WORLD CHAOS

ITS ROOT AND REMEDY

AN INQUIRY INTO THE DEEPER REASONS
AND URGENT LESSONS

By

G. H. LANG



LONDON:
THE PATERNOSTER PRESS
1948

First printed 1948

Made and printed in Great Britain
for The Paternoster Press Ludgate
House Fleet Street London E.C.4
by Wyman & Son Limited London
Reading and Fakenham

CONTENTS

CHAP. PAGE

FOREWORD - - - - - - - - - 9

I. PANTHEISM AND ITS OUTCOME - - - - - - 11

Hitler's earlier influence—Influence of religion, as in Himmler —Spinoza—Eckhart—Rosenberg's views—Ley—Nietzche—Rosenberg on Deity of Christ; on love and grace—Force—Vikings—Frederick the Great—National honour—Lecky on Christianity—J. R. Green on Methodism—Rosenberg on immortality of man—Suicide—Transmigration of souls—Alternatives of grace or brute force.

II. PANTHEISM, POLYTHEISM, ROMANISM, HUMANISM, PROTESTANTISM - - - - - - - - 29

Pantheism induces polytheism and the worship of man—Eckehardt—Hindu exaltation of the soul in Upanishad—Israel to witness to Unity of God—Christ did so and to Trinity in God—Roman Catholic worship polytheistic—female element in Diety, Mariolatry, Dr. Mivart—Humanism teaches sufficiency of man, as against Reformation doctrine; is pagan —Protestantism; its original doctrines drawn from the Bible—Humanists attacked the Bible; as Voltaire, Paine, Higher Critics — Protestantism in general yielded the position; Strauss, Wellhausen, Germany, Krummacher.

III. FATALISM - - - - - - - - - 40

Pagan, Mohammedan—Undermines morality—Hitler, Rosenberg, Hildebrand, Goebbels, Doenitz—In British thought—Ahab's death ordered in Court of God; judicial, not fatalistic —Nebuchadnezzar, the Flood, Sodom, Canaanites exterminated—Benefit of affliction, purification—the "Modern Mind"—the Court of God—the unjust steward—After death; Dives and Hades—God condemns Chance and Fate.

IV. PREDESTINATION - - - - - - - - 59

Foreknowledge does not compel foreordination—Augustine, Calvin, Luther, Rutherford—Baker Eddy, Newman, Ezekiel, Christ, Paul, Romans 8—God's choice is conditional—Salvation is eternal, reward is conditional—Foreordination is not unto salvation but unto glory—Pharoah in Exodus and Romans 9—Pardon offered to all rebels; office and honour demand suitability—Dr. Griffith Thomas, Dr. Campbell Morgan.

CHAP. PAGE

V. THE DEVIL - - - - - - - - - 73

Persian Dualism—The Anointed Cherub, Ezekiel 28—Satan the beginner of evil—the Liar—Hitler on lying—Satan's universal influence—Christian Science—Transubstantiation—Conversion of an atheist—The Spirit of Truth—Inspired utterance of demons—Tongues Movement—Inspired writings—Hitler and astrologers—Horoscopes—The gods make men mad—Apostasy and delusions—Froude on Elizabethan Age—Verses " The Devil Gone."

VI. TO-DAY—WHITHER ? - - - - - - - 93

The judgment of God ; to be learned from the Bible—the First Commandment ; Nazis rejected it—Second Commandment, against idolatry—Third Commandment, misuse of the Name of God ; swearing, perjury—Fourth Commandment, the Day of Rest—Fifth Commandment, honouring parents, submission by the wife—Sixth Commandment, murder—Seventh Commandment, adultery, fornication, divorce—Eighth Commandment, stealing, by individual, by the State ; on compulsory acquisition by Government ; Communism is atheistic ; German inflation, 1924—Ninth Commandment, false witness—Tenth Commandment, coveting property or persons ; Blandford scene, Durham miners—Man to work—The race to spread, not concentrate ; to multiply, not to restrict population.

VII. TO-DAY : SOME CHIEF CAUSES - - - - - - 115

Methodist Revival incomplete—Brethren Movement—Satan's counter-attack.

Tractarian Movement.—Coptic and Catholic worship—Intoning—Newman, Manning—Eastward position—Disregard of clerical vows—Tract XC—Masses—Revised Prayer Book—Flinders Petrie—Worldly Craft.

Higher Criticism and Modernism.—God speaks—The Bible—The Reformation, Wesleyan Movement, the Brethren—Higher critical attack—Rome and the Bible—Satan and Eve ; Critical doubts and queries—Progress of Critical attack—Marcus Dods—Foote, Paine, Liddon—Christ's authority challenged—Insincerity of critical school ; " unanimous " results.

Evolution.—Popular doctrine outlined—In church—Contrary to the Bible—Bunyan's *Holy War*—Darwin and Huxley agnostics—No Flood ; Peter thereon—Natural selection—Nietzsche, Hitler—cruelty induced—Lady Hope and Duke of Argyll on Darwin—*Origin of Species*—Gosse on a planned revolution.

VIII. FURTHER FACTORS OF WEIGHT - - - - - 142

1. The King ; features required by God ; sovereigns of England—2. Princes ; a modern statesman—United Nations ; J. Huxley—3. The Jews ; God's plan and its reasons—4. Liberty of Religion ; Christ's authority ; obedience or disobedience to rulers ; right to spread the truth—5. Mohammedanism ; supported by British authorities—6. The Godly a blessing to the Ungodly—7. Prayer ; God's mercy to His foes, as Paine and Lenin.

CHAP. PAGE

IX. EGYPT AND THE MIDDLE EAST - - - - - 166

The cradle of mankind—Napoleon's designs—God's Intentions—Isaiah 19—Literal fulfilment required—God will Himself visit Egypt—Judgment on false religion—idolatry is demonism—Civil strife—Natural resources destroyed—Spirit of perverseness—a Cruel lord, as in France, Germany, Russia—Jehoshaphat, Asa.

X. ENGLAND AND THE CRUEL LORD - - - - - 183

Monopoly in Commerce—in Labour—my father, a friend, myself—Monopoly in Government—powers of Executive—Emergency Powers Act, 1940—Danger of despotic power—Value of High Court—Its powers curtailed or cancelled—Departmental despotism—Interference with the Press—Monopoly in coal—Christ and His followers, their attitude—Deteriorating influences on British character; in home, factory, by loss of personal freedom, by enforced silence; dislike of work—Comparison with ancient Rome; Gibbon—Degradation of law by regulations—Voluntary action crushed by compulsion.

XI. THE STATE AND THE SUPER-STATE - - - - - 211

The State impersonal, unreal—Supremacy of State—Real supremacy in Executive—England advancing towards Russian system in: 1. Source of power; 2. Royalty negatived; 3. Aristocracy nullified; 4. Parliament degraded from both Right and Left—Hitler an example; 5. Land, policy as to; State ownership or control; 6. Family life corrupted; 7. Trade controlled; 8. Individual freedom restricted; 9. Religion suppressed or controlled—The End an atheistic totalitarian State—Same tendency in America—Napoleon destroyed the Revolution—Remedy proposed; the Super-State—Difficulties thereof, especially human nature—Annie Besant—Need of a Superman to rule the Super-State; Anti-Christ or Christ the alternative.

XII. ANTICHRIST - - - - - - - - - 231

Israel's failure—World rule transferred to Gentiles—the Four World Empires—the Ten-kingdomed Super-State—Its final monarch, Antichrist—his eyes, mouth, blasphemies, persecutions, arbitrary rule, Satanic energy, universal authority, control of trade, collapse.

XIII. THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND CHRIST - - - 238

Suffering and glory of Messiah foretold—Christ adopted these prophecies to Himself—His reign foretold as to its triumph, character, the renewing of human nature—Psalm 72—Three stages of the eternal kingdom—Rational ground for the expectation.

CHAP. PAGE

XIV. HAS CHRISTIANITY FAILED? - - - - - - 246

What Christianity is—Christ's Church not an organized visible system—only a minority of mankind form it—the Divine programme, Acts 15—Old Testament confirmation—Reasons for God's plan; an executive body required; the faithful rewarded; the rebel government superseded—the Investiture of Christ as Ruler is future, not past—so of His people—His and their glory a reward of present fidelity.

XV. THE TRUTH AND THE LIE - - - - - - 256

"Truth" and "THE Truth"—the latter refers to the true nature of God—"The Lie" is a false view of God, the pantheistic—Romans 1—Man's deliberate rejection of God and acceptance of the lie—Man deified—Christ on the subject, John 8—The future and final conflict between Anti-Christ and Christ—2 Thessalonians 2—A decision must be made by each.

CONCLUSION - - - - - - - - - - 262

Christian experience to-day coincides with and confirms that of the first Christians, as in 1 John 5: 20, 21.

INDEX - - - - - - - - - - 265

FOREWORD

THE ancient bark of human society, already decrepit, has just battled through the most awful, and almost universal, tornado it has yet encountered. It has ridden out the storm, but is sadly battered, leaking and creaking badly, and the serious question is whether it can be patched up ere another and worse tempest send it to the bottom.

These pages are an inquiry as to the essential nature of the tornado—what let it loose, what were its driving forces.

The disease which afflicts humanity is deep-seated and chronic, having been at work for six thousands of years. But it received a violent aggravation lately through one Adolf Hitler.

To do justice to Hitler and the subject, I have felt it a duty to toil through the 782 pages of the two volumes of his book *Mein Kampf* (My Struggle). The figures in brackets are the page numbers of the 1933 German edition.

Alfred Rosenberg was Hitler's philosophical henchman, possessed of the human learning in history, languages, and philosophy that his master mostly lacked. Hitler made him his Minister of State for the desired philosophical education of Germany. The 701 pages of his book, *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts* (*The Religion of the Twentieth Century*), 1935, have also been read. The same duty to be fair has caused the translations to be as literal as I could make them.

The influence of these books in Germany may be estimated from the number used. In eight years (1925–1933) the first volume of *Mein Kampf* had reached 910,000 copies: in five years (1930–1935) Rosenberg's book had reached 453,000 copies. Of the former there were, I believe, over twenty later editions. Books which powerfully affected millions of an able race must have significance. If the victors can sensibly reduce their influence and re-educate Germany they will indeed perform a miracle and render a mighty service.

To illustrate or enforce certain matters I have cited *The Encyclopædia Britannica* as being more generally accessible than various books not known to the many or out of reach or out of print.

G. H. LANG

ABBREVIATIONS

D.T. = The *Daily Telegraph.*

E.B. = *Encyclopædia Britannica,* Edition XIV.

L.D.H. = *The Last Days of Hitler.* H. R. Trevor-Roper, of Christ Church, Oxford, official Government investigator of this subject.

M. = *Der Mythus des* 20. *Jahrhunderts* (The Religion of the Twentieth Century). Alfred Rosenberg.

M.K. = *Mein Kampf* (My Struggle). Adolf Hitler.

Quotations from the Bible are usually made from the Revised Version.

CHAPTER I

PANTHEISM AND ITS OUTCOME

EVERY EFFECT REQUIRES A CAUSE ADEQUATE TO PRODUCE IT. It must be worth while to inquire what are the causes that have produced the colossal universal upheavals of the past few years. They may be studied to advantage in the man that has been the central agent in causing them—Adolf Hitler.

True of Hitler are Shakespeare's lines on Cæsar :

> The evil that men do lives after them ;
> The good is oft interrèd with their bones.

For Hitler did some good, little as non-Germans may be willing to allow it. Before the war one could learn in Germany that he lived clean ; was abstemious, using neither flesh food, alcohol, nor tobacco ; and was a hard worker. His infatuated younger devotees imitated him for a time in these features, which worked for good in outward life.

Then, too, he lifted his disintegrated nation from confusion to cohesion. His economic measures and military preparations relieved unemployment, and a land that in fact was practically bankrupt seemed to be in prosperity.

Beyond this, he saved Germany from the threatening horror of a Communist revolution. After Russia joined the war on the side of the Allies, too many writers performed an odious *volte face* and could not praise the Reds enough. But the real Russia was pictured, though but faintly, in the Press before the war. It could not have been without warrant that the British Government had forcibly closed the chief Russian bureau in this country and seized its documents.

No doubt Hitler used the fear of Communism for all it was worth politically, but there was solid ground for the fear. He had had foretastes of what the Reds would do. With the utmost violence they had endeavoured to destroy his Movement in Munich in its early days. He draws a spirited picture of such an attempt at one of his great gatherings in 1921. Blood flowed freely (M.K. ii. 596, 597). In the election that carried him to power there were some millions of Communist electors against him, a formidable force for disturbance.

The facts as to Russia were known in Germany more fully than further west. Such news travels more freely by land communication than oversea. In 1923 I was for some time on the Russian frontier of Eastern Poland. What was going on beyond the frontier was learned easily and reliably from refugees who left all to escape, taking the risk of being shot at sight by the Red sentries that lined the frontier. I asked Russians of that region whether they would prefer to remain under the Poles or be again part of Russia. They were not having too easy a time under the Poles, and they said that in general they would rather be under their own people, but *not* as things were *then* in Russia.

I have stayed many times in a village in Germany with reliable, godly, intimate friends. They were well assured that their names were on the local Communist list for destruction directly the intended revolution should burst forth.

From this menace Hitler saved the country, and it was no wonder men and women were grateful.

BUT—" the good is oft interrèd with their bones," while the evil lives on. And Hitler did evil, on a colossal scale, evil which is not likely to be remedied until the God of heaven sets up His kingdom on earth, as foretold. Some time before the war there appeared in a Yorkshire daily paper an article on Hitler that struck me as better informed than anything else I had read in England. After saying just things in his favour, it concluded that he would bring Europe down in ruins rather than that the Democracies should triumph. Hitler had himself declared this : " We may be destroyed, but if we are we shall drag a world with us—a world in flames " (Rauschning, *Hitler Speaks*, 15).[1] Events have fulfilled this, fulfilled it terribly, devastatingly. It remains to be seen whether the now triumphant Western Democracies can survive the shock and strain and become again really democratic, or whether Hitler's forecast will be fulfilled that, should the enemy nations win the war, they would nevertheless be compelled to adopt his theories of life and government. In some important ways the latter seems in process of realization.

Hitler's career contained features not peculiar to him, but showed by previous dictators. He was of a resolute, determined nature. He had been embittered against the existing order of society by hard early experiences in the underworld of a great city, Vienna. He had been hardened to the use of brute violence as a soldier in

[1] " The vast mass of intimate matter since available has shown Rauschning to be completely reliable."—(Trevor-Roper, L.D.H., 4, 5, note.)

the 1914–1918 war. He was a fiery orator. He knew human nature and how to influence it. But these and suchlike factors are not enough to explain his career. The springs of human life and action lie deeper, and the deepest of all is the religious. Hitler himself evidently recognized this. He wrote: " the great mass of a people does not consist of philosophers, but it is precisely for the masses that [dogmatic] faith is frequently the only foundation of a moral outlook on life in general. . . . The attack on [religious] dogmas . . . will end in a worthless religious nihilism " (M.K. i, 293).

There is an ancient oriental book once tolerably well known and respected in the West, but to-day considerably neglected and even despised. This book, we are told, Queen Victoria declared to be the secret of England's greatness. It is known commonly as The Bible—that is The Book. But certain modern " scientists " declared its statements to be incompatible with their opinions, so it must be unreliable. And certain modern " theologians " declared its histories to be inconsistent with their unfounded reconstructions of ancient history, so it must be discarded. And certain modern " philosophers " found its views of things contradictory to their speculations and therefore to be rejected. It is to be noted that Hitler and his Nazi philosophers were essentially in the same attitude to this Book.

Yet in this ancient Hebrew Book there are statements which cannot reasonably be gainsaid. Here is one. The subject is the universal practice of mankind to worship idols, false deities, represented by some visible form of man's invention. The ancient Hebrew poet said of these gods (Psalm 115 : 8) :

> They that make them shall be like unto them ;
> Yea, every one that trusteth in them.

The principle underlying this statement is that the worshipper becomes like the being he worships ; that is, his character and conduct are the product of his religion. I have seen exposed for sale on the streets of Calcutta good-sized pictures of the great Hindu god Krishna, representing some of his abominable licentious doings. They that worship him become like him in immorality. The great goddess Kali is a monster of cruelty—cruelty permeates Hinduism. Many Englishmen have worshipped the golden sovereign and have become as hard as gold. The principle is illustrated luridly in the case of Heinrich Himmler, " whose wife remembers him only as a somewhat insignificant person, but a good breadwinner " (L.D.H., 143). Yet this quite commonplace man became the second most powerful and terrible figure in

Nazi-ism, simply because of his wholehearted reception of Nazi religion, even the adoration of Adolf Hitler. Trevor-Roper writes :

> Thanks to that principle of loyalty his life had been as simple and uncomplicated as his naïve faith in the metaphysical Nordic balderdash of the Nazi religion. Protected by that magic armour, he had known neither thought nor doubt; he had believed and acted: he had worshipped the Aryan deities, contemplated the Aryan truth, and partaken of the Aryan sacraments. He had extirpated heresy, and in the name of orthodoxy had sent millions, unthinkingly, even benignly, to the torture chamber and the gas-van. Imagination cannot comprehend the sum-total of the human suffering, or even of the mere deaths, which had proceeded from the authority of that single true believer . . . who himself never seems to have considered, far less examined or relished or regretted, the consequences of his authority . . . a terrible, impersonal priest of Moloch. . . . (L.D.H., 143).

It is false that it matters little what a man believes. It matters supremely. His religious beliefs will determine his character and conduct, and should his beliefs collapse he and his ways will alter completely, so deep is the influence of the one upon the other. Himmler's suicide displays this in awful reality. Mr. Trevor-Roper continues :

> It was an appropriate death, as appropriate as the barbaric funeral of Hitler and the silent, secondary death of Goebbels[1]; appropriate to his character—for it was squalid and delayed[2]—and appropriate to the functions he could no longer exercise. The terrible high priest of Hitler, who had once served the altar, expounded the mysteries, and presided over the human sacrifices with such undeviating devotion, having once yielded to doubt, had become a mere wandering shadow, a ghostly sacristan, fitfully haunting the shrine he could no longer attend. Now the god himself had perished; the temple had been utterly destroyed; the faithful had been scattered or converted; and the suicide of the exiled priest is the natural end of a chapter in history; the history, it seems, of a savage tribe and a primitive superstition (L.D.H., 248).

The reader is greatly indebted to Mr. Trevor-Roper for this altogether striking emphasis upon the dominant influence upon men of religious belief. Here is an universal clue to human nature and action. Let us apply the same religious test to the man who brought down Europe in ruins. What was Hitler's religion? In 1938 in Germany I put this question to a German who was

[1] Directly after Hitler's suicide Goebbels had his six children killed, and then killed his wife and himself. Such can be the violent reaction from a misplaced faith in man.

[2] At the very last minute, while he was being searched at a British post, he bit a capsule of poison that was in his mouth, and was dead in a few seconds.

highly educated and expert in matters religious. He replied: "If he is anything he is a pantheist." What, then, is a pantheist? The word is formed from the Greek *pan* all, and *theos* god. Webster defines it as "The doctrine that the universe, taken or conceived of as a whole, is God; the doctrine that there is no God but the combined forces and laws which are manifested in the existing universe." The shorter definition in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* is to the same effect: "Doctrine that God is everything and everything God."

This conception of the universe has been most widely held. It was taught in India in ancient times, perhaps 1000 B.C., by *Brahman* being identified with the universe. Similarly in ancient Egypt *Ra*, *Isis*, and *Osiris* were identified with everything that exists. Plutarch says that the temple of Isis bore the inscription "I am all that hath been, is, or shall be; and no mortal has lifted my veil." The doctrine was held by many Greek philosophers as early as the sixth century B.C. It is observable in Nea-Platonist writers in the Middle Ages (see E.B., vol. 17, art. Pantheism, p. 191).

The great modern advocate of this doctrine was the Dutch Jew Spinoza (1632–1677). "Spinoza rejected the idea of an external Creator. . . . Instead of Nature, on the one hand, and a supernatural God on the other, he posited one world of reality, at once Nature and God, and leaving no room for the supernatural . . . he raised Nature to the rank of God by conceiving Nature as the fulness of reality, and the One and All . . . God and Nature become identical" (E.B., vol. xxi, art. Spinoza, p. 235). Or, as J. A. Froude (in *Short Studies*, vol. 1, ed. 1894, 360) summarizes Spinoza: "God is the *causa immanens omnium* [imminent cause of all things]; He is not a personal being existing apart from the universe."

Spinoza is mentioned here simply to show what pantheism is in essence according to its chief modern exponent. Of course, the Nazis, because of their virulent antagonism to Jews, do not quote him. But there was an earlier pantheist than Spinoza, one who for them had the vast merit of being German. He died in 1327. His name was Johannes Eckhart (Meister Eckhart), and of him Rosenberg speaks with the utmost approbation and repeatedly. He is a "religious noble" (M. 138), the "holy and blessed Master" (M. 221), "the great German" (M. 225, note). Now, Rosenberg quotes Eckhart as saying that "man is God" (M. 229). This was because (as the E.B. says) he taught "that apart from the divine existence there is nothing. Every creature has its own essence, but its existence is that of God, and God and the creature are more closely related than matter or form or than the parts and the whole. . . . Although the divine existence permeates all

being, it is regarded by Eckhart as especially manifested in the human soul, whose end is union with God. This union is to be accomplished through knowledge. The soul must first understand that creatures in themselves are nothing, and then, having perceived the continuity of its being with the divine being, it can dispense with the external means of salvation and abandon itself to God, Who finds in it His own existence." But this existence is only negative, " For Eckhart, God is the absolute and infinite Being best characterized as nothing on the ground that His simplicity is irreconcilable with a plurality of predicates " (E.B., vol. 7, 907).

This, then, is the teaching of the much-lauded and chief Master of the chief Nazi philosopher. It involves either a new and incomprehensible sense of the word " nothing," by which " nothing " still remains " something " ; or else it results in pure atheism—indeed, in nihilism ; for, according to the theory, the soul, a nothing, is to seek by knowledge union with the divine, which also is nothing. But the union of nothing with nothing will amount to nothing, which will come virtually to the ancient Hindu doctrine of *maya*, that all seeming existence is but *illusion*. This is the essential doctrine of Christian Science also.

Whatever may be the sense of these confused conceptions this at least is clear, that the Deity, however conceived, is IMPERSONAL. This was made plain in 1942 by another chief Nazi, Martin Bormann, head of the Nazi Party Organization, who said : " If we National Socialists speak about ' faith in God ' we do not mean the same God as the naïve Christians. . . . The natural Force which maintains these innumerable planets in the universe we call the Almighty or God " (D.T., February 21st, 1942).

Thus almighty Force displaces almighty God ; from which very much else flows. Rosenberg quite logically denies the following doctrines of the Bible :

1. The distinction between the Creator and the created.
2. The creation of the universe out of nothing.

He calls these a " monstrous foundation dogma, against which the Germanic spirit has always stood in sharpest conflict." In proof he appeals to the

> . . . oldest Nordic Creation myth of the world, the Indian, which does not know of a period when nothing was, but mentions only a billowy Chaos, against which an inner-working principle of order contended with the Chaos and caused Kosmos [order] to arise. It thinks for a moment on the Orderer from without (not

on the Creator out of nothing !), but, with the highest philosophical consideration of the question whence the creation sprung, it concludes :

> He who has brought forth the creation,
> Who sees it in the light of highest heaven,
> Who has made it, or not made it,
> Who knows it !—or does he also not know it ? (M. 249, 250).

Thus, according to our philosopher, as regards the primary question of the origin of the universe, the highest knowledge to which the highest philosophy has reached is ignorance. This is like the saying of the Greek philosopher, " One thing I know, I know nothing." And such is the boast of many a modern philosopher when his self-applied description is *agnostic* (which Greek word is the equivalent of the Latin *ignoramus*) ; as when the agnostic J. B. S. Haldane defines agnosticism as " being a refusal to make up one's mind at all " (*Science and Ethics*, 1928, p. 19 : quoted by R. E. D. Clark in *Scientific Rationalism and Christian Faith*, p. 61).

It will be observed that such ignorance is *deliberate*, it is a " refusal to make up one's mind " as to the reality of God and of His claims upon man and as to man's moral duty to Him. This attitude is not at all modern in origin. Describing the attitude of men of most ancient times, so deep a thinker as Paul wrote (Romans 1 : 28) that " they *refused* to have God in their knowledge." The peril and penalty of such culpable ignorance was, and is, that " *God gave them up* to a reprobate mind," that is, a mind ἀδόκιμος *adokimos*, as worthless as unrefined silver (Isaiah 1 : 22, lxx), counterfeit coin (Plato), or land choked with thorns (Hebrews 6 : 8).

A former chief Nazi here confirms Paul. The following is from the *Daily Telegraph* of October 27th, 1945 :

> NUREMBERG. Dr. Robert Ley, former leader of the Nazi Labour Front, left a message for the Germany of the future among papers he prepared in his room in his prison cell before his suicide last night [October 26th]. His message ... declared : ' We have forsaken God, and therefore we were forsaken by God. We put our human volition in the place of His Godly Grace . . . God lifted me up and now lets me fall. I have tortured myself to find a reason for this downfall, and this is the result of my contemplations."

Paul lived in regions and at a time when ancient philosophies were still comparatively modern. It is no wonder that as a Christian he terms philosophy a robber, warning Christians thus :

> Take heed lest anyone shall be to you the robber [the one robbing you ὁ συλαλογῶν ὑμᾶς] through his [the] philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ (Colossians 2 : 8).

Nor can we wonder that such philosophers abhor Paul. Nietzsche is praised highly by Rosenberg (M. 212). In a life of him we noticed how he seemed unable to find words bitter enough to denounce Paul. Rosenberg of necessity follows in this. He speaks of "the honouring of Paul, an original sin of Protestantism" (M. 12): he describes him as a "materialistic Rabbi" who made "falsifying additions to the picture of Christ" (M. 13); as "the fanatical intolerant Paul" (M. 49). Sceptical writers outside Germany thus abhor Paul.

If now the reader can and will honestly compare the influence of Paul in ameliorating human life, over many centuries and vast regions, with the desolating of human life over many lands by some of his recent adversaries, he may begin to discern the deeper reasons that operate in human affairs. For Paul's solitary means of influence in purifying and uplifting men was the things he believed and taught. He was without any other resources, being poor, outcast by society, persecuted by the religious of Judaism and paganism, oppressed by rulers. It was his religious convictions and teachings which acted so powerfully that he could remind some of his adherents that they had been fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, effeminate, abusers of themselves with men, thieves, covetous, drunkards, revilers, extortioners; but could add "but ye washed yourselves, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God" (1 Corinthians 6: 9–11).

In like manner it was the false and irreligious views held by the Nazis that caused them to become some of the most awful, colossal defilers, destroyers, desolators that the world has yet seen. This will be now illustrated.

This passage from Rosenberg is significant of the Nazi view and spirit:

> The fight concerning the relationship of man and God in Jesus, the strife concerning love and grace, concerning immortality or mortality of the soul, drop out of the area of vision of a renewed Teutonic-German religion (M. 611).

Three vital elements of Bible doctrine are here repudiated: (1) the Deity of Christ; (2) Love and Grace; (3) the Immortality of Man.

1. *The Deity of Jesus Christ.* As God is not a Person He can be neither Father nor Son. That God became incarnate in Christ is thus impossible. That the Son was sent forth by the Father into this world to reconcile man to God and restore the original fellowship is out of the question. The whole conception, and all that

it involves, must drop out of view. Therefore also the idea must be abandoned that Christ is to establish the Kingdom of God on this earth. The doctrine of the Millennium is a " dangerous poison " (M. 109). From the foregoing it follows that man can reach no quietness of conscience as to his haunting past, nor tranquillity of hope as to the future of the earth. The one is left black, the other blank.

2. *Love and Grace.* As to the character of God, the Bible has two specially noteworthy assertions, all-comprehensive and illuminating : " God is Light . . . God is Love " (1 John 1 : 5 ; 4 : 8). Light signifies both knowledge and purity, because of which qualities God both knows all that His creatures think, feel, say, do ; and also He must judge and condemn what, because it is evil, is contrary to Himself. Light *must* oppose and banish darkness. Upon this more must be said later.

