelation, and especially verse 21. In the making of the great image of gold and the requirement to worship it (Daniel 3), is expressed Babylon's purpose that its own kingdom should be permanent, and that there should be no kingdoms succeeding it, as represented in Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great image by the parts of silver, brass, iron, and clay. So also has modern Babylon opposed the establishment of God's kingdom by setting up a false kingdom, although under the pretense of loyalty to God. Finally, in the seventeenth chapter of Revelation, we have the title 'Babylon the Great' written upon the forehead of the woman who is defined to be 'the great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth.' This great city was Rome, and the woman was the Church of Rome, which is thus distinctly declared to be 'Babylon the Great.'

or modern Babylon.

\*5. We now come to the fifth and most important of these propositions; namely, that in the priesthood of the papal church and its sacrifice of the mass, will be found the fulfillment of the central features of this prophecy. In establishing this proposition it becomes necessary to show that the Papacy has taken away 'the continual burnt offering' and has trodden down the host and the sanctuary.

"Two or three preliminary observations should be made before dealing with the main proposition. It is first important to note to what sanctuary reference is made in this prophecy. This can be easily determined by noting that it is the sanctuary which is in existence at the close of the 2300 prophetic days, or 2300 literal years, mentioned in the fourteenth verse. This period, commencing in 457 BC and closing in 1844, brings us down to a time many centuries after the time that the sanctuary of the typical Jewish system was destroyed. The sanctuary of this prophecy is therefore the one mentioned in the divine interpretation of the typical system in these words: --

"We have such a high priest, who sat down on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, not man."  
Heb. 8:1, 2.

"In the same epistle the contrast is drawn between 'the copies of the things in the heavens,' referring to the typical sanctuary and its service, and 'the heavenly things themselves,' referring to the sanctuary in heaven. In the further discussion of this subject we shall therefore assume that the sanctuary of this

prophecy is the heavenly sanctuary, where Christ our great High Priest has ministered since his ascension to heaven.

"We must next inquire into the meaning of the phrase 'the continual burnt offering.' In the Authorized Version the phrase is 'the daily sacrifice.' Translators of both versions, following the interpretation of many commentators, regarded the little horn of this chapter as a symbol of Antiochus Epiphanes, and referred the whole prophecy to the work of that king, his overthrow of the ancient ritual service, and his defilement of the temple at Jerusalem. In harmony with this view they supplied a word which would limit the meaning to one particular phase of the typical service, the sacrifice. The interpretation of the prophecy which makes the Papacy a very prominent factor in its fulfillment naturally suggests that a different word should be supplied. In order to determine what that word should be, it is proper to consider the use of the word continual in the Old Testament in connection with the sanctuary service, inasmuch as it is used in that same connection in this prophecy. From such a study we learn that the word continual is applied to the burnt offering (Ex. 29:42), to the incense offering (Ex. 30:9), and to the showbread (Num. 4:7). These were the three principal features in the sanctuary service, as is indicated in 2 Chron. 2:4. We conclude, therefore, that with the word continual used in this prophecy in connection with the heavenly sanctuary, such a word should be supplied as would cover in a general way the whole antitypical service in the heavenly sanctuary, of which the earthly service was a type. We therefore suggest either 'ministry,' 'service,' or mediation.' Inasmuch as it is through the service of the

heavenly sanctuary that the mediatorial work of Christ finds expression, we think that the word mediation is the most appropriate one to supply. The following extracts will be helpful in this connection: --

"The expression 'the perpetual service' is not in the Old Testament an equivalent for the daily sacrifice, although used in that sense in the Talmuds and later Hebrew." -- "Daniel and His Prophecies," C.H.H.Wright, page 179.

"Tameed [continual] is everything in the worship of God which is not used merely temporarily, but is permanent, as the daily sacrifice, the setting forth of the showbread, and the like. The limitation of it to the daily morning and evening service in the writings of the rabbis is unknown in the Old Testament. The word much rather comprehends all that is of permanent use in the holy services of divine worship." -- "Commentary on the Book of Daniel," Keil, page 298.

"We are now prepared to affirm that whatever fulfills the specifications concerning the little horn of this prophecy, must attempt to take away from Christ, our great High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary, his ministry of mediation, and put in its place a system of its own invention. Has the Papacy done this?

"In attempting to answer this question we present first the fact that the Pope of Rome, the head of the papal system, is Pontifex Maximus, the head of a sacrificing priesthood: --

"The Council of Trent based the priesthood, in accordance with Old Testament principles, upon the offering of sacrifice in the mass."  
-- "Hand Book of the Controversy With Rome,"  
Karl Von Hase, Vol I, page 153.

"All the power of the Western priesthood is summed up in the Pope, who, according to the Roman dogma, by virtue of divine appointment is the head of the collective church, the viceroy or Christ on earth." -- Id., page 196

"Furthermore, it is openly asserted that in the system of mediation established in the Roman Catholic Church is found the full realization of all that was foreshadowed in the ancient typical service of the sanctuary. This is made dear by the following extract from a Roman Catholic source: --

"It is only necessary to run over the books of the Old Testament, especially Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy, to establish the fact that the Jewish church, called by the evangelists and the apostles the shadow and the figure of the Christian society, can in fact be the shadow and figure of the Catholic Church alone. In the Jewish system there is one visible head, Moses, continuing to live on in the sovereign pontiffs, the successive high priests, who act in his chair. This head presides over a complete hierarchy, to which entire obedience is due under the severest penalties. These priests teach with authority, explain the law, preserve the traditions, maintain the practice of morality, pray, and offer sacrifices, -- in a word, govern the religious society. In these features who cannot recognize Jesus Christ still living for the government of the Catholic Church in Peter and his successors, the Roman pontiffs presiding over the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, over the authority, the consecration, and the functions of the priests of the new law? If Christ is come "not to destroy the law, but to carry it to perfection," all that is imperfect in the synagogue ought to be perfect in the

church, -- high priesthood, sacraments, sacrifices, etc. This perfection of the law we perceive throughout the Catholic system.'

-- "Catholic Doctrine as Defined by the Council of Trent," by the Rev. A. Namon, S. J., page 62.

"The extent to which this human system of mediation has been developed is well described by a conservative writer: --

"Few of us have ever grasped the full significance of sacerdotalism as a papal device. It puts the priest between the soul and all else, even God, at every stage of development, in the most ingenious and subtle system ever imagined. First of all, it controls wedlock, coming between the man and the woman, to determine whom each shall wed, in the interests of the church. Then when offspring come, it puts the priest between the infant and its ingrafting into the church, in baptism; subsequently between the child and the Word of God, in catechetical instruction; between the sinner and absolution, in the confessionals; between the communicant and the mystic wafer, in the mass; between the candidate and the gift of the Spirit, in confirmation; between the man and the ministry, in ordination; between the dying and his hereafter, in extreme unction; and even beyond death, follows the soul into purgatory, in masses for the dead. From the cradle to the grave, and even afterward, there is always a human mediator to interpose; and this alone accounts for the marvelous power of the priesthood, wherever this internal tribunal holds sway.'

-- Rev. A. T. Pierson, in the Missionary Review of the World, July, 1908.

"According to Roman Catholic theology the sacrifice of the mass is a 'continual sacrifice whereby to worship God in a manner

worthy of him,' and in offering this sacrifice the priest takes the place of Christ. This is set forth in the following quotations: --

"It was therefore proper that, as in the law of nature and in the Mosaic law there were sacrifices instituted by the Almighty, there should also be in the law of grace a continual sacrifice whereby to worship God in a manner worthy of him, besides the One Sacrifice offered by our Lord Jesus Christ on Mt. Calvary." -- "Catholic Belief," Rev. Joseph Faa Di Bruna, D. D., New York, Benziger Brothers, page 97.

"The holy sacrifice of the mass does not differ in its essence from the sacrifice offered up upon Mt. Calvary. As we find on Calvary and in the mass the same identical victim and the same principal Offerer, Jesus Christ, the two sacrifices are essentially the same. The two sacrifices only differ in non-essentials, because only the manner of offering is different. One was offered by Christ personally, the other is offered by him through his ministers. The former was offered with real suffering, real shedding of blood, and real death of the Victim; the latter with only a mystical suffering, a mystical shedding of blood, and a mystical death of the same Victim. Therefore the priest, at the time of the consecration, does not say "This is the body of Christ," but, acting in the person of Christ, "Do this," or, "Offer up this." It is on account of this sacrifice offered daily on our altars by Christ that our Lord is called "a Priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek." -- Id., page 101.

"A noted saint and doctor of the Roman Church has defined the position held by the priest, in these words: --

"When he ascended into heaven, Jesus Christ left his priests after him to hold on earth his place of mediator between God and men, particularly on the altar." -- "Dignity and Duties of the Priest; or Selva," St. Alphonsus de Liguori, New York, Benziger Brothers, 1889, page 34.

\* \* \* \* \*

"The Pope, as the head of the Roman Catholic priesthood, is given the very same title which in the Scriptures is accorded to Christ. Thus in an editorial in the Tablet (Roman Catholic) of June 13, 1914, Italy is mentioned as that nation "whose capital is also the center of Christendom, and against the spoliation of which, as the seat of his necessary temporal dominion, Christendom's head, in the person of our High Priest [Italics ours], still makes his dignified protest." It is thus made clear that Roman Catholics regard the Pope as 'our High Priest.'

\* \* \* \* \*

"The center in Christian theology is the mediatorial principle. The center of the Christian system is neither God nor man, but the God-man -- the Mediator. Christianity is the religion of reconciliation. "All religion is union between God and man." But the religion of the Bible is a reunion, a reinstated fellowship. In the accomplishing of this reunion, or reconciliation, Jesus Christ is the sole Mediator. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." Hence the central idea in Christian theology is mediatorial.'" -- "Creation Centered in Christ," H. Grattan Guinness, D. D., London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1896, page 88.

Opening of 10:45 session.

Prayer by Elder Daniells.

Professor Sorenson presented his subject as follows:--

The brethren who have gone before me have dealt with various sections in what appears to me a conclusive manner. It now becomes my part to present the last section, the section of Daniel 11, from verse 40 to the close of the chapter. This is a comparatively easy task of delineating the history of the past century.

It is a fact well recognized that in many lines of thought objections present themselves. It is also well recognized that a subject is not necessarily faulty in its presentation because every objection is not cleared away. In dealing with large questions of religious and historical truth, it is quite possible for certain objections to present themselves to the mind that may remain unanswered for a time. But if the points in favor of a given view are more , and involve more certainty than the objections raised against it, the line of argument will still stand. The nature of the human mind is such that a full, comprehensive view of truth is not arrived at in an instant. Objections that appear insurmountable for the time being may clear themselves later on as truth presents itself to the mind in different relations.

The subject itself I have divided into ten simple, clear, and consecutive topics. My division was given me by the text itself -- the Scripture itself, as I call them off one by one. I only expect to give a very simple, straightforward presentation, and call your attention to some facts that are not obscure in the least, but known to every student of history. And the books I have used are here on the platform, and I would be glad to have you examine them. They are practically all books of recent date of publication. It is not necessary to go to some obscure, unknown history, but go to standard books of reference, books that are recognized as being standard. My first division, then, is --

(1) The Time of the End

This section begins with a very definite time specification -- "At the time of the end." In this same chapter under consideration, in verse 33, we find the people of God spoken of:

"And they that understand among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days. . . .

"And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end: because it is yet for a time appointed." (Verse 35.)

An appointed time during which the people of God would suffer affliction at the hands of the papal persecutors is repeatedly referred to, both in the prophecies of Daniel and also in connection with those of Revelation. In every instance that refers to a time when the Papacy received power to exercise dominion over God's law and over

God's people; the period beginning with 533-38, continuing 1260 years, and terminating with the momentous events of the French Revolution and the captivity of the Pope, from 1793-98. In Great Controversy, on page 356, we find the following quotation concerning the time of the end:

"This is especially true of the book of Daniel. But that part of his prophecy which related to the last days, Daniel was bidden to close up and seal 'to the time of the end.' Not till we reach this time could a message concerning the Judgment be proclaimed, based on a fulfillment of these prophecies. But at the time of the end, says the prophet, 'many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.' . . .

"Martin Luther placed the Judgment about three hundred years in the future ~~in~~ from his day. But since 1798 the book of Daniel has been unsealed, knowledge of the prophecies has increased, and many have proclaimed the solemn message of the Judgment near."

Thus we have located, first in the language of the Scriptures themselves, the duration of time which would terminate in the time of the end. With this interpretation, held by this people since its very beginning, clearly coincides the teaching of the Spirit of Prophecy as just read.

## (2) The King of the South

"At the time of the end shall the king of the South push at him." The pronoun "him" in this case is not difficult to locate. It clearly finds its antecedent in the willful infidel king introduced in the 36th verse. This king has conclusively been established, by Professor Lacey, as being France at the time of its revolutionary experience. The Great Napoleon was simply a child of the revolution. He was a young unknown lieutenant of artillery during the opening years of the revolution. As the general commanding the Italian armies of that movement he mounted to fame. His work in Italy was finished by the Treaty of Campo

Formio in 1797. The great enemy of the French Revolution was England. The revolutionary leaders realized that their cause would not be secure unless it were possible for them to break the sea power of England and cripple that country. Napoleon was appointed commander in chief of the army of invasion. He went down to inspect the preparations made for carrying an army of invasion across the channel. He clearly saw that the time had not come yet, and therefore he persuaded the Directory to send him in command of an adequate force to conquer Egypt from the Mamelukes, and by the reopening of the Suez Canal provide a way to India whereby that colonial possession might be wrested from England as the first step toward her downfall.

