

VX/11 00 5034
257

*A Comparison of Positions
on Daniel Eleven*

A COMPARISON OF POSITIONS ON DANIEL 11

By Robert M. Eldridge

Let it be said at the outset of this discussion that we have the most profound admiration and respect for Elder Uriah Smith, not only for the great help he has given in the study of the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation, but for his sterling qualities as a true Christian and dauntless pioneer in the Advent movement. We believe, with most other Seventh-day Adventists, that he was a chosen minister of God, even as also were many other early stalwarts in the third angel's message. Along with Elder Smith should certainly stand Elder James White, Joseph Bates, A. O. Tait, J. O. Corliss, S. W. Haskell, and many other men of God who led out in the remnant church, and whose skill in the scriptures and solid sincerity gave power to their utterances and writings.

We do not believe, however, that Elder Smith or any of these men made any claim to the prophetic gift as it was so signally manifest in Mrs. E. G. White. Or that they would sanction the idea that their interpretations and deductions from prophecy could in nowise err. Actually, they differed widely upon certain features of some of these prophecies, Elder White taking public issue with Elder Smith on one occasion with regard to the "Eastern Question." Elder White was convinced that if Rome was the iron in the toes of the image of Daniel 2, and if Rome was the fourth and last beast of Daniel 7, and if Rome was the little horn of Daniel 8, then Rome was also the king of the north of Daniel 11, and he plainly stated his view of the matter.

While the broad outlines and much of the detail of God's prophetic message was undeniably understood correctly by the pioneers of this message, we believe that so far from claiming infallibility for their writings they would be the first to raise an objection to the suggestion that theirs is the last and final word on all prophetic interpretation. Mrs. E. G. White has stated plainly in "Gospel Workers," p. 303: "We must not trust to others to search the scriptures for us. Some of our leading brethren have frequently taken their position on the wrong side." And in "Testimonies," Vol. 5, p. 707, she says: "The fact that there is no controversy or agitation among God's people, should not be regarded as conclusive evidence that they are holding fast to sound doctrine. There is reason to fear that they may not be clearly discriminating between truth and error. When no new questions are started by investigation of the Scriptures, when no difference of opinion arises which will set men to search the Bible for themselves, to make sure that they have the truth, there will be many now, as in ancient times, who will hold to tradition."

The supposed statement of Mrs. White to the effect that an angel of God stood by Elder Uriah Smith's side and guided his hand as he penned his book, "Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation," has to our knowledge never been found in her writings. But even had this statement been made, it could conceivably be true without necessitating the acceptance of every deduction or comment of the writer as infallible. Surely God led William Miller in his ministry and writings, but William Miller was not thereby brought to the full knowledge of the last day message. God's hand has at times been over certain details of prophecy and scriptural truth, apparently reserving a full understanding of them for a later time, when according to His infinite wisdom a more perfect knowledge of them should fill His allwise purposes. Mrs. White states plainly in "Gospel Workers," p. 301: "No one has said that we shall find perfection in any man's investigations."

Many of our good people seem to feel that to so much as question the time-honored interpretive position regarding Daniel 11:36 involves a matter of disloyalty, not only to Elder Smith, but to the great fundamental doctrines of our faith. Further, that the one who undertakes a re-examination of the subject lays himself open to the charge of heresy. This is a wholly indefensible attitude to take, and one which would unquestionably be abhorrent to Elder Smith himself. Page 297, 298 of "Gospel Workers" says: "It has ever been the tendency to cease to advance in the knowledge of the truth. Men rest satisfied with the light already received from God's word, and discourage any further investigation of the Scriptures. They become conservative, and seek to avoid discussion. There are men now preaching to others, who will find upon examining the positions they hold, that there are many things for which they can give no satisfactory reason."

In the first place there seems to be some confusion regarding the distinction between fundamental doctrine and interpretive position on prophecy. The great fundamental doctrines of the remnant church, as laid down so fully and clearly in the scriptures of truth, are mighty pillars which are immovable. But to place in the same category with the truth of the second coming of Christ, or the state of the dead, or the sanctuary, the rightly named "Eastern Question," is, in our opinion, assuming too much. This is not to say that the "Eastern Question" does not involve truth, or that it is unimportant. It seems obvious that a proper understanding of this matter will become increasingly valuable as we near the end of time. Upon Daniel 11 the Spirit of Prophecy gives us no instruction, but this does not mean that the ultimate in understanding of all truth has been reached, and that there is no further need of inquiry and study. Pertinent to this point are the following inspired statements. "Gospel Workers," p. 310: "We must not for a moment think that there is no more light, no more truth, to be given us."

And from "Testimonies," Vol. 5, p. 708,709: "As a people we are called individually to be students of prophecy. We must watch with earnestness that we may discern any ray of light which God shall present to us. We are to catch the first gleamings of truth; and through prayerful study, clearer light may be obtained, which can be brought before others. When God's people are at ease, and satisfied with their present enlightenment, we may be sure that He will not favor them. It is His will that they should be ever moving forward, to receive the increased and ever increasing light which is shining for them. The present attitude of the church is not pleasing to God. There has come in a self-confidence that has led them to feel no necessity for more truth and greater light."

Some profess to see little, if anything, to be gained by a study of this prophecy, contending that the old positions have been held for a long time by better theologians than they are, and since it has "nothing to do with one's salvation" why not let well enough alone? While the burden of all phases of scriptural truth cannot fall upon everyone alike, the disassociation from salvation of a prophecy that ends with the coming of our Lord seems a strange attitude to us. If such be true of this wonderfully detailed prophecy, of what value from the standpoint of salvation do any of the prophecies have? We feel that the same thirst for truth that the pioneers of this message had should characterize us as a people today. A careful re-examination of any position which we hold should always be in order, for it is self evident that real scriptural truth would only be more firmly established thereby.

The foundation doctrines of the third angel's message, let it be repeated, are not, however, under examination in this discussion. They have been indisputably established, and shine with greater luster as we near the end. In our humble opinion, a correct understanding of Daniel 11 will not only buttress these foundation doctrines, but will fulfill the important mission of prophecy for the remnant church, namely; forewarning, protecting from deception, preserving from fanaticism, and establishing of faith. We know that we are living in "grand and awful times." Should we not also know of a certainty the full prophetic significance of them? "Many shall be purified, and made white and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand." Dan. 12:10.

We should always bear in mind the great spiritual forces in mighty combat on this earth as we trace Bible prophecy. Every prophecy has some bearing on the controversy between Christ and Satan, and nations and individuals are brought to view because of their involvement in that conflict. No nations are mentioned without point. No detail is thrown in without significance. The struggle which began in heaven is to be finished upon this earth, and men and nations are playing important roles in the fearful drama, God in His love has outlined in painstaking detail the order of events, the succession of world powers, their characteristics, and their work. We stand today on the breath-taking eminence of the end of the time of the end, where we can scan the fulfilled prophecy of sixty centuries. Surely with the settled certainty that the last trump is about to sound, we should be diligent students of those few remaining prophecies which have application to the closing hours of earth's history.

In a spirit of sincere Christian love, and with an earnest desire to be constructive and helpful in the study of an important problem of prophetic identity, we wish to take issue with some of Elder Smith's conclusions regarding the latter part of Daniel 11. In passing, let us say that this effort should not in any sense be construed as a reflection upon Elder Smith's ability in logic, or scriptural perception. Much has happened in the world to change the general picture since Elder Smith wrote. Many developments have taken place in the past thirty years which, could he have seen them, would undoubtedly have changed the current of his deductions in some cases. We feel that if Elder Smith could review this prophecy in the light of more recent world developments, he would be the first to revise his position. In any case, he would not wish to close the door upon further study, and insist, as many do, that all should unquestioningly follow the best light of one man in this matter.

A careful perusal of Elder Smith's book, "Daniel and Revelation," will immediately impress the reader with three things. First, with Elder Smith's profound knowledge of the scriptures and of history. Second, that he draws heavily at times upon the commentaries and suggestions of other Bible scholars. And third, that he is not dogmatic, but rather takes pains to present the problem of a divergence of opinion on certain points. After marshalling what to him is sufficient evidence for a given view, he proceeds to lead his readers along that line of interpretation to an explanation of each point. He has rightly named his book "Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation." To our way of thinking he never intended that it should be considered more than this. A disturbing attitude today, on the part of many of our ministry and laity as well, is the positive certainty of and almost fanatical adherence to positions based solely upon statements in "Daniel and Revelation" of which Elder Smith himself was not nearly as certain. Let us quote a few lines from page 305 relative to the last phrase of the 40th verse of Daniel 11:

"Thus far there is quite a general agreement in the application of the prophecy. We now reach a point where the views of expositors begin to diverge. To whom do the words 'he shall overflow and pass over' refer--to France, or to the King of the North? The application of the remainder of this chapter depends upon the answer to this question. From this point two lines of interpretation are maintained. Some apply the words to France . . . others apply them to the King of the North (Turkey, in Elder Smith's mind). If neither of these positions is free from difficulty, as we presume no one will claim that it is, absolutely, it only remains that we take that one which has the weight of evidence in its favor."