But what is in the heart of God towards His creatures ? The answer is *love* ; and this love extends even to those who hate and oppose Him. He desires intensely their highest welfare. There has been much wilful perversion as to the character of the God of the Bible. It has been represented that the conception of Him in most ancient times was of a vindictive tribal deity, of low grade, and that only gradually did Israel evolve nobler conceptions. This is to do violence to the documents. One of the earliest descriptions of God is found in the second book of the Book, and dates from fourteen centuries B.C. It reads :

> And Jehovah descended in the cloud, and stood with him [Moses] there, and proclaimed the name of Jehovah. And Jehovah passed by before him, and proclaimed, Jehovah, Jehovah, a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy and truth ; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin : and that will by no means clear the guilty ; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation (Exodus 34 : 5–7).

This early self-revelation of God reaches the full height of the latest statements as quoted above : " God is *Light* "—He by no means allows guilt and iniquity to escape due punishment ; " God is *love* "—He is merciful, gracious, abundant in loving-kindness, and most forgiving.

This is the uniform testimony of the Bible. Four centuries after the time of the statement quoted David the king said : " The face of Jehovah is against them that do evil, to cut off the remembrance of them from the earth " (Psalm 34 : 16), but " I

acknowledged my sin unto Thee . . . and Thou forgavest" (Psalm 32 : 5), though the sin was adultery and constructive murder. God is light and love. Three centuries later (700 B.C.) Micah exclaimed, "Who is a God like unto Thee, that pardoneth iniquity? . . . He retaineth not His anger for ever, for He delighteth in loving-kindness" (Micah 7 : 18). There is divine anger, for God is light; there is pardon, for God is love.

According to the Book this combination of God's attributes was fully displayed in Jesus Christ, the Son Whom the Father sent into the world for this very purpose. The inflexible holiness of the Light blazed forth in Christ's holy life, it withered the proud, the cruel, the hypocrites; but He was merciful, shown in pardoning and restoring the humble and repentant. His teaching was summarized by one who heard Him in words already partly quoted: "This is the message which we have heard from Him and announce unto you, that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1 : 5). And that God is love was declared in Christ's immortal words that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3 : 16).

Love lavished upon the unworthy is *Grace*. It exhibits itself in pity, compassion, kindness, forbearance, mercy. It calls for merciful conduct by such as have obtained mercy. It inculcates meekness, mercifulness, purity of heart and a care to be a peacemaker (Matthew 5 : 3–9). Those who have been forgiven by God are to forgive others (Matthew 18 : 32–35; Ephesians 4 : 32; 5 : 1, 2).

Rosenberg repudiated this love and grace as motives of action. Contrasting love and pity with honour and duty, as opposed ruling principles, he wrote: "But in the moment in which love and pity (or, if one will, to sympathize) became predominant began the epoch of the racial, national, and cultural degeneration in the history of all at any time Nordic constituted States" (M. 147). And again: "The spirit of Christianity . . . was and is the bitterest enemy of the German Nature-sense" (M. 359). And again he speaks disparagingly of the "worship of the gods of humanitarianism, philanthropy, pacifism, slave emancipation, and the like" (M. 509).

Similarly did Hitler write: "If nations are fighting for their existence on this planet, the fateful question 'to be' or 'not to be' enters, and all considerations of humanity or æsthetics collapse into nothing . . . for Nature knows them not" (M.K. 195).

"Grace and truth came through Jesus Christ," that is, love and

light in combination (John 1 : 17). But Christ is to be displaced because He exhibited grace; or, if so powerful a Personality cannot be altogether ignored, at least only His sterner elements are to be recognized. Says Rosenberg :

> His personality often stands forth as mild and pitiful, then again harsh and rough. It is His *life* that has significance for the German man, not His torturing death. The powerful Preacher and the man of wrath in the temple, . . . not the lamb of sacrifice of the Jewish prophets, not the crucified, is the formative Ideal to-day (M. 604).

All this follows logically and necessarily from the basic principle noted, that the god to be honoured is FORCE. What type of man is required and to be admired? Rosenberg answers thus : " For the iron future the hardest man is only just hard enough " (M. 572). How shall such men of iron be developed? By giving them the right kind of gods and heroes to admire, so justifying incidentally the hated Hebrew singer quoted, " they that make [the gods] shall be like unto them, yea, every one that trusteth in them." So, to the German, the divine hero is the Greek Achilles (M. 212) or the Norse Odin, who is mentioned often and praised much; both renowned for violence and cruelty. To Odin human sacrifices were frequently offered, especially prisoners taken in battle. His worship seems to have prevailed chiefly, if not solely, in military circles. These features are to be noted, in view of the Nazi capacity for cruelty and its love of war.

Answering to this are the typical human heroes to be honoured. The Vikings are a chief model of the qualities to be exalted. " They plundered indeed, as all other warriors. But they dreamed of Honour and State, of Ruling and Creating " (M. 456). Of these ruthless devastators of many lands the E.B. says : " An immense joy in battle breathes through the earliest Norse literature, which has scarce its like in any other literature; and we know that the language recognized a peculiar battle fury, a madness by which men were seized and which went by the name of ' berserk's way ' [" Berserk was famed for the reckless fury with which he fought, always going into battle without armour." E.B., vol. iii, 462]. The courage of the viking was proof against anything, even as a rule against superstitious terrors. He was unfortunately hardly less marked for cruelty and faithlessness. It is also true, however, that they showed a capacity for government, and in times of peace for peaceful organization " (E.B., vol. xxiii, 149).

Courage, cruelty, faithlessness, capacity for organization, joy in war, madness, defiance of superstition—truly the Nazis worshipped to purpose Odin, the chief god of the Vikings, and became like him.

Answering to this are the typical human heroes to be honoured. Another chief hero of Rosenberg is Frederick the Great. Of him we learn that " his wit was often cruel " ; that he treated his wife " harshly and even brutally " ; that " at his court ladies were seldom seen, a circumstance that gave occasion to much scandal." In early manhood he repudiated Christianity, and always spoke of it mockingly (E.B., vol. 9, 716–718). For a time the French infidel Voltaire was his great favourite. Of them both John Wesley, a contemporary, wrote in his *Journal* (August 26th, 1784) :

> On the road I read over Voltaire's *Memoirs of Himself.* Certainly never was a more consummate coxcomb ! But even his character is less horrid than that of his royal hero ! Surely so unnatural a brute never disgraced a throne before ! *Credite, Romani : Credite, Graii !* A monster, that made it a fixed rule to let no woman and no priest enter his palace ; that not only gloried in the constant practice of sodomy himself, but made it free for all his subjects ! What a pity that his father had not beheaded him in his youth, and saved him from all this sin and shame.

Wesley's ampler statement explains the former remark as to the absence of women from the palace causing much scandal. His closing remark refers to the threat of Frederick's royal father of the death penalty if his son continued the rebellious conduct of his youth.

A marked feature of Frederick was his *patriotism.* The E.B. stresses this, and Rosenberg gives a whole page (M. 199) to quotations from him to this effect, as, " I will either be buried under the ruins of my fatherland or . . . will myself end my life. In all my dealings I have always allowed myself to be led by this inner voice or by the demands of honour, and I intend so to act in the future."

This patriotism both Rosenberg and Hitler iterate and reiterate (e.g. M.K. 30–34). Rosenberg concentrates this in these words :

> A faith, a religion is genuine only when it has laid hold of the *whole* man. . . . The conception of honour of Fritz, the method of discipline of Moltke, the holy will of Bismarck, are the three forces which, embodied in different persons in different combinations, all serve the one end ; the honour of the German nation (M. 521).

This means " Deutchland uber alles "—Germany before all ! This drove Frederick to aggressive wars, and modern Germany also.

In contrast to this blighting, ruin-spreading national selfishness are the universal love of God and His grace. When He chose

Abraham and his descendants to be His special people it was that they should be His agents for the recovery from rebellion and misery of the whole race of men. To Abraham God said: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Genesis 12 : 3). This was nineteen centuries before Christ; 700 B.C. God said to the Messiah He had promised to send to Israel, "It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be My servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be My salvation unto the end of the earth" (Isaiah 49 : 6).

Thus Christ also stressed that the love of God is to *the world*, and that He had been sent by the Father "that *the world* should be saved through Him" (John 3 : 16, 17). This universality of the grace of God was emphasized by Paul: "God our Saviour would have *all men* to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. . . . Christ Jesus gave Himself a ransom *for all*" (1 Timothy 2 : 4, 5, 6). John assures us that "Jesus Christ, the Righteous, is the propitiation for our sins [of Christians], and not for ours only, but also for *the whole world*" (1 John 2 : 2).

The heart that is held by this world-wide love of God ceases to be nationalistic, and therefore ceases to be devoted to the honour and aggrandisement of one nation as against others. Therefore did the Nazis abhor the good news of the love and grace of God to all men without distinction. Rosenberg speaks contemptuously of Jehovah, this God of love, as a Romish "demon" (M. 250), a "desert demon" (M. 294). He writes plainly:

> For us the idea of honour—national honour—becomes the beginning and end of our whole thinking and acting. It tolerates alongside itself no centre of power, of whatsoever sort, as of equal worth, neither the Christian love, nor the humanitarianism of Freemasonry, nor Romish philosophy (M. 514).

Possessed utterly by this brutalizing passion, all means that will exalt this degraded "honour" were justifiable. True love cannot serve this end and must be suppressed: hatred does serve it and must be cultivated. Speaking of the old Icelandic poem, *The Edda*, and particularly of "The song of the Niebelungen," Rosenberg says that "The Song of Siegfried's Death is one of the greatest revelations of German nature, the song of love, faithfulness, hate, and revenge" (M. 313). From the lengthy account given in E.B. (vol. xvi. 407–410) it is clear that this celebrated poem is a record of lust, avarice, cruelty, comparable to the Iliad and Odyssey as a picture of brutal, sensual, passionate life.

Mastered by this dishonourable selfishness, misnamed "honour," everything that seemed to contribute thereto was practised. Hitler wrote :

> A more powerful race will drive off the weak, because the pressing impulse to live, in its ultimate form, will burst asunder all the ridiculous fetters of a so-called humanitarian feeling for the individual, and will replace it with the humanitarianism of Nature, which destroys what is weak to give place to strength (M.K. i, 145).

The connexion between the grand idea of national honour and brute force was thus stated by Hitler when justifying the formation of his Storm Troops :

> The conviction of the right to employ even the most brutal weapons is always bound up with the presence of a fanatical faith in the necessity for the victory of a new and revolutionary ordering of the earth (M.K. ii, 597).

It was the logical and practical pursuance of this policy that led to war, to rendering the weak or diseased incapable of marriage, to wholesale murder of imbeciles and persons otherwise useless for national "honour," to concentration camps, and to general massacres of the unwanted or the hated, as of the Jews.

Fallen human nature is the same at all times. It is said that, when Metternich urged upon Napoleon that his armies were made up of but boys and that France needed peace, the grand Ruffian answered that France did not want peace, she wanted *glory*. So Europe was further drenched with blood, as again of late.

In Syria I was told that the Sultan Abdul Hamid looked upon the plea of America and England for fair treatment of the Armenians, because they were, as Christians, co-religionists of theirs, as merely a pretext for interfering in his affairs and extorting political and trade concessions. Whereupon he said, The way to get rid of the Armenian question is to get rid of the Armenians ! And the Kurds were let loose against them. But Abdul, as a Moslem, was a pantheist and fatalist, and could claim for his barbarities the sanction of his religion, as the Nazis of their philosophy.

What an awful harvest of misery is our poor race still reaping from the maintenance of that ancient refusal to retain God in its knowledge and from its continued rejection of His love and grace revealed in Jesus Christ His Son. For consider what have been the general effects of the message of His grace, even under the very partial reception it has hitherto received, as attested by

competent historians. The celebrated Irish historian, W. E. H. Lecky, was rationalistic in tendency. He wrote :

> It was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character, which through all the changes of the eighteen centuries has filled the hearts of men with an impassioned love ; and has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments, and conditions ; and has not only been the highest pattern of virtue, but the highest incentive to its practice ; and has exerted so deep an influence that it may be truly said that the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers, and than all the exhortations of moralists. This has been the well-spring of whatever is best and purest in the Christian life. (*History of Morality*, ii, 8, quoted from Row, *A Manual of Christian Evidences*, 49.)

Of the beneficial effects in England, and through England on the world, of the gospel of the grace of God as preached by the early Methodists in the eighteenth century, John Richard Green wrote :

> But the Methodists themselves were the least result of the Methodist revival. Its action upon the Church broke the lethargy of the clergy, and the " Evangelical " movement, which found representatives like Newton and Cecil within the pale of the Establishment, made the fox-hunting parson and the absentee rector at last impossible. In Walpole's day the English clergy were the idlest and most lifeless in the world. In our own time no body of religious ministers surpasses them in piety, in philanthropic energy, or in popular regard. In the nation at large appeared a new moral enthusiasm which, rigid and pedantic as it often seemed, was still healthy in its social tone, and whose power was seen in the disappearance of the profligacy which had disgraced the upper classes, and the foulness which had infected literature, ever since the Restoration. But the noblest result of the religious revival was the steady attempt, which has never ceased from that day to this, to remedy the guilt, the ignorance, the physical suffering, the social degradation of the profligate and the poor. It was not till the Wesleyan movement had done its work that the philanthropic movement began. (*A Short History of the English People*, Chapter .)

If any reader doubts these estimates of the moral value of the grace of God revealed in Christ Jesus, he need but humbly open his own heart and life to its influence to be convinced that divine saving energy works in the gospel. Nazi-ism is the latest vast demonstration that the rejection of it is diabolical, damning.

3. *The Immortality of Man.*—The third question which Rosenberg, in the passage quoted, treats as negligible is that of the permanent existence of man.

As regards the word "immortality," it never ought to have been applied to the matter in question. It means "incapable of dying," and this can be affirmed of God alone, "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords; *Who only hath immortality*" (1 Timothy 6: 15, 16). Man will not share this property except by resurrection unto eternal life (1 Corinthians 15: 53, 54). Prior to that change man is mortal and dies; that is, he passes from the state called life into a realm and state called death. He ceases to be a living soul (person) and becomes a dead soul (person), and exists still in the latter condition.

What is now meant by the common but inexact expression "immortality of the soul" is that the individual has permanent existence. This is a question of deepest importance, however considered. If the thought be put away, and the death of the body be regarded as the end of the conscious individuality of the man, much else must go with it, especially in conjunction with the pantheistic view of the universe.

For if God be not a person, with individual existence, then He cannot be the Judge of individual creatures; and if man ceases to be an individual by being absorbed into the sum total of things, talk of a judgment is idle, as well as of the wrath of God that the evil doer must face. If this last prospect be a mere theological figment what will follow?

1. The lot of those who have striven on earth to be and to do good, yet have mainly suffered and been unrewarded, is miserable indeed. "If in this life only we have hoped in Christ we are of all men most pitiable," wrote one such man (1 Corinthians 15: 19). Unrewarded virtue will mean that truly the universe is non-moral, for no one will affirm it is fully rewarded in this life.

2. An ancient observer was perplexed at the present prosperity of the wicked; how they often lived in affluence, and died suddenly and easily without being plagued as they deserved to be (Psalm 73). If there is to be no future judgment and punishment, then again justice does not reign.

3. If the dread of wrath be removed from the heart of man he will work evil with resolution and persistence. Men may declaim as they will against the doctrine of the wrath of God being used to warn the wicked; they may protest that love is the proper motive and appeal; but every one knows that fear is a powerful and inherent element in human nature, and that if the wicked have nothing to fear they are reckless in evil, as witness these Nazis.

I knew well a respectable, useful woman who had formerly lived in a slum in the depths of drunkenness and misery. She told me that one night she went down to the nearby canal determined to drown herself. I asked what deterred her. She replied: "It was only the knowledge that if I went down into those waters I should go down to hell."

Remove this fear of the judgment to come, and one of the results is—SUICIDE. Among pagans it has been almost a virtue. The Chinaman will bring public disgrace upon the man who has wronged him by committing suicide on his enemy's doorstep. It has been often the short cut out of present trouble by disheartened and godless men. When I was first in Budapest in 1923, the police were daily recovering bodies from the Danube. Before the late war Hitler gave as one reason that something drastic must be done for Germany, that since the 1918 war two hundred thousand Germans had committed suicide. The reader will have noted the words of Frederick the Great above, that he would either be buried under the ruins of his country or "will myself end my life," and he will not need to be reminded that several chief Nazis took this fearful step, Hitler included.

The heart pities deeply those who destroy themselves because of material misery, but it is not they alone who do this. It is within living memory that a South African diamond king threw himself off a ship because he was weary of life. Others have taken the fatal step to avoid exposure and disgrace. But when the fear of the wrath of a holy God is alive in the heart, and the man believes he will but hasten his steps towards *eternal* misery, then he hesitates to take the plunge, and, hesitating, retains the possibility that the grace of God may save him through Christ from sin, guilt, and doom, as with the woman just mentioned.

But who shall save him who, with Rosenberg and Hitler, both rejects grace and despises wrath?

The pantheistic doctrine of the transmigration of souls is no effective substitute for the fear of judgment applied by the justice of an all-knowing and almighty Judge. It imagines that the soul must pass through an indefinitely extended series of re-embodiments, for its purification from its stains and its materiality, until at last it shall lose its individuality by being reabsorbed into the All from which it emanated. The sorrows in each life are the inevitable outcome of the wrongs wrought in some earlier life. The only means of escape from the past and of advance towards *Nirvana*, cessation of conscious existence, is the cultivation of passivity, the ignoring or suppressing of desire. In the measure

that this is attained there will be less need for further embodiments in flesh, and so at last shall be reached the goal of separate existence ceasing.

Now no man has any consciousness of any former existence. As to any such life his mind is blank. Therefore his judgment cannot assent to the justice of present sorrow, for he cannot in the least relate the one to the other. Nor is his conscience quickened by being compelled to assent to his afflictions as described. There is wholly lacking the condition seen in the thief dying on a cross by Christ. He showed an active exercise of judgment and conscience, saying to his fellow-criminal: "We indeed [suffer] justly: for we receive the due reward of our deeds" (Luke 23 : 41). In such a case moral benefit results. But no such benefit is wrought by the transmigration doctrine, for it works not on the conscience. Thus in India, where it has been most widely and longest held, the moral state of men is deplorable, and vice and cruelty are almost unrestrained. As has been truly said: "Hinduism has no Saviour."

Rosenberg does not specifically avow acceptance of this doctrine of transmigration, but he describes it as "aristocratic" and as originating in "a valiant heart" (M.212). But this sympathy with it had no moral restraint upon his conduct.

Let us take stock of the situation thus reached. There is no personal God. There is no Creator, or creation. There is no supreme Ruler. Love, with its children pity, mercy, gentleness, is to be abhorred. Grace to the guilty is foolish weakness. There is no Son of God sent by the Father to effect the reconciliation of His enemies, by Himself bearing their punishment. There is no divine purpose or plan in history conducting heaven and earth to a worthy goal. In place of all this we are to be ruled by selfish ambition, by lust of power; brute force is honourable and essential; the weak must be eliminated wholesale and ruthlessly. National "honour" is to oust God. Indeed, there is no God to fear nor wrath of God to dread.

And the outcome?—reversion to the most fearful barbarities of the degraded gods exalted before misled men to be their heroes and models. Every effect must have a cause adequate to produce it. Here certainly cause and effect tally exactly, and endorse that ancient statement in that ancient oriental Book: "The fool has said in his heart, There is no God! They are corrupt, they have done abominable works" (Psalm 14 : 1). Yet this at least the Nazis have done that is noteworthy: they have demonstrated absolutely the immoral nature of the pantheistic philosophy of the universe. He that hath eyes to see, let him see.

CHAPTER II

PANTHEISM, POLYTHEISM, ROMANISM, HUMANISM, PROTESTANTISM

LET US PROBE THE SORE FURTHER AND PUT ITS PRODUCTS AGAIN under the microscope.

Man is inherently religious. He craves for something to adore. This natural necessity even Nietzsche tacitly acknowledged. He wrote to his sister: "Incommunicability is in truth the most awful of solitudes. A profound man needs friends, *unless, indeed, he has a God.* I have neither God nor friend." Commenting on the words I have italicized, a reviewer said: "And that way madness lay," which state Nietzsche, alas, reached.

I. PANTHEISM AND POLYTHEISM

Now hide from man the true and living God and he will "worship and serve the creature" (Romans 1: 25). Why not? Since all things are God everything may be worshipped, each being a manifestation of God. Cats and beetles, winds and trees, sun, moon and stars, vermin and phallus—all alike are adorable, divine. Pantheism warrants polytheism. But this is degrading, so philosophy comes to the help of the proud. Such bestial worship will do for the lower masses; the cultured must have something superior. For a *man* to worship a *beast* is, says the savant, ridiculous, humiliating, as truly it is. He ought to worship the *highest* manifestation of the ALL, and this is himself, *man*: let him therefore worship himself.

The pantheists shall speak for themselves. The italics are mine.

It was the work of Eckhart to teach the German "to awaken *the God in his own bosom*" (M. 219). He spoke of "God's kingdom where *man is God*" (M. 229). And to the same effect Rosenberg writes of "*the God in the bosom*, who is not the object of the Ego, but *is the Ego* itself" (M. 395). And more fully:

> I cannot deny myself to insert here a psychically related passage out of the Chandogya Upanishad: "In truth man is made of will. Spirit is his material; life his body; light his form; his decree is truth; his ego is infinity: it is all-knowing, all-working, embraces the ALL, silent, untroubled: this is my soul (*atman*) in

> the inner heart; smaller than the grain of rice, or barley, or mustard seed, or millet corn, or the kernel of a millet corn—this is my soul in the inner heart, greater than the earth, greater than the atmosphere, greater than the heaven, greater than these worlds.
>
> The all-working, all-knowing, the all-embracing, silent, untroubled; this is my soul in the innermost heart, this is the Brahman, which I shall become, when departing hence, entering in. Most truly to whom this came to pass, he doubts not. (M. 240 note.)

Well, were man really all this no doubt it were fitting to worship him. But the consciousness of each one of us is to the contrary. Man is full of inward division and contradiction; he is largely ignorant, is impotent, limited, noisy, troubled; his decrees are all too frequently wrong in nature and effect, the opposite of truth.

Pantheism is not only false in its view of God but also of man. It was this false estimate of man that Rosenberg's new religion was to assert: "But there awakes to-day a new Faith; the religion of blood, the faith that with the blood is ready even to defend the *divine nature of man* in general" (M. 114).

The Upanishads date from 500 B.C., but enshrine older conceptions, so that the above quotation shows how pantheistic falsehood blinded vast areas from the oldest periods. We have remarked before that the early Egyptians held the doctrine and taught that their senior deities were the All, the universe.

It was a leading purpose of God in taking up Israel as a people that they should stand for His unity, for mankind had almost universally refused that knowledge. Moses was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Acts 7: 22). With the utmost emphasis he taught Israel that "Jehovah *our* God is *one* Jehovah," and demanded that they should wholly concentrate on Him as the sole object of worship; "and thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might," (Deuteronomy 6: 4, 5). The polytheism to which they had sunk in Egypt (Joshua 24: 14) was to be completely abandoned, and before all pantheistic and polytheistic peoples their privilege and duty was to maintain the truth of the unity of God.

And by his simple, explicit account of the creation of the heavens and earth by God, Moses declared the falsity of all theories that confuse the Creator and the creation. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (Genesis 1: 1). It is no wonder that Rosenberg wrote emphatically that: "The so-called Old Testament must accordingly be banished once for all as a book of religion" (M. 603). In this he was at least consistent and

honest, in contrast to writers who hold the same view but talk deceitfully about desiring only to purify the Book and make it truer and more acceptable. To such the word of the Lord is: "I would thou wert cold or hot" (Revelation 3 : 15).

To this high trust Israel was not long faithful. When they were so, their God endorsed them, kept His promises, and made them prosperous; when they lapsed to polytheism He as surely abandoned them to enemies and miseries. It has been a persistent effort of wily foes, posing as friends of the Book, to confuse or reject its histories in order that this their uniform and solemn testimony should be impaired.

After their severe national chastisement in Babylon, in the sixth century before Christ, Israel ceased to worship idols, and they have since asserted the unity of God wherever they have been scattered. But to-day the more part of the nation are irreligious, and the prophecies show that at the close of this present period of human affairs a large proportion of them will again become idolaters. See Isaiah 2 : 17–21; 65 : 1–3; Zephaniah 1 : 1–15.

As mentioned, the father of modern pantheism, Spinoza, was a Jew, and many of his race will follow him in this and will proceed to polytheism. This theme cannot be here enlarged. It is enough to show how ancient and persistent is the pantheistic and polytheistic philosophy, and also the age-enduring and irreconcilable conflict between it and the Word of God.

When Christ came He stressed heavily the unity of God, declaring that the statement by Moses above quoted was the great and first commandment. Two of the narratives quote this endorsement (Matthew 22 : 34–40; Mark 12 : 24–31). But the Lord's teaching that He was in a special sense the *Son* of God, and also that the *Spirit* of God proceedeth from the *Father* and is sent forth by the *Son*, brought into relief what in the Old Testament had been only hinted and not stated, even that in the Unity of the Godhead three Persons share while yet being only one God.

This nearer and enlarged view of God was equally as antagonistic to the pantheism and polytheism of mankind at large, and the secret powers that fight against the truth, to hold men in darkness, set themselves to nullify the testimony to God by Christians as they had largely nullified that of Israel.

2. ROMANISM

And they as largely succeeded. For into Christian circles there soon crept able men whose work was to saturate the thought of Christians with pagan philosophy and to introduce pagan religious

views and practices; and by the time of Constantine the Great (cent. 4) the by then merely nominal Christian church was ready to baptize pagan gods, goddesses, ceremonies, and pagans themselves, and give them Christian names. This confederated Church duly became the Roman Catholic Church in the West and the Greek Orthodox and allied Churches in the East. The following authorities may be studied: Dr. E. Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, and *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches;* Dr. James Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire* (ch. vii); Bingham, *Antiquities of the Church;* G. H. Pember, *The Church, the Churches and the Mysteries*, and *Mystery Babylon the Great and the Mysteries and Catholicism;* Alex. Hislop, *The Two Babylons*. Most of these are out of print. The general reader can find a remarkable and detailed statement of the pagan origin of Romanism in Charles Reade's famous and learned historical novel, *The Cloister and the Hearth*, ch. lxxiv. The author was a scholar, a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and a D.C.L.

In the works mentioned there may be seen in great detail the essential nature, oneness, and corruptness of paganism, whether avowed or nominally "Christian." It shall be illustrated here by one prominent feature—the attributing of a female element to Deity. It is common to pagan religions that nominally a male god is supreme, whether Ea in early Babylonia, Ra in ancient Egypt, Zeus in Greece, Jupiter among the Latins, or "The Father" of Roman Catholic doctrine. But in actual practice a female deity has become dominant, has received most adoration, again under many names, Damkina, Isis, Astarte, Venus, Juno, "Mary," and has been accorded supreme honour as the Mother of God, the Queen of heaven.

Our philosopher fully recognized the descent of the Romish system from paganism, including Nordic paganism (M. 163). He hated "the Church" with a virulence second only to that against the Jews; and one ground of his antagonism was real and valid, even that the Church was a cruel despot, enslaving the bodies and souls of men. Yet he did not seem to recognize that in essence "the Church" was one with his own philosophy, as indicated in its worship of the Mother of God. For this whole idea of a feminine element in deity is pantheistic, for if the universe is God and God is the universe, then, because in the universe there is in fact a female element, so must there of necessity be such in God.

Romish books explain that the reason why Mary is so popular is because her womanly tenderness draws to her the woman heart for sympathy. But this does not explain why *men* also have enthusiastically supported this practical supremacy of a goddess.