I will call attention to the map that stands before us, and locate these places. That is what makes my task so very simple -- it is merely a matter of location, geographical situations, and present some facts from history, because the time assigned to me is brief. France was carrying on a great propaganda. It was not merely infidelity; not merely Bolshevism pacific, but Bolshevism militant; socialism and infidelity in a militant frame of mind; trying to carry their doctrines by force. The great instrument under God for law and order has been England -- England has been the great force for law and order. And the great question was, how to cross the channel and take England. Naturally the Directory would say it could not be done; it was not possible. Napoleon had finished his campaign in Italy, as leading general of the Revolution. Instead of crossing over, Napoleon saw this task was entirely

too large, and he took 40,000 men and landed at Alexandria. The idea was to later get an adequate force, reopen the Suez Canal, and thereby send fresh forces down and conquer India, which had recently been in possession of the British and had passed into the hands of the English during the preceding fifty years. The idea was to reopen the Suez Canal, have access to the British fleets passing to India, and thereby conquer India and cripple England, and in time break her power, and so enfeeble her as to take possession without let or hindrance.

The king of the South in the early part of this chapter is located in Egypt, the division of Alexander's Empire established by Ptolemy. At the time under consideration, 1798, Egypt was to all practical purposes an independent dominion, controlled by the Mamelukes, a military aristocracy governed by two beys. The historian Rose, in his "Life of Napoleon," edition of 1901, on pages 171, 173, well states the situation:

"For this seizure of neutral territory he offered no excuse other than that the Beys, who were the real rulers of Egypt, had favored English commerce and were guilty of some outrages on French merchants. He strove, however, to induce the Sultan of Turkey to believe that the French invasion of Egypt was a friendly act, as it would overthrow the power of the Mamelukes, who had reduced Turkish authority to a mere shadow. This was the argument which he addressed to the Turkish officials, but it proved to be too subtle even for the oriental mind fully to appreciate. Bonaparte's chief concern was to win over the subject population, which consisted of diverse races. At the surface were the Mamelukes, a powerful military order, possessing a magnificent cavalry, governed by two Beys, and scarcely recognizing the vague suzerainty claimed by the Porte," — meaning the Turkish government.

This same independent state of Egypt is well set forth by the historian J. C. McCoan, in "Egypt As It Is," pages 75, 76:

\*The conquest of the country by Sultan Selim I, in 1517, abolished the Mameluke dynasty, but did not establish in its stead the full sovereignty of the Porte (meaning the Turkish Government). The great military aristocracy of the beys remained in unweakened force, and the conqueror was fain to conclude with them a regular treaty by which Egypt was constituted in effect a republic, feudally subject to the sultan and his successors, but the government of which was still left in the hands of the Mameluke chiefs, acting as a council of regency under a pasha, whose almost only function was to receive and remit to Constantinople the stipulated tribute, and who was himself deposable at will by this Mameluke divan. The beys also retained the right of electing their own chief, who, in concert with his fellows, levied taxes, maintained an army, coined money, and otherwise exercised supreme authority over the country. Shadowy as was the sovereignty thus left to the Porte, it became, if possible, still more unreal during the domestic turbulence and foreign wars of the succeeding reigns, until, in 1763, the then dominant bey refused payment of the tribute, expelled the resident pasha, and proclaimed himself 'Sultan of Egypt and Lord of the Two Seas.' -(This is more than twenty years before the time of the end.) Although this revolt was not successful, the Porte gladly compounded the treason by reconfirming the disaffected chiefs in their old powers; and the deposition of its representative, by the simple fiat of the beys, became thenceforward an incident of almost yearly occurrence. To this merely nominal suzerainty had the authority of the sultan been reduced when, in 1798, the French invasion under Bonaparte for three years extinguished it altogether.\*

### (3) push at Him

This expression designates the warlike situation arising between the armies of the French Revolution and the country of Egypt in the year 1798. The word itself does not necessarily indicate the nature of the onslaught; whether they came together in feebleness or in might is not indicated by the unvarying use of the word itself, as pointed out by Gesenius in his lexicon. It often represents simply a state of war.

(4) Reasons for Napoleon's Presence in Egypt

The preceding verses have clearly set before us the events transpiring in revolutionary France. When that nation whose rulers had so long maintained the power of the Papacy aroused itself, and under revolutionary influences and under different leadership, inflicted the death stroke on the Papal system, this did more than any other movement in breaking the spell which the Papacy had cast over the minds of men. A few extracts from the standard histories dealing with this subject will set forth the situation as it was in 1798 at "the time of the end." The first is from Dr. J. A. R. Marriott, "The Eastern Question," published by Oxford press in 1917, on pages 150, 151: (Any one who wishes to study the Eastern Question is almost compelled to take this work as the latest and most modern presentation of the subject, written by one of England's foremost scholars and put out by the well known publishers.)

"But it was on Egypt that his attention was really concentrated, and on Egypt mainly as a means to the overthrow of the Empire of England. Talleyrand represented his views to the Directory: 'Our war with this Power (England) represents the most favorable opportunity for the invasion of Egypt. Threatened by an imminent landing on her shores she will not desert her coasts to prevent our enterprise (in Egypt). This further offers us a possible chance of driving the English out of India by sending thither 15,000 troops from Cairo via Suez.'

"It was, however, to the command of the Army of England that Bonaparte was gazetted in November 1797. He accepted it not with an arriere-pensee (any great interest). 'This little Europe,' he said to Bourrienne, 'offers too contracted a field. One must go to the East to gain power and greatness. Europe is a mere mole-hill; it is only in the East; where there are 600,000,000 of human beings, that there have ever been vast empires and mighty revolutions. I am willing to inspect the northern coast to see what can be

done. But if, as I fear, the success of a landing in England should appear doubtful, I shall make my Army of England the Army of the East and go to Egypt."

Quoting again from "Napoleon the First," by Fournier, on page 124, we have the motives for the expedition set forth, and the reasons alleged to the Sultan given:

"The expedition to the Orient was begun with an army of 40,000 of the best soldiers, embarked upon one of the greatest fleets which had ever been equipped by France, and which was designed to assure to the Republic the supremacy on the Mediterranean. The general was accompanied by a staff of a hundred and twenty scholars, mechanics, and engineers, among whom figured Monge and Berthollet, who were to make scientific investigations in that distant country, to prepare the way for projected colonization and to open the necessary waterways. Talleyrand was to follow a little later to enter upon direct negotiations with the Porte and convince the Sultan that the expedition was in nowise aimed against him, but solely against the Mamelukes, who, despising his suzerainty, were governing Egypt like independent princes."

On page 129 of the same author we have the proclamation given by Napoleon to the inhabitants of Egypt:

"Bonaparte, having taken Alexandria on the 2nd of July, likewise addressed himself to the inhabitants of the country. In a proclamation rendered into the Arabic he represented himself as the friend of the Sultan come to destroy his enemies the Mamelukes and to deliver the Egyptian people from their tyranny. He proclaimed the equality of all men before God, the same God whom he recognized in the Koran; and in order to awaken more completely the confidence of the population and counteract the precepts of the Koran which forbade submission to any nation not of the faithful, he declared that the French were true Mussulmans, and adduced in evidence the fact that they had vanquished the Pope and annihilated the Knights of Malta. All this was hardly likely to make any great impression upon the dull sensibilities of the Fellaheen. They submitted to the new invasion as to any other domination. The actual enemy with which Bonaparte had to contend was the cavalry of the Mamelukes."

This clearly sets forth the fact that Napoleon's campaign was not primarily directed against the people of Egypt, but against the Mamelukes, the governing power of the country. If the Mamelukes had not sought to maintain themselves by military force, Napoleon and the people would

have gotten along well together.

QUESTION: (ELDER BOLLMAN) Could you give us just the reason, the significance, of what you see in that?

ANSWER: The significance to my mind is simply this, Brother Bollman, that the inhabitants of Egypt were not adverse to changing masters, except the Mamelukes and military casts. The people were willing to submit to Napoleon. But the Mamelukes organized themselves and came like a whirlwind down against Alexandria.

QUESTION: What do you see in that?

ANSWER: It is a historical fulfilment of the prediction that at the time of the end the king of the South would push at him. The king of the South is the Mamelukes. If they had given up their dominion there would have been no national uprising against Napoleon; but the Mamelukes organized their forces. And to my mind this is a fulfillment of the specification of the prophecy occurring in 1798 -- that the king of the south shall push at him.

QUESTION (ELDER TAIT): Could you just explain in a word how the king of the South should be pushing at him, when it is manifest that Napoleon was pushing the king of the South?

ANSWER: As we get a little farther along that will clear itself.

(5) The King of the North in 1798

The prophet next introduces the king of the North coming against the French armies like a whirlwind, with chariots and horsemen and with many ships. Who is represented in 1798 as the King of the North? The geographical

designation is one pointed out in the early verses of the chapter, where after the vision of Alexander's Empire that portion lying North of Palestine engaged in the long drawn-out contest with Egypt which was designated as the king of the South. In this particular exposition it was not so much a question who was the king of the North originally, nor who had been the king of the North from time to time, but we have a definite chronological landmark, -- it is "at the time of the end" this king of the North will come with overwhelming forces against the French armies. No one will question but that in 1798 the territory once occupied by in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia by Seleucus and his successors as kings of the north was occupied by the Turkish nation. This power constitutes in this portion of the prophecy the king of the North. This is the power that makes the great onslaught and comes like a whirlwind against the valliant forces of the French. Quoting from the same historians again, Rose's "Life of Napoleon I" page 184, points out the fact that the aggressive step was taken by Turkey as with overwhelming force, sustained by Great Britain and Russia, she swept down through Asia Minor and Northern Syria, in her conflict with the forces under Napoleon's command:

"Meanwhile Turkey had declared war on France, and was sending an army through Syria for the recovery of Egypt, while another expedition was assembling at Rhodes. Like all great captains, Bonaparte was never content with the defensive; his convictions and his pugnacious instincts alike urged him to give rather than to receive the blow; and he argued that he could attack and destroy the Syrian force before the cessation of the winter's gales would allow the other Turkish expedition to attempt a disembarkation at Aboukir. If he waited in Egypt, he might have to meet the two attacks at

once, whereas, if he struck at Jaffa and Acre, he would rid himself of the chief mass of his foes. Besides, as he explained in his letter of February 10th, 1799, to the Directors, his seizure of those towns would rob the English fleet of its base of supplies and thereby cripple its activities off the coast of Egypt. So far, his reasons for the Syrian campaign are intelligible and sound. But he also gave out that, leaving Desaix and his Ethiopian supernumeraries to defend Egypt, he himself would accomplish the conquest of Syria and the East: he would raise in revolt the Christians of the Lebanon and Armenia, overthrow the Turkish power in Asia, and then march either on Constantinople or Delhi."

(6) The Manner in Which Turkey Comes

I have divided this topic under three sub-heads:

(a) Like a whirlwind. All the forces of a great nation aroused to its utmost are hurled against the invader. And I would like to call your attention to the size of the Ottoman power at that time. It was no insignificant situation. The Ottoman Empire at the time of the end reached from the dividing line here, the king of the South, all around the Black Sea, and took in the entire Balkan peninsula. It was a large area to be invaded. Archibald Alison, in his "History of Europe," from 1789 to 1815, edition of 1847, on page 515 gives the whole situation:

"The consequences of the battle of the Nile were to the last degree disastrous to France. Its effects in Europe were immense, by reviving, as will be detailed hereafter, the coalition against its Republican government; but in the East, it at once brought on the Egyptian army the whole weight of the Ottoman Empire. The French ambassador at Constantinople had found great difficulty for long restraining in restraining the indignation of the sultan; the good sense of the Turks could not easily be persuaded that it was an act of friendship to the porte to invade one of the most important provinces of the Empire, destroy its militia, and subject its inhabitants to the dominion of a European power. No sooner, therefore, was the divan at liberty to speak their real sentiments, by the destruction of the armament which had so long spread terror through the Levant, than they gave vent to their indignation. War was formally declared against France, the differences with Russia adjusted, and the formation of an army immediately decreed to restore the authority of the Crescent on the banks of the Nile."

The indignation manifested by the Turks as they mustered all their forces to repel the French, is especially pointed out.

(b) He will come with horsemen.

Quoting again from Alison, pages 531, 532, we see the large number of cavalry, the mainstay of the Turkish forces, which were massed against Napoleon's comparatively small army:

"Meanwhile, the Ottomans were collecting all their forces on the other side of the Jordan to raise the siege. Napoleon had concluded a sort of alliance with the Druses, a bold and hardy race of Christian mountaineers, who inhabit the heights of Lebanon, and only awaited the capture of Acre to declare openly for his cause, and throw off the yoke of their Mussulman rulers. The Turks, however, on their side, had not been idle. By vast exertions, they had succeeded in rousing the Mohammedan population of all the surrounding provinces; the remains of the Mamelukes of Ibrahim Bey; the janizaries of Aleppo and of Damascus, joined to an innumerable horde of irregular cavalry, formed a vast army, which had already pushed its advanced posts beyond the Jordan, and threatened soon to envelop the besieging force. The French troops occupied the mountains of Naplouse, Cana in Galilee, and Nazareth; names forever immortal in holy writ, at which the devout ardour of the Crusaders burned with generous enthusiasm, but which were now visited by the descendants of a Christian people without either interest in, or knowledge of, the inestimable benefits which were there conferred upon mankind.