There is no dogmatic certainty here. No positive and unequivocal stand regarding identity of powers as now seems to be considered such a virtue by many who base their position very largely upon Elder Smith's views. We shall deal with this particular passage later on in our discussion, but it might be observed in passing that a different line of interpretation than either of the alternatives mentioned, will be found to be entirely free of the "difficulties." Continuing, let us quote further from the same page:

"Respecting the application of this portion of the prophecy to . . . France . . . so far as we are acquainted with its history, we do not find events which we can urge with any degree of assurance as the fulfillment of the remaining portion of this chapter, and hence do not see how it can be thus applied. It must, then, be fulfilled by Turkey, unless it can be shown (1) that the expression 'King of the North' does not apply to Turkey, or (2) that there is some other power besides either France or the King of the North (supposedly Turkey) which fulfills this part of the prediction. But if Turkey . . . is not the King of the North of this prophecy, then we are left without any principle to guide us in the interpretation."

We feel that Elder Smith was looking primarily at the political angle of the problem of identification, and overlooked the spiritual angle which might have suggested a different approach; and, consequently brought to view a different power entirely. This also will be dealt with at length later on. Concluding the quotations from "Daniel and Revelation" in evidence of that book's lack of dogmatic certainty upon the particular point at issue in this discussion, we will note a few brief sentences.

"On this verse (44th) Dr. Clarke has a note which is worthy of mention. He says 'This part of the prophecy is allowed to be yet unfulfilled.' This note was printed in 1825. In another portion of his comment he says 'If the Turkish power be understood as in the preceding verses, it may mean that the Persians on the East, and the Russians on the North, will greatly embarrass the Ottoman government.' Then speaking of the 45th verse of Daniel 11: "If the application to which we have given the preference in passing over these verses, is correct, we must look to Turkey to make the move here indicated." pages 309, 310, 311.

The foregoing quotations, while proving our point, do not mean, however, that Elder Smith was halfhearted in his interpretations. We believe that he was sincerely and honestly convinced from his study of the scriptures, history, and the commentaries of other good men in this field, that his conclusions regarding Turkey were correct. We are constrained to observe that events of a half or three quarters of a century ago that appeared to have apocalyptic significance, when reviewed in the light of current developments suffer considerably by comparison. National movements and clash of arms in the previous century, which involved forces of four thousand here and eight thousand there, "Daniel and Revelation", page 308, pale into utter insignificance when viewed in the "block-buster" bomb glare of the mighty upheaval now convulsing the world.

To assign complete fulfillment of the entire prophecy of Daniel 11, exclusive of the last verse, as supposedly marked by the Crimean War of 1853-1856, with the first verse of the next chapter revealing a closed probation for the world, is to assume a total prophetic neglect of the gigantic developments of the past 90 years, and especially the past 25 years, down to this present moment. For we are reasonably sure that the door of divine mercy is still ajar. "Michael" has as yet not laid aside his priestly garb and "stood up." Thus we must believe that we are yet within the scope of the eleventh chapter. While it was possible for Elder Smith to point to a remarkable chain of circumstances to support the theory which at that time seemed most plausible, yet the admitted fact that there were weaknesses in the chain of evidence from the standpoint of prophetic detail, should attract our close scrutiny. The prophecies of God's Word have a way of fulfilling down to the minutest detail which should leave no shadow of doubt. If there seems to be any conflict or difficulty in our assignment of fulfillments, we should be on our guard. We might be anticipating the actual fulfillment by unwarranted assumptions. To accept without careful examination and current comparison the conclusions reached many years ago on this prophecy is also to neglect a pointed statement from the pen of Ellen G. White as follows:

"The Lord calls upon all who believe His word to awake out of sleep. Precious light has come, appropriate for this time. It is Bible truth, showing the perils that are right upon us. This light should lead us to a diligent study of the Scriptures, and a most critical examination of the positions which we hold.

"Believers are not to rest on suppositions and ill-defined ideas of what constitutes truth. Agitate, agitate, agitate. The subjects which we present to the world must be to us a living reality. It is important that in defending the doctrines . . . we should never allow ourselves to employ arguments that are not wholly sound. These may avail to silence an opposer, but they do not honor the truth. We should present sound arguments . . . that will bear the closest and most searching scrutiny." "Testimonies," Vol. 5, p. 707, 708.

To us the book of Daniel seems like an art gallery, in which the Master Painter has hung four heroic canvasses dealing with the subject of the conflict of the ages. They vary in treatment, and should be viewed in the order in which they are hung. Daniel 2 is a masterpiece in broad, sweeping strokes. We can stand back and view it as a whole with imminent satisfaction. It is beautifully simple, and yet complete, and every line is crystal clear. Daniel 7 is next, and is done in different colors. It appears to be a seascape, but upon closer examination it is found to abound in detail built around four remarkable beasts. As we step back from this canvas we are amazed to see that it treats of the very same subject as the first painting, with special emphasis upon the fourth beast, while in the background of both is the glow of the Saviour's coming in the clouds. We eagerly step to the next painting, and find that Daniel 8 appears as though we were holding a great magnifying glass up to Daniel 7. The symbolic figures have changed from bears and leopards to rams and goats, but the painting tells the same story, and the technique is finer, so that greater detail is evident. Again we observe that a certain symbolic horn is given special emphasis, and that this corresponds exactly with the little horn on the fourth beast in Daniel 7. We also note the same sky-pattern suggested as in the previous two paintings--the triumph of the King of Kings. Now for the last one--Daniel 11. Here is the most wonderful picture of them all. It is obvious without close scrutiny that it also deals with the same subject as the other three. But gone is all symbolism. Stark realism and sharp outline characterize this canvas and the closer we look the more we see to study and ponder. Daniel 11 is like a great mural that seems to completely summarize all but the very first part of the other three. It also adds wonderful

detail that again brings us to see the amazing character and work of this "horn" power emphasized in the others. We note that in all four pictures a fierce and destructive, arrogant, and persecuting power climaxes the reign of evil which is terminated by the coming of the God of heaven.

Let us turn our attention now to a comparison of positions with respect to the meaning of certain portions of this chapter, especially the latter part. We would strongly urge the reader to have at hand a Bible open at Daniel 11 while following this discussion. We will first list briefly what we shall term the Smith position. Then having stated our reason for disagreement with some of them we shall present what seems to us a correct line of interpretation on the points at issue.

The Smith position on Daniel 11 is as follows:

1. Although the geographical boundaries of the four divisions of Alexander's empire were frequently changed or obliterated in succeeding ages, old ones being wiped out and new ones instituted, yet the first divisions must determine the names which these portions of territory should ever afterward bear, or else we have no standard by which to test the application of the prophecy. That is, whatever power at any time should occupy the territory which at first constituted the kingdom of the north, that power, so long as it occupied that territory, should be the king of the north, and likewise for the king of the south. (Daniel and Revelation, pages 249,250.)
2. Rome is introduced in the 14th verse, and in the 15th verse the king of the north drops out of the prophecy, not to be heard from again until the 40th verse. Although the king of the south is mentioned by name in the 25th verse.
3. From the introduction of Rome in verse 14 and onward, "it holds a prominent place in the prophetic calendar". Id. p. 259. And "henceforth the name of Rome stands upon the historic page, destined for long ages to control the affairs of the world, and exert a mighty influence among the nations, even to the end of time." Id. page 256.
4. Rome drops permanently out of the prophecy from verse 36 onward to the coming of Christ; and France, Egypt, and Turkey take the focus of attention. (Id. page 302 to end of chapter)
5. France is the self-exalting and wilful king of verse 36 to 40.
 - a. The specifications of verse 36 do not hold good when applied to the papal power, the subject of preceding verses.
 - b. The definite article "the" which opens verse 36, and would ordinarily refer to the power last mentioned, could properly be translated "a" which would permit the introduction of a new power.
 - c. This power must be atheistical, and it must trample under foot the marriage relation. Id. page 292.
 - d. There is a seeming contradiction between verse 37 and 38, the first speaking of an "atheistical attitude", and the next of worshiping "a god whom his fathers knew not." This contradiction being explained by the shift in France from an outright atheism to the brief worship of "the goddess of reason."

e. "Honoring the god of forces" may possibly refer to another subsequent shift in France to the recognition of a "supreme being". See footnote, page 300, Id. page 297-300.

f. The five year tenure of the worship of reason in France, with its adherents occupying the "strongholds" of the nation, constitutes the fulfillment of the first phrase of verse 39. No explanation is offered for the phrase "and he shall cause them to rule over many," but the confiscation of the vast holdings of the nobility and clergy for redistribution to the common people which occurred at the time of the French Revolution, fulfilled the last phrase, "and shall divide the land for gain." Id. page 301.

6. Turkey is now the power referred to as the "king of the north" in verse 40, and Turkey takes the center of the prophetic stage to the end of time. Id. page 302 to end of chapter.

7. Verse 40 brings to view a three cornered conflict between Egypt, France, and Turkey, and this conflict must take place in the year 1798, which year marked the beginning of the "time of the end." Id. page 304-305.

8. The two likely applications of the phrase "he shall overflow and pass over" are not "free from difficulty, but the most likely seems to be a reference to Turkey as the victor in the conflict mentioned in the first part of the verse. Id. page 306.

9. "He shall enter also into the glorious land" Verse 41, means a retention by Turkey of territories already held. Id. page 307.