For example, when the French revolutionaries in 1793 overturned the Romish religion, what did they substitute? On the high altar of Notre-Dame cathedral in Paris they set *an actress* and proclaimed *her* the being worthy to be adored. It is said that she was *naked*, and it is credible, but Carlyle at least does not mention this when recording the scene: but if it was so, the impious proceeding told most eloquently why *men* have readily exalted the great goddess. Certain it is that in all pagan spheres her worship has always been accompanied by the grossest licentiousness. And Rosenberg does not mention that this feature of Romish religion allies it with the Nordic religion he would fain have revived, for the Norsemen, too, had their great female deity, Frigg, the wife of Odin, or Freyia, after whom Friday is named.

Our immediate subject is the worship of *man*. Polytheism shows that men projected into the world above the characteristics of their own race, and peopled that world with glorified beings owning and using *all* the faculties of men, *and* indulging all their *vices*. Thus vice could be indulged under the sanction of religion, lust and cruelty were justified by the example of the gods. Thus did the Nazis (or many of them) follow Odin in violence and barbarity, becoming like the god they honoured. And it is common knowledge that they reinstituted the pagan ceremony of fire worship on the mountains.

Half a century ago, writing in *The Nineteenth Century* (January, 1900) on "The Continuity of Catholicism," Dr. St. George Mivart revealed that the Roman Church can easily adopt polytheistic paganism. He said that:

> Monotheism, in the highest sense of that term, is, of course, an indisputable truth, but can it be entirely defended as popularly understood? Newman has thrown some doubt on this matter. . . God's attributes, while distinct, are each of them equally "God." . . . But does not this really amount to Polytheism? And, indeed, we may well ask why may we not, in this way, attribute "plurality" to God? There are certainly some attributes and aspects of the Deity which may not be unfitly represented by such Pagan Gods—by Zeus, Athene, Ares, Aphrodite, Nemesis, Eros, Demeter, Pan. In a sense, the Paganism of Greece and Rome was "true" and "righteous," and the worship of the Heathen, as Cardinal Newman has said, "an acceptable service."

Dr. Mivert went on to say that he had heard four learned, devout and experienced Catholic priests declare separately that it is lawful for a Catholic "to worship God as Zeus or Athene." In this way

did a Romanist challenge the truth of the oneness of God and assert what is essential pantheism and polytheism.

3. HUMANISM

Thus in the centuries before Christ the testimony to the true nature of God, which Israel ought to have maintained in the east, was greatly nullified by that people succumbing to the philosophy and idolatry prevalent. Similarly in the centuries after Christ the same testimony which the Christian communities ought to have spread in the Middle East and Europe, and which for two centuries or more they did spread, was then largely nullified by the corrupt ecclesiastical system just considered, falsely called "Christian" but actually pagan. By its influence, polytheism maintained its blinding grip for the thousand years justly styled the Dark Ages.

As this period neared its close the darkness began to be disturbed. Wycliffe in England and Jerome in Prague (century 14), John Huss in Bohemia and Savonarola in Italy (century 15), entered vigorous protests against the errors and practices which prevailed, drew men's attention to the Book of God as the true fountain of knowledge and true seat of authority, and caused a spirit of inquiry to arise.

This incipient movement held the greatest promise of light and liberty being restored to men by a wide increase of the knowledge of the true God. How was it met? The Catholic Church opposed to it anathema and the stake, so as to maintain its supremacy of darkness and bondage over men. But at the same time a far subtler enemy appeared. In the Church the worship of man was fostered by honouring the Pope, invoking saints, and devotion to "Mary"—the Mother of God, and also by permitting men (Popes, priests, princes, and people) to indulge, as did the pagans, every lust of the senses, as well as the greed and cruelty indigenous in man's nature. But the new enemy of the truth as to God seemed an angel of light, yet worked to the same end. It revived culture, literature, æstheticism. For its learning for the mind, its advancement of art, its models for statuary, it went back to the classic world of Greece, and brought thence what?—precisely the same philosophy that had corrupted Christianity into Catholicism! The exaltation of man was the key thought of the Renaissance, and its essential philosophical conception was pantheism.

We cannot here enlarge adequately. The theme is treated in sufficient detail in a recent (1943) work entitled *Interpreters of Man* by Gwilym O. Griffith (Lutterworth Press, London and Redhill). He says (page 1): "The Renaissance . . . was more humanistic

than Christian; it was characterized by a re-discovery or re-assertion, as Berdyaev says, of 'the natural man'—by a belief in man's own competence, resourcefulness and sufficiency." This is illustrated from the writings of seventeen principal thinkers of the last hundred and fifty years, of differing schools of thought, from Hegel to Barth. And he concludes (p. 233):

> And so we bring our studies to an end. Our ethics, our social and political morality, depend upon our estimate of Man. And in these studies we have watched the declining fortunes of what we have called the Renaissance view of Man (including religious Man)—the view of him as an essentially competent being, able to make his own way in the world and advance toward perfection. We have seen how this led, in theology, to a conception of Man as essentially divine, one with God, and therefore only relatively and metaphorically in need of redemption or salvation; really needing self-discovery, and thus the dissolution of his illusory complexes. Thus again it led to a Christology which saw Christ in His "God-consciousness" as the revealer of Man to himself. This was an upward revision of Matthew Arnold's more modest lines:
>
> Was Christ a man like us? *Ah! let us try*
> *If we then, too, can be such men as He!*
>
> An ambitious revision which presently produced the succinct formula "Jesus was God, but so are we." Or, more moderately, this Renaissance spirit, blending with nineteenth-century liberalism, led to a view of man as an evolving being needing only the release of education and reform to enable him to fulfil his destiny and march forward from epoch to epoch, from world to world.

The essence of Humanism is pantheism, and the consequent worship of man as the most immediate manifestation of God. And the latest great development of this is—Nazi-ism!

4. PROTESTANISM

Battle is marked by move and counter-move. Humanism was a counter-move to the incipient revival of truth by the earlier Reformers. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was an enlargement and enforcement of that earlier revival, and an answer to Humanism.

For it insisted upon, *first*, the thorough, irremediable corruption of human nature, with its consequent inability to know or to serve God; *second*, upon the further consequence that, if man is to be helped, God must act towards him in love, on the principle of showing *grace*, as a sovereign towards a rebel; *third*, that this

love and grace were in fact displayed by God sending His own Son into this world as Man, and by Christ dying under the law of God to answer for the sins of all men, so providing a righteous ground in law upon which God may display His grace without derogation of justice; *fourth*, that the saving benefit of this atoning sacrifice can be received by faith only, since prior to such faith man is wholly unable to please God; *fifth*, that to secure a radical change for the better the individual man must receive a *new* nature, since his nature by his natural birth is wholly spoilt; he must be "born from above," God imparting to him His own nature by the act of His own Spirit. Luther said his teaching was not about doing new works, but about *a new man* to do the works; *sixth*, that the proof that a man has truly changed his mind (repented) as to himself and his ways, and has savingly believed in Christ, is that he begins to walk in love and to act in grace, treating his neighbour as God has treated himself.

This line of teaching, in basic principles and in implications, was the contradiction of Romanism and equally of Humanism, and both the latter systems set their whole forces in motion to antagonize it. Rome's methods were mainly violent; the Counter-Reformation, the Inquisition. Humanism acted by the more subtle agent of the intellect, as through the learning of Erasmus and the open scepticism of the English Deists and Voltaire. "The principle that reason is the one only guide of life, the supreme arbiter of all questions, politics and religion included, has its earliest and most complete exemplar in Erasmus" (E.B., VIII, p. 679).

The Reformers had drawn their teachings from the Bible as the sole available source of divine knowledge upon the vital matters involved. Rome had substituted a fictitious oral apostolic tradition as the primary basis of doctrine and an alleged authority of "the Church" as the final authority. The Reformers denied both and went direct to the Holy Scriptures. The Humanists of necessity set themselves to undermine this authority of the Bible. The English Deists of the eighteenth century attacked it, of which Tom Paine's *Age of Reason* was the last sample, by "a rough, ready, passionate controversialist" (E.B. XVII, p. 33). Or as a sceptical follower of Paine put it: "Paine indeed consummated the Deistic movement in England. After him it passed into a bolder scepticism" (G. W. Foote, *Annotations to the Age of Reason*, Ed. 1901, p. 206).

Now, Paine affirmed that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, nor were those books written till several centuries after the time of Moses. The historical books in general are not reliable. There is much myth and legend in the narratives. There was more than

one author of *Isaiah*; also of *Jeremiah*. The rest of the prophets are equally unreliable. The *Gospels* are marked by "absurdities, contradictions and falsehoods." The virgin birth of Christ is ridiculed. His resurrection is a "legendary tale." All this he carried out into much detail.

It is evident that if the Bible is of this character it deserves to be repudiated. The reverence which was so long accorded it was wholly undeserved and ought to cease. What, however, is to be put in its place with a view to securing, if possible, what moral and social benefits seem to have resulted from its influence? The title of Paine's book indicates this; it is Reason, human reason; that is, his position was that of the whole Humanistic movement, *the sufficiency of man*. God may have existed, for Paine was a Deist, not a formal Atheist; but if He does exist He does not count practically, for He put the universe under rigid, invariable laws, and does not interfere. By consequence, the whole notion that He does interfere, by, say, a Flood, or by becoming incarnate in His Son, Jesus Christ, or in any other miraculous manner, must be just ruled out as unthinkable.

This was the line of attack of the Deists of the eighteenth century. It was directed to undermining the general respect of English people for the Bible. Voltaire was at the same time doing the same work in France. The Revolutionaries adopted this attitude and spirit. Helped by Voltaire, Frederick the Great avowed the same hostility to the Christian faith in the first home of the Reformation, Germany.

How did Protestantism meet this wide-fronted attack? Many evangelical stalwarts met it bravely and preserved large numbers from lapsing into unbelief. But Protestantism from early days had committed the simply fatal blunder of maintaining the false Romish teaching that infant baptism effects regeneration, that the subjects of that human, non-apostolic rite had by it received the new nature, and were Christians. The result was that the Protestant churches were in time composed mainly of ungodly persons, and they lapsed as communities into almost lifeless organizations. Now the dead cannot fight battles, and Protestantism as a whole early succumbed to the intellectual poison of the Humanistic view of the Bible, so that the Book lost its former influence upon public thought and practice.

Paine died in 1809. Within ten years thereafter two German theologians and philosophers were teaching in Berlin pantheistic philosophy, Hegel and Schleiermacher. In 1831 D. F. Strauss went to Berlin and was influenced deeply by Hegel's teachings. In 1835 he published his *Life of Jesus*, from which time there flowed

over the Protestant world a very flood of sceptical views as to the Bible, the very views of Hume, Paine, and Voltaire upon that Book.

Speaking in London in 1851 upon "The Religious Life of Germany and its Infidelity," the celebrated Lutheran divine and court preacher, Dr. F. W. Krummacher, said:

> I feel as if I had to describe a "new fall of man."

Referring to the extreme radicals in theology, such as Hegel, Strauss, and Baur, he said that

> in making a "God" and in deifying that beloved "I" they robbed God of His personal deity. They called futurity the last enemy, which is to be destroyed. They applauded the emancipation of the flesh, and presented to the world a material Utopia instead of a heavenly blessedness. Thus the unbelieving theology had reached its summit in Germany, and thorough anti-Christianism had arrived. What God's Holy Word predicts was verified: "the sons of Adam thinking themselves wise became fools." In the newest battles of the spirit which are fought in German science it is not the question if this or that Christian doctrine is still to be esteemed, but if the whole Christianity—yes! if general religion—*is to be or not to be.*
>
> In Berlin which contains more than 400,000 persons, not more than 20,000 visit the house of God. The remainder, as far as our judgment allows us to infer, are with more or less knowledge attached to vulgar rationalism. . . .
>
> The anti-Christian seed which is sown so diligently increases amazingly, and material preventative measures alone will not hinder it from sooner or later bringing forth more terrible fruit than we saw appearing three years ago."[1]

The last reference was presumably to the disturbances of 1848 in most of the chief centres of Europe. It was the year of the Chartist riots in England. The forecast as to "more terrible fruit" to grow from the sowing of unbelief has been fearfully fulfilled of recent years.

This attack culminated in Germany in the oriental scholar Wellhausen. It is noteworthy that the four Germans mentioned had all been reared in evangelical truth and abandoned it. In 1882 Wellhausen resigned his chair of theology "in the consciousness that I no longer stand at all on the ground of the Evangelical Church or of Protestantism." He gave his theological

[1] The above quotation is from the 1947 American edition of Dr. Krummacher's famous book, *The Suffering Saviour.* See Preface, xxiii, xxiv.

position as " Polytheism and Monotheism together " (Quotations translated from *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge*, IV, p. 233).

After Wellhausen's death in 1918 " Claudius Clear " wrote in the *British Weekly* concerning conversations with him: " On various occasions he discussed the effect of the higher criticism on popular religion. As I have previously stated, Wellhausen considered that if his views were accepted the value of the Old Testament to the people would be largely gone. They would not be impressed as they were by a book which, far from being infallible, was very fallible " (*British Weekly*, February 21st, 1918).

This came to pass. The German people as a whole lost the faith of the Reformation, not only in the Old Testament but also in the New, for the latter fully endorses the former, and they will stand or fall together. This further involved, of necessity, that they lost interest in the Lord Jesus Christ and in appreciation of the grace of God revealed in Him, and lost thus the fear of God and the restraints of love and of wrath. In a soil so congenial the rankest weeds could flourish and such writers and leaders as Hitler and Rosenberg gained an immediate grip and exercised a veritable stranglehold upon what little may have been left in the masses of mercy and truth, gentleness and love.

By personal observation I know very many Germans retained or gained faith in the true God, in His Son Jesus Christ, and in the Word of God, the Bible; yet their influence was commonly weakened by sharing the general nationalistic outlook and spirit, and when Hitler filled the horizon most of them were at first fascinated and dazzled. Over the vast majority of the nation pantheism held sway, in fact, if not in consciously held theory, seducing the spirit and leading on to the ruin spread before all eyes to-day. As Ley too late discerned, they had forsaken God and God forsook them. Will they, and the other nations, from bitterness and misery learn and own the total bankruptcy of Humanism, of Romanism, of pantheism, with the complete depravity and helplessness of man and his utter dependence upon the God of all grace? " Thus saith Jehovah: Cursed is the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm and whose heart departeth from Jehovah " (Jeremiah 17: 5). That ancient curse has taken effect through the two and a half millenniums since the prophet of God announced it. History, personal and universal, attests this.

CHAPTER III

FATALISM

THE E.B. (IX, 109) DEFINES FATALISM THUS: "STRICTLY THE doctrine that all things happen according to a pre-arranged fate, necessity or inexorable decree. . . . Thus an oriental may believe that he is fated to die on a particular day; he believes that whatever he does and in spite of all precautions he takes, nothing can avert the disaster. The idea of an omnipotent fate overruling all affairs of man is present in various forms in practically all religious systems. . . . In Æschylus [a Greek writer, died 456 B.C.] fate is powerful even over the gods. The Epicureans regarded fate as blind chance, while to the Stoics everything is subject to an absolute rational law. . . . In Islam fate is an absolute power, known as *Kismet*, or *Nasib*, which is conceived as inexorable and transcending all the physical laws of the universe. The most striking feature of the oriental fatalism is its complete indifference to material circumstances; men accept prosperity and misfortune with calmness as the decree of fate."

This passivity is no doubt induced when the event is believed to be unavoidable or has actually occurred, but it does not hinder the fatalist pursuing with full zeal an object upon which his heart is set, so long as there seems hope of attaining it. Indeed, if he has persuaded himself that he is fated to do it, this may impart drive to his effort as something certain of accomplishment.

But a yet more notable and terrible feature of this doctrine is the destruction of moral sense. Charge a Moslem with a foul vice or crime and he will say: "I could not help it; it is *Kismet*!" Thus moral responsibility is annulled. Nor has fear of judgment any deterrent power, for it is inevadable, however one may repent and seek to amend. To the Hindu *Karma* is inescapable; to the Stoic rational law is *absolute*, therefore irreversible, and its outworking unavoidable.

Nor can there exist any just and moral government of the universe. Fate has decreed the good and the evil; there is no virtue in doing the one or wrong in doing the other; therefore neither reward nor penalty can properly be supposed; all is fated.

How hopeless is the outlook. Unless the Fates have decreed a better world than exists it will never be; why, then, labour

for it? If they have decreed it, it will come; why toil or deny oneself to create it? "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die"—so Fate will have it.

Adolf Hitler was greatly influenced by this blinding notion. It is true that he was not philosophically minded or trained and his religious views were unsystematic and more or less contradictory. It seems from his book that he had not wholly escaped from his Roman Catholic unbringing, though he repudiated and fought that Church. In consequence there are various expressions reminiscent of earlier thoughts of a personal Deity. But *Mein Kampf* reveals a powerful element of Fatalism dominating his mind.

Its very first sentence reads: "It serves me to-day as a happy determination that Fate appointed Braunau-on-the-Inn as my birthplace" (1). It was Fate that united Austria and Germany (11), a subtle justification why Hitler should incorporate the former country into the German empire. He tells us that his father had been reared on the land, but determined when a boy to become something higher and had become a State official, yet ended his days tilling land. He, too, hoped similarly "to forestall Fate and become 'something,' but in no case an official" (17). Yet, as with his father, Fate had its way, and he became the chief official of the empire. "When my mother died my Fate had already in one respect reached its decision" (18). "What at that time appeared to me the severity of Fate I praise to-day as the wisdom of Providence. Whilst the Goddess of necessity took me in her arms and often threatened to smash me, the will to resist grew, and at last the will remained victor" (20). "It will be evil if Fate appoints as leader of a State one who knows much but accomplishes nothing" (38). "Fate itself instructed me" (48). "Fate weights the balance with its blessing" (68). "I must be more than thankful to Fate" (85). "Believest thou thyself to be chosen by Fate" (126). "The inexorable hand of the Goddess of Fate" (178). "In my youth Fate seized me with unmerciful severity" (223). "Fate itself seemed now to provide a finger-post" (242, 742). "The quacks and prattlers that since the Revolution [of 1918] Fate had let loose upon Germany as 'Statesmen'" (258). "The hammer-stroke of Fate" (321). "From the deepest depths of the heart we should thank Fate" (554). "It is futile to quarrel with Fate" (680). "We have been chosen by Fate" (743). "Fate has made no exception, but has given us what we deserved" (762). "I frequently implored them to let Fate have free course" (773).

These twenty-one sentences are quoted from the 113 occurrences of the word Fate which I have counted. They are found from the first page to the tenth from the end, and display "Fate" as perhaps the most striking and distinctive word of the book. The conception swayed Hitler to the end of his life. On April 16th, 1945, he said in an Order of the Day, "Fate has disposed of the most formidable war criminal of all times" (D.T., April 17th, 1945). The reference was to the death of President Roosevelt.

In his Political Testament he wrote, "I wish to share my fate with that which millions of others have taken upon themselves" (D.T., December 31st, 1945). His associates knew that this conception animated him. The British Army Report upon his death said that Dr. Gilsing, his throat specialist, "notes that Hitler believed he was chosen by fate to be the leader of the German people" (D.T., November 2nd, 1945).

The same doctrine weighed heavily with Rosenberg also. The word Fate is found at least sixty-eight times in *Der Mythus*. As early as page 3, in the Introduction itself, he states that "Fate" had put forward the theme he treats. He regarded the present hour as one of "great psychical Fate" for all nations, and if they are not prepared "to tread a new way" there must "come with the political collapse a psychical *catastrophe* also" (15): Sulla and Augustus "could no longer restrain Fate" as to the Roman Empire (57). The anti-biblical nature of this conception is seen in this sentence: "To a people with unbroken racial character the doctrine of inherited sin would be incomprehensible, for there lives in such a nation an assured reliance on itself and on the perception of its will as Fate" (71). The irruption of the Northern races into south Europe was "a menacing, powerful, primitive Fate" (80). The persecutions of the Waldenses (93) and the Hugenots (99, 100) are described as Fate. "Eckhart's death was one of the most fateful hours of Europe" (254). Beethoven is quoted as saying that his goal was "to seize Fate by the jaws" (262). "In *all* German songs appears the idea of Fate-appointed honour" (314). German thought "combines 'I' and 'Fate' as two together existing facts, without inquiring as to the original cause of either position" (397).

The conception is elaborated and extolled in a reference to old Germanic legends and songs. "The billows of the heart could never foam or soar so grandly did not Fate, as a silent rock, withstand them." On the Catalonian fields Germans encounter Germans, both parties in the belief that they must fight for their

freedom and honour. And the German singer closes his song of Fate thus :

> Curse strikes us, brother, that I thee should kill ;
> It ne'er shall be forgotten ;
> The decree of the Fates is hard.

" Here the impassive Fates appear as the symbol of an inscrutable but perceptible cosmic law of Necessity " (398). Again, " In the accomplishment of the self-begotten law of honour the elder Hildebrand recognized at the same time the ruling of Fate " [that is, that he should knowingly kill his own son in fight], which Rosenberg described as " a conception which reaches the deepest German mysticism, which recognizes the ' uncreated soul,' as God of its own fate " (399). Thus do pantheism and fatalism belong together, and compel, by a law of necessity, brothers to slaughter brothers and a father to slay his son, the blinding impulse thereto being a false " honour."

In the song Hildebrand had invoked the " o'erruling God," but " L. Wolff quite justly shows that the god to whom Hildebrand appeals is not the God of Christianity " (400). This is most certainly and altogether true. This whole conception of " God " as " Fate " is utterly and wholly pagan, not Biblical.

This must always be kept in mind when Hitler speaks of " the creation of the universe " (234), or uses similar expressions lingering in his mind from earlier years. His real sentiments are heard in such titles and phrases as " the cruel goddess of Necessity " (i. 116), " the inexorable hand of the goddess of Fate " (i. 178) ; for their highest life men have to " thank the knowledge and ruthless application of the iron laws of Nature " (i. 316), and again, " the Goddess of inexorable vengeance " (i. 406). His thinking was early paganized. As early as 1924, addressing the court that condemned him to prison, he said, " history as the goddess of a higher truth and better justice will smilingly tear this judgment in pieces " (ii. 780). Writing of the Aryan he said : " he is the Prometheus of mankind out of whose bright forehead the divine spark of genius has at all times sprung " (317). His mind turned naturally to the pagan myths for its comparisons.

Goebbels showed the same attitude of mind. In April, 1945, when national collapse was clear and he was asked what event he expected to justify the optimism he still expressed, he answered that " he could not say, but Fate still held many possibilities in her hand" (L.D.H., 109). And a few days later the words quoted above from the ancient German song were justified : " The decree

of the Fates is hard." Admiral Doenitz also was a fatalist. In his last message to Hitler he wrote :

> I shall do everything possible to relieve you in Berlin. If Fate nevertheless compels me to rule the Reich as your appointed successor, etc. (L.D.H., 226).

During the war we, like many others, kept an open table for soldiers. One Britisher passed a remark such as many others have been known to make. Speaking of bullets he said : " Well, if my ticket's on it, it will find me." Conversation showed he was a pure fatalist in outlook. At the other social extreme, in April, 1947, a world-famous British statesman called upon a friendly State to follow the path to which " Destiny " has called them.

Every error is the perversion of some truth. What, then, is the truth, or aspect of truth, behind the error of fatalism ? Is there *any* sense in which the bullet finds its particular man ? For answer consider this old-world story from the same ancient oriental Book. It is found in the second book of Chronicles, chapter eighteen, and it is worth pondering.

The British Empire is but a youth—a proud, vigorous youth, it is true; but young, though seemingly already in decline. Fourteen hundreds of years before its barbarian Saxon ancestors came to Britain, the Jewish State was already at its zenith under David and Solomon, the one renowned as a warrior, the other proverbial for wisdom. But the wise Solomon had a fool for his son and heir, against whom five-sixths of the nation rebelled and formed a separate northern kingdom. This kingdom apostatized from the worship of the true God and presently adopted the pagan idolatry of Baal.

Some eighty years passed and a king named Ahab was reigning in the north, and Jehoshaphat was king over the southern realm of Judah, where the worship of Jehovah was maintained. This pious man was so foolish as to make a political alliance with his God-rejecting neighbour, Ahab, and duly paid him a state visit. How modern it is ; professedly " Christian " statesmen making alliances with blood-soaked atheists or with pagans.

Now, Ahab's northern neighbour, the king of Syria, had attacked his territory beyond Jordan and captured the important town of Ramoth in Gilead. It had come into Ahab's mind to attempt to drive the Syrians out ; but, though wicked, he was neither so wicked nor so foolish as to be an atheist and act without consulting the powers above. Yet, as he had rejected Jehovah the God of Israel, he could, of course, appeal only to his own deity, Baal, four hundred of whose soothsayers, magicians, or, to give

their modern description, mediums, were in his service. To them he applied, just as Hitler consulted mediums and astrologers. With united voice they assured the king that God would give him the victory; and as the king of Judah was present, these false prophets blasphemously professed to speak in the name of the God he revered, Jehovah.

But Jehoshaphat deeply distrusted these idolatrous prophets, and asked Ahab whether there was not in his whole kingdom at least one prophet who stood truly and avowedly for the true God, Jehovah. Yes, said Ahab, there is one such man; his name is Micaiah, " but I *hate* him; for he never prophesieth good concerning me, but always evil " (verse 7). This is significant, highly significant. Let it be noted that a messenger of the true God, though speaking at risk of life itself, inflexibly denounced evil against an evil man!

However, to please Jehoshaphat, the man was summoned to the royal presence. The visitor to Ahab's capital, Samaria, can still enter the ruins, as the writer did, between the massive towers which guarded the city gate, and in the open space within can muse over the strange scene now in question. The two kings, each on a throne; the assembled court; the general throng; and in the centre the four hundred prophets of Baal vociferously assuring Ahab of success in the intended campaign. And the tranquil brilliant heaven shining over all. One lone, brave man dares to oppose the united and vast majority. Micaiah tells Ahab that the issue of the war will be that his people will be left as a flock without a shepherd (verse 16). And then he adds an announcement that surely defies invention, bears on its face the stamp of veracity, and at least is consistent with the whole of God's Book. His words were:

> Therefore hear ye the word of Jehovah: I saw Jehovah sitting upon his throne, and all the host of heaven standing on his right hand and on his left. And Jehovah said, who shall entice Ahab king of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth Gilead? And one spake saying after this manner, and another saying after that manner. And there came forth a spirit, and stood before Jehovah, and said, I will entice him. And Jehovah said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt entice him, and shalt prevail also; go forth, and do so. Now therefore, behold, Jehovah hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of these thy prophets; and Jehovah hath spoken evil concerning thee.

A man in peril of life will scarcely invent a scene sure to anger the tyrant in whose grip he is. Micaiah did not hedge and trim

to save his skin. And the sequel? Ahab defied the warning, went to the battle, and Jehoshaphat recklessly joined him. The king of Israel resorted to a dirty trick. He persuaded Jehoshaphat to dress in royal attire, while he himself went into the ranks in common armour. Thus the attention of the foe would be diverted from himself, and any special danger would attack his confederate. At first the manœuvre seemed to succeed. The king of Syria had ordered the commanders of his thirty-two chariot divisions to concentrate their whole attack against the king of Israel, and they pressed upon Jehoshaphat. But they perceived their mistake and turned from him. Yet Ahab's wile failed. A common Syrian soldier shot an arrow, as he had doubtless shot many others that day, but this shaft found a crevice in Ahab's suit of mail, and the wound proved fatal. The bullet had found its billet, as foretold.

But this is not fatalism, just as the judicial execution of a criminal by order of the High Court, is not fatalism. The differences are patent and vital :

1. Here is no blind impersonal Law acting, but a personal living Being.
2. Here is no non-moral implacable, unintelligent Necessity, but a reasoned procedure settled after discussion in open court.
3. Here is no inscrutable, arbitrary action, but a judicial sentence after long forbearance and strong warnings. For Ahab had reigned twenty-two years, and from the beginning had surpassed in wickedness all his royal predecessors. His general history is found in the first book of Kings, chapters 16 : 29 to 22 : 40. There is reason why his affairs are given so much space. He illustrates the awful wickedness possible to the human heart, and also the forbearance and the justice of God.