"Kleber had left Nazareth with all his forces, in order to make an attack on the Turkish camp but he was anticipated by the enemy, who advanced to meet him, with fifteen thousand cavalry and as many infantry, as far as the village of Fouli. Kleber instantly drew up his little army in squares with the artillery at the angles, and the formation was hardly completed when the immense mass came thundering down, threatening to trample their handful of enemies under their horses' hoofs. The steady aim and the rolling fire of the French veterans brought down the foremost of the assailants, and soon formed a rampart of dead bodies of men and horses, behind which they bravely maintained the unequal combat for six hours, until at length Napoleon, with the cavalry and fresh divisions, arrived on the heights which overlooked the field of battle, and amid the multitudes with which it was covered, distinguished his men by the regular and incessant volleys which issued from their ranks, forming steady flaming spots amid the moving throng with which they were surrounded."

Quoting further from the historian Abbott, in

"The Life of Napoleon Bonaparte," Vol. 1, pages 217-219,

we hear more of the numbers of the horsemen and chariots which the Turks sent against Napoleon:

"Napoleon had been engaged for ten days in an almost incessant assault upon the works of Acre when the approach of the great Turkish army was announced. It consisted of about thirty thousand troops, twelve thousand of whom were the fiercest and best-trained horsemen of the world. . .

"Kleber was sent forward with an advance guard of three thousand men. Napoleon followed soon after with three thousand more.

"As Kleber, with his little band, defiled from a narrow valley at the foot of Mt. Tabor, he entered upon an extended plain. It was early in the morning of the sixteenth of April. The unclouded sun was just rising over the hills of Palestine, and revealed to his view the whole embattled Turkish host spread out before him. The eye was dazzled with the magnificent spectacle, as proud banners and plumes, and gaudy turbans and glittering steel, and all the barbaric martial pomp of the East were reflected by the rays of the brilliant morning. Twelve thousand horsemen, decorated with the most gorgeous trappings of military show, and mounted on the fleetest Arabian chariots, were prancing and curveting in all directions. . . The French, too proud and self-confident to retreat before any superiority in numbers, had barely time to form themselves into one of Napoleon's impregnable squares, when the whole cavalcade of horsemen, with gleaming sabers, and hideous yells, and like the sweep of the wind --- (it seems very strange to me that the historian, not a Bible student, should so accurately describe the things mentioned in the 11th chapter of Daniel. Somehow it impressed me profoundly as I read it) -- like the sweep of the wind came rushing down upon them. Every man in the French squares knew that his life depended upon his immobility, and each one stood, shoulder to shoulder with his comrades, like a rock."

(c) With many ships.

This is pointed out by the prophecy as being one of the features of the campaign worthy of note. The Turks themselves have not been known in history as a sea-faring people, but in this connection the fleets both of Russia and of England, joined themselves with the Turks in their desperate attempt to break the power of the revolutionary armies. Quoting from Alison's "History of Europe," Vol. 1, page 517, we see the strange combination made between the Turk and the fleet of their former enemy, Russia:--

"Among the many wonders of this eventful period, not the least surprising was the alliance which the French invasion of Egypt produced between Turkey and Russia, and the suspension of all the ancient animosity between the Christians and Mussulmans in the pressure of a danger common to both. This soon led to an event so extraordinary, that it produced a profound impression even on the minds of the Mussulman spectators. On the 1st of September, a Russian fleet, of ten ships of the line and eight frigates, entered the canal of the Bosphorus, and united at the Golden Horn with the Turkish squadron; from whence the combined force, in presence of an immense concourse of spectators, whose acclamations rent the skies, passed under the walls of the seraglio, and swept majestically through the classic streams of the Hellespont. The effect of the passage of so vast an armament through the beautiful scenery of the straits, was much enhanced by the brilliancy of the sun, which shone in unclouded splendour on its fullspread sails; the placid surface of the water reflected alike the Russian masts and the Turkish minarets; and the multitude, both European and Mussulman, were never weary of admiring the magnificent spectacle, which so forcibly imprinted upon their minds a sense of the extraordinary alliance which the French Revolution had produced, and the slumber in which it had plunged national antipathies the most violent, and religious discord the most inveterate.

"The combined squadrons, not being required on the coast of Egypt, steered for the island of Corfu, and immediately established a rigorous blockade of its fortress and noble harbour, which soon began to feel the want of provisions. Already, without any formal treaty, the courts of St. Petersburg, London, and Constantinople acted in concert, and the bases of a triple alliance were laid, and sent to their respective courts for ratification."

QUESTION: Where is Corfu?

ANSWER: It is an island off the coast of Italy. (referring to map) France occupied a series of islands along here. They wanted to have a series of sub-stations so they could always keep in touch.

It is the size of the fleet that I wish to emphasize by this quotation -- "many ships." They were noted for their many horsemen and camel packs, but when it mentions "many ships" it has an unusual application, and this is designated as one of the landmarks of the application of the prophecy.

Again quoting from the historian, J.C. Abbott,

"The Life of Napoleon Bonaparte," Vol. 1, pages 223, 224,

we have the same matter set forth with greater elaboration:

"One afternoon in Mah 9 the seventh), a fleet of thirty sail (ships) of the line was descried in the distant horizon, approaching Acre. All eyes were instantly turned in that direction. The sight awakened intense anxiety in the hearts of both besiegers and besieged. The French hoped that they were French ships conveying to them succors from Alexandria or from France. The besieged flattered themselves that they were friendly sails, bringing to them such aid as would enable them effectually to repulse their terrible foes. The English cruisers immediately stood out of the bay to reconnoiter the unknown fleet. Great was the disappointment of the French when they saw the two squadrons unite, and the crescent of the Turk and the pennant of England, in friendly blending approach the bay together. The Turkish fleet brought a reenforcement of twelve thousand men, with an abundant supply of military stores. . . .

"A horrible scene of slaughter ensued. The troops from the ships, in the utmost haste, were embarked in the boats, and were pulling as rapidly as possible across the bay to aid their failing friends. Sir Sydney himself headed the crews of the ships, and led them, armed with pikes, to the breach. The assailants gained the summit of a heap of stones into which the wall had been battered, and even forced their way into the garden of the pasha. But a swarm of janizaries suddenly poured in upon them with the keen saber in one hand and the dagger in the other, and in a few moments they were all reduced to headless trunks. The Turks gave no quarter."

In these various specific details given by the prophet which are fully met by the events of the time, we see a minute and specific series of fulfillments of the delineations of the prophecy. Our time is specific. The forces engaged are fully described. The geographical locations are pointed out, and to my mind we have a true delineation of the prophecy with the proper events of history applied thereto. We will now turn to the events subsequent to that great campaign so graphically described in the prophetic work.

(7) Re-Conquest of Palestine by Turkey

The king of the North shall come like a whirlwind; he shall enter into the countries; he shall overflow and pass

over. This clearly indicates the victorious outcome of the Turkish aggression.

In verse 41, the prophet continues in reference to the king of the North, that he shall enter into the glorious land, the land of Palestine, and many countries shall be overthrown. By the aid of Russia and England, Turkey was fully enabled to repel the invaders and to reestablish herself in all her previously held positions. Not only was she able to reestablish herself with a power equal to that which she had held at the time of the end in 1798, but she obtained a new lease of life. Her grip on the adjacent territories was not only continued, but extended.

#### The Escape of Arabia

"These shall escape out of his hand, even Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon." These designations describe in Biblical language the people of the Arabian peninsula. The Beduin tribes of that country were not subdued by the conquering Turk. Feeble steps were taken from time to time to bring them into subjection, but without avail. The religious bond of Mohammedanism continued to be held in common by the two bodies of people, but of political union there was none worthy of mention.

Now I merely quote a few extracts from the Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition, Vol. 11, page 270, (this book was published only a few years ago), in describing the government of Arabia, it points out very clearly the fact above mentioned:

"The provinces of Hejaz and Yemen are each administered by a Turkish governor-general, with headquarters at Taif and Sana respectively; the country is nominally divided up into divisions and districts under minor officials, but Turkish rule has never been acquiesced in by the inhabitants, and beyond the larger towns, all of which are held by strong garrisons, Turkish authority hardly exists. The power Bedouin tribes of Hejaz have always asserted their independence, and are only kept quiet by the large money payments made them by the sultan on the occasion of the annual pilgrimage to the holy cities. A large part of Asir and northern Yemen has never been visited by Turkish troops, and such revenues as are collected, mainly from vexatious customs and transit duties, are quite insufficient to meet the salaries of the officials, while the troops, ill-fed and their pay indefinitely in arrears, live on the country as best they can."

From this quotation we see that down to the present time to the outbreak of the great European War, Turkey was never able to subdue that peninsula nor bring her people into any semblance of submission. As we all know, since the war developed, an independent principality has been established in the Arabian Peninsula under British protection.

(8) Dominion Over Egypt

In the 42nd and 43rd verses the prophet continues:

"He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt; and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps."

(You see the Mamelukes positively passed out of existence --that feudal order that had lasted 600 years, passed out as Turkey swept on in conquest.)

We will begin with the last specification. Libya and Ethiopia are divisions of Africa lying the former West and the latter South of Egypt. The modern name of this stretch of territory South of Egypt is now called the Sudan. This district was early subdued by the Turkish governor of Egypt at great expense to himself. The events fulfilling that prophecy are graphically described by Mr. Cameron, in his "Egypt in the Nineteenth Century," page 114:

"This expedition started in February, 1820, and after a desperate battle, completely succeeded in its object. Siwa was permanently annexed to Egypt, while certain Europeans surveyed the district, and furnished the accurate information published by Jomard in 1823.

"The main expedition for the Sudan left Cairo in July 1820, and consisted of 3,400 infantry, 1,500 cavalry, some artillery, and a contingent of 500 friendly Ababdeh Arabs. As it passed Wadi Halfa, the remnants of the Mamelukes, who had been driven South by Ibrahim, the pasha's eldest son, and who had informed their order, or camp, at the place now known as Dongola, broke into two parties, the one surrendering to the Egyptians, while the other retired into Kordofan. Old Ibrahim Bey had recently died, and with him the famous order, which had ruled Egypt for six centuries, definitely ceased to exist.

"Leaving the White Nile, he proceeded up what was then held to be the main stream, and arrived at Sennar, where the Sultan Bady paid him homage, and was appointed the viceroy's agent. The short campaign had been entirely successful, and Ismail sent down thousands of slaves to Assouan, where a military camp was being formed for a drilling of the new army.

"Meanwhile, the viceroy had sent a third expedition under his son-in-law, Mohammed Bey Defterdor, into Kordofan, which province was annexed in 1823."

The expense involved in this and other expeditions was very heavy indeed. The required and constant outlay of money which was not forthcoming from the depleted Turkish treasury, the governor of Egypt not only taxed his provinces for all that was possible, but he completely confiscated the land and practically laid claim to all the income of the country. Mr. Paton in his

"History of the Egyptian Revolution," Vol. II, pages 26, 27, gives specific evidence of this policy, as is also given by Mr. Cameron in his history on page 90:

"Having drained the treasury by these expenses, he levied a benevolence of 40,000 pounds (\$200,000) on the Copts, and raised 250,000 pounds (more than a million dollars) by an extra tax on the fellahen."—Cameron.

You remember the Scripture says that the treasures of Egypt shall come to him. Here we have the historical evidence of that specification.

"It was in the years 1808-10 that Mohammed Ali effected a revolutionary transfer of landed property in Egypt. Not content with greatly increasing the taxes on the soil, he ordered an inspection to be made of all title-deeds; and, on one pretext or another, his agents objected to their validity,--contesting the legitimacy of the successions, imposing additions to the land tax, and in a great multitude of instances retaining the title-deeds, which were burned. A few influential sheiks were spared; but, wherever the government chose, the land, for want of titles, gradually lapsed to the Miri; so that in a few years the pasha became landlord of nearly the whole of the soil of Egypt, some insignificant annuities being granted in compensation. Mohammed Ali's elevation to power was, as already said, founded on public opinion; but his first acts, after the consolidation of his rule, were the most flagrant defiance of public opinion, and of the sacred rights of private property in the modern annals of Egypt."

(9) Tidings Out of the North and Out of the South

Shall Trouble Him.

That expression very fittingly describes the international outlook of the Turkish nation from the time of the expulsion of Napoleon to the present day. The friendship professed by the Russian government was only a pretense. It was merely a means leading to the subduing of the upstart Napoleon. After the settlement of European affairs by the Conference of Vienna in 1815, Turkish history has been one of continual retrogression. Before this body of men one would scarcely

need to go into the elaborate details possible to set forth the different campaigns in which Russia, the great threatening monster of the North, has sought to enhance her own fortunes at the expense of the Sick Man of the East. At the outbreak of the great world war in 1914, it was on the offered help of Germany that Turkey was leaning when she entered the great contest. Germany had all the trouble she wanted nearer home, and small and feeble was the aid she was able to send to her Turkish Ally. By the Treaty of London, concluded between the Allied Forces in the early part of the war, definite assignment of Constantinople and all European Turkey was made to Russia as her part of the spoils. Fearful must have been her outlook as she watched the contest among the Western European nations. An allied victory would certainly mean to her the awful troubles she had anticipated from the North. On the other side, as she turned her eyes to the East, up the Mesopotamian valley, fighting its way with dogged persistency, step by step pressed the British army under General Townsend. The temporary reverses at Kut el Mara was only a lull in the storm that was coming. Soon reinforcements arrived under the British, captured Bagdad, and continued their victorious march up the Tigris and Euphrates basis, until in time they were joined by the victorious forces of General Allenby sweeping up from Egypt. And there she stands at the present moment, not knowing what to expect either from the East or from the North.