10. "And many countries shall be overthrown" Verse 41, means the abandonment to the Turks by the French of all their conquests in Palestine, "with all of its provinces," representing the term "countries" of the text. Id. page 307.

11. "He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape," Verse 42, means Turkey's recovery of Egypt from France. The phrase "Egypt shall not escape" means that Egypt allegedly desired to remain under the dominion of their French conquerors, but could not escape being taken back by the Turks. Id. page 308.

12. Very little comment is offered on verse 43, the inference being dropped that the tribute paid by Egypt to Turkey fulfilled the first part, and that "the unconquered Arabs" constitute the Lybians and Ethiopians who were to be "at his steps" as mentioned in the last part of the verse. Id. page 308.

13. The Crimean War of 1853-1856, in which Turkey, "a government whose army was dis-spirited and demoralized, whose treasuries were empty, whose rulers were vile and imbecile, and whose subjects were rebellious and threatening secession," (Quoted from D&R page 310.) declared war on Russia, thus fulfilling verse 44. Russia and Persia caused the troublous tidings from north and east.

14. The 45th verse is yet unfulfilled. (90 years later.)

For the sake of brevity in discussing these fourteen positions we shall refer to them by number and letter, the reader being urged to check back carefully to be sure of an accurate basis for comparison. Our first observation as we approach the matter of the present day identity of the King of the North is the obvious conflict between Smith positions 1 and 6, in which the first division of Alexander's empire by his four generals is said to determine the geographical boundaries of those powers known as the kings of the north and south, (kings of east and west are not mentioned) and, further, that Turkey is the king of the north on this basis. Now Seleuceus is admitted by all to be the general who took kingship over what is termed the northern division of Alexander's Empire. The first division of this territory, as stated on page 214 of D&R was comprised of "Syria and Babylon, which lay principally to the east". This does not correspond to the present territory of Turkey, since Turkey lies to the north of both of these territories. The argument that at one time Turkey did hold sovereignty over this territory, does not remedy the situation for the present, because Smith position #1 states that "whatever power at any time should occupy the territory which at first constituted the kingdom of the north, that power, so long as it occupied that territory, should be the king of the north." Turkey has occupied none but the very edge of this territory for many years. If the view be taken that what really constituted the northern kingdom under Seleuceus was the greater realm he acquired by conquest of territories held by Cassander and Lysimachus, namely, Greece "and adjacent countries which lay to the west" and Thrace "which then included Asia Minor," then the main premise of Smith position #1 that the first division is the determining factor, must be laid aside. Likewise it must be noted that at present Turkey controls but a small portion of this greater Seleucidian kingdom. What shall we do with other powers, much more powerful than Turkey is, who today control the greater portion of this former Seleucidian kingdom?

Considering Smith position 2 we agree that Rome is introduced in verse 14, but we cannot follow the argument that the king of the north drops from sight in verse 15, not to be heard of again until far down in the 40th verse. We feel that a careful examination of the wording of these verses will show that the power spoken of as the "robbers of thy people" who should "exalt themselves to establish the vision," and who is admitted by all to be the subject of the following 19 verses, namely Rome, takes from the Seleucidea the title "king of the north." Note the following paragraphs from D&R relative to this power. "Far away on the banks of the Tiber a kingdom had been nourishing itself with ambitious projects and dark designs. Small and weak at first, it grew with marvelous rapidity in strength and vigor, reaching out cautiously here and there to try its prowess, . . . til it boldly reared its head among the nations of earth, and seized with invincible hand the helm of their affairs." Id. page 256. "Antiochus could not stand before the Romans who now came against him. No kingdoms were longer able to resist this rising power. Syria was conquered, and added to the Roman Empire, when Pompey, B.C. 65, deprived Antiochus Asiaticus of his possessions, and reduced Syria to a Roman Province." Id. page 258, 259. Rome then, according to Smith position 1 must have become king of the north by virtue of occupying not only the first northern division of Alexander's Empire, but also the greater Seleucidian kingdom. This, strange to say, Elder Smith does not see, else he would not have said regarding verse 40, "after a long interval, the king of the south and the king of the north again appear on the stage of action. We have met with nothing to indicate that we are to look to any locality for these powers other than those which, shortly after the death of Alexander, constituted respectively the southern and northern divisions of his empire." Id. page 302.

The fact is that the little horn of Daniel 8, which all recognize to be pagan and papal Rome, is represented as coming out of one of the four horns, or divisions of Alexander's Empire. This should be of considerable help in identifying the northern power of Daniel 11:40. This power, which absorbs and comes out of the northern or Seleucidian kingdom, is said to wax great toward or against the South. That it thus steps into the role of king of the north seems to us a sound and reasonable deduction. That the distinction between the kings of north and south are maintained throughout chapter 11, in spite of the fact that Rome also conquered Egypt, is evident from verse 25 where the long conflict continues, the king of the south being mentioned by name.

The conflict between positions 3 and 4 is apparent. Position 3 is in agreement with the general picture as presented by the other prophecies of Daniel and of John in the Revelation. The iron in the toes of the great image of Daniel 2; the great and terrible beast of Daniel 7; the little horn of Daniel 8; the fierce beast of Revelation 13, the number of whose name is six hundred and three score and six--all of these present a healed Rome as dominating the scene down to the "standing up" of Michael. For a prophecy as minutely detailed as Daniel 11 is, to drop completely from view this dominant power, and bring in a relatively insignificant kingdom, which has never had important dealings with God's people, to take the center of the prophetic stage clear to the coming of Christ,--this we say would be a strange thing indeed, and this we do not believe the prophecy does.

The very first "difficulty" in accepting France as the wilful king of verse 36, mentioned in Smith's position 5, is found with the definite article "the" which naturally would identify the power being dealt with as the same one which had been under consideration in the preceding verses, namely Papal Rome. Even the word "and" which opens the verse would give the thought that what is to follow is a continuation of that which has gone before. We are not justified in assuming that some word other than that which is found in the original can be used simply because "it is said that some of the best biblical critics give it this rendering, Mede, Wintle, Boothroyd, and others translating the passage 'a certain king'" 1d. page 292. Brother Smith was undoubtedly sincere in his acceptance of this change, and it assuredly was necessary to the future course of his interpretation, but the original Hebrew has the definite article "the" without a variant. The late M. C. Wilcox says, "The Septuagint, with all its aberrations on Daniel, is uniform with the Hebrew, and reads 'ho basileus', 'the king'; the English and American Revised Versions, and the Douay Version, 'the king'. Spurrell, 'the king shall accomplish his desire'. The learned Dr. Wright; Weiss; Bishop Newton; Jamieson, Faussett and Brown; the Bible Commentary (by bishops of the Church of England) edited by Cook; Birks, who holds with Mede; Keil; and Boothroyd, who cites Mede with no variant reading,--all render or approve the common version, 'the king.' The only authority or translation we know that varies, is Wintle, who has 'a king', a reading which he does not defend, but which is necessary to his erroneous theory that the king of verse 30 refers to Antiochus Epiphanes, and therefore there should be a change from 'the' to 'a', because Wintle thinks rightly the wilful king applies to Rome."

The next thing in verse 36 that gives us pause is the strikingly familiar ring of the words "shall do according to his will." Where have we heard this phrase before? Looking back through the chapter we stop on verse 16, "But he that cometh against him shall do according to his own will." The power of verse 16 by common consent is Rome. "And he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every God." Again there is a familiar tone to these phrases. Let us recall 2 Thess. 2:4, "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped." Certainly a striking parallelism of phrases, and no one is uncertain as to the identity of the power Paul was referring to--Papal Rome. What about "magnifying" himself? We recall that phrase in Dan. 8:25 "And he shall magnify himself in his heart", and behold it is Papal Rome again. Continuing with the 36th verse, "And he shall speak marvelous things against the god of gods." Our minds turn at once to Dan. 7:8 and the words, "a mouth speaking great things" belonging to the little horn of Papal Rome; also the 20th verse "a mouth that spake very great thing"; and the 25th verse, "and he shall speak great words against the Most High;" and again we remember similar words in Rev. 13:5,6, "And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things, and blasphemy . . . and he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God." The compass needle swings steadily in one direction--Rome.

The next phrase of verse 36 has called forth no comment from Elder Smith, and strange to say, has been admittedly overlooked entirely by many with whom we have talked. It is, "and shall prosper til the indignation be accomplished." The question might first be asked "What time is meant by the phrase "til the indignation be accomplished?" We can best determine the meaning of the word "indignation" by noting its use in other scriptures. In every case where God's future indignation is spoken of it refers to the pouring out of judgment, such as, "hide thyself . . . until the indignation be overpast." Isa. 26:20. "Who can stand before his indignation?" Nahum 1:6. "Looking for of fiery indignation," Heb. 10:27. "Into the cup of his indignation," Rev. 14:10.