It was on account of his evil, and that of his people as led by him, that God through Elijah announced beforehand, and sent, a famine, by withholding rain and dew for three years and a half. At the close of that dreadful visitation Elijah announced beforehand, and brought, a restoration of the rain, and effected the death of Baal's prophets, the king's servants in leading the nation astray. There was therefore no doubt at all that the infliction was a divine judgment and the removal of it a divine mercy. That Jehovah was the true and only God was then demonstrated conclusively by the open test of fire falling from heaven upon the sacrifices offered to Him, whereas the altar of Baal stood cold.

Later, by means of a prophet, God twice gave Ahab guidance as to resisting attacks by the king of Syria. Nevertheless, this tyrannical and evil ruler profited by a murder contrived by his still more pagan and vicious wife, herself daughter of a pagan king. Charged by Elijah with this wickedness, and threatened with a disgraceful end to himself, his wife, and his family, Ahab humbled himself before God, and experienced the divine clemency to the humble, in the postponement of the threatened vengeance. Yet after all these marked and powerful dealings of God he persisted in his evil course, until the justice of heaven could no more tolerate him, and sentence was passed as shown and duly executed.

Such a sentence *is* inevadable, but it is not *fated* to be, because timely repentance and amendment would have averted it. Of all this there are other instances given in Scripture. For example :

The earliest great empires arose in Assyria, i.e., Mesopotamia. The first chief centre was Nineveh, but by 600 B.C. the mighty Nebuchadnezzar had subdued the Middle East and Egypt and had made Babylon the world capital. His conquests were attended by the utmost savagery. Some miserable captives he " roasted with fire," not simply burned, but *roasted* them (Jeremiah 29 : 22). When three honourable princes resisted his will (on a matter of religion) he flung them into a furnace (Daniel 3). One rebellious king he treated with simply fiendish refinement of cruelty. He slaughtered the king's sons in the presence of their father, whose eyes he then put out, and left the wretched man to drag out his days in dark captivity with that as his last bitter memory. There were Hitlers before Hitler. No European land to-day has been so utterly devastated as was Palestine by Nebuchadnezzar. Why the Almighty God permitted this we will consider later ; at the moment our concern is with His punishment of the great Emperor. The account is in the fourth chapter of *Daniel.*

When the world had been subdued the warrior turned builder, and made Babylon the most magnificent city the earth has ever carried. Before the war the visitor to the Friedrich Wilhelm Museum in Berlin could walk through a street and gateway of glorious blue tiles of great size, ornamented with embossed animals, which had led to the temple of Ishtar in Babylon. But Nebuchadnezzar grew too proud and wicked for those angel rulers mentioned to endure, and they resolved, for his final good, to humble him. Of this they gave him striking warning, first by a vision of the cutting down of a noble tree, supplemented by the interpretation of the vision, and by its direct and personal application to himself, by God's servant Daniel. He was warned that " the sentence is by the decree of the *Watchers* and the demand by the word of the

Holy Ones; to the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdoms of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will, and setteth up over it the lowest of men."

Then they allowed him a year's grace to amend his ways, but in vain. Whereupon while he was in the act of boasting, to his own glory, of the mighty city he had built, a voice rang out of heaven, and confirmed the former sentence. The great and masterly mind suddenly broke; Nebuchadnezzar went mad for seven years, until he lifted up his eyes unto heaven and blessed the Most High that liveth for ever. Thereupon he was restored to his kingly state, granted the yet greater glory he was now morally fit to bear, and issued a royal proclamation to "praise and extol and honour the King of heaven; for all His works are truth and His ways justice; and those that walk in pride He is able to abase."

Note the recent fulfilment of two sentences especially. Modern history confirms these ancient records of the judgments of God. First, "He setteth up over it the lowest of men." Nebuchadnezzar was the son of a long line of kings, but that did not remove him from the power of that court of angels. Recent years have seen the collapse of many monarchies, some of hoary age. What type of men have succeeded to power? Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, Mustapha Kemal, were all of humble rank. What is the explanation that all at once, and in many lands, such an overturning has occurred, such a reversal of conditions? Is any of England's present ministers (1947) of other than lowly origin? In past centuries such seldom rose to power. Is it not so with the present ruler of China? And consider some contrasted facts. No one will accuse the Emperor of Abyssinia, the President of the United States, or their Majesties who have occupied the throne of England for the past hundred years, of being proud, tyrannical rulers, defiers of the Most High. *Their* authority has not been overthrown. But where are the proud Shah or Sultan or Czar or Kaiser of the former generation? Or why has the Emperor of Japan, pagan as he is, been permitted at least a titular survival of rank? We are now told that he honourably refused to break his word of alliance with Britain and the United States and was thrust aside by his haughty military clique. They have gone; he remains; but not by Chance or Fate.

Then, secondly, it was learned by Nebuchadnezzar that "those that walk in pride He is able to abase." Oh, that the recent shameful end of many proud and boastful leaders may be heeded by any other such who, for a season, are being tolerated by the Watchers. For solemnly true, indeed for the godless fearfully

true, are the lines of Longfellow, translated from Friedrich von Logau of the seventeenth century :

> Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small ;
> Though with patience He stands waiting, with exactness grinds He all.

The same principle of judgment determined upon moral grounds, which is seen in the dealings of the Most High with individuals, is revealed in His general judgments.

Consider the first of these—The Flood. The moral basis of that universal wrath is stated in the narrative with the utmost emphasis (Genesis 6). Fallen angels, in human form, were begetting children by the daughters of men, thus greatly intensifying the corruption and violence of mankind. " And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented Jehovah that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And Jehovah said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the ground ; both man, and beast, and creeping thing, and fowl of the air ; for it repenteth me that I have made them. But Noah found grace in the eyes of Jehovah."

Observe how fatalism is excluded by the bold statement that " Jehovah changed His mind [repented]." The Fates do not change their mind. According to that philosophy what is to be is to be, and it must be. God had indeed foreseen that man would " fill the earth with violence " (verse 13) ; but He had in no wise determined this, nor incited man thereto. On the contrary, He stood waiting with patience for some fifteen centuries after the creation of man, and only then did He resolve to reverse that attitude and let justice have its course.

Even then He distinguished carefully between the wicked and the righteous and delivered the latter. Nor was mercy lacking ; for as the removal of a criminal is a benefit to society, so was it good that the human race should make a new start under better moral conditions. The Flood was not aimless or uncontrolled ; " Jehovah sat as king at the Flood ; yea, Jehovah sitteth as king for ever " (Psalm 29 : 10).

Follow the history to the next great judgment some centuries later. The race had again renounced the knowledge of the true God and had sunk to the deepest possible moral vileness, as

detailed in Romans 1 : 18–32. It was reported to the Most High that two cities situated in the centre of the nations were unendurably abominable and should be blotted off the earth (Genesis 18 and 19). But God did not leave so terrible an infliction to His heavenly officers, for they are fallible. He said: "*I* will go down now, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto Me; and if not, I will know." This holy Judge made personal investigation before passing capital sentence.

And again the one comparatively righteous man was exempted, in answer to the plea of a still more truly righteous man that the Judge of all the earth must distinguish between the righteous and the wicked. Only when this had been effected were Sodom and Gomorrah destroyed by fire from heaven, as a warning to the teeming world around that was likewise ripening for judgment.

If anyone requires other than Bible evidence of the abominations of common life in those days let him look reflectively at the pictures of the times sculptured on the walls of the temples and royal palaces of ancient Egypt, or read attentively the particulars given by Herodotus of ancient Babylonia and Egypt, which moral conditions had continued to his own day, the fifth century B.C. As to the raining of fire from the skies, probably the miserable survivors of Hiroshima will not think the narrative incredible. If it be asked whether God has thus dealt with later cities, let the reader inquire as to the immoral conditions prevailing in Pompeii in the first century and Messina in the nineteenth, and he may reasonably conclude that the same holy Judge dealt with them on the same grounds as with Sodom and Gomorrah.

The same moral element is asserted as regards the extermination of the races that occupied Palestine when Israel invaded it. Four centuries earlier God had solemnly covenanted with Abraham that his descendants should own and occupy that land; but He had told him plainly that He could not yet dispossess its then inhabitants, for it would not be warranted morally, because "the iniquity of the Amorite is not yet full" (Genesis 15 : 16). This iniquity was emphasized by Moses on the eve of the invasion by Israel. He said twice, "for the wickedness of these nations Jehovah doth drive them out from before thee . . . for every abomination unto Jehovah which He hateth have they done unto their gods; for even their sons and their daughters do they burn in the fire to their gods," and also they were adept demonists, spiritists (Deuteronomy 9 : 4, 5; 12 : 9–14). Their unnatural, abhorrent, and disgusting sexual enormities are detailed in Leviticus 18 as a ground upon which God would destroy them. Their

extermination was the same kind of benefit to the world at large as is the eradication of a malignant growth from the body.

The historicity of these events is not here discussed. There never has been any just ground to question it, and the archaeologist has consistently confuted the higher critic. The claim of the latter to have rendered the Old Testament intelligible and credible is mere conceit. What he has really done is to serve the dear end of the Father of Lies to discredit the Bible in the minds of the people in general, so that they should cease to fear the Most High and be blind to His overruling of affairs now as in ages past; and being thus ignorant of the true nature and character of God should be open to imbibe the false and poisonous philosophy of pantheism and fatalism, and begin to sink morally towards the level which will demand the wrath of God.

The point now pressed is that the doctrine of the Bible concerning God and His government of the world is opposed radically to the pantheistic, fatalistic philosophy, so ancient, so modern. If the Bible conception of a personal, eternal, infinite, omnipotent holy Judge is the truth, then how dreadful must needs be the future of any creatures who deny and disregard Him, who despise His mercy and defy His wrath. Bible history enforces the warning, while it emphasizes the forbearance of God and His delight in forgiving.

In the afore-stated activities of a supreme court of angels, over which God Himself presides, lies the explanation of one of the deep enigmas of human affairs. A thousand years before Christ an observant and reflecting man set forth a problem that had puzzled such men before him and still baffles men. Asaph wrote: "As for me, my feet were almost gone, my steps had well nigh slipped. For I was envious at the arrogant, When I saw the prosperity of the wicked." And then the startling, puzzling contrast: "Surely in vain have I cleansed my heart and washed my hands in innocency; For all the day long have I been plagued; And chastened every morning" (Psalm 73 : 2, 3, 13, 14).

If Fate rules, the lesson from these facts is that Fate is at least *non*-moral, caring nothing for right or wrong; indeed, often seeming to favour the wrong, to be *im*moral. But the Bible has a quite different explanation, one far superior and also accordant with observable fact. It is that suffering is the fire that purges the gold and fits character for the highest uses and honours; "ye have been put to grief in manifold trials, that the proof of your faith, being more precious than gold that perisheth though it is

proved by fire, may be found unto praise and glory and honour at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 1 : 6, 7).

This conception is of very early date. The much-afflicted Job said: "When He hath tried me I shall come forth as gold" (Job 23 : 10). This really ancient history of Job is concerned specifically with this very problem of the sufferings of the good and pious. It sets those sufferings as having origin in that same court of angels that dealt later with Ahab and Nebuchadnezzar (Job, ch. 1 and 2). It shows an Accuser and Slanderer as falsely traducing Job before that court. To vindicate Job where it is of real importance that a man should be vindicated, even in the High Court of heaven, the House of Lords of the universe, from the decisions of which lies no appeal, the Accuser is permitted to inflict upon him a series of heavy and bitter trials. He is deprived suddenly of family, property, health; he loses the confidence of his wife, who suggests that to escape misery he should curse God and pay the full capital penalty; and his best friends misjudge and malign him to his face. Finally, he is tested with the keenest of all trials, that he shall pray that his maligners be forgiven by God.

By such tests it was shown that the Accuser was a Slanderer and Job sincerely true and upright, a man who did honestly fear God, as much in adversity as in prosperity. There was shown also the profoundly needful fact that poverty improves piety, that "a man's [real] life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth," as He later taught and exemplified Who, having been rich beyond the dreams of avarice, voluntarily impoverished Himself that His enemies may be enriched; and Who urged men to "take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness" (Luke 12 : 13–15; 2 Corinthians 8 : 9).

But Job's trials did far more: they advanced his state from uprightness to holiness, from external propriety to inward purity. He learned to abhor himself and to adore God. The fire purged away the dross of lingering self-esteem, and the gold of inward godliness was found unto praise and honour and glory. Thus was Job morally fitted for double the prosperity of earlier days.

As a young man I heard Dr. A. T. Pierson speak on Job. He said that a small boy often passed a smithy and watched the work. With a small hammer the master touched lightly the white hot iron on the anvil and his man brought down the heavy sledge. Apparently a budding trade unionist, the boy seemed to think this an unfair division of labour, and asked the smith what he did with his tiny taps. Oh, said the master, I'm showing him where to hit! And thus, said the preacher, God puts His finger on the weak point in His child's character, and the devil brings down the

sledge-hammer of affliction to weld that character into one whole and strong nature. Then he added quaintly, " And thus the Lord makes the devil sweat for the saint's benefit."

Now it is not of the least concern to me to make acceptable to the " modern mind " this picture of the heavenly world dominating this lower world. This boastful Modern Mind, that thinks its dictum the final word on almost all matters, let us set it in its proper perspective in the long vistas of human history.

It has made progress in mathematics and mechanics and natural science, and gigantic progress in the fell art of turning these to evil. It has thereby proved the worth of this ancient statement concerning mankind, that " Destruction and misery are in their ways ; and the way of peace have they not known (Isaiah 59 : 7, 8 ; Romans 3 : 16, 17).

But let us compare it in the realm of philosophy, of abstract thought, with the mighty intellects that have wrought and taught before it, and who have influenced profoundly millions upon millions of men through long centuries. What now has this Modern Mind added to philosophy or to the knowledge of the deeper and eternal elements of life ? Thus viewed it appears in truth a somewhat ludicrous Upstart that has of late reared its childish form, and struts about this juvenile western world with its nose to the skies, stuffed full with conceit as an egg is with meat, and in danger of bursting with blowing its baby trumpet. The pitiful thing is that so very many other children value this strange little figure at its own estimate and mistake noise for sense.

Many have boldly and often asserted that no men of brains now believe the histories of the Bible, for the " unanimous results " of the higher critics and the discoveries of " science " have made that impossible, and all too many believe the assertion because it is shouted so often, so noisily, so confidently. This is a painful, an awful proof of the truth of this remark of Hitler upon a political matter, that it is " a very just principle that in the greatness of the lie there lies always a certain factor in its being believed " (M.K., i. 252). This precocious Modern Mind is the latest bairn of Humanism, the deceitful notion of the self-sufficiency of man. Like father, like son. Its other recent progeny, Nazi-ism, shows Humanism's true and undisguised countenance, ugly and dangerous.

No, my concern is with any who are lowly in mind, honest of heart, seeking sincerely for truth. Let me press upon such the question whether it be not comforting, fortifying, as well as more rational, to believe in, to trust to, a personal, living Creator and Ruler, as benevolent as He is powerful, as gracious as He is righteous,

equally kind and just, rather than to abandon the universe and oneself, in time and for eternity, to Fate, blind, dark, callous, implacable, irreversible, inescapable Fate!

In a world where the wicked are commingled with the righteous there is no greater necessity or benefit than just laws enforced by upright judges. It is the very foundation of order and well-being. They will not be able to eliminate evil, for that requires a change of nature in mankind; but they can restrain it and preserve order. Now what human society has almost universally failed to effect is to supply such a judicial system. In no land where, in no time when, the Word of God has not had public and general influence has such been known. Corruption in the judicial system has been the rule. But what man, what Humanism, has failed to provide, is provided in that heavenly tribunal revealed in Holy Scripture, nor does there seem any other explanation of the deep truth expressed in the adage "murder will out." It is through their ceaseless activities that this statement of Christ is fulfilled: "there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known" (Matthew 10: 26).

And that Court, with its infallible and almighty President, has this supreme advantage over the best earthly judges, that it takes cognizance of the world beyond death and can and does pursue there the wrong-doer who may not have been adequately punished in this life.

Man is short-sighted. He cannot peer into the world of the dead. To very many, for all practical purposes, it does not exist. And Satan, the prince of this world, is very content that his blinded subjects should be wholly engrossed with things of sense and the hour. Yet when any are restless about the future (as, for example, when a loved one has gone thither), then this "Deceiver of the whole inhabited earth" (Revelation 12: 9) has two principle wiles with which to mislead. First, he has now, as the centuries through, an army of lying priests, pagan and Roman, who, for a money payment, will guarantee to order favourably affairs in that realm, either for those already there, or for the person who pays in advance in view of going there. Or, secondly, he has an army of spiritist mediums who, instructed by his demon servants, will give rosy but imaginary pictures of that realm, and will even pretend to put inquirers into touch with friends there.

But it is urged that no one from that other realm has ever returned thence and told about it; how, then, can we attain certain knowledge? This is a mistake in fact. One from the supramundane world has visited this world and given us light. Jesus

was either insane or sane. If the latter, then He was either the greatest liar that ever lived, or was, as He claimed, the Truth itself. He asserted positively: "I came out from the Father, and am come into the world. . . . I came down from heaven. . . . I am the living bread which came down from heaven," and similar statements (John 16 : 28 ; 6 : 38, 51). I knew in India an Englishman, a fierce Unitarian. But one day he read John, chapter six, and, for the first time on these questions, he reasoned reasonably, became indeed a *true* rationalist. He said to himself: I always allowed that Jesus was a good man; and if He was a *good* man I suppose I ought to believe what He said, for good men don't tell lies. So as He says He came down from heaven, I ought to believe this! And he did believe, sincerely and heartily; as he said to me, "I ate of the Bread." At once the effect promised by Christ was realized in him. He received a new life energy. He had been a drinking, cursing, wife-oppressing man. She herself said to me that the immediate change was that the tiger was changed into a lamb. It was an apt comparison. They lived with tigers not far away.

Jesus therefore knew that other world from its highest height to its deepest depth, and this that follows is what He taught about the conditions that immediately follow death (Luke 16).

There was a steward of an estate who had played tricks with the owner's goods and was to be deprived of his job. To secure for himself friends who would entertain him after he should have been dismissed he enriched them at the expense of his master. Our Lord did not at all condone this dishonesty, but He did make this application of it: "And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles" (verse 9). It is at death that riches cease to be of any use and fail the holder of them.

This shows (*a*) that beyond this earth life there are dwelling-places appropriate to that other realm, (*b*) that by the benevolent use now of money we can assure to ourselves a welcome there by those befriended here. This involves important features: (1) that realm is real, actual, active; (2) it has a social side, friendly intercourse, which implies recognition of one another; (3) that a man's experiences there are conditioned by his conduct in this life: there is a moral continuity from the one realm to the other; (4) therefore it is highly necessary to be faithful to the trust granted by God in this life and to use rightly and lovingly the transitory riches of this world; for if we do not, the true riches of that world will not be entrusted to us. A man must and will serve either

God or Mammon (possessions, vast or few). If he serve God he will use aright and in love what earthly possessions God may entrust to him. If not, he will worship the possessions themselves, grasping and keeping them, using them for his selfish ends. But it is impossible to do both (verses 10–13), as impossible for a disciple of Christ as for anyone else.

Thus did Christ speak direct to the heart of the problem of the right use of earthly possessions, money or other, and insist that the *end*, not the present, is the important consideration, and that that end is beyond this life. Now there were listening to Him some rich men, lovers of money. They were also religious hypocrites; they "devoured widows' houses, and for a pretence made long prayers," of whom Christ said "these shall receive greater condemnation" (Luke 20: 47). *When* will they receive this? —they do not always do so in this life.

These rich men abhorred Christ's teaching that the future should outweigh the present in our judgment of matters. It was with them essentially as with Crœsus, the fabulously wealthy king of Lydia in century six B.C. According to the story of Herodotus, he asked Solon, the wise Athenian, concerning true happiness, who answered: "I see that thou art wonderfully rich, and art the lord of many nations . . . but in every matter it behoves us to mark well the end; for oftentimes the Deity gives men a gleam of happiness, and then plunges them into ruin." Upon which the comment of the historian is: "The king saw him depart with much indifference, since he thought that man must be an arrant fool who made no account of present good, but bade men always wait and mark the end" (Herodotus 1: 32, 33).

Are there not myriads to-day who think the same as Crœsus? The Pharisees then listening to Christ so thought, "and they scoffed at Him." This is how He answered them:

> Now there was a certain rich man, and he was clothed in purple and fine linen, faring sumptuously every day: and a certain beggar named Lazarus was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table; yea, even the dogs came and licked his sores.
>
> And it came to pass that the beggar died, and that he was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom; and the rich man also died, and was buried. And in Hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am in anguish in this flame.

> But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things: but now here he is comforted, and thou art in anguish.
>
> And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, that they which would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us.
>
> And he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house; for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. But Abraham saith, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham; but if one go to them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead (Luke 16: 19–31).

That Hades is the place and state immediately after death is certain from the fact that Dives' brothers were still alive on earth while he talked with Abraham. Thus the Lord, Who knew, taught that at death there took place a sudden reversal of conditions. The tables were completely turned. The selfish passed from luxury to torment; the wretched from misery to bliss: "Thou in thy lifetime receivedst [in full] thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things: but *now here*, he is comforted, and thou art in anguish" (verse 25).[1]

Now, who effected this drastic change? The angels, so Christ said; that is, the subordinate officers of that supreme court where sentence is passed. To the same effect Christ spoke on another occasion of a rich man who went to rest at night planning to rebuild his barns so as to house the abundant crops that were to enable him to live in idle pleasure for many years. "But God said unto him, Thou foolish one, this night do *they* require thy life of thee; and the things which thou hast prepared, whose shall they be? So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God" (Luke 12: 13–21). "*They* require thy life"—*Who* do this? Those same heavenly officers who know well the secret, hidden from the savant, of the vital connexion between the life and the body, and know how to sever it.

In the Bible there is much more to the same effect, such as the stern denunciation by James of rich oppressors (James 5: 1–11), or by Isaiah, seven centuries B.C., chapter 5: 8–12. But the foregoing must suffice to establish that the Word of God allows

[1] Augustine. "During the time, moreover, which intervenes between a man's death and the final resurrection, the soul dwells in a hidden retreat, where it enjoys rest or suffers affliction just in proportion to the merit it has earned by the life which it led on earth."—(*The Enchiridion*, chapter CIX.)

of no fatalistic element in the universe, but reveals an intelligent constant control, exercised on moral grounds, assuring strict justice, but allowing for escape therefrom by timely repentance and amendment, even as Solomon said: "He that covereth his transgressions shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall obtain mercy" (Proverbs 28 : 13).

Indeed, God most distinctly, in explicit terms, condemns the doctrines of chance and fatalism. The prophet Isaiah just mentioned lived at a time when his people Israel, in Palestine, had imbibed idolatry, philosophy, and manners from the East. In the name of God he denounced this sternly, and called upon them to return from that darkness to "walk in the light of Jehovah," Who had forsaken them because of that apostasy (ch. 2 : 5–11). Before he closes his appeals and warnings he announces these statements as spoken by God Himself: "But ye that forsake Jehovah, that forget My holy mountain, that prepare a table for *Fortune* (chance) and that fill up mingled wine unto *Destiny*: I will destine you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter" (ch. 65 : 11, 12). Here the pagan deifying and worshipping of Chance and Fate is expressly reprobated by Jehovah and declared to be a capital offence under His law.

Oh, that men to-day would abandon their pantheistic and fatalistic philosophy and turn humbly unto the living God. Only, "seek ye Jehovah while He may be found; call ye upon Him while He is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto Jehovah, and He will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon" (Isaiah 55 : 6, 7). The ground in divine law of this pardon has been set forth by Isaiah in the immediately preceding chapter 53 : 5, 6, in the moving prophecy concerning Jesus the Son of God: "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all."

CHAPTER IV

PREDESTINATION

FORTY-FIVE YEARS AGO J. O. WEST WAS RECTOR OF ST. PHILIP and St. Jacob Without, Bristol. In his parish was the headquarters of the Secularist Society, militant atheists, followers of Charles Bradlaugh. He invited these to an open conference and asked me to support him. One question asked was, Does not foreknowledge involve foreordination? Presumably the questioner had in mind the idea that one could not positively foreknow that an event would take place unless one had the power and intention to bring it to pass. Had that been admitted he would doubtless have urged that, by consequence, God was the author of sin and the responsible actor therein.

I answered that foreknowledge does not necessarily imply foreordination; for one may get to know that a burglar intends to raid his house, but he does not therefore foreordain the deed. The chairman, an atheist, remarked: "But your own Book is against you" and referred to Romans 8: 29, 30, where it is stated of God that:

> For whom He foreknew, He also foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren: and whom He foreordained, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified.

In reply I pointed out that this does not say "Whom He foreknew He *therefore* foreordained," as if the one followed automatically from the other, but it says "He *also* foreordained," which shows that the foreordination was *additional* to the foreknowledge, and therefore distinct from it. Here the matter was left.

Upon this topic Rosenberg wrote these strong words:

> In the Jewish–Syrian–Romish thought-world, which tears apart Personality [i.e. human personality] and God and sets them at enmity, the idea of "foreordination" became an insane conception which humiliated mankind to the level of born slaves (M. 395).

Passing by the bitterness of this statement, as an honest man and a Christian I must own to some sympathy with those opponents

of Christianity who are stumbled by this dogma of predestination. The fault initially is with those theologians who have declared it in hard terms and drawn from those terms hard and awful inferences not taught in the Word of God.

Augustine said:

> God worketh all things in us; rewarding His own good, and punishing His own evil.

This seems to imply that moral evil is wrought by God, and then He punishes the one through whom He works it. This statement by Augustine is quoted by E. T. Vaughan in the footnote to page 61 of his 1823 translation of Luther's *Bondage of the Will.* He does not give the reference. In *The Enchiridion*, ch. C. Augustine speaks of

> The supremely Good thus turning to good account even what is evil, to the condemnation of those whom in His justice he has predestined to punishment, and to the salvation of those whom in His mercy He has predestined to grace.

Calvin wrote:

> Whom therefore God hath created unto the shame of life and destruction of death, that they should be instruments of His wrath and examples of His severity: from them, that they may come to their end, sometime He taketh away the power to hear His Word, and sometime, by the preaching of it, He more blindeth and amazeth them (*Institutes*, Bk. iii; chap. 24: 12).

Luther wrote:

> . . . We do everything by God's alone will, and by a necessity that is laid upon us. . . . So that all things still happen by necessity, as it respects us . . . since then God moves and actuates all things in all things, it cannot but be that He also moves and acts in Satan and in the wicked . . . (they are) hurried along by this impulse of the divine omnipotency. . . . Hence it arises, that the wicked man cannot but go astray and commit sin continually; inasmuch as being seized and urged by the power of God, he is not allowed to remain idle; but wills, desires, acts, just according to what he is (*Bondage of the Will*, 251, 252, 266, 267; ed. E. T. Vaughan, 1823).

Luther's editor just named added to page 222 this footnote:

> In asserting that the kingdom of hell has earned, and is earning, its subjects through a power which God has given to the devil, I would be understood to intimate that the devil could neither be, nor continue to be, without the will of God; and that hell is filled through his agency; by which, in perfect consistency with all creation relations and obligations, ruin was originally brought upon man; and by which he [the devil] secures and retains to

himself that spoil, which it is the Father's good pleasure that he should carry off, to HIS glory [i.e., the glory of God the Father].

Samuel Rutherford was indeed a rare and faithful disciple of Christ, yet in the 234th letter of Bonar's edition of his *Letters* there is a dreadful example of Calvinistic theology. The lengthy argument may be thus summarized :

> God's will is essentially holy and just . . . that God saith to reprobates, " Believe in Christ (*Who hath not died for your salvation*), and ye shall be saved," is just and right . . . God hath obliged, hard and fast, all the reprobates of the visible church to believe this promise, " He that believeth shall be saved "—and yet *in God's decree and secret intention* there is no salvation at all decreed and intended to reprobates. . . . Hence because there is malice in reprobates, and contempt of Christ, guilty they are, and justice hath law against them, and (which is the mystery) they *cannot* come up to Christ, *because He died not for them*. [The italics are mine.]