(10) Help

In verse 45, the closing statement is, "Yet he shall come to his end and none shall help him." A fair inference from this is that from time to time help has been given to the Turkish power whereby the long expected end has been deferred from time to time. Grave have been the consequences to the world's peace as the statesmen have contemplated the driving of the Turk out of his European possessions. Time after time, in order to avoid greater calamities, help has been extended to him. Sometimes France has been the supporter. Again, as in the Crimean War, the chief support came from England and Sandinia. It looked in the year 1840 as though Turkey was in her last dotage and must ~~forever~~ forever renounce her place as an independent and sovereign state in Europe. She was wholly unable at that time to subdue her rebellious subjects in Egypt. Her admiral had deserted, carrying the entire Turkish fleet into Egyptian harbors. The great Powers intervened with the consent of the Turkish government and settled the conflict. By the Peace of Paris, concluded on March 30, 1856, at the termination of the Crimean War, the following clause, quoting from "The Eastern Question" by Marriott, page 245, was inserted whereby Turkey was again given her place as a nominal independent nation among nations:

"1. The Sublime Porte was formally admitted, on the invitation of the six powers (including the King of Sandinia), to 'participate in the public law and concert of Europe,' and the Powers engaged severally to respect, and collectively to guarantee 'the independence and the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire.'

"2. The Sultan, 'in his constant solicitude for the welfare of his subjects,' announced to the Powers his intention to ameliorate their condition 'without distinction of creed or race'; but the powers, while recognizing

'the high value of this communication,' expressly repudiated the 'right to interfere, either collectively or separately,' in the internal affairs of Turkey."

Dr. Marriott's comments on these clauses as given on page 247, are of interest in this connection:

"Of the other results of the war the most obvious was the new lease of life secured to the Ottoman Empire. The Sultan was to have his chance, free from all interference, friendly or otherwise, from his powerful neighbor, to put his house in order. He could enter upon his task with renewed self-respect, for was he not at last admitted to the most polite society of Europe? and his subjects should realize the spontaneity of his beneficence; if he chose to persecute, it was his affair; the Powers had expressly repudiated the right of interference; equally, if he chose to extend civil or religious liberty, the extension was the outcome of his own loving-kindness towards his people. Such was the formal position secured to the Ottoman Empire by the Treaty of Paris."

Later on it appeared to the greedy Sultan that the German Kaiser was a more profitable support on whom to lean. Strength and support had been promised from that direction. The young Turk movement was wholly under German domination. Great commercial concessions were granted to German corporations, and the wistful outlook of the Kaiser to a great kingdom in the East was only thwarted by the war just closed. From every part of the European continent, first by one great nation, then by another, help has been given to that power.

The sure word of prophecy points out that as he plants the tabernacles of his palace near the city of Jerusalem, and comes to his speedy end, it will be because the patience of all Europe has been exhausted. No other nation will extend any further help to the long decayed power.

A general observation on the interpretation of this prophecy may well be in order. As has already been pointed out by others, the parallallism between the prophecies of Daniel and the prophecies of Revelation are very striking. The work of the French Revolution is clearly indicated in the pages of the book of Revelation. It is one of the fundamental laws of Old Testament interpretation that the Old Testament must be interpreted in the increasing light shed upon it by the new. As students of the prophecies, we are all agreed in assigning a leading part in the prophecy of Revelation to the events of the French Revolution and the closing scenes of the drying up of the Turkish power. Since we are all agreed about this application in the book of Revelation, why may we not also believe that the great God of heaven, who reveals his secrets unto his servants the prophets, has given us a similar line in the book of Daniel.

This view, now concluding the prophecies of this great chapter, traces down the unfolding of events as pointed out by prophecy from the days of the prophets down to the closing scenes of earth's history. The great climax of this prophecy is not the drying up of Turkey; the climax is properly found in the 12th chapter, the 1st verse, where in language of power and beauty the prophet announces:

"And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

We naturally look with favor on any prophetic interpretation which gives us certainty along our progress and points us to the glad consummation of our hope. For seventy years we have stood before the world as a people who have their loins girded about, and their lamps burning, waiting for their Lord's return. The interpretation pointed out leads us to that glorious event. Any other view of that prophecy leads us into the field of uncertainty. Many and varied events must yet take place before the coming of that blessed day, according to other views. The view we are now studying leaves us only one event yet to be fulfilled. The first part of verse 45 points out the last closing scene in the great chain of landmarks of the prophecy: "He shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain." In the language of the Revelator, chapter 16, verses 12 to 15, we find the parallel of this prophecy. The River Euphrates is dried up. In connection with that, great troubles and distress will come upon the nations; the kings of the East ~~will~~ will come, and as a last warning admonition the voice of the coming King is heard, saying: "Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments." Well may the waiting church reply, as her heart is cheered by the unfolding of the word of prophecy, "Even so, come Lord Jesus."

\*\*\*\*\*

## DISPOSITION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

ELDER DANIELLS: It is time to adjourn. The committee to decide what shall be done with the manuscript which these stenographers have been producing has asked that it shall have the afternoon for its work. This is a very important matter. Many have come to me and asked if they could get these manuscripts, and some have expressed a willingness to pay for the reproduction. We have appointed a committee to bring us some counsel. You are the conference, what do you say? Do you realize the labor and the expense that will be involved in reproducing this matter? Brother Knox is chairman of the committee, and in speaking about it we thought it would be well to just ask the conference to consider it. It seems as though we might get some suggestions from this body, so we could see what meets the general mind.

ELDER F. W. WILCOX: I have a suggestion. It seems to me that it would be practically impossible to reproduce all the papers and all the discussions, but it seems to me that if each one who has given a paper could present an outline of his study, and let that outline be duplicated and furnished to the members of the conference, that would be the best that can be done.

ELDER DANIELLS: Do you mean, have Brother Prescott take his studies and reproduce them as he wants to have them appear, and M. C. Wilcox the same, and Brother Lacey, and all the studies given?

ELDER WILCOX: That would eliminate all discussion.

ELDER UNDERWOOD: I do not think there is very much

question in regard to the presentation of some of these topics, but you take the Eastern Question, that is a vital question. You say it is going to cost something to reproduce this matter. It has cost us something to come here -- some of us, large delegations have come from one end of this country -- clear over from the Pacific to the Atlantic, and from the South and the North, and we are spending our valuable time, which represents not simply thousands of dollars, but a good many thousands of dollars in expense; and it seems to me that we should have this. The cause cannot afford, and these men cannot afford to have these historical facts that have been presented in these papers for our study lost sight of. The matter furnished has been a help on both sides.

ELDER WILCOX: I think Brother Prescott's studies will appear in the Review.

E.R. PALMER: How would this do: For those who have presented their studies to ~~xxxxxx~~ reduce them as much as they can, possibly, and preserve the clear lines of ~~xx~~ thought, and then to put it on the linotype and pull simply galley proofs sufficient for a certain number of the committee, and not carry it any further from that point. I suppose you do not want it circulated as a book or pamphlet, because it does not agree with anything or anybody.

ELDER WAKEHAM: It seems to me this is one of the reasons why we ought to have it in form so we can study both sides intelligently and be able to compare notes. I know it would be a heavy cost, and yet I believe we would pay quite a large sum of money to get just what we have been having here.

ELD. DANIELLS: Your suggestion applies to the whole of the manuscript?

ELD. WAKEHAM: No, I do not think that. I think we ought to have it quite complete.

ELD. DANIELLS: Of course we could reduce it very much by rigid editing, so we could get all the facts stated and cut out a lot of unnecessary verbiage.

E. R. PALMER: Permit me to say further that it seems to me this is a matter that we cannot afford to save money on. I think this is a matter along the same line as making the "Source Book." We spent \$5000 in just preparing the manuscript for that book. It is worth more than money. And there are some of these things that I think we ought to have before us for study. It could be reduced half the material in hand, and make it a great blessing by doing so.

ELDER KNOX: Brother Palmer's suggestion was to pull a few proof sheets. Are we clear as to how the matter of circulation is to be handled. If it is only to be furnished to a few, how are we to decide who should have it and who should not. I have no doubt that before we leave this room there would be many requests for a copy, and many more requests would come from people outside of this room.

ELDER WILCOX: I would raise the question, if the report is to be published in that way, if it would be advisable to issue it to any but ordained ministers in this conference.

ELDER WILKINSON: There is considerable agitation going on in the field, and when we go out to camp-meetings

M

40-j

7-16

our ministers everywhere are clamoring for a report of these things, and it does seem to me that we should have something to answer them.

ELDER BRANSON: That is the way I feel about it, because every minister is going to require of us at least a synopsis of what was discussed here. It seems to me that if they could have the matter firsthand, in printed form, it would be infinitely better than for every person who has been here to either try to tell it or give it in his own words, because he will not give a clear vision of either side of the question in that way. It seems to me the only way to help the brethren who are not here is to give them a clear statement of this whole situation in some printed form.

ELDER PRESCOTT: That would practically mean publishing it in book form. And if you publish it in book form, why did you object to anybody and everybody coming here? You were very insistent about that.

ELDER DANIELLS: I do not think it was to keep the people from knowing what we said that we advised that, but in order that it would be manageable, and so that we could freely follow our studies without interruption, it was thought best to confine the number to a few.

ELDER PRESCOTT: There is no objection to publishing everything that has been said here, as far as I am concerned, but it is a question of what it would mean. I would express the hope that if we do publish it we would not publish simply the things about which we do not agree, and so carry the idea that this conference was simply a discussion of disputed points,

or arguments over points of difference, and that the absolutely fundamental things were overshadowed by other things; but that it was not merely a conference to show our differences, but really to show our unity on fundamental things, and that there exists a spirit of unity and charity even about things on which we do not agree. I think we should be careful about how we handle the matter in any publication.

ELDER UNDERWOOD: I think if we publish this in pamphlet form it will be used against us, even though an explanation may be made.

ELDER TAIT: It seems to me that we have not reached the place yet in the study of these questions where we ought to be willing to throw them out all through the field for general discussion. This is what it would amount to if we were to publish it and scatter this publication widely, as has been suggested by some of the brethren. Personally I believe very strongly in the instruction that has been given to us through the Spirit of prophecy over questions of this kind; that where there are questions among the brethren that groups should get together, something as we have done here, and should study over these questions, and pray over them, until they are united, and then ~~xxx~~ present a united report. I fear the very thing that Professor ~~xxxx~~ Prescott suggested, and was feeling some of these sentiments very strongly. I think it would be very proper for us to go to considerable expense, as Brother Palmer has suggested, to make this matter available for us, for still further study of these questions among men who have been here, and if they are not here, that can be taken into this study. But it would be an easy matter

an  
for us to print something which would give ~~the~~ impression  
which positively is not true. I believe there is no man  
here this morning but that has more faith now in this old  
message than he has ever had in all its existence. The thing  
stands on a permanent foundation. We have been discussing  
the things the brethren present, the strongest things in the  
matter of the king of the North, but I can see nothing that  
convinces me of the error, of the position we have taken  
all along the way. There are things I would like to have  
cleared up. There are many questions I would like to ask.  
The matter is not all clear to me at all, but it is not  
vital and fundamental. There are questions in connection with  
that old theory (I do not speak of it disrespectfully), but  
the idea that we have held to, which are puzzling me, and I  
do not see the why of it, and I would like to have the  
matter for further study; but I do not think it advisable  
to put it out in a general way, where in one place they will  
take one view of the matter, and in another place take  
other views.

PROF. WIRTH: I feel as Brother Tait and others  
have expressed, that it is a rather hazardous thing to  
throw this out all over. Students came to me before I came  
away and wanted me to promise to tell them all about this  
conference, and I have received letters from them saying they  
want me to tell them all about it when I get back. We are  
going to be besieged with such requests. I am not going to  
tell them everything about it. I am going to ask the Lord  
to give me wisdom. Because I do not think they are ready.

I shall feel very badly if they get hold of this thing. One would take one side and one another. While I would like to have this for myself, yet candidly I doubt the wisdom of letting immature minds get hold of this. I would like to guide these students, and use wisdom in handling the matter, and I do not think it would be well for them to get hold of the things in the free way they have been discussed here.

PROF. WALDORF: I only want to suggest that a limited number of copies be published and sent to each school, where the teacher can have them and refer to them. I think that would be a good way.

At this point it was moved by Elder Underwood, and seconded by Elder Tait, that the subject of "The Spirit of Prophecy" be considered this evening, as it was understood some will not be here tomorrow night.

ELDER G. B. THOMPSON: I think that the publishing of this matter would sow seeds of division and discord, and as far as I am concerned, I am not in favor of sending out anything.

ELDER DANIELLS: It is all right to throw things out in the field, and then to try to smuggle them is another thing. I think that our brethren who have exercised so much freedom, and have cut away from their mooring places, ought to consider the trouble that it is going to make, and follow the counsel that is given. I believe when we get through with it all we shall find the counsel of the Spirit of God good wise counsel, that there is common sense in it,

and that we will do well to adhere to it. But I confess it is going to take more wisdom than we have to pilot our way through without damage to the work. As has been stated, these are not the fundamental things. We can all get through to heaven if we never understand all these questions. All of us have had good Christian experiences and have led thousands of people into this truth. But now the result of such freedom which has been taken has brought us into a perplexing situation, and now we must have wisdom to go through. I sometimes think it would be just as well to lock this manuscript up in a vault, and have any one who wishes to do so come there for personal study and research.

VOICE: That is my impression.

ELDER PALMER: Recalls his suggestion to furnish galley proofs, in view of the situation involved.