This power then was to prosper until the time of the executive judgment, or the close of probation. What can be said of poor France at the present time? Certainly one of the most tragic examples in the world's history of the very opposite of national prosperity is France, which has been crushed under the tyrant's heel, and today grovels in the dust of slavery and forced labor. Surely this power does not fulfill in any sense this important specification. Conversely in applying it to Papal Rome what do we see? A perfect agreement between this verse and all the other prophecies relating to the tenure of this God-defying power. "Great Controversy," p. 579, says, "Paul states plainly that the man of sin will continue until the second advent. To the very close of time he will carry forward his work of deception." The verse says further, "for that that is determined shall be done." The Word of God cannot be broken. Dan. 7:21,22 declares that "the same horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them until the ancient of days came." Dan. 8:24,25 says that the papal horn shall "prosper and practice" and "he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand," but both Daniel and John declare that "he shall be broken without hand." "He shall come to his end and none shall help him." Dan. 11:45. "The beast was slain and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame." Dan. 7:11. "Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all." Rev. 18:21.

We shall leave until later a discussion of the lettered subheadings under Smith position 5 which deals with the activities referred to in verse 36. Continuing our examination of positions, the three cornered conflict that is seen by Elder Smith in verse 40 is understandable in view of his previous conclusion regarding France. However, it is very difficult to assign a suitable fulfillment of the major part of the verse to waning Turkey. Where and when did this mighty whirlwind campaign, involving a great navy, materialize between Turkey and France? Turkey had been a constantly declining nation since the middle of the 16th century, and even then its power was mainly on land. Here in verse 40 is portrayed a colossal naval invasion which results in "entering into the countries," and "overflowing" and "passing over." Surely Turkey's small naval armament at the time of Napoleon's invasion of Egypt in 1798, even when supplemented by help from Russia and England, did not produce the mighty naval combat here predicted. "Entering into the countries" surely does not mean a recovering or retention of territories already held, and as for the "overflowing" and "passing over," Elder Smith does not attempt to explain how this was done, contenting himself with the assertion that Turkey, as King of the North, must be the power referred to.

In Smith position 10 it is assumed that what the scriptures mean when they say "many countries shall be overthrown" is the reclaiming of the Holy Land by Turkey from French conquest. This seems difficult to follow, for "many countries" cannot mean provinces of one country, and to be "overthrown" surely does not mean to be reclaimed.

An interesting and important question must be asked of the last part of Smith position 12. When have Ethiopians ever been "unconquered Arabs"? And if they were unconquered, what accounts for their being "at his (king of the north's) steps", or as another version renders it "in his train?" indicating that they should be in the conqueror's train of conquest and subject to him. The plain truth in the matter is that Elder Smith had no satisfactory explanation for the Ethiopians being included in the conquest of the Biblical king of the north, whom he thought to be Turkey, since Turkey has at no time in history had any victory, suzerainty, or control over Ethiopia. He permitted the matter to pass with the suggestion of Dr. Clarke that Ethiopians meant "the Cushim" or that indefinable land of Cush, the son of Ham, the son of Noah, which is thought to be the land of Ethiopia as mentioned in the second chapter of Genesis. This exceedingly general identification doesn't stand close examination, since all we need be concerned with in locating the Ethiopia mentioned in the text is to determine its boundaries at the time of the fulfillment of this prophecy, namely, the time of the end, or since 1798. This is very easy to do, inasmuch as Ethiopia, as at present located, was a nation a thousand years before Turkey appeared on the scene. No, Ethiopians are not "unconquered Arabs", and further in our discussion we shall discover an intensely interesting reason for Ethiopia's being singled out from among the nations in this prophecy, and for her place in the conquests of the real king of the north, or Rome, which took the attention of the whole world in 1935.

As for the Lybians, they have not been subject to Turkey since 1911, when Rome wrested them in conquest from the Ottomans. Why was it Rome and not some other war-like people? The Word of God standeth sure.

As to Smith position 13, we feel that a thoughtful review of the past thirty years of world history, to say nothing of the sixty years before that, will raise the serious question as to why this detailed prophecy which terminates in Christ's second coming, should totally ignore such world-shattering movements as these years have witnessed. Why should a comparatively insignificant war, localized as the Crimean War was, be meant by the prophet as he penned the striking words of verse 14 where a power is represented as going "forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many." When conflicts involving the entire world, many times as furious and infinitely more destructive of life and treasure were to be waged before the Saviour should come. The description of Turkey's military, political, financial, and physical condition at the time of the Crimean War, as given in D&R, does not sound like a power which could move the prophet's pen to use the stirring words of the text. But even more to the point than these questions,-- what special connection did the Crimean War have with the great spiritual conflict in the world which particularly involves God's children? We can put it down as an anchor point in our study of prophecy that nation's and their wars are only brought into focus on the prophetic screen because of the bearing they have on the great spiritual controversy, and the fortunes of God's children in the earth. We feel compelled to look further than the Crimean War for a fulfillment of this text, and we are confident that a different position as to the identity of the "king of the north" will lead to more satisfactory conclusions regarding its fulfillment.

In D&R relative to Smith position 14, dealing with the 14th verse, which is "allowed to be yet unfulfilled" the point is made that because Jerusalem lies within Turkish territory, it would be an easy and natural thing to move his headquarters there when the right time came. This, of course, has all been changed since Elder Smith wrote these lines. The British wrested the "glorious Holy Mountain" from the Turks on December 10, 1917, and have held it up to the present time. The Turkish capital was indeed moved from Constantinople, not to Jerusalem, but to Ankara, and the present likelihood that the great world powers, who always keep a jealous eye on the Holy City, would ever permit Turkey to establish his capital in so coveted a prize is extremely remote indeed. Further in our study we shall see a much more significant and imminent possibility.

We have now stated certain reasons for our dissatisfaction with the time-honored positions taken by Elder Smith regarding these last parts of Daniel 11, and it remains for us to offer what we consider to be a more accurate and reasonable interpretation in the light of present conditions and information. In the first place, we feel there is a deeper significance in the term "king of the north" than merely the physical geography involved. This thought is prompted by noticing the direction from which came all of the oppressors of God's people back to the time of Babylon, and also noticing the similarity of their characteristics. For the sake of brevity we shall simply note several texts in this connection, trusting that the reader will take the pains to look them up and see for himself that when a definite direction is mentioned from which wicked and oppressive nations are to come, it is invariably the north. A few of the texts are as follows: Isaiah 41:25; Jer. 1:14, 15; 6:1,22; 25:9,26; 50:3; 51:48; Eze. 38:6,15; 39:2.

It is apparent that there have been many "kings of the north," and therefore it is more important to observe and compare the characteristics and work of northern powers in our effort to identify specific ones as they appear in prophecy. As we look at the "king of the north" in Dan. 11 we see a power with world ambitions, ruthless, arrogant, persecuting and oppressing God's children, seeking to rule over all, and meeting with a large measure of success. These characteristics are much in evidence in this power right down to the time when "he shall come to his end and none shall help him." But Paul says, "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against wicked spirits (margin) in high places." Eph. 6:12. Looking for the source of this northern power's strength and animus, we find behind him the great pseudo-king of the north, who, as Rev. 13 says, "gave him his power and his seat, and great authority." This usurper of the north is none other than the dragon and Lucifer, who exclaimed, "I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north." Isa. 14:13 This, then, brings us to understand who the true King of the North is, the One to whom universal dominion rightfully belongs. It is He whose dwelling is "Mt. Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great king." Ps. 48:2. "He stretcheth out the north (place of his throne) over the empty place." Job. 26:7.

Surely, friends, there is deeper significance in this term than merely political or geographical considerations. The people of God are faced today with a resurgent and healed beast power, which we know from prophecy will briefly succeed in controlling the world, and bringing all under its persecuting dominion. This power is Papal Rome. Our hearts would fail but for the reassuring promises of God's Word, such as are found in Joel 2. As a people we recognize this chapter as dealing specifically with the end of the great controversy, with the "day of the Lord." It presents a fearful picture of God's final judgments; it calls upon God's people for repentance with fasting and mourning, and then from the 18th verse to the end of the chapter it offers the choicest and most wonderful promises. Among them is this significant line from the 20th verse: "But I will remove far off from you the northern army."

Let us bear these considerations in mind as we continue the study of Daniel 11. If, as we fully believe, there is a perfect parallelism between the prophecies of Daniel 2, 7, 8, and 11, we have the broad framework established without question, that depicts succeeding world powers which take the center of the stage in their turn. The picture need not become confused with "new powers," and involved in speculation and guesswork, if we keep this principle before us. The most concise summary of world history to be found anywhere is in Dan. 7:17,18, "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the most high shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even for ever and ever."

Whereas, when the vision of Daniel 7 was given, Babylon dominated the world and was the first power represented in that chapter, Medo-Persia had taken its place when the vision of the 11th chapter was given. And so we see Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome, with the development of a religio-political, persecuting and world-dominating power, Papal Rome, ending in the final judgments of a victorious Jehovah--this is the framework of these remarkable prophecies, and this is the broad outline of world history to the coming of Christ.

Dan. 11 deals at some length with the divisions of Alexander's empire, particularly the latter conflict between the northern or Seleucid kingdom and the southern or Ptolemaic kingdom. Seleucus was insatiate in his ambition for world dominion, and was ever warring with the south until the power of the rising Roman Empire engulfed him. This action occupies the first 13 verses of the chapter. Beginning with verse 14 the fourth and final world empire makes its appearance. "And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision; but they shall fall." Dan. 11:14.