This line of thought culminates in the doctrine of reprobation, that is, that God by His sovereign uncontrolled fiat did from before creation determine that some should be rescued from sin and damnation, and for these, the elect, and these alone, it was intended that Christ should die and so redeem them ; but the rest were fore-ordained to be damned, and it is not the willingness or intention of God to save them ; yet He commands them to repent and to believe, though He knows they cannot do so and that He does not intend to grant them the grace to do so, and then He sends them to hell for their disobedience.

Wholly as I reject Christian Science, I am not surprised that Mary Baker Eddy as a girl was shocked and repelled by this hard dogma. Newman I regard as one of the most hurtful men of a century ago, but agree with his description of predestination to eternal death as a " detestable doctrine " (*Apologia*, ed. Dent. 31).

This attitude is not the result of the prepossession of my own mind or feeling. To allow these to determine an issue would be simply an example of that rationalism or humanism which I reject equally. If the Word of God taught this dogma, it would be for me to accept it ; but, as I read that Word, its teaching is to the exact contrary.

Through an ancient prophet, six centuries B.C., God Himself declares, and on oath :

> As I live, saith the Lord Jehovah, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked ; but that the wicked turn from his way and live : turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways ; for why will ye die, O house of Israel ? . . . Have I any pleasure in the death of the wicked, saith the Lord Jehovah ; and not rather that he should return from his way, and live ? (Ezekiel 33 : 11 ; 18 : 23).

Since God would *prefer*, yea, yearns for the sparing of the wicked from temporal death, how can He have already, by set design, have predetermined his eternal death ?

The Son of God declared unequivocally that " God so loved the *world* that He gave His only begotten Son that *whosoever* believeth on Him should not perish but have eternal life " (John 3 : 16). To say that this *means* the world *of the elect* only is doing violence to the words in themselves and to their plain sense. Christ's apostles understood them in that plain sense. John writes of Him that " He is the propitiation for our sins : and not for ours only, but also for the whole world " (1 John 2 : 2). Here the " our " refers to the writer and those addressed, that is, such as had already accepted Jesus Christ the Righteous One as Saviour and Advocate. Outside of this circle of believers were all the rest of mankind, the world. If it be argued that this also means the world of the elect, it must be asked whether that limit can be imposed upon John's further words in the same Letter (ch. 5 : 19) : " We know that *we* are of God and the *whole world* lieth in the Evil One." Here is the same distinction between the company of the believers and the rest of mankind, and it is out of the question to say that the whole world *of the elect* are those in the sphere of Satan. The elect are the " we " of this passage, not the world.

But how luminous is Paul's exhortation that prayers are to be offered for *all* men, including pagan kings and officials (1 Timothy 2 : 1–7). On what ground is prayer to include all men ? Because " This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour ; Who would have *all* men to be saved." The emphasis here is on the " all." " Who *all* men desires (ὅς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει) to be saved." And so intense is this Divine desire that " Christ Jesus gave Himself a ransom *for all.*" Here the " all " comes thrice, and as the first time it includes specifically the godless, so it must each other time.

Such is the testimony of the whole Bible. It presents God as lamenting over His foes (Ezekiel 27 : 1, 2 ; 28 : 12) ; as earnestly desiring them to gather under His protection as chicks under the hen (Matthew 23 : 37) ; as caring, providing, chastening, pleading, warning ; and as waiting patiently through centuries, yea, millenniums, in hope that some more of them will repent and accept pardon (2 Peter 3 : 9, 15). For judgment is to Him a " strange work, His strange act " (Isaiah 28 : 21), whereas " in mercy He delighteth " (Micah 7 : 18) ; and to the former He proceeds only when mercy is rejected, will no more be useful, and can no longer be permissible in justice.

The dogma of reprobation postulates that all this yearning, this patience and pleading with the wicked, is superficial, merely

apparent, not real; that behind this external and sustained attitude there stands the real God Who has predestined the godless to be damned. There is in truth little to distinguish this Being from the Fates of pagan philosophy. For they also allow to man that measure of prosperity and pleasure they enjoy for a time, they also permit affairs to run on quietly for lengthy periods; but at last their inexorable and hard decrees blast their helpless objects.

Let us look more narrowly at Romans 8 : 29, 30 above quoted : " Whom He foreknew He also foreordained."

The translators of the Authorized Version reveal, it would seem, doctrinal prejudice by their rendering " He also did *predestinate*." For this unjustified word they went back to Catholic Versions, the Rheims and the Vulgate, which have *predestinavit*, whereas the earlier English Versions of Wycliffe and Tyndale had the softer and more accurate word " preordain." This is the more noticeable in the case of Wycliffe seeing that he was translating from the Vulgate. These later translators had reason for forsaking the Latin, and its restoration by the Authorized Version has had the disastrous effect of fixing in the mind of the English reader the fatalistic notion so foreign to Scripture. If the Authorized translators had understood Isaiah 65 : 11 considered in the last chapter, they might have felt the wrongness of introducing the idea of destiny seeing that God had solemnly condemned it. Their change is the less excusable seeing that in 1 Corinthians 2 : 7 they translate the same word by *ordain*.

A thing may be foreordained without it being irreversible, for it may be ordained on conditions, which not being fulfilled the ordination lapses. And this is the case here. The passage is speaking of those foreordained being " conformed to the image of God's Son [and] glorified." Now but a few sentences earlier (Romans 8 : 17) it had been written that the children of God are " heirs indeed (μὲν) of God, but (δὲ) joint heirs with Christ, *if so be* that we suffer with Him, that we may be also *glorified* with Him." In his last letter which we have the same writer states the same condition as attaching to the same prospect of sharing the glory of Christ (2 Timothy 2 : 10–13). He speaks there of the elect obtaining " the salvation which is in Christ Jesus *with eternal glory*," and he adds that " Faithful is the saying : For if we died with him, we shall also live with Him : if we endure, we shall also reign with Him : if we deny Him, He also will deny us."

This conditional element has been given little, if any, weight in Calvinistic treatment of this theme and is often strongly repudiated. Yet it is quite evidently present, and it rules out completely every attempt to attach a fatalistic sense to these passages.

God's foreordination was conditioned by something that He foreknew, and by its very terms is conditioned by the response of man.

The Calvinistic zeal in this controversy has been gendered largely by the desire to maintain the truth that the sinner justified in Christ by faith stands justified before the law of God *for ever*; that the new life he receives in Christ is *eternal* life and is nonforfeitable. This doctrine the opposite school, known as Arminian, denies, and asserts the Scripture to teach that salvation is, in possibility, entirely forfeitable by misconduct.

Certainly the Calvinistic doctrine on this point is the plain meaning of various passages; as when Christ declared of His sheep, who follow Him, that "they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of My hand. My Father, Who hath given them unto Me, is greater than all, and no one is able to snatch them out of my Father's hand. I and My Father are one" (John 10: 27–29). Or when Paul concludes the most full and elaborate of all statements of Christian doctrine by declaring his reasoned persuasion that nothing conceivable "shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Romans 8: 39).

It is obvious that there can be no contradictions in writings in any real sense God-given. The plain meaning of God-breathed words must hold, and I personally accept unhesitatingly the plain meaning of the passages just quoted, that justification and life eternal are unforfeitable, being "free gifts" (Romans 3: 24; 6: 23), free, that is, of conditions, absolute gifts.

The passages mostly used by Arminians to maintain the contrary view do not deal with the matter of the judicial standing of the sinner in law. As to eternal salvation Christ stated positively of the man who attends to His word, and believes the Father Who sent the Son and spoke through Him, that such an one "cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life" (John 5: 24). Later utterances must be read in harmony with this, as can readily be done. The branch can be cut out of the vine, and wither and be burned up. But the theme in John 15 is not life eternal, but fruitfulness in present life, that interior union with Christ which is a benefit distinct from and additional to both justification in Him before the law and the gift of life in Him. This heart communion *can* be lost and its fruit cease.

This topic was opened, and I think sufficiently proved, in my book *Firstborn Sons, their Rights and Risks*, now out of print.

What I would add here is the view that in like manner the passages as to election and preordination do not apply to the question of salvation, but rather to the prospects of persons already saved.

Romans 8 : 29,30. Foreordination is unto *conformity to the image of God's Son,* to being *glorified.* The word " image " means external likeness to another object : " he is the image of his father." A king may pardon a criminal and so grant further life ; but it does not follow, it is no necessity, that he shall bring this former rebel into intimate public association with the Heir Apparent and attire him in splendour suitable to that association.

Romans 9 : 23 : " vessels of mercy which He afore-prepared *unto glory,*" not merely vessels redeemed unto exemption from perdition.

Hebrews 2 : 10. God is " bringing many *sons* unto glory " ; the thought being that from among the vast multitude of His children some are being trained, educated, developed into grown-up *sons,* who can be *heirs* of the honours and authority of the Son of God in the kingdom of the Father.

Romans 8 : 19–25. The same conception is found here. The passage speaks of " the revealing," the unveiling, " of the sons of God " as being their " adoption." This word does not refer to the new birth into the family of God, but to the final possible outcome of that birth. The Roman noble could choose any one of his male children to be heir to his titles and estates. This youth he led before the Senate and declared in due form that this was his son and heir. Thereupon the robe of a youth was removed and he was given that of manhood. Similarly, it is not yet made manifest to the universe which of the family of God will reign with Christ ; but when the present body of humiliation gives place to a body like unto the glorified body of Christ it will be made clear : " When Christ [Who is already] our life shall be *manifested,* then shall we also be manifested with Him *in glory* " (Colossians 3 : 4).

1 Peter 1 : 2 ; 5 : 10. We are indeed " chosen according to the foreknowledge of God the Father," but this is not applied to exemption from hell, but is " in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ " ; that is, unto priestly office, priestly nearness to God, and priestly service ; for it was at the consecration of the priests that the water was used first and the blood was sprinkled later (Leviticus 8), whereas in the restoration of the leper from banishment to fellowship the blood was applied first and the washings followed (Leviticus 14). And this sanctification and obedience are not stated here as precedent to salvation from doom, but the call of God in view is " unto His *eternal glory* in Christ." These promises of sharing the glory of God Himself are indeed " precious and exceeding great," and it is in view of this " abundant entrance into the eternal kingdom " that Christians are strongly urged " to give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure " (2 Peter 1 : 1–11) ;

for, though eternal life is for ever secure, the *glory* of the priesthood and kingship in the kingdom may be forfeited.

1 Thessalonians 2 : 12. Thus Paul also exhorted Christians " to walk worthily of God," not because their justification in Christ was contingent upon their walk, but because God " calleth you into *His own* kingdom and *glory*."

Ephesians 1 : 4, 5. It is to the same effect that we are told that " God chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world that we should be holy and without blemish *before Him*," where *katenopion* (κατενώπιον) means *under His eye*, in His immediate presence, not in some remoter region of the kingdom, as is the lot of the majority of a monarch's subjects. Therefore this statement continues : " having foreordained us unto *adoption* as *sons*," in the full sense above exhibited.

Colossians 1 : 12. The same sense attaches to Paul's words written at the same period as the last-mentioned passage, that God " made us capable (*ikanós*, see Alford here) with a view to sharing *the inheritance* of the saints *in the light* "—" the light," i.e. as above, in the immediate presence of God Who is light.

It is evident that in these places where God's choice (election) and call are in view the connexion is not with deliverance from perdition, but with the prospects of the saved. We think it is thus everywhere in Scripture. Yet it will be objected that Acts 13 : 48 says that " as many as were *ordained* to *eternal life* believed " and that therefore eternal salvation *is* a matter of *foreordination*. But the word here used, *tasso*, is not the same word as *foreordain*, and it has here rather the sense of being disposed towards a certain course or act ; so that as many as had hearts well-disposed towards the offer of eternal life made by God's messengers believed the message. It is in this sense that the verse is taken by Alford, Bloomfield, Wordsworth, Humphrey, Bartlett (*Century* Bible), Rotherham, and so understood it has no bearing on the matter of foreordination unto salvation. Its use to support that doctrine only weakens the argument for it.

Romans 9. It remains to consider this passage, which is perhaps chiefly employed to support the teaching of reprobation. The salient sentences are :

> And not only so ; but Rebecca also having conceived by one, even by our father Isaac—for the children being not yet born, neither having done anything good or bad, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. Even as it is written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.

> What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy. For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, For this very purpose did I raise thee up, that I might shew in thee my power, and that my name might be published abroad in all the earth.
>
> So then he hath mercy on whom he will and whom he will he hardeneth.
>
> Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he still find fault? For who withstandeth his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus? Or hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long suffering vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction: and that he might make known the riches of his glory upon vessels of mercy, which he aforeprepared unto glory, even us, whom he also called, not from the Jews only, but also from the Gentiles (verses 10–24).

Let it be noted:

(1) Verse 11. The electing (choosing) act of God was connected with *a purpose* of God. Therefore it was not a mere act of will, a fiat. God did not say, It shall be merely because I will it to be; on the contrary, it was *choice*, therefore an act consequent upon consideration of different factors; and a choice directed to the fulfilment of a purpose. This last also involves reflection, consideration, the deciding upon an end to be served.

(2) This choice and purpose were settled by God in advance of the birth of persons who would become involved therein (as Esau and Jacob), and therefore God did not formulate His purpose to meet circumstances that had arisen. He formed and announced in advance His purpose according to what He foreknew.

(3) Verse 13. God loved Jacob and hated Esau. *Why*, in each case? The histories stress certain facts, such as that Esau "despised" privileges which God had granted him, whereas Jacob valued and sought them (Genesis 25 : 29–34).

Strictly it is of Esau's descendants that it is said that God "hated" them and gave up their land to destruction (Malachi 1 : 2–5). Of course, God does not feel that vicious hatred which fallen beings develop. His "hatred" is holy; it is an intense aversion to what is morally odious. Hence, it is called into exercise by unholiness; and so it is written of Esau, "men shall call them the border [frontier] of *wickedness*." This is why they are "the people against

whom Jehovah hath indignation for ever." Whoever will read over the twenty passages where Edom is mentioned in psalms and prophecies will see how just is the description of them as *wicked.* He would be no holy Being who did not feel indignation against such depravity as Esau and his descendants displayed.

Thus God's differentiation between these brothers took account of moral state. It was not arbitrary.

(4) Verses 15, 16. God has mercy on whom He will. Yes, most true; *but* it is a wholly unwarranted assumption that His action is not governed by reason and exercised on moral grounds. The introduction here of a *capricious* action by God is the false and misleading notion that has vitiated the reasoning of many. All Scripture is against it. The Fountain of reason and of morals acts upon rational and moral grounds, as just quoted. He does as He will, whether in mercy or in wrath, nor does He consult others as to what He will do; but His will is formed on the basis of His foreknowledge of moral conditions that will arise and with which He will have to deal on moral grounds.

(5) Verses 17, 18. God hardened Pharaoh. The history fully illuminates this instance and argument. It is given in Exodus, chs. 3–14.

(*a*) Ch. 3 : 19. When commissioning Moses to go to Egypt and demand that Pharoah shall release his Israelitish slaves, God showed His foreknowledge by saying, " I know that the king of Egypt will not give you leave to go."

(*b*) Ch. 4 : 21. God charged Moses thus : " See that thou do before Pharaoh all the wonders that I have put in thine hand, but I will harden [literally, make strong] his heart, and he will not let the people go."

(*c*) Ch. 7 : 2, 3. Moses and Aaron are charged to present a second time to Pharaoh the demand of God, but again God says, " I will harden [make obstinate, Darby] Pharaoh's heart."

(*d*) Ch. 7 : 13, 14. The demand was presented, the rod was changed to a serpent, but note how the result is now described. It does not yet say that *God* at once made the king's heart hard, but that " Pharaoh's heart *was strong* [or stubborn] and he hearkened not." In like form God adds the comment, " Pharaoh's heart is heavy (stubborn). *How* it became heavy is not here stated.

(*e*) Ch. 7 : 22. A further judgment was inflicted, and again the effect in the king is stated as before, " Pharaoh's heart was hardened." Now notice the change on the next occasion.

(*f*) Ch. 8 : 15. Another plague attacked the land. At first the king seemed to relent, and asked for its removal ; but upon respite being granted Pharaoh himself " hardened his heart " ; he deliberately *made himself* " heavy," indifferent, unresponsive, disobedient.

(*g*) Ch. 8 : 19. And after yet another infliction, this self-induced obstinacy continued, and still Pharaoh's heart was hardened (strong in its opposition to God).

(*h*) Ch. 8 : 32. Yet another judgment seemed to promise a betterment in the king, and he proposed a compromise, but once more we read that by his own act " Pharaoh hardened his heart this time also."

(*i*) Ch. 9 : 7. Again a blow falls, but as before the king's heart " *was* stubborn " [heavy] ; no change was induced.

(*j*) Ch. 9 : 12. Seven appeals had been made, seven opportunities for submission had been given, six solemn strokes had been inflicted ; but Pharaoh had himself resolutely hardened his heart, and only then do we read that Jehovah hardened the heart of Pharaoh. Now he was beyond hope, and though he winced under the next blow and begged for relief, which was granted, yet at once —

(*k*) Ch. 9 : 34 " he sinned yet more, and hardened his heart," and this time the evil had overcome his court officers also.

(*l*) Ch. 10 : 1. And now God tells Moses that at length *He* has acted upon the proud, defiant rebel, saying " *I* have hardened his heart, and the heart of his servants."

(*m*) Ch. 10 : 20. A further fearful judgment followed ; once more the king begged for respite, which was granted, but " Jehovah hardened Pharaoh's heart, and he did not let the children of Israel go."

(*n*) Ch. 10 : 27. This was repeated on the part of the king and of God, as in

(*o*) Ch. 11 : 10, it is stated again.

(*p*) Ch. 12. Then followed the final overthrow of the resistance of the king and his people by the death of all their firstborn, and they thrust Israel out of the land.

(*q*) Ch. 14. But soon relenting, they displayed the utter folly of the God-hardened heart by hastening after the people to endeavour to create again the very situation which had cost them such a heavy and bitter price and overwhelming defeat. Nothing could now stop their mad fury. They acted insanely—deterred by neither the glory of the pillar of fire, the thick darkness in which they found themselves suddenly enveloped, nor the obvious danger of plunging down into the bed of the Red Sea with shimmering, shivering walls of water towering beside them. The awful explanation of such uncontrolled and suicidal folly is in the previously stated words of God (verses 4 and 17), " *I* will make strong Pharaoh's heart, and he shall follow after them ; and I will get me honour

upon Pharaoh, and upon all his host; and the Egyptians shall know that I am Jehovah."

For if the subjects of a sovereign will not honour him by loyal obedience, they must be compelled to honour him by the enforcing of due penalty; and if thereby they get to know his majesty and authority this shall prove in the end a benefit to them and the realm in general.

In the Word of God this history is given with unusual fulness of detail, and it is examined here in some detail because it is a very important revelation of the present and future ways of God with persons and with nations. But in this chapter its main lesson is that, while the Most High does most surely have mercy on Whom He will, and harden and destroy whom He will, in neither case is His action arbitrary or fatalistic. Like all His actions, these are directed by, and are a display of, what He is in His nature—the Fountain of morality, wisdom, reason. The Judge of all the earth does indeed as He pleases, but what He does is always *right*. "Behold then the goodness and severity of God" (Romans 11 : 2). It was a man who lived in wicked and desperate days who wrote: "Who is wise, that he may understand these things? prudent, that he may know them? for the ways of Jehovah are right and the just shall walk in them; but transgressors shall fall therein" (Hosea 14 : 9).

The view here offered of the divine election and fore-ordination may be illustrated in this manner. It is as if a king faced a vast rebellion. He proclaims *bona fide* an amnesty to all the rebels, and, of course, for the good of the realm, and his own honour, he would be glad that every rebel should submit. In this sphere he makes no distinction and has no reserve against any person. But from among those who do submit he selects this man for such a post and that man for another honour, "each according to his several ability" (Matthew 25 : 15).

The illustration differs from the reality in that a human king could act only after submission had been made; or could at the most, in his own mind, make choice of officers only on the supposition that they would submit, whereas the foreknowledge of God enabled Him to make His choice of those to be honoured in advance of their very creation. But the principle is the same, even that God's offer of salvation is *bona fide* what its terms certainly suggest, even that it is available for all and that He on His part wishes that all would accept His mercy. But, knowing beforehand what each would do, He determined to make some into a "bride" for His own Son, into a ruling body in the kingdom;

others to rule on earth, as Israel; others to be the general mass of the subjects in the kingdom. And this differentiation is based on reasonable and moral grounds, nor does it in any case supersede the action of the will of the subject of the purpose of grace. Salvation may be rejected; or if salvation be accepted, the crown of glory may be lost.

No fatalistic element exists in God or operates in His actions or ways.

It is at least twenty-five years since the writer saw the above view of election as being the meaning of Scripture. He has taught it ever since. Since these pages were written it is an encouragement to find the following passage in Dr. Griffith Thomas's able work, *The Principles of Theology*, 255, 256, issued in 1930.

> But a careful study of Scripture will reveal certain truths which may help to place the doctrine of election in a truer light. There is no doubt that all men *may* be saved, if only they are willing to accept Him who died for all without exception. Further, He will most assuredly save all, except those who, having heard, persistently and finally refuse to accept Him. These, having exercised their freewill, must suffer the inevitable result of such choice. Thus Christ is not only the possible, but the real Saviour of sinners, subject only and always to the power of any sinner to exercise his freewill in rejecting salvation. There is no other way of salvation, and no other merit than the sacrificial death of Christ on Calvary.
>
> But while all this is true, it should be carefully noted that the Bible does not separate men merely into two classes, the saved and the lost, for it seems to reveal not only one class of saved ones, but several classes or grades of the saved, and it is along this line that at least some relief to our intellectual perplexity may be found.
>
> The highest salvation is clearly associated with what the New Testament describes as "the Body of Christ", or "the Lamb's wife", and the various references to the "elect" are to this community of "heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ", who are said to have been "chosen before the foundation of the world". Yet the Bible clearly indicates that these are not the only ones saved. On the contrary, there are plain statements that, in addition to the body of Christians called "the Bride", there are other communities of human beings who are saved from everlasting destruction, and yet do not, and will never, form part of the "Body of Christ". This salvation is outside of and altogether secondary to the salvation of those chosen persons who collectively make up His spiritual Church. The following passages seem to indicate these grades:
>
> 1. There are peoples of the world over whom, according to Scripture, the members of the Church of God are to reign with

Christ as kings and priests (1 Corinthians 7 : 2 ; Revelation 20 : 4–6). It is surely impossible that these people over whom the saints are to reign are the lost.

2. Reference is made to " the nations " at Christ's coming to judgment, and as the Church or " Bride " will have been previously caught up to meet Him in the air, it is clear that those who are set on the right hand of the King and are described as blessed and invited to inherit the kingdom cannot possibly be either the " brethren " of Christ or the Church (Matthew 25 : 31–46).

3. Then we read of people raised at the last Resurrection, judged according to the deeds done in the body, and out of this number those whose names are found written in the Lamb's Book of Life (Revelation 20 : 12–15 ; 21 : 27). Seeing that the members of the Church have long before been raised and glorified in the first Resurrection (Revelation 20 : 4–6), who are these mentioned as in the Lamb's Book of Life long after the first Resurrection ?

4. In Hebrews 12 : 23 we read of " the spirits of just men made perfect " as a distinct class from " the general assembly and Church of the first-born ". If there be a " Church of the first-born " who inherit the full blessing, is it not a fair inference that there are second-born ones who inherit a lesser blessing ?

5. When St. Paul writes that " all Israel shall be saved," we are again apparently concerned with a number of persons who are altogether outside the " Body of Christ ".

6. The Heavenly City, the Bride, the Lamb's Wife (Revelation 21) is generally accepted as representing the glorified Church, and if this is so, who are " the nations " who walk in the light of the City, and who are " the kings of the earth " who bring their glory and honour into the City ? There must be some distinction between these and the members of the glorified Church.

A careful consideration of these passages seems to show that, while God made a selection of men to form His Church, yet the members of this collective body are not the only ones who are in some sense saved. And although the truth of Election belongs to the mysteries of God and will never be finally solved in the present life, the consciousness of these various grades of the saved will help us to realise that Scripture seems to imply that it is incorrect to think of the majority of the human race as lost and only a few saved.

I have also been shown the following statement by Dr. G. Campbell Morgan in *The Parables of the Kingdom*, The Net, pp. 156, 157 : " election in Scripture is to the Church, and never to salvation."

It is hoped that this discussion may relieve honest minds of difficulties honestly felt upon this topic.

CHAPTER V

THE DEVIL

THE CONFUSED CONDITION OF THE UNIVERSE ARRESTS thoughtful minds and provokes inquiry. There are abundant tokens of a benevolent power and abundant of an evil power. How can this be explained? Is there any escape, present or future, from this tangled conflict, or will the tide of battle ebb and flow for ever, with never-ending desolation and restoration?

In ancient days one school of philosophy proposed Dualism as the key to the riddle. In this connexion the best-known name is that of the Persian Zoroaster (sixth century B.C.). With him Nietzsche was simply fascinated, and wrote his book *Thus saith Zarathustra.* Rosenberg described him (truly enough) as "one of the greatest personalities of Indo-European history" (M. 32).

The theory is that there exist two Beings equally eternal and powerful, one the principle of Light, the other of Darkness, and it is the ceaseless contention of these which explains the contradictory and confused condition of affairs.

Tested by the Bible, there is in this a measure of truth, but a fatal error, the latter being the idea that the evil Being is eternal and of equal power with the Good. Were it so, there could be no prospect of any final triumph of Light and Good; the world would be without hope.

Rosenberg says that it was out of the Persian myth of Agromaynin (that is, Ahriman) that the Jews created their Satan (M. 33). This shows his inadequate acquaintance with the Hebrew Scriptures. These histories reveal this dread being as working long centuries earlier than the contact of Israel with the Persians, indeed, before these or any other national distinctions had arisen; and even those Hebrew prophets who were of the era of Zoroaster give essential details concerning him at complete variance with the Persian conception. We will examine these.

Ezekiel 28 : 11–19 :

> 11 Moreover the word of Jehovah came unto me saying,
> 12 Son of man, take up a lamentation for the king of Tyre, and say unto him, Thus saith Jehovah God: Thou sealest up the

sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. 13 Thou wast in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, the topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was in thee; in the day that thou wast created they were prepared. 14 Thou wast the anointed cherub that covereth: and I set thee, so that thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. 15 Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till unrighteousness was found in thee. 16 By the multitude of thy traffic they filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned: therefore have I cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God; and I have destroyed thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire. 17 Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness: I have cast thee to the ground, I have laid thee before kings, that they may behold thee. 18 By the multitude of thine iniquities, in the unrighteousness of thy traffic, thou hast profaned thy sanctuaries; therefore have I brought forth a fire from the midst of thee, it hath devoured thee, and I have turned thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee. 19 All they that know thee among the peoples shall be astonished at thee: thou art become a terror, and thou shalt never be any more.

1. It is at once clear that this "king of Tyre" cannot be the human ruler of that city. What is said of him makes it impossible.

2. He was "the anointed cherub that covereth." In the Jewish tabernacle, where God was present and which was the centre of His worship, cherubim of gold overshadowed with their wings the mercy seat, where a ray of the glory of God showed His presence (Exodus 25 : 10–22). This "anointed cherub" had held a similar post of honour in "Eden the garden of God," the heavenly region which preceded the Eden of Adam, and was the original of which the latter was the copy on earth. This Garden was on "the holy mountain of God," the true Olympus, the Greek notion of which was but a local memory of the real region of which mankind had presumably known in far earlier times.

3. This cherub was the acme of perfection: "thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty . . . thou wast perfect in thy ways." His glory is so described as to show him to have been the original from which the attire of glory and beauty of Israel's high priest was copied on an earthly scale. This glory the cherub then had will be more brightly displayed in those who are to form in that same world above the final and glorified

company of the sons of God, pictured in Revelation 21 : 22 as the " city of God, adorned with all manner of precious stones," as were the Cherub and Aaron of old.

4. But this cherub, though so magnificent and perfect, was only a creature, and had had a beginning. " The day thou wast created " is mentioned twice. Here, then, the statement parts decidedly from Dualism and its *eternal* principle of Darkness.