ELDER KNOX: The committee will take into consideration the discussion which has been brought out, but I would like to express my feelings now: The reasons stated why this institute should be a strictly limited one, based on the instruction we have from the Spirit of God, considering that we were going to take up the study of questions that we were not agreed upon, then I hold that the same reasons would cause us to refrain from scattering the report of the conference. Now there will be enough feeling upon the part of our brethren who are not here, who feel that they have been excluded from this study, so we need not take any step in the future to intensify this feeling by withholding from them what they know will be put in some

kind of a permanent form. I believe it would be better not to print it at all, or else we ought to be willing to face criticism and send it out to them. The latter, I am sure you will all agree with me, would be a wrong step to take.

901

ELDER F.M. WILCOX: I would like to make this further suggestion that there be gotten out a brochure containing the historical extracts alone, that have been read in this convention, and furnish this to any one who wishes it, but <sup>and</sup> that all the discussion of the papers be not printed.

Adjournment

KNOX: The first subject for discussion this afternoon, as I understand it, is the Mediation of Christ. Brother Prescott, have you anything to say before we enter upon the discussion?

WILKINSON: Brother Chairman, I would like to make a statement. On the ground which Brother Prescott covered this morning, I thought there seemed to be in the minds of some, the wrong impression from my paper. They seemed to think I was endeavoring to make the French Revolution a bigger thing than the Papacy. That was not the idea, and I stated in my paper that the Papacy not only had a place, but a great place, but what I was obliged to do and tried to do, and plead guilty of trying to do, was that in verses 36-39 of Daniel 11, I tried to make the French Revolution bigger than the Papacy because there I believe it is bigger than the Papacy. In regard to the statement Brother Prescott made this morning about the interpretation of 2 Thess 2, where it says he shall sit in the temple of God and exalt himself above everything that is called God and worshiped, I have always adhered to the view given by Mead in the 2nd century where it is pointed out very clearly that 2 Thess. 2, can be understood by following the lead of the words "Son of perdition". The Lord shall not come except there come a falling away first and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition. He pointed out that the first son of perdition was Judas. There are only two in the New Testament. The second one is Antichrist, and Judas was a type of Antichrist, and is the title used in 2 Thess. 2, therefore Mead goes back and shows that the antitypical Judas, or Antichrist, would follow the typical one, that is Judas, and would base his claim to being God by the succession of apostolicity,--by apostolic succession. He would base it on that like Judas did, and on possessing the bishopric. When Judas lost it and they were electing a successor for the bishopric of Judas, it shows that they ~~recognized~~ looked upon

Then the antitypical son of perdition will base his claim to sit in the temple of God showing himself that he is God on apostolic succession and on holding a bishopric, and that is exactly what Rome does. In view of that I may claim that he shall exalt himself, referring to the Pope of Rome, above every other God except of course the God upon whom he bases the claim of a bishopric.

But in the case of the French Revolution, it exalted itself against every god. One was counterfeit, the other was rejection. One was covered immorality, the other, uncovered immorality. Consequently, enlarging on that point and making it clear, I still believe that as far as ~~xxxx~~ verses 36-39 in Daniel 11, are concerned, it is in keeping there to bring out the contrast that exists between the French Revolution and the Papacy. On the other hand we all know that all through the Bible there is much attention given to the Papacy that stood up as Antichrist, especially during the 1260 days.

CHARLES THOMPSON: Is there any difference between italicised words in the Old Testament and in the New Testament? I noticed yesterday that in the Old Testament the word "I Am" was in italics and was used right along. In the New Testament, the italicised words are often omitted to get the connection. Is there any difference?

PRESCOTT: No, it is the same principle in both places. The translators inserted words in the translation for which there is no exact word in our language. In Isa, it expresses it "I am he, I am God." But as to the verse, there is no difference whether you read the italicised word or leave it out.

WAKENAM: I would like to have Prof. Prescott or someone who ~~is is~~ has the matter quite clearly in mind, if it doesn't take too long, to state quite definitely what was taken away and when, in the taking away of the daily and establishing the Papacy. What was taken away and when?

WIRTH: Elder Daniells just requested us outside, that if the matter of the Daily were brought up, it be deferred until he is here.

KNOX: Now brethren, there doesn't seem to be anything special on your minds on this subject. How would it do for us to go forward then? Brother Daniells told me the subject of the United States in Prophecy would be brought in by Brother Wakeham during the last period.

U.C. WILCOX: Is there going to be anything more said about the King of the North, Daniel 11?

PRESCOTT: Is U.S. in Prophecy to be the afternoon subject? I thought presentations were to be in the morning and discussions in the afternoon.

F.M. WILCOX: I haven't any very strong partisan opinion about the king of the North, and would suggest that we have discussed it about long enough. We have had both sides presented pretty well and in my judgment it would be well to let the matter rest. We can discuss other things more profitably.

PRESCOTT: I don't want to discuss the matter at all, but in the very able papers presented to the Conference, extracts of such length from various historians have been presented for consideration. The purpose and use of the extracts would be to establish a view which some of us hold as to what will happen in the future to the Turkish power. Long extracts, I believe, have been read and used and long arguments made with considerable force and skill. It occurred to me that while we are discussing here in a very earnest way an interpretation that leads us to the conclusion that in the future Turkey will come to his end at Jerusalem, there are some men over at Paris that

are doing the very thing we are talking about, so I thought if you would allow me to read a little current history along with all the ancient history that has been read, and read what is being done now without regard to what we would do if we had the handling of it, in order to make it come out right, it would be interesting. It is in the Literary Digest for July 12. The subject is "END OF THE TURKISH EMPIRE".

"If shades can laugh, the spirits of Peter the Hermit, Louis IX, and Richard the Lion-Hearted may have joined in an outburst of sardonic mirth the other day when the empire ten crusades failed for three centuries to vanquish sent its Grand Vizier to Paris, and a delegation of Turkish notables along with him. On their way to and from the sessions of the Council of Ten of the Peace Conference in the cloak-room of the Quai d'Orsay, they were required to enter and depart through different doors from those used by the members. As the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post remarks: 'These smooth-speaking gentlemen from the Golden Horn were not envoys of an empire, for it is not yet quite determined whether Turkey is to be considered as still having a national entity.' They visited Paris simply as experts from whom the Council of Ten might obtain information regarding Turkish affairs. While there they sought to exonerate the Sultan from all responsibility for the war, obtain for him the right to remain in Constantinople, and present the views of the Moslem population, which 'desires with equal earnestness the maintenance, on the basis of the status quo ante bellum, of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, which during the last forty years has been reduced to the least possible limits.'

After an interval, remarkable for brevity, as these things go, the Council of Ten advised the emissaries from the Sublime Porte to return thither--which they did, not excepting Grand Vizier Damad Ferid Pasha himself. Nevertheless, the Council had the goodness to answer their petition, and they have carried home a note, in the course of which Mr. Clemenceau says to the Sultan's chief representative:



M.C. WILCOX: I would like to present a few observations of mine on this view of the 11th chapter of Daniel that was given by Elder Wilkinson.

1. If the old view of Daniel is a part of the seeking of the fathers of the message for new light, what can we say of the rejection of the restoration of the Papacy on which the new view was based by Elder Uriah Smith?

2. Would not the very fact that "comment" stands alone with no modifying word in Daniel 11:22 indicate a different comment from the occurrences of the term in verses 28 and 30, where in every case it is modified by the word "holy"? The fact that the first mention is merely "comment" and the next, "holy comment" would naturally indicate that the first covenant was not holy in character. This would not be the case with a simple term that followed in connection with the mention of the holy covenant.

3. The founder of Rome was not Caesar. He helped to develop the empire. But that did not affect the character of Rome, nor does Holy Writ note any change. The Roman power is one, republic, empire, papal, all coming in connection with God's people, symbolized by a little ~~hax~~ horn growing ever greater.

4. A "tenth part of the city" (Rev. 11:13) is made greater and more prominent than the whole of the city, Papal Rome, shall we suspect the theory or its lack of balance? The scope and purpose of Daniel 11 and Revelation 11 are quite different as all Bible students know, which the angel Gabriel is the angel of all Revelation

5. Time of the End. According to the law of first mention the vision of the 2300 ~~ax~~ evenings and mornings fixed the time of the end logically and obviously at the end of the great period, 2300

years. The vision "belongeth to the time of the end," to "the appointed time of the end." And that appointed time is the cleansing of the sanctuary, and the time of the judgment.

The question of Dan. 12:6 is not "How long to the end of the Papal persecution or the oppression of the little horn, but to the end of the wonders, including the resurrection of Verse 1. The answer encourages hope, but gives no definite answer. The days of persecution would end, but no more would be learned till the time of the end. Daniel says, "I heard, but I understood not," and then he asks, and is told that the words are shut up and sealed till the time of the end, the greatest and most important date in the history of redemption. The beginning of hope came even before 1798, for men even then expounded the prophecy, but "since 1844 light from the heaven of heavens has beamed from the open door of the temple of God." E. C. W. in "Signs of the Times", Nov. 1899.

Note the following: "The message itself sheds light as to the time when this movement is to take place. It is declared to be a part of the 'everlasting gospel;' and it announces the opening of the judgment. The message of salvation has been preached in all ages; but this message is a part of the gospel which could be proclaimed only in the last days, for only then would it be true that the hour of judgment had come. The prophecies present a succession of events leading down to the opening of the judgment. This is especially true of the book of Daniel. But that part of this prophecy which related to the last days, Daniel was bidden to close up and seal 'to the time of the end.' Not till we reach this time could a message concerning the judgment be proclaimed, based on a fulfilment of these prophecies. But at the

time of the end, says the prophet, "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." 909

"The prophetic visions of Daniel and John foretell a period of moral darkness and declension [Rev. 14:8]; but at the time of the end, -the time in which we are now living--the vision was to speak and not lie." Vol. V, p. 9,10. See Hab. 2:3[1844]

"They saw that the prophetic periods reached to 1844, and the same evidence which had been presented to show that prophetic periods closed in 1843, proved that they would terminate in 1844. Light from the word of God shone upon the position, and they discovered a tarrying time--"If the vision tarry, wait for it?" E. W. (256)? 247, See Hab. 2:3

"Daniel stood in his lot to bear his ax testimony which was sealed until the time of the end, when the first angel's message should be proclaimed to our world." "These matters are of infinite importance in these last days, but 'many shall be purified, and made white and tried,' the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand." How true this is! Sin is the transgression of the law of God, and those who will not accept the light in regard to the law of God will not understand the first, second, and third angel's messages." Ms. K. 59,90.  
See Great Controversy pp. 355, 356.

In "Views of Prophecy & and \* Prophetic Chronology", selected from Mes. of Wm. Miller, with a memoir of his Life, by Joshua V. Himes, Published by Moses and Doir, 107 Hanover St., Boston, Mass., 1841, in the editor's remark, we read:

"These times' [prophetic periods] are nearly accomplished, as all who believe in prophetic periods agree. Some have fixed upon the year 1863, some 1847, while Mr. Miller fixes upon 1843 as the 'time of the end' We think he has given the more satisfactory demonstra-

tion of the correctness of his calculation."

No particular matter of importance came to the church in the date itself in (798. The overthrow of the Papacy was a noted event, but it gave no light that would stabilize or hold the church in correct views. Not so with the end of the days of Dan. 8. It was the climax of prophetic periods.

6. In the application of the particulars of Dan. 11:38-39 it was stated again and again that the sin of France was more than the Papacy. For France denied God, while the papacy made itself a demigod, or representative of a higher God. But Dan. 7:25 declared, He shall "speak great words against the Most High," Dan. 8:25; "He shall stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand." And other passages are equally strong and clear. The indignation it has been clearly pointed out is not a temporary indignation ~~against~~ against the Papacy, but God's indignation at the end.

Regarding the contrast which was drawn by Elder Longacre between the Syrian King and the Jews, and imperial Rome and the Jews, it is sufficient to say, that in the time of Antiochus IV, who styled himself the god manifest, the Jews were the central light bearers of God in the world, in the holy city and temple, which he was to honor by his own presence in his Son; and that king's attitude toward the Jews was that of a persecutor, and ~~the~~ their sufferings were for the Lord's sake. But ~~ix~~ God's judgment upon the Jews which followed the rejection of his Son was quite a different matter. The greatest persecution the church will ever know was during the 1260 years, but after apostate Christendom rejects Christ in his last message, there will be more apostate Christians slain under God's judgment--

of the true  
millions more than were slain during the dark ages. The one  
is a persecution of the true, the other the judgments of God upon  
those who have utterly identified themselves with sin. It is  
equally true of the Jews before and after the first advent.

Let me say that the proponents of the new view  
do not ignore the persecutions of pagan Rome; the  
little horn of chapter 9, of which chapter, chapters 10 to 11  
are fuller explanations, covers the whole field, both pagan and papal.

There are many other things I would be glad to mention  
if there were time. There are many things in the chapter  
where both sides leave common ground. May I not here record  
the earnest wish that in all our future study we shall  
magnify arguments and minimize differences, and not endeavor  
to appropriate common truth from one side only?

H. C. LACEY: Since I had a little part in the presentation of the new view, I would like to say just a word or two. First, I would like to remind you of what I said at the opening, that this was no choice of mine. It has never been a hobby of mine, but I am bound to say that as soon as my attention was called to it some years ago, there was that in the new view which appealed to me. I have styled myself a student of it from that time to this, and I am still so.