Here is the power whose work shall establish unmistakably the truth and accuracy and finality of this revelation from the heavenly messenger. But the Holy One could not refrain from injecting the promise, even here at the first mention of this great and terrible power, that right would finally triumph, and that "they shall fall."

The remainder of the chapter deals with Rome, first pagan, then papal. It shows how it came into world dominion, and mentions specifically its conquest of the "glorious land" and "chosen people." We can readily identify Julius Caesar in verses 17-19, then Augustus Caesar in verse 20, and Tiberius Caesar in verses 22 and 23, "yea, also the Prince of the covenant" who should be "broken" for the sins of all mankind under the tyrannical rule of this "vile person."

Without dealing at length with the great sweep of prophetic history in the succeeding verses down to verse 36, suffice it to say that the conflict with and opposition to "the holy covenant" as mentioned in verses 28, 30, and 32, brings to light the development of the great "mystery of iniquity," "the man of sin," the "anti-Christ" power which should make war with the saints and "prevail against them" "even unto the time of the end."

Verse 35 closes an epoch. It brings us to the end of the 1260 years of papal persecution, in which the people of God should "fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days." We are all agreed that the date is 1798, the beginning of the time of the end. From our study of Rev. 13 and of history we know that this marked the "wounding" of the papacy, but we should not forget that this "deadly wound was healed, and all the world wondered after the beast." Rev. 13:3. For His own good reasons God did not mention this brief interlude in the papal career in any of the four great prophetic chapters of Daniel. He saw fit to reserve this detail for the Revelator to write. Thus we should not think it strange that verse 36 of Dan. 11 proceeds with the self-exalting and blasphemous work of the papacy, following the great period of persecution, without reference to the "deadly wound."

We have already shown that the opening words of the verse indicate definitely that there is no change in the subject of the prophecy. Indeed the characteristics and work of the power of verse 36 is a continuation of the development of the wicked power of the previous verses. It is the same wilful and self-exalting power of Dan. 8:24,25. Elder Smith's premise on page 292 of D&R, that because of the phrase in verse 37, "nor regard any god," this could not apply to the papacy, since the papacy has never professedly set aside or rejected God, is hard for us to follow.

The next phrase in verse 37 explains what is meant, "for he shall magnify himself above all." This has been, and will continue to be, one outstanding characteristic of the papacy, and is so stated by other scriptures. Whether this crafty and self-exalting power, the handmaid of the great usurper, shows "regard" in any proper sense for the true God will be left for the reader to judge. Surely to "speak marvellous things against the God of gods" would indicate a marked lack of "regard."

The whole tenor and tone of these verses indicate a false religious power, for they are very much concerned with God and worship. If, as Elder Smith holds, this must be an atheistical power, how is it that this king places himself above every god including the God of gods, if he doesn't even believe in God's existence? The comment of Paul in 2 Thess. 2:3,4 should help us to see in our text the "Man of sin, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

"Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers" indicates an apostasy, and departure from the pure faith and teachings of the apostolic church, and in the papacy this is fully manifest. In what special way has the papacy exalted and magnified itself in the years following the beginning of the time of the end? We look at its history, and lo, in the year 1870 a papal dogma was promulgated by the Council of the Vatican, which is admitted by all to have greatly enhanced and exalted the power of the papacy,--namely, papal infallibility. The late James Cardinal Gibbons, in his book, "Faith of Our Fathers," p. 121, says of it, "This doctrine is the keystone in the arch of Catholic faith." Obviously this blasphemous assumption has served to exalt and magnify the papacy in the minds of hundreds of millions around the earth, and has advanced its power and prestige among the nations.

Let us note carefully verse 38, for it appears that the translators were not exactly certain of its meaning. We will find the marginal notes of special help in this passage, and shall quote the verse as it would read by incorporating the clearer marginal thought: "But as for the Almighty God, in his stead (or place) he shall honor, yea he shall honor a god whom his fathers knew not, with gold and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things." Clearly, here is a substitution for the true God, of a god unknown to the apostolic fathers of Christianity. The word rendered "forces" in the text is made clear by the margin, the root word "Mauzzim" meaning God's protectors, or intermediaries. What development in papal doctrine, following the beginning of the time of the end, introduced a false god in the place of the true God, acknowledging and increasing this god with glory as the 39th verse says, honoring and worshiping with gold, silver, precious stones, and pleasant things? We turn to Catholic church history again, and behold, in the year 1854 the dogma of the "Immaculate Conception" of the Virgin Mary was promulgated. If the reader will consider for a moment the all-important place that this false god, set up by the papacy, holds in the thought and life of multiplied millions in the world today, the significance of this verse will be readily seen. It is true that Mary was venerated and extolled in the papal church long before 1854, but this blasphemous doctrine of conception without taint of original sin, which robs Christ of His special prerogative as the Sinless One, and puts Mary in His place as Mediator and Confessor, was only made official in 1854. The following lines from the pen of Cardinal Gibbons, who is really apologizing to Protestants for this doctrine, will help to emphasize this point. "These two women (Jael and Judith) are true types of Mary, who was chosen by God to crush the head of the serpent, the infernal enemy of mankind." Faith of Our Fathers, p. 171. This takes from Christ,

the "Seed of the woman," His place as our Saviour and Redeemer. Quoting further, "The piety of a mother usually sheds additional luster on the son, and the halo that encircles her brow is reflected upon his," and applying this to Mary and Christ, he continues, "All the glories of His Mother are essentially His own," p. 17 174. Mary is styled "our most holy, immaculate and most glorious Lady, Mother of God and ever Virgin," Id. p. 168. "Queen of Angels and Saints," Id. p. 182. Speaking of her supposed usurpation of the mediatorial work of Christ, we find these lines: "Surely Our Lady can stand as an advocate before Him," Id. p. 187. "The influence of Mary's intercession exceeds that of the angels, patriarchs, and prophets in the same degree that her sanctity surpasses theirs." "That will He (God) refuse to her who is His chosen daughter of predilection." "How irresistible must be the intercession of Mary, who never grieved Almighty God by sin--from the first moment of her existence till she was received by triumphant angels into heaven." "We must never lose sight of her title of Mother of Our Redeemer, nor of the great privileges which that prerogative implies." "She exercised toward Him all the influence that a prudent mother has over an affectionate child." "Mary has never forfeited in heaven the title of Mother of Jesus. She is still His Mother, and still retains her maternal relations, and He exercises toward her that loving willingness to grant her request which the best of sons entertains for the best of mothers," Id. p. 182, 183. The reader can readily see the significance of the term "God's protectors" in verse 38 of the text, as it applies to this god "whom the fathers knew not." The thought of such a god never occurred to them, for had not Christ plainly said, "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Matt. 12:50. Verse 39 continues the reference to this false god, "Thus shall he do in the most strong holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory." Thus in the high places of the earth, the centers of power and influence, this god is increasingly exalted and glorified as we see so strikingly in the great Eucharistic congresses which are held frequently in the great centers of the world. Speaking further of Mary, Cardinal Gibbons says, "Her natal day, and other days of the year sacred to her memory, are appropriately commemorated by processions, by participation in the banquet of the Eucharist, and by sermons enlarging on her virtues and prerogatives," Id. p. 178. "Monuments and statues are erected to her. Thrice each day,--at morn, noon and evening--the Angelus bells are rung, to recall to our mind,--the participation of Mary in this great mystery of love. Her shrines are tastefully adorned by pious hands, and visited by devoted children, who wear her relics or any object which bears her image, or which is associated with her name," Id. p. 177. "The Mother of Jesus exercises throughout the Christian commonwealth that hallowing influence which a good mother wields over the Christian family. What temple or chapel, how rude soever it may be, is not adorned with a painting or a statue of the Madonna? What house is not embellished with an image of Mary? What Catholic child is a stranger to her familiar face? The priest and the layman, the scholar and the illiterate, the prince and the peasant, the mother and the maid, acknowledge her benign sway," Id. p. 187, 188.

Thus the former dean of the papal hierarchy in America unconsciously expresses the accomplished facts which are brought to light in the text of the prophecy. A strange god has been exalted and glorified in the esteem of the multiplied millions in the earth who profess the worship of God, and this usurper is being honored with gold, silver, and precious stones, as no god in the annals of idolatry has been honored.

Dr. Juan Orts Gonsales, former Franciscan friar, teaching priest, and apostolic missionary, in his book "Do Roman Catholics Need the Gospel?" says, "Does the Roman church consider Christ as the basis and center of Christianity and Christian life, and therefore give to Him the first place in her prayers, in her churches, and in her official acts? Do faith and trust and love to Christ constitute the leading thought of the religion and worship of Roman Catholics? Not at all! On the contrary, outside as well as within the church, in private, as well as in public worship, Christ is either disregarded entirely, or at least, put in a secondary place." Mary, it might be added, unquestionably has the first place.

Along with Mary is a multitude of lesser gods, saints, and patrons who have their part in distracting from the Saviour the affection and worship of humanity. Every activity and avocation of men is parceled out to the patronage of some one or more of these false gods, and they literally control and rule the lives of hundreds of millions. Medals and charms bearing their images are kept constantly on the person, and prayers invoking their guidance and help are repeated endlessly. As might well be expected this idolatry results in fabulous income for the church, and especially for the papal see. It is estimated by certain authorities in the Roman Church that the personal income of the pope exceeds fifteen million dollars annually. It may well be actually much more than this when one considers Rome's exactions from four hundred million Catholic communicants, and the methods which are employed throughout the church for acquiring gain.