5. There came a time when this grand official of heaven doted on his beauty and brightness, ceased to adore his Creator. " corrupted his wisdom " into folly, sinned (that is, missed the true way to live), became unrighteous, violent, profane.

6. In consequence, he lost his high and noble place. But this fall took place in three stages. First, the inward, moral fall. Then he was cast out from the holy mountain of God, from the midst of the stones of fire where formerly he had walked in safety and glory, in immediate nearness to God Who is a consuming fire (Hebrews 12 : 29). Finally, he was cast down to the ground, where kings could gaze in astonishment, and was consumed to ashes in a fire that proceeded out of himself, to the terror of beholders.

In this last view of the cherub it is implied that he has by some means assumed a human, material form, for men on earth cannot see an immaterial spirit being.

No doubt this is a different representation of the Devil from the common picture of a man with horns and hoofs and a spiked tail. But it is the Biblical description; and even yet, though degraded from the highest heaven, where the Most High has His personal abode, Satan still has access to the lower heaven, where God holds those sessions of His judicial court before noticed; and is there a kind of Prosecutor-General, as well as being Executioner-in-Chief of the universe (Job, chs. 1 and 2 ; Hebrews 2 : 14 ; Luke 22 : 3, 31, 32 ; Revelation 12 : 7–12). These last two passages show that his final destruction on this earth, in human form, is still future. As yet the disglorified cherub can " fashion himself [as to external form μετασχηματίζω] into an angel of light " (2 Corinthians 11 : 14), in which guise perhaps he presents himself before God in that court above, or shows himself to his deluded votaries in the dark depths of seances.

Here, then, as far as the Word of God teaches, is the beginning of evil. It arose near to the throne of the Creator, and descended to lower realms, reaching the human race as narrated in Genesis 3. It started in the heart, not through external agency, in the heart

of the most exalted of all created beings. In nature it was pride, in development ambition, in practice rebellion, in result it is destruction. As creation began with a person, so also did sin originate in a person; it is more than an impersonal energy, though viewed abstractly it is a principle of action causing degeneracy and corruption in the whole being of the person who yields to it. That so sublime a creature as the anointed cherub fell, assures all created beings that there is no security save in constant dependence upon the Creator: let the heart look away from Him to itself and the very endowments granted by God become a snare, as it is written: "I will curse your blessings" (Malachi 2 : 2). Satan was not the last to be proud of his (or her) beauty and brightness.

That Satan is the origin of evil is declared distinctly in the New Testament in the words: "he that doeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning" (1 John 3 : 8). From the beginning of what? Not from the beginning of his existence, for we have read that he was created perfect; therefore from the beginning of sin he was the sinner, and therefore the first sinner.

Long before John so wrote of the devil he had heard the Son of God speak to His enemies these informative and terrible words: "Ye are of your father the devil and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. *He* a man-killer was from the beginning, and has not stood [maintained his standing] in the truth, because truth is not in him. When he speaks the lie, out of his own things he speaks, because a liar he is, and the father of it" (John 8 : 44). This passage, here rendered somewhat literally, will be considered later. (See ch. XV.)

Thus this mighty being was the first liar, first killer, first user of violence, first deceiver, seducer, destroyer. Whose voice then, if not that of the Father of lies, do we hear in these sentences of Hitler?

> If for an army the principle once holds good that any order is better than none, so must this hold first place for youth, that any answer is better than none. The fear to give an answer lest something false should be said must be considered more shameful than to give a wrong answer. From this primitive principle onward is youth to be educated, that they may gain courage to act (M.K. ii, 462).
>
> The task of propaganda is, for example, not a weighing of different rights but the exclusive emphasis on exactly the one [right] which is through it [propaganda] to be pleaded. Its object also is not to investigate the truth, so far as this is favourable to the other parties, so as to set this before the masses with doctrinaire uprightness, but is uninterruptedly to serve its own interests.

> It was fundamentally false to discuss the war [of 1914–1918] from the standpoint that not Germany alone could be made responsible for the outbreak of this catastrophe, but it would have been right to have loaded this guilt entirely on to the Enemy, even if this had in truth not corresponded to the actual circumstances, as nevertheless was in fact the case (M.K. i, 200).

So propaganda may lie in the interest of its own cause. But before any propagandist, in commerce, politics, or religion, throws a stone at Adolf Hitler let him make sure he does not himself live in a glass-house. It was in English that I read the caustic definition of a diplomat as being a man that tells lies for the good of his country, and of the greatest of modern Frenchmen, Napoleon, this was written concerning his articles for his *Moniteur*: " They lie as impudently as the most lying of his bulletins . . . They are saturated with perfidy and spiced with poisonous insinuations " (*Times Supplement*, May 5th, 1921, the centenary of his death). It demands an exceptionally honest heart to face this pronouncement of Holy Scripture, that, " for all liars, their part shall be in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone " (Revelation 21 : 8).

Oh, my indignant reader, I pray you keep calm a moment before you hotly declaim that such a prospect is too horrible to contemplate. Consider whether lying by word, and deceit by action, and this by many persons, did not play a primary and essential part in setting Europe ablaze in the late veritable inferno. Why should the doom of liars be less awful than the misery they caused ? " Shall not the Judge of all the earth do *right ?* " (Genesis 18 : 25).

There is another aspect of importance. During the late war I talked in a train with a British soldier of perhaps twenty-eight years. Like millions more to-day, he had no religious views ; but he was thoughtful, and he said, " This affair is so universal and vast that it seems to me beyond human power to have caused it." A just inference. I showed him that this is the Bible view of such matters ; that there is this powerful " prince of the world," as Christ three times styled Satan, this prince of the authority of the air, the " spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience " (Ephesians 2 : 2), in whom " the whole world lieth " (1 John 5 : 19), and so is infected with his spirit of pride, ambition, rebellion, falsehood, cruelty.

It is because of this dread and real situation that no individual, no nation, can rectify the conditions existing. Their origin is in a spirit being, exercising spiritual influence upon the inner spirit element in man, deceiving him, inciting him, utilizing his powers of spirit, soul, and body. Statesmen in general ignore this dominant

factor and so are foiled in even their best attempts to improve matters. There is but one hope, and it is given in these words, which millions have proved to be true in individual experience: "To this end was the Son of God manifested [on earth] that He might bring to nought the works of the devil" (1 John 3 : 8).

Take another instance, the rise and rapid spread of cults which have nothing in them to explain the sudden grip they gain upon millions of minds. A powerful American speaker said of Mrs. Eddy's book, *Science and Health*, the text-book of Christian Science, that one could begin at the beginning and read it straight through, or begin at the end and read it backwards, or begin in the middle and read it both ways at once, and it made equally good nonsense either way. This is true. I think I may be one of the very few, outside the circle of devotees to this cult, who have read it right through. It and the Koran are the dreariest literary wastes over which I ever toiled, and I read them solely to be able to understand and to help those deceived by them.

What, then, is its secret? This, that the book denies every truth of the Christian faith, from the foundation truth as to the nature of God to the last truth that is built on that foundation. If the Word of God is from God, then Mrs. Eddy's book is necessarily from the "father of the lie." And that it should in a very short time arrest and blind myriads of minds is readily explained by the fact that myriads of lying spirits suddenly and unitedly press errors on human attention, and do this with power.

Or, again, the Catholic Church asserts that when its priests mumble a short formula over the bread and wine on its ten-thousand altars the astounding change then and there takes place that those elements in those multitudinous churches must and do become, save in appearance, the veritable body and blood of the Son of God now at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

For this assertion there is no proof or reason. The bulk of the material involved must indefinitely exceed any human body. Yet hundreds of millions have assented to it, including men of noble intellect and high culture such as it would be difficult to deceive in any secular matter. To an intelligent young man who had lately seceded to that Church I urged that no intellectual ground for the dogma could be shown, and that of our bodily senses, four, sight, touch, taste, and smell, were against it, while hearing had no bearing on the point. I pressed upon him that man *cannot* believe a thing unless he has what he thinks to be evidence of it, and here all evidence was against it.

His reply was startling, yet enlightening. He said: "We do

not need evidence. We receive a supernatural gift of faith which enables us to believe without evidence."

To the Rationalist this will seem absurd, a mere deceit. But it is not so, at least not of necessity. Let us shift the question to the orthodox evangelical beliefs, say the doctrine of sin as above stated, or that of the atonement for sin by the precious blood of Christ. The Hon. Dr. Lyttleton, speaking at the church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, related that Thomas Huxley, the agnostic, said to a Christian friend that when he felt that people believed in Christianity he took for granted that they were muddle-headed and confused in mind. But you, said he, are a clear-headed man: how does it come about that you believe in these things that to me are unimaginable? (D.T., March 15th, 1917). Now, Huxley must have known perfectly well that men of giant intellect had believed these things. If he had never read Augustine or Calvin, he surely did know that Faraday and Gladstone were avowed believers in Christ and the Bible. It is to be observed that in his attitude to things spiritual this "scientist," whose canon was that science can take knowledge of only those things which can be known objectively, adopted a purely subjective test by rejecting that which to himself happened to be unimaginable.

The description of believers in Christ as muddle-headed was impertinent, but the question is pertinent; and he who will honestly seek the answer may reach knowledge of eternal importance. To the reader who has courteously read thus far I will put the matter personally, merely as a test case. What impression, as regards the intellect of the present writer, have these pages made? Is he one of the muddle-headed? Were it so, the reader would not have read so far. Well, then, why do *I* implicitly and unreservedly believe the Christian message, the gospel, the good news of God? The answer is strictly analagous to that of my young Roman Catholic acquaintance. A piece of history will illustrate this.

In Bristol a young working man, an atheist, was strolling up Old Market Street one Saturday evening. He had read Paine, Voltaire and the like, and a little in science. His moral life was low. Pulling up at a knot of people at the top of the Batch, he heard an unlettered man telling in poor English that he had been a rough, wicked fellow until he heard that Jesus Christ had shed His blood to redeem such as he from their sins; and that by putting the trust of his heart upon Christ to be his personal Saviour he had been literally rescued from his vices and enabled to lead a new life.

Now, the young atheist despised this sort of talk; but as he listened to the uncultured speaker some strange power seized his

mind, he felt convinced that what he had then heard was true, and in a few minutes he was making a fool of himself by getting down on his knees on the open road, in the circle gathered, and was crying to the Lord Jesus Christ to do for him what He had done for the other. And Christ did so, as He had gladly done for tens of thousands before.

After some time a much older Christian, or professed Christian, began to ply this convert's mind with higher critical views of the Bible. He was very astonished to hear this older man employing the very reasonings which he had already learned from Paine, Rousseau, and company. It shook his new faith. He was advised to see me, and I said: You have learned some science, so are acquainted with the axiom that any hypothesis to be true must cover all the facts. Ask this older man to explain on his view of the Bible your experience that night on the Batch. You will find him unable to do so. You were quite satisfied with your atheistic opinions, especially as they did not condemn your evil ways. You had no sense of your sinfulness or of your danger from the wrath of God. You would not have condescended to converse with a man who could not talk Queen's English. You flatly rejected what he said about the saving power of the blood of Christ. Yet a real power wrought within you, quite unsought by you, changed your whole mind and outlook, convinced you that what you disbelieved was truth, and constrained you to seek in public the saving grace of God. And the result, you say, has been a new moral power and a new practical life.

Now, the Bible, I continued, offers an explanation of this which covers all the facts and fits them exactly. It tells us that there is now on earth a divine spirit Being called the Holy Spirit of God, and that He is here to do just such work as you have experienced. Being by nature a spirit, He can act directly upon the spirit part of man. Indeed, He is the Creator of our spirits. He is here (1) to convince of sin, specially the sin of not believing on Christ, should we have heard of Him; (2) it is His office to make Christ real to our understanding and affections; (3) He is to impress us with the importance of the future, so that we cease to be bound to the present; (4) He is to be in us the power of a new nature, so enabling us to lead a new life, free from the dominance of the old and evil nature.

The Gospel histories, I continued, say that Christ, just before He died, and again before He left this earth for the presence of the Father, definitely promised to send this His own Spirit, and that the effects described, and others, which are wholly supernatural, should be produced in such as should believe in Him as Saviour

and Lord. The book of Acts describes the historic fulfilment of this promise, by the descent of the Spirit of God. And you, I said, have had a true personal experience to the same effect. This hypothesis as to the Spirit of God covers and corresponds with all the facts, and no other explanation does so. And thus at the same time it confirms the truth of the Book in which, and nowhere else, these promises in advance are given.

My friend was thoughtful for a while, and then said : Yes, I see, and this explains why I have not been swept away into renewed unbelief. *I knew that something real did take place in me that night on the Batch.*

It is this " something real," this impact of the Spirit of God on the inward man, this that no one can gainsay, which creates a deep, indelible conviction, and the subject of it can never honestly refute it or dismiss it, even when unfaithful to it.

> He gives the witness that excels all argument and sign :
> When we have heard it for ourselves *we know* it is *divine*.
>
> (HAVERGAL'S Poems, *The Key Found.*)

The Spirit of God does not do this work by logic, but by a direct action upon our conscience. This explains such a case as the following. A learned divine delivered six learned discourses upon the evidences of Christianity in the hope of convincing a learned unbelieving judge. At the close of the last sermon the judge sought the preacher, who said, I am very glad to see you, and I do not mind telling you that it was in hope of helping you that I have delivered these addresses. Which of them has brought you here ?

The judge replied : It is neither of your addresses. But as I was leaving the church an old woman in a shawl tripped on the gallery stairs and would have fallen but that I caught her in my arms. She looked at me, thanked me, and said, Oh, dear sir, I do hope that you love my Saviour ! and this is what has brought me here.

Now, it is obvious that such a remark from such a person could not of itself have suddenly convinced that trained and cultured man that his views were false and himself a sinner needing a Saviour. The cause is simply not adequate to the effect. A bullet will not itself kill, but it will do so when shot from a good rifle by a good marksman. The Spirit of God can do His work by the simplest remark of one in whom He dwells. He who has been the subject of this divine operation has in it a *rational evidence*

of the truth of the doctrines upon the subject and of the truth of the only Book from which these doctrines can be drawn.

This inward action of the Spirit of God throws light upon the statement by the Roman Catholic that he received a supernatural gift of faith to believe, for the spirits of darkness also can work thus on the human mind. Then how shall the operations of each be distinguished, the true from the false?

(1) The Spirit of truth does not require that to be believed which is not otherwise verifiable. The gospel calls for faith in a Person, Jesus Christ; the facts concerning Him are authentic history, in spite of attacks of infidel criticism. The doctrine of the Real Presence on the altar is utterly unverifiable, as well as being actually contrary to our reason and senses.

(2) The effects reveal the nature of the cause. It is promised in advance that distinct moral consequences shall attest the truth of the gospel message, and for nineteen centuries the promise has been fulfilled in millions of lives. No such benefit ever results from accepting the false. One who has carefully observed life in the lands, western and eastern, where the dogma of transubstantiation, for example, has been generally accepted needs no other proof than the lives of priests and people that the dogma is morally powerless. Before 1870, when the Popes were the sovereigns of Italy and the Church was supreme, there were more Foundling hospitals in Rome, that city of celibate priests, than in any three cities of Europe put together (Alex. Robertson, *The Roman Catholic Church in Italy*, 30).

" Joseph Goebbels was the intellectual of the Nazi party. . . . The prize pupil of a Jesuit seminary, he retained to the end the distinctive character of his education; he could always prove what he wanted " (L.D.H. 18).

Here, then, is a solemn and terrible thing, that wicked spirits can present to the human mind a falsehood with such overwhelming force that it shall be accepted and shall be capable of driving the man to the greatest folly and evil. As the Holy Spirit can make men supernaturally holy, so the Evil Spirit can make men supernaturally wicked. Here is the deepest and adequate explanation of Dachau and Buchenwald; and thus it need not be doubted that Hitler *believed* he had been chosen by Fate to lead Germany and was its Messiah, and that he must act accordingly. And he did act according to this. His senior military officer, General Halder, said: " I never found genius in him, only the diabolical " (L.D.H. 45). Trevor Roper writes: " Hitler's lust for blood was unabated, perhaps even increased, by time and defeat "

(*ibid* 78). Halder says: "He was suddenly seized by a lust for blood" (*ibid* 79). Trevor Roper adds: "In his last days . . . Hitler seems like some cannibal god, rejoicing in the ruin of his own temples" (*ibid* 80).

This leads on to the further portentous fact of

INSPIRED UTTERANCES OF DEMONS

It is very well attested that in spiritualistic seances unlettered mediums, who even do not speak their own language correctly, will have mind and speech so taken hold of by evil spirits that, while the ecstasy lasts, it is not the medium who speaks, but the demon; so that the utterance is in chaste diction, sometimes in excellent verse, and will deal accurately with difficult subjects of which the medium knows nothing.[1]

Enemies of the Bible declaim loudly against the claim of Zechariah, Paul, and others that it was by the Spirit of God that they, as prophets, had the words of God given to them. Verbal inspiration is bitterly opposed by many, and only half-heartedly received by others. But as evil spirits can and do speak *their* words through *their* prophets, why shall not the Spirit of truth so use *His* prophets?

The Word of God definitely recognizes this activity of evil spirits. On that fatal day (see ch. III) when Ahab, king of Israel, was to be lured to his deserved death (see 2 Chronicles 18), the end was effected by that evil spirit who appeared before Jehovah and said, "I will go forth and will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, thou shalt entice him, and shalt prevail; go forth and do so. Now therefore," said the prophet of God, "Jehovah hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets; and Jehovah hath spoken evil concerning thee."

Beware of majorities. That day four hundred were united in their counsel, only one opposed. But the event showed the one spake truth, the many lies. I heard a great teacher say to a company of Christian leaders:

> We have a saying "Great is the truth and will prevail"; but that is never so in this age. In this age truth is always with the minority; and so convinced am I of this that, if I find myself agreeing with the majority, I make haste and get over to the other side, for I know I am wrong.

Upon this matter of demon inspiration let this paragraph of Rosenberg be studied, with its quotation from Nietzsche, noting

[1] See *Earth's Earliest Ages*, Pember, Ed. 15, p. 199, 3.

the words I have italicized. It concerns Nietzsche's book *Thus Spake Zarathustra.*

> Scarcely any one has so finely described the birth-hour of a great work as Nietzsche: "Has any one at the end of the nineteenth century had a definite conception of what the poets of a more powerful age called Inspiration? Revelation in the sense that *suddenly*, with *indescribable assurance and freedom*, something becomes visible and audible, something that convulses and overthrows to the very depths. . . . One hears, *one seeks not;* one takes, *one asks not who gives;* as a lightning flash a thought blazes out, with necessity, in form unhesitating—I have *never had a choice.* A transport, the immense tension of which now and then finds relief in a flood of tears; through which the pace involuntarily now storms forward, now becomes slow; a being *wholly out-of-oneself* . . . a depth of happiness, in which the most painful and gloomy does not work as an opposite [but as] a condition, a challenge, a *necessary* colour in such an abundance of light. All comes to pass in the highest degree involuntarily, but as a tempest of freedom, of unrestrictedness, of divinity" (M. 424).

Such inspiration is thus:

1. Sudden. This may be so in inspiration by the Spirit of God also. Ezekiel 11 : 15 : "And the Spirit of Jehovah *fell upon* me, and He said unto me, Speak." See also Acts 10 : 44; 11 : 15. In either case it shows that an outside power is acting.

2. The man is lifted "out of himself" into a consciousness that is abnormal, into ecstasy (Acts 10 : 10; 11 : 5; 22 : 17). It is the state elsewhere described as a being "in spirit" (Revelation 1 : 10; 4 : 2; 21 : 10), in which supra-normal condition communications can be received from the supernatural world.

3. But here is the contrast between the Satanic and the Divine. In the former the man gives himself up entirely to the influence without questioning its source or character; "one seeks not . . . one asks not who gives . . . I have never had a choice." But God does not permit of the personal will of *His* prophets being thus negatived. *His* call is: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but *prove the spirits*, whether they are of God: for many *false* prophets are gone out into the world." And this is the infallible test. "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God: and this is the spirit of the anti-christ, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is in the world already" (1 John 4 : 1–3). Self-control is maintained: "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets" (1 Corinthians 14 : 32).

4. The influence affects the body as well as the mind. Nietzsche's sister adds to the above quotation that his ecstasy was accompanied " with the most distinct consciousness of delicate shocks and thrills to one's very toes ; a feeling of happiness " (*The Lonely Nietzsche*, 1915, p. 154). Such descriptions were frequent in the early days of the Tongues' Movement mentioned below.

Tested thus, Nietzsche and the Nazis were not of God, most emphatically not, but were inspired by the spirit that will animate the Antichrist, Nietzsche's projected and desired Superman. But of this more later. (See ch. XII.)

It has been a marked feature of those under demonic influence that they refuse to test the spirits acting upon and through them. The demons dread to be tested, lest they be exposed and rejected. They prefer secrecy and darkness as conditions for their manifestations. A Freemason sought to kindle in me an interest in that Society. He offered the bait which Satan used for Eve, " Ye shall know," for he spoke of the knowledge imparted in their meetings, and that the higher one rose the more one was taught. I asked *what kind* of knowledge it was that would only be given behind fast closed doors and under shocking vows of secrecy? He would say no more. I pressed upon him the words of Christ : " men loved the darkness rather than the light ; for their works were evil. For every one that practiseth ill hateth the light and cometh not to the light, lest his works should be reproved. But he that doeth the truth cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest, that they have been wrought in God " (John 3 : 19–21).

Christ practised what He preached. To His accusers and judges He could say : " I have spoken openly to the world . . . in secret spake I nothing " (John 18 : 20).

In the early years of the modern religious Movement in which speaking in unknown tongues is emphasized there was not a little demonic influence. On some prominent occasions the sinlessness of Christ was denied, and not a few false prophecies were given by persons speaking under the power that came upon them. Their chief prophet in India published widely such a prophecy, declaring that within seven months Colombo would be sunk in the sea. The chief personality in England in those first days was a woman. Her brother shared her experiences of the spirit energy that came upon them from time to time. He told me that on one occasion a neighbour's little boy was dying. His sister, when the spirit came upon her, was told specifically that the child would live, and she sent her brother to comfort the father by this assurance.

On the way there the power fell upon the brother and the prophecy was confirmed. Yet when he reached the house the boy was already dead. To his sister he said that it was plain that it was a false spirit that was acting, and he left the Movement; but she deceived herself by the notion that they had misunderstood the message, its real meaning being that the boy would live on that next plane of existence to which he had gone!

Thus thoroughly can a willing heart be blinded by that Tempter of whom we read, "the serpent *beguiled* Eve in his craftiness" (2 Corinthians 11 : 3). The word rendered "beguile" (ἐξαπατάω) means to deceive thoroughly, hoodwink.

There ought not to be difficulty in believing literally the story of Genesis 3, for, apart from the action of a visible serpent, it is being re-enacted daily. And that an animal should speak is by no means incredible. Has the reader never felt that his favourite dog or pet cat would put its affection into words, if it could; that it required only that its "mouth should be opened," as was that of Balaam's ass?

This inspiration can extend beyond speech to writing. Permanent influence can live and work in a book. It is so with the Word of God, and this is the secret of its supernatural and purifying influence. Resolutely opposed as I am to theosophy, and understanding sufficiently its reasonings and claims, I yet felt a powerful and dangerous grip seizing my mind as I read one of its best-known treatises. It is no wonder that the uninstructed or the well-disposed are persuaded and mastered by such demon-inspired writings.

Writing of Mrs. Baker Eddy's *Autobiography*, Mark Twain drew attention to marked differences in literary style found therein, and thought that Mrs. Eddy was the author of the earlier part, but not of the rest (Mark Twain, *Christian Science*, 101 ff). But it may have been plain Mrs. Eddy writing the one part and demon-inspired Mrs. Eddy the other part.

So the Deceiver may be permitted by God to deceive a man who has definitely given himself to be deceived by rejecting divine instruction available. Is not Hitler an instance? He knew a good deal of the Bible. His book contains many allusions to its sayings and strong repudiation of its doctrines. Persisting thus, yet doubtless feeling his need of higher wisdom than his own, he turned to astrologers, and being, as we have just shown, ready to lie and to deceive others, he was himself given up to those deceivers and lured on to the only possible end.

Can we not see here the true reasons for the, from the point of

view of Germany, disastrous mistakes he made? At Dunkirk he inflicted on the British what Mr. Churchill called at the time a "colossal military disaster." Why did he not at once press that advantage and attack this country? On the other hand, what fixed in his mind the stubborn and reckless decision to attack Russia? Surely he knew of Bismarck's advice that German armies would simply melt away in those vast steppes.

Here is a modern parallel to the classic instance of that mighty Crœsus of Lydia before mentioned. Watching the advance towards his land of the armies of Cyrus of Persia, he pondered whether he should forestall the enemy by attacking him. He therefore sent messengers and rich gifts to the world-famed oracle at Delphi in Greece to consult the great god Apollo. The answer of the oracle was that if he crossed the river Halys, the boundary of his realm, he would destroy a great empire. He attacked and was routed and captured, so learning that the crafty demon-inspired answer had been fulfilled, but to his own ruin, not that of his enemy.

These satanic advisers have marked skill in forecasting a mixture of truth and error. By means of the former they gain and keep the confidence of their victims, and by the latter they beguile them to their ruin.

As to the former class we read (L.D.H. 93):

> In Hamburg, Schellenberg [one of Himmler's later advisers] had discovered a promising astrologer called Wulf, a student of poisons, of Sanskrit, and other interesting subjects. Wulf's prophecies, as seen by Schellenberg in retrospect, seemed remarkably accurate. He had prophesied that Hitler would survive a great danger on 20th July, 1944; that he would be ill in November, 1944: and that he would die a mysterious death before 7th May, 1945.

As to enticing men unto their ruin, as late as April, 1945, when Germany was already defeated and collapsing, Hitler and Goebbels were buoyed up by elusive hopes built on astrology. On September 9th, 1918, Hitler had had a horoscope drawn up of the Republic, and one of himself on January 30th, 1933. Trevor-Roper tells us that Hitler's Minister of Finance wrote that:

> Both horoscopes had unanimously predicted the outbreak of war in 1939, the victories till 1941, and then the series of defeats culminating in the worst of disasters in the early months of 1945, especially the first half of April. Then there was to be an overwhelming victory for us [i.e., Germany] in the second half of April, stagnation till August, and in August peace. After the peace there would be a difficult time for Germany for three years; but from 1948 she would rise to greatness again (L.D.H., 107, 108).

Wars are among the judgments that the Prince of the world can bring over his realm, and there is no difficulty in thinking that he can therefore foresee the course of what he purposes shall come to pass. But his activities are liable to interference by the over-ruling will of God and so his forecasts may fail. In the present case he may well have designed the deception of his victims as to the end of their evil and mad course, so as to lure them to the appointed doom by persisting in resistance when it was plainly useless.

In the story given above from Herodotus, Solon is made to tell Crœsus that the gods knew how to exalt and to cut down. Based on such observation of human affairs, the heathen had the saying that, Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. This was said of Jehovah also by one of His prophets, Jeremiah, who most sternly denounced paganism in Israel, yet tacitly confirmed this saying. In chapter 25 it is said that Jeremiah was to take a symbolic cup " of the wine of wrath at my hand, and cause all the nations to whom I send it to drink it. And they shall drink and reel to and fro, and be mad, because of the sword that I will send among them " (verses 15, 16). Then follows a list of some twenty peoples of the Middle East to be involved in this wrath of God, the last-named being the king of Sheshach, that is, Babylon (verse 26, and see ch. 51, 41). This last name is preceded by reference " to all the kings of the north, far and near," which points to Asia Minor, Armenia, and the Caucasus areas ; and then it is added that the judgment will really be unrestricted in extent, for it is to rest upon " all the kingdoms of the world which are upon the face of the earth."

The universality of this divine indignation is emphasized in verses 31, 32 : " Thus saith Jehovah of hosts, Behold evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great tempest shall be raised up from the uttermost parts of the earth [that is, the most remote from Palestine, which is the centre from which Bible prophecy looks out]. And the slain of Jehovah shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth." The centre of the tempest shall be at Jerusalem, its conclusion at Babylon.