I have listened to the strong--I suppose the strongest--presentation of the new view, and, honestly, I would like to advocate it if I could; but in all that was said on the part of the three men who stood for what they are calling the old view, the essential points were not proved,--or if they were proved I could not catch them. I do hope there will be a writing up of this in a fuller way so that we can get the arguments. I jotted down several little points during the reading of those three papers, but while I was writing those down, they passed on to others. ~~xxxxxxx~~ There has emerged out of the whole thing two or three considerations which I do think bear upon this matter, and this is what I feel.

First, I feel that the citation of a whole mass of history is not a proof of the accuracy of the view. What I mean by that is that the brethren who represent the other view may gather a great mass of citations from history to prove what is going to happen to Turkey, but the important thing is to note the verse where the thought turns, and right there has been the weakness,--verse 14, verse 36, and verse 40 are the turning points, and right there has been the weakness in the old view; and it has not been strengthened here.

You know we are face to face with a false doctrine on the return of the Jews. You listen to some great preacher who believes

in that, and he presents a great mass of evidence to prove his point, and you almost believe in it yourself.

J.N.ANDERSON: He starts with the wrong premise, and the premise is the important thing.

H.C.LACEY: Yes, it is.

C. M. SORENSON: I suppose Brother Lacey will be specific and point out where the failure comes.

H. C. LACEY: I just mention the verses where the weakness appears. You brethren all went so rapidly, and we had no opportunity to break in with you, as you did with us.

Now what we want to do is to get into the original and see what those verses say. I do hope the time will come when there will be a committee of five or six appointed—all scholars in the Greek, and that excludes me—who can give this thing a careful and thorough, but absolutely unbiased and intellectually candid study, following the line of the Hebrew text; then we shall reach more easily the correct ground.

Another thing I could not help noticing was the facility with which the literal language of Daniel 11 can be applied in various ways. If you read Miller's lectures on Daniel 11, you will find that he applies this all to Napoleon Bonaparte, and he expatiates on the wonderful accuracy of the fulfillment. Many apply it to Antiochus ~~Epiphanes~~ Epiphanes, and others apply it to the papacy. This great difference of opinion should lead us to be very magnanimous. The fact is, we must get down to the Hebrew in its original significance and see what it was that Daniel said.

Another thing I want to suggest in closing is that I think we cannot settle this matter here, but that, with minds open for the

reception of truth, we should stand back of what we call the old view in our teaching. I believe we can do that and be perfectly honest. I am a member of the Fireside Correspondence School faculty, and students write in about the old view, and I correct their papers with the old view in mind. Two years ago Brother Daniells had a nice little talk with me at College View, and now I feel that I can honestly, being a member of the denomination that holds certain denominational views,--I feel that I can honestly teach those views, not in any Jesuistic spirit, even though in my own mind and heart I hold the other view.

If you will read concerning the Jewish belief on the state of the dead in the days of Christ, it was exactly the popular belief today, that when you died your spirit was taken where it belonged. If you had been good, it went to heaven, <sup>to a place in Abraham's bosom,</sup> and if you had been bad, it went to a place in hell. Christ was for three and one-half years among those Jews, and I have looked in vain through the gospels for a suggestion that Jesus taught contrary to that accepted view. Not only did Jesus silently ~~xxxxx~~ acquiesce in the views of the time, but he actually endorsed it, for he gave the parable of the rich man and Lazarus.

(LACEY—Cont'd)

In his teaching of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, on the State of the Dead, Christ endorsed a popular misbelief of his day . . . Why? Because the people were not ready to receive the truth. If he could do that, I think I can. I do not say that Jesus taught the error, but he did not correct it. There is no text where Christ said, "Your belief in the state of the dead is wrong." Now what we teach about the state of the dead, is correct. It is in the Bible.

I remember what Brother Daniells said to me that "it is as ~~xxx~~ important to have ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ shepherds of the heart than teachers of the head." We want to live the truth and teach the truth, but, as it was in Christ 's day so it is now, the teaching of the truth may ~~xxx~~ hurt more than ~~xxx~~ if you allow an error to exist. I think even though this Conference can not decide just who the king of the north is, I will hold to the old view anyhow, following the plan of Jesus in teaching the people of his day.

UNDERWOOD: Do you really think Christ endorsed error?

LACEY: ~~Id~~ I do not mean he endorsed the correctness of the popular view on the state of the dead, but he used the system that was in vogue.

PRESCOTT: I will take dvantage of the willingness of the chairman to spend a little time on my theme concerning the "Daily." As you well know, ever presentation of this subject is ~~xxx~~ neutralized or an effort is made to neutralize it, by quoting the view given in Early Writings, and therefore any view that is not in harmony with that is wrong. All I ask is to



ended in 1844. My father and grandfather passed through that time of confusion, and I remember some of it even myself, when they set the time. My father was in what was called "the '54 movement", and I can remember when 1867 was a date set; and there has been time set since that time. The First Adventists have been setting time and there has been great confusion over that question. But there has never been any confusion over the question as to whether the 'daily' was paganism.

(Reading) "The Lord has shown me that the message of the third angel must go, and be proclaimed to the scattered children of the Lord, but it must not be hung on time. I saw that some were getting a false excitement, arising from preaching time; but the third angel's message is stronger than time can be. I saw that this message can stand on its own foundation, and needs not time to strengthen it; and it will go in mighty power, and do its work, and will be cut short in righteousness."

I thought I would like to read that selection .

W W PRESCOTT: Now if you take this language absolutely and don't allow this correction, then the date 1844 is wrong, and 1843 is right.

BOLLMAN: I don't know but what we have gone away from that phase of the thing, but I wanted to speak about Brother Prescott's study this morning. I noticed that he this morning, and Brother Lacey a few days ago, seemed both to go out of their way to make a statement that there was absolutely no way of connecting Rome with Greece as coming out of that one horn of the goat, except seeing it come forth from the battle of Pidna, and issuing there as a candidate for world empire. I must say I was never satisfied with that view. Something over a year ago I made quite a study of it, and I would like to read two or three paragraphs here of what I wrote in regard to it:

"This [the coming forth of a little horn] was literally fulfilled by Rome, and by Rome only. In every essential sense Rome came out of the Macedonian\*Greco horn of the "he goat." Four so-called universal empires have ruled the world, -- Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome. None of these was in reality world-wide or truly universal, except in its potentialities, but each in its turn ruled the world as it was then known to civilization. Every schoolboy has heard that Alexander wept because there was no other world for him to conquer. The story, while probably not true, serves to emphasize the popular conception of the universality of Alexander's rule. The point of this is that the little horn ~~came~~ that came out of one of the four horns of the goat must of necessity come from some actual or potential part of Alexander's empire. As a matter of fact, it did come forth from the Macedon

horn, the most western division of Grecia.

"Rome, in its inception, as Vergil testifies (opening lines of the Aeneid), was colonized by Greeks, reaching the Tiber by way of Troy. Thus, ethnologically, the Romans sprang from the same parent stock as the Greeks. Then, too, the many points of similarity between the Greek and Latin languages point unmistakably to a common origin. Again, from the standpoint of the prophecy, Rome was also closely related to Greece politically and geographically. Lying to the west and peopled by descendants of the original Greek colonists, Rome had much in common with Greece, with whom it was long on the most friendly terms. Dr. Eduard Meyer, professor of ancient history in the University of Berlin, referring to the relations of Greece and Rome, says:

"As a matter of fact, the West [or in other words, the Greek part of Italy] was left [by the mother country] to its own devices. But it presently became evident that the development which there took place, untroubled by interference from without, was fraught with consequences of the utmost moment to the Hellenistic political system. By abstaining from peremptory interference while such interference was yet possible, the Macedonian kingdoms permitted a power to arise in Italy so strong that in a very short time it proceeded to aim a fatal blow at their own existence."

--"The Historians' History of the World," Vol V, p. 1.

"Greece might have reasonably assumed some control of the colonies of her people in Italy, but it seems she did not, and thus they grew into a distinct empire.

"On page two of the same volume, Dr. Meyer adds:

"As early as the sixth century [B.C.], during the Etruscan period, the city of Rome on the Tiber had grown into a large and important community. . . . With the Greeks it was on friendly terms: from of old, Greek civilization had found almost as ready acceptance among the Latins as among the Etruscans, and in the struggle with the latter people Latins and Greeks had fought side by side."

12

On page 2, Dr. William Soltau, professor of ancient history in Zabern, says:

"A steady stream of Greek colonists had been occupying the coast of southern Italy ever since the eighth century B. C., their first settlement dating from two centuries earlier. . . . The population of southern Italy adopted the language, manners, and customs of the Greeks, and in the north the Etruscans served both as exponents of their own peculiar civilization and as intermediaries between the Greeks and the mountain tribes."

It seems to me that those are excerpts from history that we would do well to study, and not be too ready to consent that there is no connection. They say a horn coming out of a goat must be a goat's horn, and that there is absolutely no connection. I believe that the horn was Rome, and that it was settled, so far as it was civilized, by Greek colonies, and finally overthrew the parent state.

NEILSEN: I would like to say a few words in regard to the two positions in regard to the beast power. I don't want to appear egotistical, and yet I feel that I have some things that will help bind those two points together. I believe that there is a way of getting those admittedly weak points together and

not emphasizing them, but rather bringing together the points that we all agree are strong, and emphasizing them.

I believe the beast of Revelation 17 to be a symbol of civil power, the woman to be a symbol of the religious powers. I feel like agreeing with Brother Wilcox that the seven heads take the same beasts as brought to view in Daniel, beginning with Babylon, and that the viewpoint which the prophet had is our present time. That being the case, it will eliminate two of the weak points from the chart here. One of these is this "continue a short space." I hold Babylon is the first head, then Meda-Persia, Grecia, Pagan Rome, and Papal Rome the one that is wounded, the fifth standing in our own time as John was given the vision, five were fallen, one is, and that, remember is the sixth head, which is and yet is not, it is not and yet is. It said of the beast that the beast that was and is not and yet is. There is a time, then, when the beast is not, and while it is Satan to an extent, still in another way it does not exist. The best way I can illustrate that would be to say Here is a glass. Remember the sixth head is not and yet is, for the sixth head is at the time with <sup>when</sup> the beast is not and yet is. Here is a glass. I break it. I may say, that cup was and is not, and yet is because I have the pieces. The sixth head is not, and yet is, because there is no universal kingdom in Europe, church and state united but broken up. In that sense the angel says to John, This sixth one is not in the sense that the others have been and yet is. The seventh will be when Protestantism makes the image to the beast and the papacy is restored so that all the world will wonder after the beast; when that thing takes place and the mark of the

beast is enforced, then there will be a universal power again, which is head number seven. Leaving the tenth horn for the time being, it does not say the beast had eight heads, and yet in another sense it does say so. It says the beast is the eighth and is of the seven. I hold that the beast having the eighth or being the eighth and yet of the seven is after the beast has come out of the bottomless pit. Remember the beast is civil power down through the ages, used by Satan. After the beast ascended out of the bottomless pit I read in Great Controversy that after the one thousand years -- after the resurrection of the wicked there will be a form of government, at least it will be a military form when all the nations of earth, the wicked are massed together, and they are marshalled under generals and captains with Satan as the great general king after the thousand years. That is where I place the eighth which is of the seven. It is not an eighth head really and yet to the prophet it looked as if there were something more. That is Satan's last attempt to make one. Now taking the view that we are living under the sixth, that does away with this weak point which I think was acknowledged as a weak point.

LACEY: No, sir, I did not call that a weak point. Satan himself is the eighth beast.

NEILSEN: Well, then, I think it a weak point. The Devil was in the beginning, and is not now, though he goeth around like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour. But that eliminates that weak point to my mind.

Now then the ten horns in Brother Wilcox's presentation, it seemed to me as if there was rather a weakness where at this point

a

60a

7/16

just before the coming of Christ in saying that the beast which is the eighth was to ~~apply~~ play its part in the seventh head. It was a little difficult for me to understand just how Brother Wilcox meant it, which was the eighth and the seventh, and what the ten horns were to do. Now to my mind it appears that the papacy restored is the seventh head.

NIELSEN: A few things are said about the ten horns which to me must locate them. One is they will be of one mind. They give their power to the beast. They make war against the Lamb, God's people, the 144,000. And during this period of one hour, whether 15 days or 30 days, whatever period it may be, they will also make war against the woman, which is the religious power. Now what may we expect to take place just after the close of probation? This:--The ten horns may be socialistic powers or atheistic powers in Europe that will bind together to enforce the decree against the 144,000 and then they will turn against the 7th head, against the dominating power which is then the 7th head, against the woman, and God has put it in their mind to do it as part of the judgment.

One little thought more. You will remember the beast in Revelation 13, while it may not be ~~not~~ identical with the one of Revelation 17, yet we find it is very much like it, and in Revelation 13 it has the elements of those beasts in Daniel. And so if Revelation is a complement to Daniel, we go back to where Daniel begins and it gives us a scope of the work and where we are is down at the end and what we are to expect is the establishment of the image, papacy, and work of that 7th head, and we as God's people must do our part in giving the third angel's message.

KNOX: What do you want to do? There is really nothing assigned to the next period. How will it do to let Brother Lacey bring in his two or three points and Brother Wilcox ask his question if he has one? If there is work ahead of us, I think we had better rest.

LACEY: I will get through in a moment. We have had brotherly fun in pointing out the weak points and I am always willing to admit the weak points in anything I advocate and I want Brother Nielsen to admit his weak point.

He quoted the text of the beast that was and is not, and yet is, and banked on that "yet is". But none of the Greek texts support that. It is the beast that was and is not, and shall be. You cannot bank on that. It is a very weak point, Brother Nielsen.