We make no claim to a full and complete understanding of every phrase of the prophecy under consideration. No doubt, additional light has or will come to others, and we pray constantly that we too may be so blessed. But we do feel that the careful student in these days must see more in Dan. 11 than was apparent to Elder Smith.

Upon one side of the scales of relative importance in the great spiritual conflict of the ages let us place the world-encompassing dogma of papal infallibility and all that this has meant to the resurgence and healing of that power; and over against this let us place the comparatively brief debacle of revolution in one nation--France. Then for further comparison of spiritual weight let us place on one side the world-wide, continual, and ever increasing adoration of the Virgin Mary, and on the other the exceedingly brief and circumscribed "worship" of the goddess of Reason in France from 1793 to 1799. The comparison speaks for itself. If nations and powers are brought into prophetic view because of their connection or dealings with the people of God, as Elder Smith held and we fully believe, the question may properly be asked, what special bearing upon the Church of God, or what important significance in the great controversy did the French revolution, with its admitted excesses and atheism have? The same question must be asked regarding Turkey. The Turks, in their strongest period of history, namely the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are not even referred to in Dan. 11, Rome admittedly holding the prophetic spot light down to 1798. It is difficult to understand the certainty of many today that Turkey, in her weakest period, takes the center of the world stage down to the coming of Christ.

What of the remaining six verses of our text? Consistency would dictate a further examination of the history and crafty workings of the great papal power, since the 40th verse depicts a mighty conflict involving the king of the south and the king of the north. Because there is nothing in the verses before or after verse 40 which would indicate the presence of a third power in the prophecy, we need not be confused by the seemingly ambiguous use of the pronoun "him," it being quite clear that the first "him" refers to the king of the north, and the second "him" applies to the king of the south.

Our reading of the 40th verse is much like studying an optical illusion. We have so firmly fixed in our minds that a new and third power is introduced in verse 36 that we can see no possible alternative to the general conception that both the kings of north and south are to "come against" this supposed third power in verse 40. In other words, an erroneous interpretation of verse 36 induces an interpretive error in verse 40, and causes us to think that the king of the north, who has been a mortal foe of the king of the south throughout the chapter, was somehow to mend his ways and ally himself with the south against this supposed third power.

If we can but see that verse 36, instead of introducing a third power, delineates a further development in the character and work of the northern power which has wrought such havoc among the children of God in verses 32 to 35, then we will have little trouble in reversing our perception regarding the "hims" in verse 40.

"And at (in) the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him: (the 'him' whose character and work has just been outlined in the previous verses), and the king of the north shall come against him (the 'him' who has just 'pushed', or the southern power) like a whirlwind."

Once we can get this straight in our minds there will be no "difficulty" with the rest of the chapter. We will not need to conjecture about who is meant by the phrase "and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over" as is done in D&R, p. 305,306.

This interpretation is entirely consistent with the accepted use of the pronoun in the rest of the chapter. The opening phrase of the verse, "and at the time of the end," designates in general the time of this conflict. However the "time of the end," having begun in 1798 is thus far one hundred and forty five years long, and we need not hold that this conflict must occur at the beginning of the period. Verse 35 brought us "to the time of the end," and verse 40 speaks of events "at" or in the time of the end.

History does not record the mighty conflict spoken of here between a revived Rome and the king of the south, or Egypt, during the nineteenth century. It is only as we launch into the twentieth century that we find events which arrest our attention as being possible fulfillments. Meanwhile, the affairs, policies, defense, and control of Egypt have passed into the hands of a great Protestant nation, arch foe of medieval intolerance and religious oppression, England.

Since an outstanding characteristic of the religio-political power of papal Rome is deception and craft, as the Scriptures plainly state, we must be on our guard against accepting at face value its pronouncements and communiques. It has deceived, is deceiving, and will continue to deceive the entire world until the end, not only with regard to spiritual truth, but as to its intrigue and secret political maneuvering. We should not be content with a superficial acceptance of the explanation of events as they appear in the general newspaper reports, and in the prepared statements of interested prelates and statesmen. There are sources of information from which can be gleaned, by the careful student, a true conception of at least some of the underlying causes of great world movements; and these facts, laid against a background of diligent prophetic study will serve as a guide to sound interpretive conclusions.

Just now a mighty struggle is in progress involving the forces of the Rome-Berlin Axis, and the might of Protestant England, with action directed toward Egypt, and the Holy Land. This fact should give us pause. Moreover, the added fact that all the Axis leaders, including Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Petain, Laval, Horthy, Tiso, and all the puppet rulers of the Axis European "New Order" are Roman Catholic should make us search closely for the source of their fanatical hatred of democracy and "liberalism".

When we see totalitarianism and dictatorship, essential conditions for real papal control, sweeping the entire continent of Europe into its grasp; when we behold Freemasonry driven out and abolished, and the Jesuit order promptly and openly restored in every country that has fallen before the Axis; when the avowed purpose of the dictators is a return to medievalism, and a restoration of the Church of Rome to its "rightful place"; when the papacy maintains close diplomatic intercourse with the assassins of humanity, and so far from denouncing them, expresses satisfaction with their accomplishments; then we have some ground for suspecting the crafty hand of the papacy in this terrible struggle which grips the world.

At the risk of emphatic objection by some who have not studied the matter from this angle, we will go on record as holding that the present war has its tap-roots in the scheming intrigue of papal diplomacy. Further, that Nazi-Fascism, and its ruthless conquest of democracy, is the fruitage of many years of secret Jesuitical maneuvering, to the end that once again Papal Rome shall dominate Europe and the world.

To those who feel that this position regarding the papacy is unwarranted we would refer again to the prophecies. That the time must come when Rome will say, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow"; when all the world shall wonder after her, and when once again she shall briefly control the nations of earth, we all agree. By unmistakable signs that time is just before us.

Because of space limitations we must be content with a very limited number of quotations and references in support of this position. These will be found at the close of this discussion. It is earnestly hoped that the reader will procure and read one of the most informative booklets that has come to the writer's attention, bearing upon this matter. It is "Behind the Dictators," written by L. H. Lehmann, a former Catholic priest, published by Agora Pub. Co., 229 West 48th St., New York City. Price 50 cents, a 66 page booklet packed solid with tremendously important information concerning the undercover manipulations and political maneuvering of the Church of Rome. Dr. Lehmann does not dip his pen in vitriol, but writes dispassionately and factually, with true Christian courtesy, regarding matters of which he is well informed. He is also editor of a small magazine, "The Converted Catholic," which would prove of great value to any student of Bible prophecy because it gives current and specialized information on the Roman question. It is a monthly journal, published at the same address as the book, and is \$1.00 per year. The reader is strongly urged to avail himself of this material.

Continuing with verse 40, "and at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him," another version renders it "repel him," which probably gives a little clearer meaning, since the king of the north is the real aggressor.

From early in this war the Axis has threatened Egypt, coming from the north and west with armored military might, and has succeeded in approaching almost within shelling distance of Alexandria. The tide of battle has ebbed and flowed until the developments of the winter of 1942-43 which have astounded the world for their singular nature. Marshall Rommel's two thousand mile retreat across north Africa has been called "the longest military route in history." Egypt's defenders, the British and her allies, have "repelled" the crafty forces of the "north." This action has certainly been on a scale befitting the magnitude of events implied in the prophecy; it is the first action in the necessary locality, and involving the necessary powers since the beginning of the time of the end, and it thus may well claim our attention as a possible fulfillment. Subsequent events, should they dove-tail with the prophecy as these do, will be much more understandable as we watch their development.

In spite of the good success of the southern power in repelling the north, a final decision for the defenders of democracy and freedom even now seems very remote. As we read the 40th verse again, we do not find the second phrase to be reassuring. "And the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over." This would indicate a colossal military onslaught by the Axis, to counter the Allied repulsion from the south. The stage appears to be set for just such a development this spring or early summer of 1943. According to the text, it would take the form of a tremendous assault and overflowing of mechanized forces ("chariots" and "horsemen") with an accompanying naval attack which caused the prophet to speak of "many ships." This would also include mighty armadas of the air. The success of this great "blitzkrieg" may be judged by the next few verses, for it would carry the king of the north into many "countries" as conqueror, including Palestine and Egypt. Although for a time a determined defense of the vital waterway of Suez would hold off from Egypt the invaders, yet the prophet says "Egypt shall not escape." Stating the prophesy thus would suggest that it might appear for a time as though Egypt were to escape. Axis propaganda is succeeding well in giving the impression that its only hope or plan now is to stand behind strong defenses around the coasts of the "Fortress of Europe" and endeavor to ward off invasion. This covers their real intentions and serves to foster unwarranted Allied optimism. But the "northern army" is playing for yet bigger stakes, and the power behind the dictators is bent upon nothing short of a restoration of its medieval dominion. Dan. 8:24 says, "His power shall be mighty, but not by his own power." This last phrase speaks volumes. The papacy, by playing one nation against another, by secret diplomacy and intrigue, and by keeping the people in ignorance and superstition, has always obtained and held its power and dominion. Its methods have not changed through the centuries. "Divide and rule" has ever been its motto. Today it is climbing back to its place on the scarlet beast through the military might of those men and nations which it can control, while at the same time keeping the peoples of opposing nations deceived as to its real aims through clever propaganda and pious encyclicals. All nations realize the apparent urgency of keeping a representative within close ear-shot of the "best informed center in the world." The Vatican is called the "pope's kitchen" and the dark and evil concoctions which are prepared there are showing their results in a world filled with hatred and violence. The ingredients for a complete fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy seems to be assembled before our eyes.