Nothing so strictly universal has been yet known on earth, beginning in remote regions and converging on the Middle East ; but it demands serious reflection by all serious persons whether recent world events do not conform pretty closely to the program outlined. At the moment there is a lull in the storm, but no one feels sure that it is really over.

However this may be, such a world turmoil is to be God's answer to man's defiance, and our present inquiry is as to the activity of the great Deceiver in furthering the judgment.

Let the thoughtful reader ponder this one further prediction, found in 2 Thessalonians 2. The passage reads :

> 1 Now we beseech you, brethren, touching the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him ; 2 to the end that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled, either by spirit, or by word, or by epistle as from us, as that the day of the Lord is now present ; 3 Let no man beguile you in any wise : for it will not be, except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, 4 he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped ; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God. 5 Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things ? 6 And now ye know that which restraineth to the end that he may be revealed in his own season. 7 For the mystery of lawlessness doth already work : only there is one that restraineth now, until he be taken out of the way. 8 And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of his mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of his coming. 9 Even he, whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs, and lying wonders, 10 and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that are perishing ; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. 11 And for this cause God sendeth them a working of error, that they should believe the lie : 12 that they all might be judged who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

This foretells :

1. An apostasy from the Christian faith by many who at least professed it. Darwin and Huxley were among such. Until lately the people of lands like Germany, England, and some others, declared themselves "Christians," meaning a general acknowledgment of that religion. Of late the majority make no such acknowledgement and multitudes repudiate it.

2. Then will come on the scene, "the man of sin, the son of perdition, the lawless one" ; Nietzsche's Superman. He claims all worship for himself. His pretentions are to be supported by "the working of Satan with all power and signs and wonders of falsehood, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that are perishing ; because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved" (verses 9, 10). The inquirer can find this dread epoch more fully outlined in chs. 12 and 13 of *Revelation.*

Now follows what concerns us most at the moment, the secret influence by which the race will be ripened for judgment, and the reason why God must at last resort to these stern measures. "And

for *this cause God* sendeth them a working of error, that they *should believe the lie*: that they all might be judged who *believed not the truth*, but had pleasure in unrighteousness" (verse 12).

By the time of that consummation of this age the good news of God will have been preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all nations, as Christ foretold (Matthew 24: 14). There will be no heathen nation which knows nothing of it, but it will have been generally rejected, accompanied by violent persecution of such as adhere to the worship of the true God, Jews and Christians. This will at length provoke the wrath of God against all unrighteousness.

The Bible doctrine of the mighty Prince of darkness and his hosts, of their fell influence upon mankind, of their subordination to the superior power of God, of the consequent confused affairs of earth, the battleground, covers the facts thoroughly. No other hypothesis known to me does so even approximately.

In this materialistic age, which treats the supernatural as incredible, it will be in place to remember the part of such beliefs in the past. James Anthony Froude, Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, had not such religious convictions as one could wish, but he well emphasized the influence of belief in the supernatural in making the great sea captains of century sixteen, the men who laid the foundation of England's maritime supremacy, the men they were. In his *Short Studies*, vol. i, 444, he says:

> An earnest faith in the supernatural, an intensely real conviction of the divine and devilish forces by which the universe was guided and misguided, was the inheritance of the Elizabethan age from Catholic Christianity. The fiercest and most lawless men did then really and truly believe in the actual personal presence of God or the devil in every accident, or scene, or action. . . .
>
> It is a form of thought which, however in a vague and general way we may continue to use its phraseology, has become [about A.D. 1870], in its detailed application to life, utterly strange to us. . . . That Raleigh and Bacon could believe what they believed, and could be what they were notwithstanding, is a proof to us that the injury which such mistakes [as Froude had come to regard such beliefs] can inflict is unspeakably insignificant: and arising, as those mistakes arose, from a never-failing sense of the real awfulness and mystery of the world and of the life of human souls upon it, they witness to the presence in such minds of a spirit, the loss of which not the most perfect acquaintance with every law by which the whole creation moves can compensate.

The last sentence should be noted. It was written at the time when scientists of a certain school were diligently indoctrinating

modern thought with the infidel dogma of the invariability of natural law, so that miracle and the entire supernatural must be impossible. Time has already justified Froude that the loss of that older belief in God and the devil cannot be compensated. The dogma of unvarying law, itself a form of fatalism, has no moral power to restrain vice or to promote virtue.

In 1928 there was issued a book entitled *Creation by Evolution.* The agnostic Julian S. Huxley contributed a paper on *Progress Shown in Evolution.* This progress he attributed to " cosmic forces . . . the forces of Evolution . . . the automatic working of natural forces " (p. 338). He asserted that this progress " does not in any way prove the existence of a supernatural purpose in evolution " (p. 337), but added:

> This of course is not to say that there may not be a purpose in the background, behind all those apparently blind forces. But we have no means whatever of knowing whether that is so or not; and it is the first duty of anyone who wishes to think scientifically to suspend judgment on such questions in the absence of evidence.

Here is the typical agnostic attitude. It is asserted that there is no evidence of the supernatural in nature. We meet this by a flat denial, and assert unhesitatingly that there is abundance of such evidence. For the four thousand years of authentic human history, that is from the days after the Flood, there has been an ever-accumulating mass of testimony that men have been in contact with supernatural beings and forces. *Millions* upon *millions* of persons have declared this as personal experience. Among these multitudes there have been and are very many millions who assert that they have had conscious connexion with that very God Whose existence such as Julian Huxley deny. They are persons as worthy of credit as any that ever lived. They lack nothing of the character, intelligence, and ability required to justify their claim. All this vast and weighty evidence the agnostic simply ignores, or he treats the witnesses with rudeness, as did Huxley's grandfather as just before mentioned. This ignoring of reliable evidence is the very negation of the scientific spirit and method.

Satan's activities touch individuals, as Job, a good man, and Ahab, a bad man. They cover races, nations, empires, and, indeed, are universal. But they are controlled and limited by the Most High, and are made to serve His ends of justice and mercy. Most happily true is Charles Reade's remark that if Satan sometimes wins the skirmish it is God Who wins the battle.

In the light of all this where do the nations stand to-day? Where their kings and statesmen? Yes, where does the writer stand, and the reader—where?

That there is an external tempter of men can be learned from the common experience that often individuals receive a powerful urge to commit acts they naturally detest, as to commit suicide, to be unchaste, or vulgar. The following lines from more than fifty years ago give a challenge no objector can answer.

THE DEVIL GONE

Men don't believe in a devil now as their fathers used to do;
They forced the door of the broadest creed to let his majesty through.
There isn't a print of his cloven foot or a dart from his fiery bow
To be found in earth or air to-day, for the world has voted so.

But who is mixing the fatal draught that palsies heart and brain,
And loads the bier of each passing year with ten hundred thousand slain?
Who blights the bloom of the land to-day with the fiery breath of hell,
If the devil isn't, and never was? Won't somebody rise and tell?

Who dogs the steps of the toiling saint and digs the pit for his feet?
Who sows the tares in the field of time wherever God sows the wheat?
The devil is voted not to be, and, of course, the thing is true;
But who is it doing the kind of work the devil used to do?

We are told that he does not go around like a roaring lion now;
But whom shall we hold responsible for the everlasting row
To be heard in home, in Church, and State, to the earth's remotest bound,
If the devil by an unanimous vote is nowhere to be found?

Won't somebody step to the front forthwith, and make his bow, and show
How the frauds and crimes of a single day spring up? We want to know!
The devil was fairly voted out, and, of course, the devil's gone;
But simple people would like to know who carries his business on.

ALFRED J. HOUGH.

CHAPTER VI

TO-DAY—WHITHER ?

THE STUDY OF HISTORY IS OF VALUE IF THE LESSONS OF THE past be accepted and exert influence to-day. As one of Dickens' characters was made to say: " The value of these observations lies in the application thereof."

But whose opinion as to present-day affairs is of value? If the situation is as shown in earlier chapters, if that be true which the first world emperor discovered by hard experience, even " that the heavens do rule . . . that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will . . . and He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay (lit. strike up) His hand, or say unto Him, What doest thou ? " (Daniel 4 : 26 ; 25 : 32,35)— if this be the actual present position of affairs (as it is), then quite obviously the only material question is how do matters look to the powers of heaven? The great Welsh orator, John Elias, would stop abruptly and exclaim, " I wonder what they are saying in heaven about this ? "

How shall this be ascertained ? How can we learn the judgment of God ? What tests will teach this ? There is no real difficulty, because He has declared His purpose and requirements. Christ was asked a question still of urgent importance: " Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause ? " The answer will be considered later. His questioners pointed out that Israel's great law-giver, Moses, had sanctioned divorce on various grounds. But the Son of God replied by saying why this was done, but that "*from the beginning*" it had not been so. The principle of this is, that if we do really wish to learn the true will of God for man, we must observe what He *originally* instituted, not what He *tolerated* far on in human history when adverse conditions had arisen.

Now when the original conditions are considered, as set forth in the opening pages of God's records, some primary facts face us.

1. God the Creator and man the creature had direct friendly intercourse. The heart of God was wholly love to the man He had made ; the heart of man was wholly love towards his Creator.

He fulfilled the first, the great, the all-embracing duty of man, to love Jehovah his God, with all his heart, soul, mind, and strength (Matthew 22 : 37, 38).

To-day. As we have seen, Hitler and his leading men rejected, yea, hated, the only true God. They transgressed the first of the Ten Commandments and set up another god of their own imagination, Nature, Force, the All ; proceeding thence to re-instate Man as the divinity, the model men being the old pagan gods of the north. The German people as a whole acquiesced, outwardly, if not in heart, as regards many.

Where do the British people stand to-day ? They have not yet got so far as violently to reject God or to establish openly pagan gods. But the vast majority simply ignore His existence and rights. From one year's end to the other they are *practical* atheists. If there were no God it would make no difference to their way of life. Were the vast body of subjects thus to ignore the king it would be virtual rebellion, which would assuredly culminate in open revolt. This result as to God was reached in Germany ; it will be reached in the British Empire unless a mighty spiritual revolution is granted.

The first Commandment mentioned reads : " Thou shalt have none other gods beside me " (Exodus 20 : 3).

Humanism violates this command, for it puts man in the place of God as the being to be served and honoured. Wealth, pleasure, power, lust are some forms of man-worship, being all a " worshipping and serving the creature rather than the Creator " (Romans 1 : 25). There are men and women who love a pet dog rather than God. Others put their own wife, husband, child before their Maker.

2. Here is a second fact of that earliest intercourse with God : man had no visible object which represented God to his bodily sight.

To-day, as for four thousand years, almost all men have such an object. Not only avowed idolators, who form a majority of the race, but Moslems, professedly haters of idols, have their sacred stone at Mecca ; the eastern Churches, Greek, Coptic, Nestorian, have pictures of Christ and the Saints, and the Roman Catholic Churches are adorned (or disfigured) with images and pictures innumerable. Before these hundreds of millions bow down contrary to the express prohibition of the second commandment, " Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, nor the likeness of any form . . . thou shalt not bow down to them " (Exodus 20 : 4–6).

3. In those days, when man loved his Maker and revered his God, he used reverently His name, as men always do who fear God.

To-day no one can go very long without hearing that holy name abused. A decent young fellow said to me recently of the language in the R.A.F. which he had lately joined : " I knew it was bad, but I had no idea it was as bad as it is." Travelling from Marseilles to London in 1915, a man in almost every sentence used carelessly the name " Christ." I reproved him. He at once expressed regret and said : " I have just put in six months on H.M. ship the *Queen Elizabeth*, and it's a place to finish your education in bad language."

Nor is this true of these services only, not by any means. Offices, warehouses, factories, and general conversation are besmirched. John Howard, the prison reformer, heard God's holy name misused. To the bystanders he said : " Gentlemen, button up your coats : the man who will take God's name in vain will be ready to take your purse ! "

But this is not the most serious form of the abuse of God's name. It is often thoughtless rather than designed ; but what of perjury in the courts of law ?

It is true that two hundred years ago this profane speech was even more common than to-day. The eighteenth century felt the purifying effect of the powerful working of the Holy Spirit of God mentioned in chapter I, whereby many open vices were made disreputable and much mitigated. *To-day* they are reasserting their baneful sway. It is lately that a writer in a paper complained strongly of the " swear-words " in the B.B.C. Light Programme (*British Weekly*, April 17th, 1947). The individual who damns people to the devil on Saturday and Monday is rightly regarded a rank hypocrite if he sings the praises of God on Sunday. Will the Almighty think any higher of the B.B.C. religious broadcasts ? Whither will this drag the nation, if it persists ? It will bring it under the warning attached to the third Commandment, " Jehovah will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain " (Exodus 20 : 7).

4. In those pristine days of man's career there was an institution which God ordained, and sanctified by His own example. Having in six days refitted the heavens and the earth to serve His ends in making them, God " rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it : because that in it He rested from all His work which God had created and made " (Genesis 2 : 1–3). Like all His acts, this was for the good of His creature : " the Sabbath was

made for man," said Christ, the incarnate Creator (Mark 2 : 27), and man cannot do well without it. It is stated that even the infidel Voltaire said : " Whether Englishmen know it or not, it is the English Sunday that has made and keeps England great." To-day, alas ! Englishmen do *not* know this.

The day of rest was not ordained first at Sinai and for Jews. The fourth Commandment bade them to " *Remember* the Sabbath Day to keep holy " (Exodus 20 : 8–11). There exist traces of the day of rest from times preceding Sinai (fifteenth century B.C.). The ordinance dates from the creation of man, has never been abrogated, and has universal validity.

This day was also to be an acknowledgment by man of the right of his Creator to his whole time, service, love, worship ; it was a sort of " token " payment, an acknowledgment of larger rights.

To-day. The world over this original duty of man is ignored.

Seven centuries B.C. God remonstrated with Israel upon their disregard of His sabbaths, and stated that their future prosperity would be contingent upon their not doing their pleasure on His holy day, but calling the sabbath a delight, holy, honourable (Isaiah 58 : 13, 14). At the same period He made the blessing of non-Israelites equally contingent upon the same regard to the day of rest (Isaiah 56 : 6–8). These promises do not deal with man's eternal destiny, but they do apply to his present welfare under the blessing of God in life on earth.

I am not a Seventh Day Adventist declaring that he who keeps the first day and not the seventh thereby secures his eternal damnation. Nor am I a Jew pleading for the observance of the burdensome rabbinical details which Christ repudiated. Nor am I one who thinks it of much use to demand enforcement by the Courts of the Lord's Day Observance Act. The day should be observed according to the letter and spirit of the interpretation and application of the Lawgiver Himself, as set forth in Matthew 12 : 1–14 ; Mark 2 : 23 – 3 : 6 ; Luke 6 : 1–11 ; 14 : 1–6. He sanctioned works of real necessity and of mercy. But accepting this liberal application, the facts remain that the Sabbath was imposed at the creation of man ; is valid, necessary, and helpful for all men ; has never been repealed by the enacting Authority ; and therefore the common disregard of it must be a heavy count in the long, general indictment being prepared in the court of God against the human race, including the Anglo-Saxon portion thereof.

Formerly in England the day was commonly respected ; now, for the majority, it is a day of self-pleasing. In furthering this, the radio, by its Light Sunday programmes, is taking its full part and responsibility, as in other forms of moral and spiritual decline.

5. *Obedience to parents.* The fifth command of the law of Sinai is: "Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee" (Exodus 20 : 12). No one can go about England to-day and not observe the general and often fierce rebellion of children, even little children, against parental rule. It is an ominous feature, portentous with disaster. For if the young grow up without the self-control induced by habitual obedience they become conceited, imperious, reckless, self-assertive, self-indulgent, tyrannical. This is the spirit that leads on to rebellion against civil authority and so to public disorder. Also it induces excesses that bring strain and shorten life. When this commandment of the law is repeated for observance by children in Christian homes it is pointed out that it is the first of the Ten Commandments to which a promise is attached, the benefit promised upon obedience being length of life (Ephesians 6 : 1–3).

In this one evil is involved therefore a serious decline in physical well-being, especially nervous energy, in moral tone, in the family, in national life. The condition in England to-day has markedly deteriorated from the general standard of late generations. The lamented increase in juvenile crime is proof enough. Lately the constable in charge of a small country town was deploring it, saying to me that most offences were by youths under eighteen years.

In aggravation of this danger some urge the deplorable notion that the education of the young is best served by encouraging "self-expression," not by restraint. Which means simply that the child is to be free to do just what its corrupt human desires prompt. Such parents and such teachers must surely be either too lazy or too incompetent to exercise discipline. The punishments inflicted a century ago did sometimes err in severity, but the general result was far less dangerous to the child and to society than the laxity of to-day.

But what if the father and the mother be not worthy of honour by their children? If parents live in disregard of the authority of God, their children are likely to disregard their authority. And each generation will show a deeper decline; the fall will be the faster the longer it continues; and the end will be the judgment of God, according to His solemn sentence: "the seed [descendants] of evil-doers shall not be named for ever. Prepare ye slaughter for his children for the iniquity of their fathers; that they rise not up and possess the earth, and fill the face of the world with cities" (Isaiah 14 : 20–21). Land may become so choked and foul with noxious plants that the farmer finds no other way to cleanse

it than by fire. To the All-wise there may at last be no way to free a country from corruption other than to depopulate it.

In that original and too brief period of human innocence the woman was made for the man. He needed her and she was made for him; not the reverse. This implied a measure of subordination of her to him. It was an element in the Fall that Eve acted independently of Adam. To correct this in measure the Creator appointed that her desire should be to her husband and he should rule over her (Genesis 3 : 16). In this judgment there was mercy; the more easily beguiled party was set under the rule and protection of the one who had not been deceived. But as the generations went on men abused their greater strength and suppressed the woman. From this oppression the gospel of Christ worked to set her free, as history shows, nor has any other influence effected this. Yet the gospel still requires that she acknowledge the will of the Creator and honour her father or her husband. It holds up the attitude of Sarah to Abraham as a godly example. On this matter the Word of God is everywhere consistent; see e.g. Ephesians 5 : 22–33; Colossians 3 : 18; 1 Timothy 2 : 8–15; 1 Peter 3 : 1–6.

Whither are matters moving to-day in the west? Indeed, where have they arrived? In home life God's ideal is seriously disregarded. If the mother contends against the head of the house, will her children respect him or her? In a foreign land known to me it was common talk that the Queen of that time (a generation ago) remonstrated with her eldest son upon his vicious life, and he silenced her by asking what could be expected seeing that his father was a drunkard and his mother a harlot! What, indeed! Like father, like son.

God has set out this paralysis of parental authority, and its consequences in family and national life, in vivid histories.

David was a fine character and great king. But in a dark hour he lapsed into adultery and murder. In due time his eldest son, Amnon, committed incest by the rape of his half-sister. It was the king's legal duty to execute his son; but how could he do this seeing how he had himself acted? Presently the sister's own brother, Absalom, had Amnon murdered. How could the king execute this other son, seeing that he himself arranged the death of the husband he had wronged? As sovereign, he had tied his own hands in the execution of the law. Absalom was spared, and later revolted against his father, and would willingly have destroyed him (2 Samuel, chs. 11–18). Thus does lack of self-control in a parent work out to miseries in the family and the State.

6. It was the primary intention of God that man should

live, not that he should die. The latter was to be only a consequence of rebellion. Life is the gift of the Living God alone: man cannot create or confer it. On these grounds the Grantor reserves to Himself full proprietary rights in human life. Man may deprive his brother of life only on grounds sanctioned by God and then only by process of law. Otherwise the sixth command stands: "Thou shalt do no murder" (Exodus 20 : 13).

To-day human life has been held cheap. Metternich begged Napoleon to spare human life. The Emperor replied, What do I care for human life? and he cursed human life. How terribly has this hateful spirit asserted itself down to date.

"Thou shalt do no murder." Yet in the greatest democratic State of to-day, the U.S.A., in 1945, there were over eleven thousand murders (11,234). It is announced (January, 1947) that the most notorious gangster of Chicago has just died in bed at his palatial home. He was reputed to be responsible for 250 deaths. His gang eliminated a rival gang by machine-gun fire in the St. Valentine's Day "massacre" in 1929. What is wrong with the administration of law that Al Capone was allowed to die in his bed in his palatial home instead of dying in the electric chair in prison?

According to the Department of Commerce, U.S.A., 471 brewers and slightly more than 400,000 retailers had a gross income during the years 1941 to 1945 of over £2,600,000,000, an increase of exactly 50 per cent. on the preceding four pre-war years. In 1945 the average consumption of beer per head was over eighteen gallons, costing over £5 5s. per person (*Gospel Trumpet*, Anderson, U.S.A., December 28th, 1946). This is easily believable when one remembers the deplorable drinking habits of the average American soldier when in this country during the late war. The connexion between drunkenness, murder, and crime in general is well established.

The Divine verdict is: "blood, it polluteth the land; and no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it" (Numbers 35 : 33). How polluted before God must the United States be seeing that but very few of its thousands of murders annually are expiated by the execution of the murderers.

Because of idolatry, adultery, deceit, and the shedding of innocent blood, God thrice said of Israel of old: "Shall I not visit for these things? saith Jehovah; and shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" (Jeremiah 5 : 9, 29; 9 : 9). When will His patience end and He speak thus regarding the nations of to-day?

Surely it is time to ask our question, "Whither?" Whither

are civilized nations moving if not towards the vengeance of God the Just? They are sinking rapidly to the moral level of pagan and Moslem peoples. In March, 1935, I was informed in a town in Upper Egypt that there had been six murders there that year. In Cairo I spoke of this to an officer of the Public Prosecutor's Department. He replied: I should be much surprised if there have been only six murders there this year! And none of these crimes was punished by law, for whoever gave evidence would be the next to be murdered.

7. The seventh Commandment reads: "Thou shalt not commit adultery" (Exodus 20: 14). Another feature of Eden was that God joined together one man with one woman, thus indicating *His* intention as to matrimony. Since the Fall, because of the hardness of man's sinful heart, God has tolerated polygamy and divorce; but these are against His will and He never blesses them. It is well known that venereal disease never arises when a healthy man and a healthy woman continue faithful to each other.

To-day. Alas! alas! The pages that Hitler felt bound to devote to the awful and imminent danger that syphilis had become to Germany are solemn reading (M.K. i. 269–281). How far is it otherwise in England? Wherefore solemn warnings in Parliament? What mean the public advertisements of clinics giving free treatment? It all betokens widespread and general fornication, a sin that God sternly condemns and has ordained that nature shall severely avenge. And this severity is for man's own good, as a deterrent.

In his report for the year 1945 the Somerset Medical Officer of Health said: "The very heavy increase in illegitimate births has been a sweeping catastrophe. . . . I may be permitted to say that we who deal with this work are appalled at the decline in moral standards, and we are dismayed to find, only too frequently, the complete absence of any sense of personal responsibility. Many of the young women are tough and callous. . . ."

Nor is fornication by the unmarried the only lamentable feature of to-day: it is accompanied by fearful unfaithfulness in the married. Forty-two years ago (1905) there were only 670 divorce actions in that year. For 1947 the number is given as 65,000! What an appalling amount of marital infidelity is thus declared; and how much more of it does not come into the Divorce Court who can say? Alas that Adam and Eve fell! But there is no hint that they fell so low as to be unfaithful to each other.

In America matters are worse. "One American city strikes the chord of to-day's moral degeneracy. In 1900 there were 461 suits for divorce in Los Angeles, after 1,505 licences to wed; in 1945, on 37,090 marriage licences there were 33,267 suits for divorce or a [threefold] increase of divorce. It is the world's tragedy that it does not realize that worsening morale destroys everything—at last. A rotten humanity can only produce a rotten world." (*The Dawn*, August, 1946, 229). An American religious magazine states that it is computed that there are 300,000 divorces annually in that country (*Help and Food*, January, 1947, p. 35).

Human law may multiply as man pleases the legal grounds for divorce; the law of God for to-day recognizes only one cause—adultery. He Who is to be man's final Judge has twice announced in advance His rule of law; "I say unto you that every one that putteth away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress [that is, upon her marrying another]; and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery" (Matthew 5 : 32; 19 : 9). And the same applies, of course, to the other sex.

It was on this ground that brave Bishop Latimer reproved Henry VIII for his shameless life. He gave to the king a New Year gift of a New Testament with a napkin bearing this inscription: "Fornicators and adulterers God will judge" (Hebrews 13 : 4). (*Hugh Latimer*, by Demaus, 213, quoting John Foxe, vol. vii.)

8. The eighth Commandment is "Thou shalt not steal" (Exodus 20 : 15). We may be sure that in those sweet days of their early love our first parents did not rob each other. They enjoyed all things in common. Each delighted in the pleasure of the other. The design of the eighth Commandment is the preventing of infringement of the personal rights of another, rights granted by God to each individual.

Thou shalt not steal as does a common thief or highwayman or burglar.

Thou shalt not steal as does the gambler. He seeks to acquire that which is his neighbour's without giving him anything in exchange. So colossal has this form of theft become that the *Daily Telegraph* of January 3rd, 1947, said that in 1945 "The aggregate on all forms of betting must have been well over £500,000,000." This in one small country; and the vice is rampant in all lands.

Thou shalt not steal as does the employer when he does not pay a fair wage, nor as does the workman when he takes pay that he has not fairly earned. In England the law has largely stopped

the former wrong, but the latter has greatly increased. It shows a serious decline in honesty.

Thou shalt not steal as does he who sells shares that he knows will shortly fall in value, or buys shares that he privately knows will advance in value. I have known this latter done by directors of a limited company, to the loss of shareholders for whom they were in some sense trustees. Let stockbrokers also search their consciences before the heart-knowing God does so. He who loves his neighbour as himself will not take advantage of prior knowledge to act to his disadvantage. If he does this he is breaking half the law of God by the act of breaking its second great Commandment.

Thou shalt not steal as does a powerful commercial house when it opens a shop next door to the trader who will not sell his business to it, and so ruins him.

Forty-five years ago an able and godly American said to me that every one over there knew how a certain oil magnate gave to charities a million dollars at a time; he put up the price of his oil only a halfpenny a gallon for a month. If oil were found he would offer to buy the land. If refused, he would sink borings all around and drain that land.

Thou shalt not steal as does the State that grasps by law a total monopoly of an essential commodity, fixes quality and price as it pleases, and compels its subjects to buy a low-grade article at a very high price. If a private monopoly did this it would justly be abhorred. If a State announces its intention to acquire an industry and thereupon the value of the shares falls, and it then fixes its own price at the lowered value, and so impoverishes the shareholders, will not the Almighty Judge regard this as stealing?

Indeed, looking still deeper into the Divine view of things, what if the All-wise Owner of all things rules it to be stealing that a State should by law compel its subjects to sell to it their private property against their will? If this is His view of such transactions, if He holds it to be a violation of the right of private ownership sanctioned by Himself, then how serious is the peril in which that State or government places itself.

Nor has God left His view of this matter at all obscure. The basic ground upon which He dispossessed the Canaanites and gave their land to Israel was this: "the land is Mine" and all men are only "strangers and sojourners" upon it (Leviticus 25 : 23). This situation arises from two facts: (1) that the Creator of everything is the only and the perpetual Proprietor of everything; (2) that each man in turn dies and passes on.

Upon granting Palestine to Israel the Divine Proprietor directed

that it was to be divided among their twelve tribes, and within the territory of each tribe every family of that tribe was to have a share proportionate to its numbers (Numbers 33 : 54). Thus was there a reward for having large families.

It was expressly prohibited that land granted originally to one tribe was ever to pass to another tribe (Numbers 36 : 1–9). The holder of any portion could mortgage it, or, more strictly, the use and the fruits of it; but not in perpetuity: fifty years was the longest term allowed, and then the land reverted to its proper tenant (Leviticus 25 : 23–28). Thus the creating of vast estates held by a few was to be prevented. Seven centuries later than Moses God denounced His Woe upon some who were violating this provision of the law (Isaiah 5 : 8). The laws of God do not lapse merely by lapse of time.

Plainly these regulations equally denied to the King or the State any proprietary ownership of the land as a whole and any right to evict. The feudal principal that the Sovereign was the owner of a country, by right of conquest or otherwise, was thus denied in advance. Each original owner and his descendants were constituted by God His grantees in law, and, as against anyone but Himself, the right of tenure was indefeasible.