You said the 8th head was over in the thousand years, it really was not a head, but as John ~~x~~ looked at it, he thought it was. 7 heads are 7 mountains and they are 7 kings, and the beast, <sup>himself,</sup> he is the 8th. You cannot avoid that.

NIELSEN: There are 7 heads on the beast.

LACEY: Yes, but that is the strong point. The beast is of the 7 heads, but he himself is the 8th head,—that is Satan. Satan personified, he is the 8th head. I cannot go back on John. He saw it, and when you say he didn't see it, but it looked that way, I cannot agree. I think when you bring in an opinion that is absolutely new in prophecy, it is a weak point. Satan gathers together all the powers of the earth at the end of the thousand years, and brings them up to lay siege to the city. But there is no kingdom set up there. To me that is ridiculous.

M.C.WILCOX: The 8th head is a new kingdom?

LACEY: The beast himself is the 8th head.

--Recess--

(After the intermission)

W. T. Knox in chair

W. T. KNOX: Elder Daniells turned the program over to me this afternoon, and told me ~~ix~~ to call on Brother Wakeham for this hour.

Elder WAKEHAM: My paper is ready, but it is in my room.

E. R. PALMER: I would suggest that while Brother Wakeham is getting his paper, on the United States in Prophecy, we agree to say a few last short words on the two or three topics that were before us the last hour, and close it up and be ready tomorrow morning for a further line. I thought we had gone far enough on the beast question, the eastern question, and some of those, so that we could drop them until we meet again the first of next July.

W.T.KNOX: I had hoped we could drop it without anything further, for we have been beating around the bush considerably.

F. M. WILCOX: I have appreciated the discussion and the good spirit shown, and I would like to see <sup>in</sup> the closing hours of the Conference the same spirit. I believe we ought to maintain our discussion on the same high plane as we started it.

M. C. WILCOX: (He made a few remarks on Elder Lacey's view of Satan's impersonation of Christ, which I could hardly understand.)

H. C. LACEY: I have thought of these texts in this connection but they do not in any way prove the point. There is no specific reference to the impersonation of Christ by Satan.

M. C. WILCOX: Is there any for the beast?

H.C.LACEY: No, but ~~as~~ the beast becomes a government in himself, as powerful as any world-wide empire. If he came as himself, he would not deceive any one, or if he came as anyone but Christ.

PROF. WIRTH: I can hardly agree with Elder Lacey, possibly because all through the prophecies we have a beast representing civil power, and I do not see how we can suddenly turn there in the 17th chapter and say that the beast represents Satan. In the 12th chapter we have the devil represented as a dragon, and he is spoken of as a dragon, and why should not the same figure be carried out in the 17th chapter. In the 12th chapter it was in connection with God's people, and in the 13th chapter in connection with the people of the world. Isn't the beast a symbol of all that is evil? A beast is ~~represented~~ used to represent a ferocious, blood-thirsty power.

It was brought out that there is no significance where it says that the beast had a mouth like unto a lion, and feet like unto a bear, and the body of a leopard. It was said that that does not represent anything so far as national significance is concerned, but that the papacy roared like a lion. It seems to me that is a rather fantastic view of that prophecy.

The symbol representing the government of the United States is described in Revelation 13, vs. 11-18/ This passage is a part of a prophecy which begins in Ch. 12, and continues to the end of the book.

To get the historical setting of this passage we must locate the preceding symbols. The whole prophecy deals with the great controversy between Christ and Satan from the first rebellion in heaven to the setting up of the kingdom of Christ.

This line of prophecy presents four leading symbols: a woman, representing the church of Jesus Christ, the "man child;" the great red dragon, which represents in a secondary sense great world powers through which Satan has worked to oppose the work of Christ; the leopard beast, which symbolizes the Papacy; and the two-horned beast which stands for the United States of America.

That the great red dragon in Ch. 12 specifically represents imperial Rome is evident from the following considerations: first, it was Rome in its pagan state that Satan used to endeavor to destroy the man-child; second, it was Pagan Rome that was Satan's chief agent during the first centuries of the Christian era to persecute the woman -- the church.

The chief symbol of the first part of chapter 13 is usually designated the "leopard beast." That this beast is a symbol of the Papacy seems clear from the following:

1. The leopard beast succeeded the dragon; Papal Rome succeeded Pagan Rome.

2. The dragon gave to the leopard beast "his power, and his seat, and great authority;" when imperial Rome declined, its power and authority passed over to the Papacy, and its seat -- the

"Eternal City," -- became the center of that ecclesiastical empire.

3. The work and character ascribed to the leopard beast in the prophecy has been fulfilled to the letter by the Papacy, and has not been fulfilled by any other power: --

1. In its wide dominion over the consciences of men. "And all the world wondered after the beast." "And they worshipped the beast, etc. vs. 3, 4,

2. In its attitude toward the people of God: "And it was given unto him to make war with the saints," etc. v. 7.

4. In its domination over civil powers. "And power was given him over . . . al nations." vs. 7.

5. In the time of its continuance. "And power was given unto him to continue forty and two months," vs. 5, viz, 1260 yrs, or from 538 AD to 1798 AD.

6. In its experience at the end of the 1260 years. "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity," etc. vs. 10.

7. In the fact that it has a distinctive mark -- "the mark of the beast." vs. 16, 17.

8. In that it has a specified number, "the number of a man," viz. 666.

All these specifications of the leopard beast having been fully met in the Papacy, that power must be symbolized by the leopard beast.

The period of time allotted to the Papacy brings us down to near the close of the eighteenth century. Then, in the language of the prophecy, "he that leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity," (vs. 10,) and it is just at this juncture that the

prophet sees another power emerging to view.

This new symbol is introduced as follows: --

"And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth."

vs. 11.

This beast is distinguished from the leopard beast as follows:

1. It is, in evident contradistinction from the leopard beast, specifically denominated "another beast." It cannot then be any part or phase of the beast mentioned in the preceding verses.

2. It came up out of the earth. The leopard beast came up out of the sea. See Ch. 13, v.1.

3. It had two horns. The leopard beast had ten horns.

4. There are no crowns on the horns of the two-horned beast. The leopard beast has crowns on its horns.

I offer the following reasons for believing that the two-horned beast of Rev. 13:11-18 symbolizes the United States of America in its fullest sense.

1. That this nation should be noticed in prophecy is an antecedent probability. Other great nations, as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome have admittedly found a place in sacred prophecy. Why not this nation?

2. No nation has, in its history, exhibited greater evidences of the personal care of an overruling Providence, or shown clearer marks of divine interposition than has this country.

Rev. J. M. Foster, in a sermon, bears this testimony:

"The Mediator long ago prepared this land as the home of civil and religious liberty. He made it a land flowing with milk and honey. He stored our mountains with coal, and iron, and copper,

andsilver, and gold. He prepared our fountains of oil, planted our forests, leveled our plains, enriched our valleys, and beautified them with lakes and rivers. He guided the Mayflower over the sea, so that the Pilgrim fathers landed safely on Plymouth Rock. He directed the course of our civilization, so that we have become a great nation."

Is it not reasonable to expect that a nation for whom God has so manifestly worked should be noticed in His book?

3. I think it is well established that a nation comes into the purview of prophecy only as its history reveals the great plan and purpose of God in the redemption of mankind, and is thus connected with the work and people of God upon the earth. In "The Model Republic," by Cyrus D. Foss, I find these words:

"Let every thoughtful American bless God that he lives in this age of the world, and In this country on the Globe.

"I maintain today that God has signalized this great American nation, this democratic republican nation, this protestant Christian nation, above all the nations that are, or ever have been, upon the face of the globe, by the place and the work he has assigned it.

"The thesis I shall defend is this: God designated the United States of America as the model republic and the great evangelizer of the world."

Certainly such a nation, with such a mission should be noticed in prophecy. But if the passage before us, Rev.13:11;18, does not refer to the United States, then this great and prosperous nation does not come within the scope of prophecy, for no other passage of Scripture brings it to view.

4. But the passage itself contains evidence that this government and no other is there symbolized:

1. In the time of its rise. The horned beast was seen coming up just as the leopard beast went into captivity, (1793-1798). But just at that time the United States was coming into view, having been born, as a nation, in 1789, on the adoption of the federal constitution.

2. In the manner in which it has arisen to its present position among the nations of the earth. The word translated "coming up" means "to grow or spring up as a plant," quietly, rapidly. And this has certainly been true of this nation. "Like a silent seed we grew into empire," says G. A. Townsend. And Edward Everett, speaking of the founders of this nation said, "Behold the mighty regions over which, in peaceful conquest, . . . they have borne the banner of the cross."

3. In its location. The leopard beast came up "out of the sea," but the two-horned beast arises "out of the earth." The sea is said to represent "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." Rev. 17:15. The earth, by contrast, must refer to a "territory previously unoccupied." "It could not, then arise among the crowded and struggling nationalities of the old world -- that turbulent sea "of various peoples and tongues. It must be found in the western continent.

4. In its form of government. It must be a democracy, for the people are represented as doing governmental business.

5. In the exhibition of its character. "It had two horns like a lamb." Horns primarily represent power. The nation under consideration must present two underlying principles which "are

the secret of its power and prosperity," and which might be represented by the two horns of the beast. It needs only to be stated that civil and religious liberty, or democracy and Protestantism are those principles. These are the foundation stones of the constitution of the United States.

6. In a further setting forth of its character. It not only had two horns, but the horns were "like a lamb." "The lamb-like horns indicate youth, innocence, and gentleness, fitly representing the character of the United States when presented to the prophet as coming up in 1798." (G. C.) The declarations concerning the equality of men, and the right of self-government placed in the fundamental charter of our government certainly appeared beneficent in the eyes of those who had been oppressed by the tyranny of old world powers.

Summing up these evidences, we may say the power represented by the two-horned beast must meet the following specifications:

1. It must rise near the close of the 18th century.
2. It must come in a quiet and peaceful manner, i. e. without wars of conquest.
3. It must spring up rapidly, as a plant out of the ground.
4. It must arise in the new world.
5. It must have a democratic form of government.
6. It must present, as the secret of its power, two fundamental principles.
7. Its appearance must be lamb-like.

It is sufficient to say that all of these specifications are accurately and perfectly fulfilled by the United States of America; and that they are not all fulfilled by any other nation past or present.

The conclusion, therefore, is inevitable. The two-horned beast of Revelation 13:11-18 does represent the United States of America.

We now turn directly to the work to be accomplished by the two-horned beast, remembering that we are now dealing with our own government, the United States of America.

After speaking of the lamb-like horns, the prophet continues: "And he spake as a dragon." V. 11. The chief characteristic of the dragon, as revealed in Ch. 12, is the persecution of the people of God. "And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev. 12:17. We must conclude from this that this nation will exhibit the spirit of the dragon and engage in relentless war against the saints of the Most High.

"And he exerciseth all the authority of the first beast in his sight" or "in his presence," i.e. in the sight of the Papacy. That is, the work of this government in this country as revealed in this chapter will be contemporaneous with the work of the Papacy in his territory.

"And he maketh the earth and them that dwell therein to worship the first beast whose death-stroke was healed." vs. 12, R.V.

To worship a civil or ecclesiastical organization, as a nation, or a church, would be to obey its laws, and reverence its institutions. This text, then, proves that our government will commit itself to a program which will ultimately compel all of its subjects to comply with some law of the Papacy, or to reverence some of its institutions.

"And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men." vs.13

The wonder working power here referred to no doubt finds its fulfillment in modern spiritualism; and it is interesting to note that those miraculous manifestations which have excited the wonder of the world originated in the United States. And those who are really familiar with the remarkable phenomena of modern spiritualism will have no difficulty in believing that its crowning deceptions may be the event here predicted, i.e. bringing fire down from heaven in the sight of men. Concerning these miracles the Revelator continues:

"And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by the sword, and did live. And he had power to give life to the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." vs.14,15

This passage suggests three important questions: viz: --

1. What constitutes the image to the beast?
2. When and how is the image to be formed?
3. When and how is life to be given to it?

To the answer of these questions we will now address ourselves.

1. The beast is a union of church and state. During the dark ages it was the Papacy in control of one or more of the civil powers of Europe, using those powers to enforce its dogmas and punish dissenters. The image of the beast must be some eccle-

siastical organization which uses the power of the state for the same purpose.

I now quote from Great Controversy, page 445:

"The 'image to the beast' represents that form of apostate Protestantism which will be developed when the Protestant churches shall seek the aid of the civil power for the enforcement of their dogmas."

2. When, where, and how will this work be done? Again I quote from Great Controversy, p. 445:

"When the leading churches of the United States, uniting upon such points of doctrine as are held by them in common, shall influence the state to enforce their decrees and to sustain their institutions, then Protestant America will have formed an image of the Roman hierarchy, and the infliction of civil penalties upon dissenters will inevitably result."

(Read also Testimonies, Vol V, page 451)

3. What will give life to the image? Again I quote from Testimonies, Vol. V, p. 712:

"When our nation shall so abjure the principles of its government as to enact a Sunday law, Protestantism will in this act join hands with popery; it will be nothing else than giving life to the tyranny which has long been eagerly watching its opportunity to spring again into active despotism."

Describing further the work of the two-horned beast, the Revelator continues:

"And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the

mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name."

Again we have three terms to question, viz: --

1. What is meant by the mark of the beast?
2. What is the name of the beast?
3. What is the number of the beast?

The beast is that power which opposes God, which has attempted to change His law. The mark of the beast must be some visible sign which distinguishes the followers of the beast from the followers of God. The followers of the beast have the mark of the beast in their foreheads; the followers of God have the seal of God in their foreheads. The mark of the beast then is in opposition to the seal of God. The one is a visible sign of loyalty to the beast, the other is a visible sign of loyalty to God.