We do not wish to indulge in speculation, and shall be content to let the rapidly developing events of these fateful years fill out the pattern of the remainder of the chapter under discussion. The complete fulfillment of verse 40 will doubtless make more evident how the remainder of the chapter is to be brought to pass, with the papacy in the leading role. Before closing the discussion however we wish to make reference to the fact that while Turkey has never had control of Ethiopia in any way, singularly enough, Rome is the only power which has numbered Ethiopia in its train of conquests. To the student who looks beneath the surface for causes, the following quotation from "History of the Sabbath" by J. N. Andrews, p. 561-564 will explain at once why Rome is, and has been for centuries, interested in control of Ethiopia:

"One of the first conversions recorded in the book of Acts is that of the Ethiopian eunuch, the treasurer of Queen Candace. By the sixth century, Abyssinia was the principle Christian power of Africa, but it was soon after so completely cut off from intercourse with Europe by the spread of Mohammedanism that Gibbon fittingly writes;--'Encompassed on all sides by the enemies of their religion, the Ethiopians slept near a thousand years, forgetful of the world, by whom they were forgotten.' Decline and Fall, chap. 47.

"When Europe came anew in contact with the Abyssinians in the sixteenth century, the seventh day was their weekly rest day; Sunday was only an assembly day,--exactly as it was in the Eastern Church when they were cut off from further contact with it by the Mohammedans. In the meantime Christianity in Europe trampled the Sabbath of Jehovah in the dust. What caused this great contrast? Simply the efforts of the papacy to suppress the Sabbath of Jehovah in Europe; while Ethiopia, whatever else it may have suffered, was not cursed with the pressure or influence of the Roman doctrines and practices. The Mohammedans were not able to conquer this Switzerland of Africa, which was preserved like a lone isle, but they starved out its spirituality. In A.D. 1534, as Abyssinia was sorely pressed by Islam, it sent a legation to the Portuguese (who were then the great naval power of Europe) appealing for help. In consequence of this request, four hundred Portuguese soldiers were sent, but they were accompanied by a number of Jesuits, who at once tried to induce the Abyssinian Church to accept Roman Catholicism. They influenced King Zadenghel to propose to submit to the papacy. (A.D. 1604) One of the first efforts of the Jesuits was to get him to issue a proclamation, "prohibiting all his subjects, upon severe penalties, to observe Saturday any longer." This attempt cost the king his crown and his life. (Gibbons, "Decline and Fall," ch. 47.)

"His successor, Sequed, submitted, saying: 'I confess that the pope is the vicar of Christ, the successor of St. Peter, and the sovereign of the world! To him I swear true obedience, and at his feet I offer my person and kingdom.' (Gibbon, ch. 47)

"Gibbon tersely remarks: 'The abyssinians were enjoined to work and to play on the Sabbath.' One of the first things the Jesuits did was to abrogate the observance of the Sabbath, and in order to break the resistance offered, they introduced the Inquisition. However the Abyssinians arose to defend their religion, and after a bloody war, the king was forced to proclaim liberty of conscience. His son, in answer to the request of his nation, expelled the Jesuits, (A.D. 1632) and restored the ancient faith. The harm done to the cause of Christ by the intrigue and carnal warfare of the Jesuits in Abyssinia, is stated by Gibbon: 'Churches resounded with a song of triumph, that the sheep of Ethiopia were now delivered from the hyenas of the west; and the gates of that solitary realm were forever shut against the arts, the science, and the fanaticism of Europe.'" Gibbon, ch. 47.

Rome's latest successful conquest of this Sabbath-keeping country in 1935 has been brought to naught for the present by the "repelling" power of Egypt's defenders. Many, not without reason, look with scorn and contempt upon modern Roman legions, and would cast wholly aside the suggestion that the present rescue of Ethiopia by Britian would ever be again reversed. All we wish to do is to call attention to the words of the prophet. Verse 43, speaking of the king of the north says, "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." The northern power has been driven completely out of both of these last mentioned conquests by the repelling forces of Britian, but if our prophetic interpretation is correct, we may expect the dark shadow of Rome to fall once again upon these unhappy countries.

For interesting and significant additional information regarding Ethiopia's history, and its unique place among the nations, we would cite a series of articles by Carl J. Ashlock in the "Message Magazine" of May to October 1942.

We know, as a people, that the great final issue between the beast and the people of God will be the Sabbath of Jehovah. It is thus not difficult to understand the enmity of the papacy for any group or race which testifies to the obligations of the fourth commandment, and which stands as a witness against the impurity of papal doctrines. In this connection, "Great Controversy," p. 573, says, "The churches of Africa held the Sabbath as it was held by the papal church before her complete apostasy. Upon obtaining supreme power, Rome had trampled upon the Sabbath of God to exalt her own; but the churches of Africa, hidden for nearly a thousand years, did not share in this apostasy. When brought under the sway of Rome, they were forced to set aside the true and exalt the false sabbath; but no sooner had they regained their independence than they returned to obedience to the fourth commandment. These records of the past clearly reveal the enmity of Rome toward the true Sabbath and its defenders, and the means which she employs to honor the institution of her creating. The word of God teaches that these scenes are to be repeated." So it was not mere happenstance in 1935 that took the Roman armies into the hermit nation of East Africa again after a previous ignominious failure in 1896, nor was it accidental that Rome claimed Libya from the Turks in 1911. The two largest conquest to date of a revived Roman Empire were specifically named by the prophet over 2500 years before.

Respecting the final verse of the chapter, some will ask, "How could it ever be thought that Rome would 'plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain'? Surely this has never been the aim of the papacy." We would remind the reader that the long succession of crusades through the middle ages were the efforts of the papacy to wrest control of the Holy City from the infidels. Exclusive ownership and dominion over the "navel of the earth" is the most coveted prize of three great religions, Mohammedanism, Judaism, and Christianity. The basis of this fact is as potent and realistic today as it has ever been in the past. The statement of Christ that "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" is pointed to by some as proving that the "infidels" or Mohammedans will control the holy places (tabernacles) until the end. If Mohammedans alone were Gentiles, that position would be sound. But even granting that Christ had reference to Gentiles as distinct from "spiritual" Jews, He would not preclude, by this statement, the great anti-Christ power of Papal Rome from among the Gentiles which should tread down the Holy City.

The fact that the southern power, defender of Egypt, now holds benevolent control of Jerusalem, and that the northern forces of the Rome-Berlin Axis are faced beligerently in that direction may prove of great significance as the future unfolds. For what it may be worth in this connection, we shall quote in full a front page news report in the Washington Times-Herald of June 27, 1940. This item, coming as it did when all signs pointed to an early Axis victory, and when the success of the "northern army" seemed assured, must be considered somewhat of a premature revelation of the true hopes and aims of the Vatican. No similar item has come to our attention since, and this is understandable, since the revelation of such a deep seated papal ambition to the American people who, subsequent to this press release entered the fight against the Axis, would have a very adverse reaction for the church of Rome. The report is as follows:

"AXIS WOULD SHIFT
HOLY LAND RULE

Favors Pope as head,
Ousting of Jews

London, June 27, 1940: The Axis powers, if they defeat England plan to turn Palestine over to the jurisdiction of the Vatican State and transport the Jewish population to Abyssinia, it was reported today by the Manchester Guardian.

Under the plan, the newspaper said, the Pope will be able to care for holy places in Palestine, while Italy will exercise the real sovereignty. The plan is calculated to win Catholic support the world over for a new world settlement. The report said, adding that it would please anti-Jewish Arabs by destroying the Jewish national home.

Rome, June 27: The long expected campaign for 'liberation of the Holy Land' got under way today with dispatches by thirty bishops of a telegram to Premier Benito Mussolini, urging him to crown the "unfailing victory of our army" by planting the Italian banner over the Holy Sepulchre.

The bishops, members of a clerical organization (Jesuit Catholic Action) dedicated to active participation in Italy's 'Battle of Gran', said that such an act would symbolize 'the harmony between civilized people of Imperial and Christian Rome.'

In an apparent attempt to further Italy's aspirations in the Holy Land, the Rome newspaper Il Piccolo has published an article explaining King Victor Emmanuel's 'legitimate' right to the titles of King of Cyprus and King of Jerusalem."

Because Mrs. E. G. White has said that nearly all of Dan. 11 has been fulfilled, does not necessarily mean that all but the last phrase of the last verse has met its fulfillment. The position that, of the 45 verses of the chapter, five are yet future, does not do violence to her statement in the least. Especially is this so in view of the fact that these five verses could meet their complete fulfillment in an exceedingly short space of time.

Certain students among us believe that if the Ottoman Empire be held to be the king of the north we are forced to conclude that he has already "come to his end," since the Ottoman Empire ceased to exist following its defeat in the first world war, and it being equally true that the present Turkish Republic does not occupy the original Seleucidian territory. This position puts a gap of many years between the last event of Dan. 11 and the "standing up" of Michael.

Other of our Bible expositors, basing their interpretation of the final verses of Dan. 11 on the theory that Turkey is the northern king of verse 40, teach that since "tabernacles" means a place of worship, and since Mohammedans have for eleven hundred years "planted" their places of worship in the "glorious holy mountain" this significant last verse of Dan. 11 only awaits the ending of the Turks for a complete fulfillment. This position ignores the fact that so far from happening a thousand years before the time of the end, the events depicted in this verse must happen in the time of the end. Moreover, judging by their location in the prophecy, they should occur in the end of the time of the end. A condition that has prevailed for over a millennium would hardly be brought in as a specific event at the close of a series of events which should mark the end of the world.

Thus we see what a confusing variety of ideas and conflicting interpretations is engendered by missing one very important point further back in the chapter. If we, as a people, could see the real power dealt with in the latter verses of Dan. 11 as Papal Rome, and shift our mental gears to a realization that the last five verses are yet to see their fulfillment, then this maze of confusion and uncertainty among us would soon dispel. We could then make a more unified and effective contribution to an understanding of current events in the light of Bible prophecy. We could give the trumpet a more "certain sound," and not undermine our influence in the world by making unsound statements based on misconceptions of prophetic identity.

Additional suggestions might be offered regarding these unfulfilled verses; the escape of Edom, Moab, and Ammon; the troublous tidings from east and north; the furious and wanton slaughter that results; etc. But we do not wish to extend this study unduly. With joy we contemplate the last phrase of the chapter. After the pitiless fury of the beast's warfare against the "little flock" of Christ, during which the remnant church will pass through the deep waters of "Jacob's trouble," the unequivocal verdict of the heavenly messenger shines forth with hope; "Yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." This wicked and persecuting usurper of the true King of the North, whose power has been "mighty, but not by his own power;" who has been upheld and worshiped by the kingdoms of this world; will come to his end, and none shall be able to help him. For "at that time shall Michael stand up." Thanks be to God, our Elder Brother, our Saviour and our King, who is touched with the faintest sob of His faithful ones, will arise to shake terribly the earth. In the overwhelming might of His righteous anger He will bring to an eternal end this great apostasy and rebellion, and will gloriously deliver every one who puts their trust in Him.

Though the night draws dark and forbidding about us now, the faithful watchman cheers our fainting hearts with the assurance that the day is soon to dawn. "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." Ps. 30:5.

April 3, 1943

Takoma Park, D. C.

(over for supplemental material)

From "Time," June 24, 1940 (Immediately following Italy's entry into the war): "Last week Most Rev. Evasio Colli, Bishop of Parma, and head of the Central Bureau of Catholic Action, asked its members to pray God 'So that He may bless our dear country and protect the sons of Italy who are fighting bravely--every one must perform with perfect discipline the duty assigned to him.' Two days later the whole Italian Clergy sent a message to Il Duce: 'May the sure victory of our arms gloriously place the Italian flag on the Holy Sepulchre, and revindicate the glory and rights of the House of Savoy, restorer of harmony among civilized people of Imperial and Christian Rome.'"

England's leading Catholic journal, the "London Tablet" of July 27, 1940, quoting a Vatican radio broadcast: "The announcement by Monsignor Tiso, head of the Slovak State, of his intention to reconstruct Slovakia on a Christian plan, is greatly welcomed by the Holy See. The new organization of the state is to be based on the Corporate system, on Christian lines and modeled on the system which has proved so successful in Portugal. . . This, coming so soon after Marshal Petain's statement that he intended to reconstruct France on a Christian basis, is doubly welcome."

Tiso is a Roman Catholic priest in good standing, appointed by Hitler to rule Slovakia and coincidentally honored by the Vatican by being made a Papal Chamberlain. Petain is a devout Catholic and actively cooperates with the French heirarchy.

From news dispatch to the Catholic press from the official N.C.W.A. News service (syndicated world news service of the Catholic hierarchy in Washington) October 12, 1942 (nine months after Pearl Harbor): "Among positive changes, the Curia hails with satisfaction; the changes in France; a greater stability in the present government of Spain and Portugal; Catholic determination in Slovakia and Coatia. Relations with Fascist Italy and with Hungary continue splendid." And referring to cordial relations with Japan which, "Today has almost twenty million Catholics under its defacto dominion," the dispatch continues, "The Vatican was happy to see M. Harada enter its bronze doors as Imperial Minister."

From a report in the "New York Times" of Feb. 17, 1940, of a speech by Jesuit priest Edmund A. Walsh, former Vatican emmissary in Germany, and present head of the Foreign service school of the Jesuit Georgetown University of Washington, D.C.: "The German war aims were outlined tonight as a re-establishment of the Holy Roman empire--Dr. Walsh said that he had heard Adolph Hitler say that the Holy Roman Empire, which was a Germanic Empire, must be re-established."

From Franco's speech of Dec. 8, 1942: "We are actors in a new era in which we can have no truck with the mentality of the past. Spain's way of thinking cannot go back to the nineteenth century, accursed by so many false conceptions." (democracy and religious toleration) Franco described Spanish Fascism as "A union between national and social forces with the supremacy of spiritual forces. . . There was not only a fusion of our national and social ideals, but also with our Catholic soul." His whole speech was a repetition of the denunciations of the democratic world to be found in the encyclicals of the popes during the last century.

Quotation from Mussolini before the Italian Parliament, Nov. 1925: "I affirm that in Fascism there are principles of life and universal character which cannot be stopped. . . This principle is not confined to Italy, but exists for all other countries." "I give to the Italian nation a hard but magnificent task, that of obtaining primacy on earth and in the skies. This primacy must be both in material things and in the spirit. . . The Fascistisation of the universe, powerful as in the days of the first empire of Augustus, Rome must again become the wonder of the whole world. The Roman Empire is a creation of the Spirit. . . May God help me to carry my arduous task to a victorious end."--Literary Digest, Apr. 23, 1927, and The Dawn, Mar. 15, 1934.

The closing paragraph of the Fascist creed which must be committed to memory by every boy and girl in Italy:

"I believe in the genius of Mussolini;
In our Holy Father Fascism and in
The communion of martyrs;
In the conversion of Italians; and
In the resurrection of the Empire."

Summarization of Roman Catholic Canon law by Dr. G. F. Schulte of Prague, in his book, "Power of the Roman popes over princes, countries, nations, and individuals.": Article 4.: "The Pope has the right to give countries and nations which are non Roman Catholic to Catholic regents (Dictators) who can reduce them to slavery." The pope has exercised this self-assumed right to a much greater extent than is generally realized; witness Slovakia, Coatia, France, Spain, all reduced from liberal republicanism to Catholic dictatorship.

Quotations from interviews with Hitler by pastor Martin Niemoeller, Protestant German leader, reported by Dr. Leo Stein in "Liberty," Sept. 20, 1941. The occasions were just prior to Hitler's accession to complete power in Germany. Hitler is speaking to a group of seventy Protestant clergymen: "I have asked you to come here because I want to persuade you that I, just as much as you, am working for a moral reconstruction of the German people. Since the last war Germany has been in need of more Christianity, more churches. I am a Catholic, but I am asking you to help me in my great task. I have to . . . crush this republic which has nothing in store for Christianity because it is a Jew republic. When I am Chancellor and Fuhrer, the Church will live again, and live freely. I shall re-establish the cooperation between the government and the Church, just as it used to be in the old Prussian state. The Church will play the major role in the educational school system." It should be noted that, as a Catholic, Hitler could have been referring to one church only, the church of Rome. All other churches are held to be schismatic and heretical.

New York Times Sunday picture supplement, June 25, 1939, shows a large picture of Pope Pius XII seated on his throne, a Spanish Fascist officer is kissing his hand, while a long line of Franco's men, . . . there are 3,200 in all--await their turn. They are paying a visit to the Vatican just following their complete subjugation of Spain to Catholic Franco's rule. The title of the picture is "Defenders of the Faith".

"Sunday School Times," item under heading "A Survey of Religious Life and Thought" by Ernest Gordon: "The Ecclesiastical Significance of the War. . . the raid on Ethiopia was a joint preceeding to bring imperial status to Mussolini's Rome and to subject the ancient Coptic Church to the Church of Rome. When the conquest was complete (with the massacre of 6,000 people in Addis Ababa), the great bell of St. Peter's tolled as it had tolled on St. Bartholomew's day after the massacre of the Huguenots."

"The raid on Greece was a similar joint enterprise. The Jesuits hoped to bring Athens and Mt. Athos under Roman Catholic domination and thereby to control the Greek Orthodox churches of the Balkans and of Greece. It is a part of their grandiose plan to conquer the whole of the Oriental Church including that of Russia."

"One sees thus how, behind all Europe's political struggle and Europe's agony, can be detected the ambitious hands of the Jesuits, scheming to make the Church of Rome supreme. Victory over Greece would be, they deemed, the beginning of the end for the Eastern Church; over England a great step toward the extinction of Protestantism.