The Scriptures plainly teach that the outward observance of the Sabbath of the Lord is the sign of our loyalty to Him. That which stands in opposition to this is the observance of Sunday, an institution of the beast. Ex. 31:17, Eze. 20:12, 20.

(Read Great Controversy, p. 449, to answer the question, "When does one have the mark of the beast.")

2. What is meant by the name of the beast?

Name stands for character, or experience. When God proclaimed his name to Moses, He set forth the attributes of His character. When God changed Jacob's name to Israel, it was because a new experience had come into the life of the patriarch. The name of God stands for the character of God; the name of the beast stands for the general character of the beast.

3. What is meant by the number of the beast?

The number is said to be the number of a man, and more

concretely, that it is 666. The Latin phrase which sets forth the position which the head of the Papacy is supposed to occupy is "Vicarius Filii Dei," the numerical value of which is 666. In claiming to be the representative of Christ on earth, thus usurping the place of the second person of the Godhead, the bishop of Rome exhibits in the most marked manner the chief characteristic of Satan -- pride, resulting in self-exaltation.

Those, then, who in the final contest between the forces of good and evil continue to manifest pride and self-exaltation, may be said to have the number of the beast.

W.H.Wakeham

7/16

[This follows Wakeham's paper]

You will all remember of course that in 1863 a movement was set on foot in this country which we all will recognize as the National Reform Association, in which a number of clergymen of different faith, mostly the Reformed Presbyterian, united. This association has been sowing its seeds throughout the world since that date. Little by little other organizations became allied to it. Among the first was the W. C. T. U., which gave great strength to the movement. This association became one of the allies of the National Reform Association in 1885. The next was the American Sabbath Union, organized in New York in 1888, and the fourth ally which came to the aid of the propagation of those principles was the papacy itself in 1888. Overtures were made by the National Reform Association to the papacy, a letter was sent to Cardinal Gibbons inquiring as to the attitude of the Catholic church upon certain matters for which the national reformers stood, and he replied very favorably, that the Catholic Church would be glad to stand for such a movement as far as it pertained to the enforcing of Sunday as the day of rest. You will perhaps all remember as well as, if not better than, I, that movement which made the Catholic Church one of the allies of the National Reform Association. Since that time there have been many other allies. Perhaps the overshadowing that we see at present is the great federation of churches in the United States. The first session of this federal council, as it was at first called, was held in 1908. On page 321 of this book on the United States in Prophecy I have a statement of the official purpose of this organization:

1. "To express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian church.
2. "To bring the Christian bodies of America into united service for Christ and the world.
3. "To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the churches.
4. "To secure a large combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.
5. "To assist in the organization of local branches of the Federal Council to promote its aims in their communities."

You will all remember that the second article of the platform laid down by the National Reform Association was to bring all local institutions and usages upon an undeniable legal basis in the law of the land, and among these the Sunday institution was very prominent. All this perhaps you are as fully familiar with as I am, and I think it might be well for me to simply close there, and if there is time for any discussion of the subjects, various other points may be brought out to follow a little more fully the standing at the present of this Federal Council of Churches or the Federation of Churches. One thing that seemed very significant to me was the fact that some time ago the very name Protestant was repudiated by the Council, and when a definite resolution was presented to the Council to recognize those who did not observe Sunday, that the resolution was almost hooted down and voted out by a tremendous majority. It seemed as though the Council

of Churches had no place in it for those who observe any other day than the first day of the week.

Wednesday Evening

## THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY

By

A. G. DANIELLS

I regret very much the circumstances underwhich I undertake to speak tonight. It was only yesterday that I really understood the meaning of this meeting and clearly decided in my own mind that I would speak on this topic, and I decided then to take some time today to gather some statements together that I wanted to use; but some things arose that called me early this morning--at 5 o'clock--<sup>came</sup> to serve others, and then a very pressing request, to conduct the funeral service this afternoon of an old sister who embraced the truth under my labors in Iowa thirty-five years ago. She passed away Monday morning, and the family, with which I was very intimately and wardly associated back when they embraced the truth, gathered and begged me to take this burden, and I accepted it, so I have been all day serving others, and I have not had time to put my hands on papers and documents that I would like to have had tonight; so it is possible I may disappoint you very much.

On the other hand, I am very glad we can come together and have a plain talk about this question, and I very much hope that good will come out of it,--help and blessing to all of us. I do sincerely pray that the Divine Spirit may be with us and help us.

I am glad that I have the opportunity of placing myself on record regarding this gift to the church. I hear criticisms now and then and reports that indicate that I am shaky with reference to the Spirit of Prophecy, that I stand on slippery ground. I do not know how the reports get out, but they do, and I am very glad to be

able to speak for myself. I do not take this up through the Review nor in camp-meetings, or in other public meetings, or personally with individuals unless something arises that calls for it. But on this occasion I have the privilege of speaking from my heart to the members of the General Conference Committee and the men connected with our schools, and I want to say right here, brethren, that if I ~~xxx~~ understand myself and know my faith and confidence, and know the ~~xxxx~~ true inwardness of this gift to the church, I am not shaky at all. I am not on slippery ground. I am not faltering in any sense of the word. I want to say that I want to be very careful through the rest of my life never to say a word or take a course in any way that will lead anybody to doubt or question this gift to the church of God during the period of time that the servant was with us. I do not want to take any course that will switch any individual or body of people away from full confidence in this divine gift to the church.

So tonight I would feel very guilty before God if I should take any position or present anything in a way that would destroy confidence. There are many considerations that lead me to say this, and lead me to feel to pledge myself to God to be loyal in this particular thing, and one above all others.

I first became associated with Sister White in the year 1879, when I was in Texas, just beginning my ministry, and she and Brother White came down there and spent the winter, attended the first camp-meeting we ever held there, and they selected ~~me~~ my wife, a young strong woman at that time, to be with them as their cook. They decided after reaching there to stay, and so had to make up their ~~xxx~~ family ~~xxxx~~ there. Brother White selected me to be, as he called

it, his amanuensis,—his vallet, I should say, his attendant to go with him, drive the team, help him, take him out, and then write for him. He had no shorthand reporters in those days in the denomination, as far as I know, and he used to walk the floor and dictate his articles, and I wrote them down the best I could in longhand and then fixed them out better, and then he fixed them up for the paper. So I spent the best part of a year with Brother and Sister White at that time.

Then I parted from them and had no close association until she came out to Australia in the year 1892; and then for eight years I was very closely associated with her there. I was under her direction, and as I look back now over those eight years, I believe with all my heart that that woman was under divine leading and guidance. I believe that she led us and taught us right plans and right methods and true light in a great deal that was done in that country; and it bears the fruits now.

Then of course when I took the position I now hold in 1901, I had to be more or less closely associated with her; but in all that period, which covered about 20 years or more, there is one thing one experience, that stands out above all the rest that I feel binds me to everlasting loyalty to that gift that God placed in the church, and I feel it will be proper for me to tell it.

When this terrible crisis was on with Battle Orsek, I knew that the leader of the opposition was in very close touch with her. I knew that he had been for many years. And I knew that when we reached the very height of that crisis he wrote a long letter of appeal, of condemnation of myself and associates, and of appeal to her, using every kind of influence he could bring to bear upon her to swing her on his side and against the administration. I knew that.

I learned of it afterward. It was over a hundred pages of typewriting, and I have it now in the vault. She turned it over to me. I knew of this being prepared. Time and again, as the controversy waxed hot, I was tempted to write her. I sat down to do it, and then I said, No, I am not to be her informant. I am not to communicate these things to her; God is to do that, and I will not write a line. And for a period of six long months that we struggled there in the very heat of that controversy, she never got a scratch of a pen from me about it, never a word concerning our side of the controversy.

We went to Oakland in that situation, she having that great epistle that appealed to her motherly instincts in a prejudicial way against us, that brought up her warmest friends,--everything that a master-mind could lay hold of to influence her to hit me and my associates and knock us to our knees, was in her hands, and I knew it, and nothing from us. When I got to Oakland, she had not come down from St. Helena.

A. O. TAIT: That was the General Conference?

A. G. DANIELLS: Yes, the General Conference of 1903. And not only that, but many of those on the other side had rallied there, having gone on ahead of us. They had been up to St. Helena, and the whole thing was staged for another 1901 affair, to sway her and have us knocked out, as a former administration, as they claimed, had been,--Brother Irwin in 1901.

Well, she had not come down. The night before our meeting was to begin I was in great trouble. I did not know what she would say to me. I had no means of knowing, and I felt that I must have God's help. I never can tell you brethren the agony of mind and heart that I suffered in that terrible crisis. I have often felt that you would

have to get back to that rebellion of Lucifer in heaven to get the experience that we passed through. Well, I made up my mind that God must help me or I would go under; and if He didn't help, then we had come to a crisis that would shake this denomination to its foundation, because I knew so much that was erected and wrong and absolutely infidel to this cause; and I said, If that thing triumphs it will shake this cause to its foundation, and we cannot survive if that sort of thing is going to rule.

So that night I went away to a room the brethren had provided for me as my headquarters, and I locked my door and I stayed there alone ~~with~~ with God all night.

Elder Daniell said to me  
not to transcribe the rest of this  
meeting, which would take over 60 pages  
of typewriting.

---

↓ 16712 1671

---

(Read from Southern Union worker, March 27, 1919)

Well there is an experience. I may not have touched every detail exactly right, but I have so far as my memory goes. Brother Palmer was very closely associated with it, and knows that in the main this statement is correct. Now brethren, that enterprise was just as far from a reasonable enterprise when we started it as anything could be. When I went to Sister White over in the hills of California with the report, there was nothing about it at all that would commend it to any business man; and she listened, and then at the last she said, "No brethren, you must not blot out that house. You must not stop. You must continue that house contrary to our best business men and our past experience." Now today, what would we do without the Southern Publishing house and its work. She said then, "Well brethren, I feel very sorry about this loss and failure. I cannot account for this," and she said perhaps it would be right to close it up as a printing house and just make a depository. We said that was just what we proposed to do, to buy books from the Pacific Press and Review and Herald. We really thought we had equipment enough then to publish all the literature we would need in North America, and we did not see any need of another house, and she agreed to our reasoning. We reasoned and talked it over; she never was unreasonable, and when we put up this proposition, her human vision and feelings passed on it; but then she got another view of it and another impression, and so after she wrote and said, "Your counsel is not right; your reasoning is not right; that is, God is to do something down there beyond anything you can see, and you keep the place and put your faith

in it and effort in it, and God will do wonders for you," and over and over she exhorted me in her letters that God wanted to do a great work in the South in the circulation of our literature. And now today, brethren, the workers down there are simply doing wonders.

It is perfectly marvelous to me that poor, old Mississippi, one of the last states in America that I would suppose would come and lead the denomination in the sale of literature. There is nothing in sight; there is nothing in the conditions that you would wager on, nothing at all, and how is it that the South now has come along and done that? Brethren, it is proving up the counsel and the facts set before us in those days. We worldly wise men could not see that, and so we discounted the counsel that came.

Now brethren, I want to say that I have never yet in my life come to the place wheren I would set aside the Spirit of Prophecy, where I had reached the conclusion that it was not safe, but many a time I have been sorely perplexed and tried by the counsel that has come, and why, just because I did not know much, because the Lord knew a lot more than I. That is the reason exactly. And I want to confess another thing, that in some of these times of perplexity I have been unwise and injudicious, and have done wrong by giving expression to the brethren with whom I have been associated, to my fears and doubts.

F. M. WILCOX: Would your faith be affected by some detail that did not harmonize with something else?

A.G.D.: No, I cannot say that my faith has been affected by apparent contradictions and unreasonable things, but questions

have come up in my mind and fears, and you know how it is, the things look so unreasonable you do not know what to do. It was so with our school in Australia. We were led to a block of land, the location of which seemed just as unreasonable to me as anything ever could. I had been brought up in the Mississippi Valley where the soil was good, and I was asked to locate a school on a sandy patch of ground, and from all that I saw and could understand it seemed practically worthless to me, and I could not make my mind consent that it was a suitable place for a school. Under certain circumstances that I must not take time to speak of now, we were led to agree to buy the land, and we bought it, and then after we did two or three of us who had been in the Mississippi Valley,- Brother Rosseau, who was over there and myself, and two or three others, we got to talking so discouragingly about it that we finally said, "Let's get a government expert and look it over for us." That was a happy thought, and it took the whole thing away from us, and we would get rid of it. He came up, and we took a horse and cart and drove all over the place, and we dug up some of the ground, and then came back to the old hotel to dinner. After dinner, we went out and said to the expert, "Now we want your opinion," and the first thing he launched out on was that we were certainly sold. He said, "This place is worthless," and about the next thing he said, "This place would not support a bandicoot." That is what he said. "well," we said, "we have paid, I think it was one thousand dollars on it." He replied that that was our smallest loss, and that if we would abandon that we would be fortunate to get out of it. He said we would

starve on the place, and that we would never be able to have a school. Of course that confirmed me and some of the rest, and we felt terrible to establish a school, to be a college, on such a place as that.

The expert went back and to show that he meant business he wrote up a report for the government, a long report of many pages, giving all the details and analyzing the ~~exam~~ soil, and put it in the report for the government, and recorded it in the archives, and we took a copy of the report and sent it over to the brethren here, and they felt badly about it, and advised us to leave it. Brother white and I, after this report, went to Sister White, and I shall never forget that hour. We went into a room, and he broke the news to her, and then I was to tell her what we proposed to do, that we proposed to go and search further.