When, in the days of Samuel, the people rejected their invisible Sovereign, Jehovah, and demanded a visible king to lead them, one evil result of which God warned them was, that their king would rob them of the best of their lands and give them to his officials (1 Samuel 8 : 14). In the coming days of the reinstatement of Israel in their land such seizure by the king will be again firmly prohibited. He will be expressly forbidden to sequester the land of a subject (Ezekiel 46 : 16–18).

Therefore, when in the time of Elijah Naboth refused to sell his inherited land to even the king (Ahab) he was well within his legal rights as given by God (1 Kings 21 : 1–4). His subsequent judicial murder, and the confiscation of his land by the sovereign, was immediately answered by God with sentence upon the king of a miserable, disgraceful death in the very city where Naboth had been basely executed, and the seizure of the land was specified as one ground of the sentence (1 Kings 21 : 17–19 ; 23 : 24).

While this particular scheme of land tenure was not in form imposed upon any nation but Israel or on any other land than Canaan, yet its fundamental principle is clear, namely, that compulsory and permanent acquisition by the State of the private property of the subject is contrary to the will of the Creator. The right of the subject to hold what he has lawfully acquired is indefeasible. The State has no right of compulsory acquisition even

if by purchase, for Ahab offered to purchase the land of Naboth, but the latter had right of refusal. The action of a sovereign or of a State is *ultra vires* when it overrides the law of God or the principles of that law, whether this be done by violence, fraud, or statute.

The New Testament is equally plain as to the full right of the individual over private property. In the ardour of their early Christian affection believers were selling of their own free will lands and goods and devoting the proceeds to a common welfare fund. To a certain seller the Apostle said: "While it remained [i.e. unsold], did it not remain thine own? and after it was sold, was it not [still] in thy power?" (Acts 5 : 4).

The fundamental principle of communism, that the "State" owns everything and the individual holds by and for the State and at its will, is it not the very same theory as underlay the feudal system, the "State" being substituted for the sovereign? In both instances it is an usurpation of the inalienable and solitary right of the Creator as Owner. Therefore in principle it is atheistic, being an ousting of God and the installing of "State" or sovereign in His place, invested with His sole prerogative as Owner and Disposer. It is no wonder that the chief modern trespassers upon these rights of the Almighty, in every land, are atheists or agnostics. The fear of God would restrain robbery by statute as by any other means, and in due time the justice of God will avenge it.

This is written by one who has no personal interest in the matter, for, by the grace of God, he owns no property that could be acquired by authorities. He is, indeed, by that same grace, very rich, fabulously rich, and in that form of wealth which all profess to seek but few find, that is, rich in love, peace, and joy of heart; but these are riches that the State can neither give nor steal.

If the State steals from its subjects, what can this effect but that the subject will steal from the State, as by evading regulations and taxes. On January 17th, 1947, the Assize Judge at Cambridge, sentencing a man on a charge of wrong dealing with petrol coupons, said: "The extensive and irksome system of controls which it has been thought necessary to create and perpetuate is making many hitherto respectable citizens take an attitude towards the law which they would never have dreamed of taking." Human nature being as it is, if the State steals from it its liberty the more it steals its integrity. Multiply crimes, multiply criminals. Thus must there hasten a general decay in honesty. Commercial men and bankers have satisfied me that men do not trust one another to-day as much as they did in my own business experience of fifty

years ago, and even then there was dishonesty enough. Whither are the nations hastening?

The Almighty Ruler has spoken many stern words against dishonesty in business. The following are among these:

> Deuteronomy 25: 13–16. Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small. Thou shalt not have in thine house divers measures, a great and a small. A perfect and just weight shalt thou have; a perfect and just measure shalt thou have: that thy days may be long upon the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee. For all that do such things, even all that do unrighteously, are an abomination unto Jehovah thy God.
>
> Jeremiah 17: 11. As the partridge that gathereth young which she hath not brought forth, so is he that getteth riches, and not by right; in the midst of his days they shall leave him, and at his end he shall be a fool.
>
> Amos 8: 4–10. Hear this, O ye that would swallow up the needy, and cause the poor of the land to fail, saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath that we may set forth wheat? making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and dealing falsely with the balances of deceit; that we may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes, and sell the refuse of the wheat.
>
> The Lord hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, Surely I will never forget any of thy works. Shall not the land tremble for this, and every one mourn that dwells therein? yea, it shall rise up wholly like the River; and it shall be troubled and sink again, like the River of Egypt. And it shall come to pass in that day, saith Jehovah God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day. And I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation; and I will bring up sackcloth upon your loins, and baldness upon every head; and I will make it as the mourning for an only son, and the end thereof as a bitter day.

See also Jeremiah 22: 13–19 for God's wrath on an oppressive ruler.

The eternal laws of right and wrong do not alter, and every transgression and disobedience shall receive a just recompense of reward (Hebrews 2: 2). "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man [or a corporation or a State] soweth that shall he also reap" (Galatians 6: 7). Hitler and the German State sowed to the wind and the whirlwind is being reaped, as one of that land wrote to me recently.

But the process of governmental fraud had been adopted by the Government that preceded Hitler. The monetary inflation of 1924 was a gigantic fraud. I was in Berlin at the time, and at

its height received for a pound twenty billions of practically worthless marks in place of the normal twenty. By paying off in such currency large loans to the former Imperial Government, the Socialist State secured the end dear to Socialism, the impoverishment of the wealthy. It also made the occupation of the Rhur an expense to the French, and thus made void its undertaking to provide reparations for the then late war. There was given also an illustration of the principle of the government of God before mentioned, that full judgment on a people is not executed until the people as a whole accept the doings of evil rulers and so share in responsibility for the same. As a whole the people understood the inflation and endorsed its ends. I visited a white metal factory where thermos flasks, gramophone trumpets and the like were made. The most skilled mechanic was taking home a weekly wage equal to half a crown English. But the design of the inflation was approved and the people stuck it out. Such acquiescence in unrighteousness necessarily created readiness of mind for the greater wrongdoings of the Nazi period, until national iniquity was full, and the wrath of heaven burst. History will repeat itself wherever the same course is taken. "Thou shalt not steal."

9. The ninth Commandment is: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour" (Exodus 20: 16). It may be taken for granted that at first Adam and Eve said no wrong about one another to God or to the creatures around them. But observe the immediate effect of their disobedience. Adam covertly cast the blame of his act on God by saying to Him in effect, "You gave me the woman who tempted me," and he blamed Eve in plain terms, though he had acted with his eyes open as to what he was doing. Similarly, Eve cast the whole blame on the serpent, as if the tempter were responsible for her sin in yielding as well as for his own sin in tempting. This was the principle of false witness.

Solomon drew attention to a well-known feature of life in hot lands: "Whoso breaketh through a fence [hedge, old wall, bank] a serpent shall bite him" (Ecclesiastes 10: 8). Around the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil God planted a hedge: "Thou shalt not eat of it." Man broke through that fence, and was instantly infected with the virus of that Old Serpent, the Devil. For Satan is a false witness, as in the case of his slanderous suggestions against Job (Job 1: 9–11; 2: 4, 5); and man by disobedience to God partakes of this wicked disposition.

This sin is fearfully prevalent. In 1910 in South India a British

magistrate told me that they did not believe a witness unless he was incriminating himself, and not always then, for someone might have made it worth his while to go to prison. This is Hinduism. False gods will create false witnesses. It was in a heathen land that there was given to Jesus Christ the noble title, " The Faithful Witness " (Revelation 1 : 6).

As we have noted, Hitler considered it would be right for public propaganda to bear false witness against an enemy country by putting on it the whole blame for a war even though the fact was known to be otherwise. Is Germany the only modern State whose propaganda has traduced an enemy people? It was to the credit of England in the late war that its public war placards and its press refrained from the vindictive, inflammatory statements of the former Great War, such as when Sir Arthur Conan Doyle wrote in *The Times* that the English ought to be deliberately incited to *hate* the enemy. But he was a spiritualist; and demons delight to inspire in men hatred of one another, as was seen in Hitler and his followers.

Is false witness increasing in the courts of law? In 1910 in Rangoon a leading Parsee barrister, who had been called to the bar in England also, said to me: " The difference between our practice here and yours in England is that you believe a witness unless you are prepared to show that he is lying; but here we disbelieve him unless he can prove that he is telling the truth." Is this praise as valid as when it was uttered?

Silence gives consent. Thou shalt not bear false witness by failure to speak when thy neighbour is slandered, though thou couldst clear him by telling the facts. Thou shalt not bear false witness by a shrug of the shoulders when he is mentioned, though thou knowest nothing really against him. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour by raking up his ancient faults or crimes as if he were still doing such, though thou knowest he is not.

Considering how varied are the ways of breaking this command the inquiry is urgent as to how matters stand to-day as seen by the Most High God.

10. The last of the ten Commandments reads: " THOU SHALT NOT COVET thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbour's " (Exodus 20 : 17).

The command is not " Thou shalt not covet." The desire to

acquire may be good, as when a poor man earnestly desires to get for his sick wife comforts not in his power to provide. The desire is sinful when it is to possess something belonging to another. This is the root of every kind of theft.

" Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's *house*." In a market town I listened for an hour to trade union speakers seeking members. One speaker was from the building trade. He cried : " These big houses : who built them ? We working men, and we'll get them some day." The tenth Commandment notwithstanding ! He did not reflect that the workmen had received an agreed wage for their time and labour, nor that the men who put the materials together did not provide them, nor design the house, nor supervise its erection, nor pay the bill. Brains and technical training and money did not count with him. Nor did he ponder that if he held it right that he should seize a bigger house than his own, the man with no house at all might think it right to seize his humbler dwelling.

In that place were some pleasant cottages that a noble lord had built and endowed so that his aged workpeople might spend their later years in comfort. In one of these an old man, hearing me narrate what the trade unionist had said, remarked that it reminded him of something that happened to his father, who had worked on that estate all his life. He was standing in a road near meadows, when a stranger pulled up and said :

" Nice meadows, these ! "

" Yes, they're very good."

" Do you know they belong to us ? "

" Oh ! who do you mean by ' us ' ? "

" Us working men : and we'll get them some day."

" Oh ! And when that day comes which of these fields would you like ? "

The stranger pointed to some of the best and said :

" I should like those."

The other answered :

" And so should I : *and what shall we do then ?* "

Precisely ! There is no avoiding contention by coveting : it provokes it for evermore.

The bigger fleas have smaller fleas
Upon their legs to bite 'em :
The smaller fleas have lesser fleas—
And so *ad infinitum !*

" Whence come wars and whence come fightings among you ? Come they not hence, even of your pleasures that war in your

members? Ye crave, and have not: ye kill, and covet, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war; ye have not, because ye ask not [i.e. of God]. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may spend it in your pleasures" (James 4: 1–3).

Bible wisdom *is* wisdom indeed. Your "pleasures": here is a chief reason for dissatisfaction and coveting. At a time when the then secretary of the Miners' Federation was telling a Committee of the House of Commons that miners were not able to live properly on their wages, my home was in a seaside town to which miners came in numbers for week-ends, and they would each spend pounds on pounds in so-called "pleasures." I have been to the bottom of a very deep mine. Indeed, such hard work deserves a good wage. I sympathize fully with the remark made to me when a certain coal owner gave £10,000 to some public improvement, that it were better if he had used it giving decent cottages to his workers. Yet even so, would there have been more than a fraction of distress and discomfort were there no drinking, dog racing, and gambling? Many years ago, when wages were far lower than to-day, I lived for weeks with miners in their small houses. The God-fearing of them often owned their houses, had furnished them with real comfort, had brought up families decently, and they entertained their guest as easily and kindly as do others. It was a pleasure to be with them, and a sorrow to observe such men were a small minority. The former had asked and gained the blessing of God upon their work and homes, their health and families; the others had either ignored their Maker or had sought more money chiefly to waste it on their "pleasures." And in this matter miners are not sinners above all that dwell in Britain.

Before the crowd in that market town scattered I pointed out that the road to the contentment they sought lay in a quite different direction to agitation and coveting. I assured them of my true sympathy, since my own income was no larger than that of some of themselves, and was of no interest to the Inspector of Taxes. I reminded them that the Son of God had been fabulously rich, but upon becoming man had freely made Himself poor that others might become rich at His expense. I pointed out that this unselfishness was the true secret of joy and peace; and that, though Jesus was more fully the Man of Sorrows than any other man, yet He was equally the happiest man on earth, able to rejoice in circumstances that depress or anger others. From history and from experience I assured them that Christ is able and glad to share His secret with ourselves; as, for example, when two of His servants of old had been unjustly flogged and imprisoned, so far were they from being resentful or dispirited, that they passed the

night singing praise to God, though painfully fastened in the stocks in a dark and noisome Roman dungeon (Acts 16). And I might have told them, what I will here tell the reader, of two old women I visited in a dilapidated two-roomed hovel in a slum, who were singing and praising God because that afternoon one of them had led the other to the peace and joy of pardon for her sins by faith in Jesus Christ and His atoning death.

"Thou shalt not covet thy neightbour's wife" (or husband). Here is the root of all adultery.

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's servant." At a time when some Act was passed to remove some social inequality, a working woman (so it was said) exclaimed: "Now we shall be all equal, and I shall be able to have a servant." Probably only a story; yet well invented, and pointing a useful lesson about the human heart. For man's heart is the heart of man's troubles. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and it is desperately [incurably] sick: who can know it? I, Jehovah, search the heart, I try the reins, even to give to every man according to his ways, according to the fruit of his doings" (Jeremiah 17: 10). And what is the fruit, the natural product, of covetousness? It is *disappointment*.

Man wants but little here below,
  As some one said before:
But when he's got it, don't you know
  He wants a little more?

Why does the Crown prosecute a thief instead of leaving this to the injured party? It is because the Crown recognizes the right of private ownership, and the thief by his act infringes that grant of the Crown, which is a misdemeanor.

Why does God condemn and punish coveting? Because that desire of the heart includes a readiness to infringe His grant to the other man of private ownership. It is an offence against Him as well as the one robbed, or to be robbed. Thus when David had stolen from a man, first his wife and then his life, his confession to God ran: "Against Thee, Thee only have I sinned, and done that which is evil in Thy sight" (Psalm 51: 4). The greater crime was against the majesty of the Supreme Ruler: the lesser, against his fellow-subject of the Great King, was included.

During the great Continental slump before mentioned, about 1924, the Polish currency fluctuated violently every day. The zloty was normally twenty-five to the pound sterling. To-day one received thirty million; to-morrow, fifty million; the next day,

forty-five million. There was nothing in the political conditions to explain this. A few experts from the British Treasury were in Warsaw to help the Polish Treasury to get things steadied. I asked one of these the reason for the sudden variations. He replied : " I am very much afraid it is *the human heart*."

This is the true root of *all* human troubles ; and because politicians and social reformers cannot deal with the root they cannot prevent the fruit, these ashes of Sodom. During a general coal strike I had the following conversation with a group of men on a street corner in a Durham mining town.

> I want you men to tell me what is at the bottom of all this trouble. I am not an employer and I am not a workman, so you needn't mind telling me frankly.
>
> You're a very happy man, Sir.
>
> Yes, I'm a very happy man, though that doesn't happen to be the reason : but what is at the bottom of all this trouble ?
>
> The bottom of the trouble is, that the people with the big pockets want to keep 'em filled.

I knew there was some truth in this, though silently I reflected that people with small pockets like to do the same if they can. But I continued :

> Then what it comes to is, that it's the selfishness of the human heart that is at the bottom of the trouble.
>
> Yes, I suppose that's it.
>
> Then, man alive, why should you think that twenty men sitting round a table in London, and talking about the trouble, are going to cure it, if that's where it lies ? No ; only Almighty God, Who created the human heart, can cure it of this disease of selfishness. Only He can change a hard, greedy heart and make it kind and generous. But He does this when men put the trust of the heart upon His Son as Saviour.

One frozen Christmas night I travelled from Berlin to Warsaw with a Polish lady, on the staff of the League of Nations, a mistress of several languages. Afterwards she wrote to me this striking sentence : " I would give all I possess if I could begin life over again with the heart of a little child."

Here was the same deep longing as was expressed by Lewis Carroll in his poem *Solitude* :

> I'd give all wealth that toil hath piled.
> The bitter fruit of life's decay,
> To be once more a little child
> For one short sunny day.

How gladly I replied to the lady : " That is exactly what God is offering you in the good news concerning His Son Jesus Christ. He says : ' A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you : and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh ' " (Ezekiel 36 : 26).

No other cure has ever been known, nor can be. As Christ said : " Ye *must* be born *from above* " (John 3 : 1–8) ; and the only means to this is that which He immediately added, faith in Himself as the God-appointed and God-accepted Substitute of man, lifted up and dying on the cross to bear away and cancel sin, the cause of death (John 3 : 14–17). After sixty-five year's experience of this sovereign remedy I testify to its sufficiency.

Animated only by love to their bountiful Creator and to each other, our first parents coveted nothing. How blissful was their contented life. And from the foregoing study it can be seen that the Ten Commandments were designed to correct the miseries consequent upon the lapse from love as the royal law of life. The law of Moses would have done this could man have kept it, but his fallen nature completely prevented it. Hence the necessity of the intervention of the Son of God, and the grant of a new nature which delights in the law of God and keeps its commands.

11. But there were two other duties to which our race were directed in those early days. The one was that the Creator ordained that man should work. He was given a garden that he should " dress and keep it." Gardening is the one occupation that is not the result of man's Fall. Field labour, house-building, clothing entered when man had departed from God. After man's rebellion, God deliberately made it necessary for man to work hard and long to gain his food, saying to Adam :

> Cursed is the ground for thy sake ; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life ; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee ; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field ; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground (Genesis 3 : 17–19).

Here also is mercy. None are so wicked as the idle. Sodom was situated in the deepest and hottest cleft of the earth in which man has dwelt. Having an abundant water supply the soil brought forth so lavishly that little labour was needed. And the result :

> Ezekiel 16 : 49, 50. Behold, this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom ; pride, fulness of bread, and prosperous ease was in her

and in her daughters ; neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy. And they were haughty, and committed fornication before me ; therefore I took them away as I saw good.

God knew how true would be our proveb, " Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do."

To-day. That man should oppress his brother and exploit his labour is heavily condemned and punished by God (Deuteronomy 24 : 14, 15, concerning an employer ; Jeremiah 22 : 13–19, concerning a king ; James 5 : 1–6, concerning land-owners). But to-day there is a general and pronounced disinclination to work. The demand is ever for shorter hours and higher pay. Yet steady and long working does not hurt. This I have proved all my life, and in my seventy-third year I work usually with brain and body between twelve and fourteen hours a day.

With the economic aspect I am not here occupied, save to remark that the present course must surely end in general poverty. It is the moral side which concerns and alarms one who sees in this yet another plain opposition to the will of the Creator. The New Testament declaration of the will of God, corresponding to His original command, is, " If any will not work, neither let him eat " (2 Thessalonians 3 : 10). As long as the State undertakes to distribute food equally many will do as little work as possible.

12. Another truly important injunction given by God to man was that he should " be fruitful and multiply and *replenish the earth*," that is, spread abroad widely and take possession. The direction was given to Adam at his creation and again to Noah and his family after the earth had been depopulated by the Flood. But very quickly this plan was dropped. " Cain built a city " (Genesis 4 : 17). And soon after the Flood men said, " Go to, let us build us a city . . . lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth " (Genesis 11 : 4). Cities are always more wicked than the countryside.

To-day, the flow of population has long been, and is, decidedly to the cities. A sixth of England's people are in the capital alone. After 1918 there was much talk of settling soldiers on the land. A cartoon appeared picturing John Bull with one hand on the shoulder of a soldier, with the other pointing to a cottage away in a field, and saying, " I want you to go and live there ! " A companion picture showed the soldier, with a girl on his arm, in a cinema queue ; with the comment, " Tommy thinks he would rather live near here." And Tommy is not alone in this.

Nearly two centuries ago, when this movement of the population set in strongly in England, Goldsmith wrote prophetic words :

> Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates and men decay :
> Princes and lords may flourish or may fade ;
> A breath can make them, as a breath has made ;
> But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
> When once destroyed, can never be supplied.
> (*The Deserted Village.*)

The complete fulfilment of these lines will be duly reached, as of every tendency contrary to the mind of our All-wise Creator.

13. The direction last quoted, to fill and subdue the earth, implied the first clause, " Be fruitful and multiply." Against this purpose of the Creator, there has been wide modern revolt. I was but an infant when Charles Bradlaugh and Mrs. Annie Besant were convicted of publishing an indecent book, with detail instructions as to defeating procreation. But the law cannot *stop* evil ; the pernicious seed grew apace, has made fornication and adultery less perilous and less disgraceful as social offences, and this practice is hastening the white races to the position where they are bound from lack of man-power to prove unequal to future conflicts with the prolific Eastern peoples. It is divine law and it is a fact that in due time *every* transgression and disobedience receives its just recompense of reward (Hebrews 2 : 2). In May, 1947, the Immigration Minister of Australia drew attention to the alarming increase of childless marriages (from 13·3 per cent. in 1911–15 to 22·3 per cent. in 1936–40), and said that Australia is " slowly bleeding to death " and that there would be no Australian nation left in fifty years if the decline in population were not arrested (D.T., May 23rd. 1947).

This rapid comparison of God's original will for man with present conditions and tendencies must suffice. The fuller the examination the more definite is the conclusion that in major matters and in much detail the Protestant world has sunk back alarmingly from the level to which it was lifted by the gospel through the Reformation and subsequent spiritual evangelical movements. Nor does there seem any possible recovery unless the God of all grace shall grant another period of extraordinary working of the Spirit of truth, of which there is no present indication. He goes on with His work of delivering individuals from sin, but gives no sign as yet of any such widespread conviction and repentance as alone can change general conditions and defer deserved judgment.

CHAPTER VII

TO-DAY: SOME CHIEF CAUSES

THREE POWERFUL MOVEMENTS CONTRIBUTED TO THIS SPIRITUAL and moral decline in the Protestant countries.

The passage from J. R. Green quoted in chapter I decribed the moral uplift in general life in England wrought by the Spirit of God through the Methodist revival in the eighteenth century. Out of it developed powerful efforts to spread throughout the world the Word of God and its purifying message.

Yet that great movement was incomplete as regards its corporate aspect. It retained merely human conceptions as to that society of men known in Scripture as "the church of God." It adhered largely to the type of religion exhibited in the Church of England, which itself, in many important particulars, followed all too closely that of the Church of Rome. It became national, instead of claiming to be universal (catholic); the sovereign replaced the Pope as official head; the law of England took the place of Canon Law. Otherwise the organization remained similar to the earlier days, and the pernicious error of regeneration by baptism was continued, vitiating the whole further development in doctrine and practice. The sanctifying power on daily life of the message of God was thus largely nullified, and God was held responsible for the failure of the "Church" to better the world. It was thus in other Reformed countries where State Churches were established by law. The great Reformation sterilized itself by this unholy alliance of State and Church, for the two joined to suppress by force and cruelty any attempt to follow closely the practice of the apostles of Christ as to His church.

This condition the Methodist movement left almost unchallenged, though it did effect a distinct outward moral improvement in many clergy and others. To supply this defect and lead to clearer views of the true nature of this society, the church of God, its present work and future prospects, God commenced in 1828 a further movement. It started in Dublin, spread to other parts, and had a powerful beginning in England in Plymouth. On this last account, to their own description of themselves as simple "brethren" (brothers in the family of God), people added the description "brethren from Plymouth" and then "Plymouth Brethren."

The effect of these truer views of the church of God, enforced by the marked sanctity and prodigious labours of those who disseminated them, was pronounced and world-wide, affecting all evangelical circles.

The Prince of the kingdom of darkness at once set in motion all his forces to counteract these attacks on his dominion in the lives of men. Among other efforts three chief lines of battle were formed, each directed by astute and powerful human agents, adequately equipped with human learning. These movements are not here discussed fully, but only for the purpose of indicating their cumulative influence upon the present moral condition of mankind. The first of these attacks was :

1. *The Tractarian Movement.* It commenced at Oxford in 1833. At first stoutly opposed within the Church of England, it duly triumphed there. In 1933, with the express approval of the Archbishops, its centenary was " commemorated in London, at many diocesan centres, and in most English parishes " (*The Times*, July 8th, 1933).

The general external result has been to re-introduce into the Church of England the doctrines and practices which in the second century began to corrupt the profession of Christianity, steadily assimilated it to pagan religion, developed into the Roman Catholic Church, and shrouded Europe in the gloom and depravity of the Dark Ages.

The effect of this has been to alienate many minds from " religion." A sense-pleasing religion appeals to some, but disgusts more. Your intelligent workman or your thoughtful man of business reckons that mediæval mummeries are no use to him, in which I agree. They throw no light on life's problems nor infuse strength against trials and temptations.

The Coptic Church of Egypt persisted in conducting its services in the ancient Coptic language, which its priests learn to mumble but do not understand. To what purpose ? It made the worship no worship at all. It kept from the people all kpowledge of the will and the grace of God. It left the laity wholly dependent on the clergy in things spiritual and eternal. The moral result has been—as I know by observation—that the " Christian " Copts are as dark and wicked as their Moslem neighbours. The latter see no reason in the life of the former to think the Christian religion superior to their own. All this serves well the wishes of Satan.

The Roman Catholic Church persisted in conducting its services in Latin long after it had become unintelligible to the people. The ends and results were similar.

The English Reformation made it illegal to use in public worship

any language but the mother tongue of the common people. How do the Romanizers in the Church of England drive their coach and horses through this statute? They *intone* the service. I had occasion to show a foreign guest some of the sights of London. While in Westminster Abbey a service commenced. It was intoned. I know English, and something of the Prayer Book, but not a word of that service was intelligible. I listened intently, but the only portion I could detect was the Gloria, and this solely because of its being repeated at the close of prayers and because of the division of its sentences. No word could be grasped. The ends and results are again the same. The common people cannot worship, for their minds are left unenlightened, they depart as ignorant of truth as they came; and the effect on practice—what is it?

Let some notorious facts testify. One can scarcely read the inner history of the Oxford Movement, as given from indisputable sources by Walsh, without being shocked at the craft and duplicity with which its early leaders practised and spread their system in secret, until it became safe or unavoidable to do so in public.[1] Its first leader, John Henry Newman, was challenged by his bishop whether he had commenced a monastery at Littlemore, near Oxford. He denied it, but it was fact, as the facts abundantly show.

Whoever thinks to read his autobiography (*Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, 1864) should commence with section 8 of the Appendix, on Lying and Equivocation. He can then, from the Cardinal's own views, judge how far to trust his statements. For example, he wrote: "Casuistry is a noble science. . . . supposing I was driven up into a corner, I think I should have a right to say an untruth." Yet when Christ was in that very position, challenged as to a point upon which confession of the truth would assure His death, He at once declared the truth and sealed His own doom (Matthew 26 : 63–66). Again, "a lawyer in respect of his clients' affairs, or a priestly confessor as to matters learned from a penitent, may tell an untruth and it would not be a lie." As authority for this he gives such standards as what is "recognized by society," "what is conformable to the universal mind of man," "what is commanded by great and wise and good men," and "by the laws of war, it is allowable to deceive an enemy by feints, false colours, false intelligence." These sanctions may suffice for Humanists and Jesuits, but will the Son of the God of truth endorse them?

[1] *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement*, Walter Walsh, F.R.Hist.S., 1897. In the Preface to the fourth edition, 1898, the author, referring to severe attacks by critics, said that, "the general character of the book for accuracy as to facts would not be affected."

He has said to His followers : " Let your speech be Yea, yea ; Nay, nay : and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one " (Matthew 5 : 37) ; and the crowning virtue commended in such as are to stand with Him in His glory is " in their mouth was found no lie : they are without blemish " (Revelation 14 : 5). In this matter there is far too close agreement between Newman and Hitler, as in the latter's justification of lying propaganda.

Lest my estimate of Newman personally be thought prejudiced, as that of an ultra-Biblical writer, I give that of a quite different writer, Dr. W. R. Inge. In the *Morning Post* of October 16th, 1924, he wrote as follows regarding two of the chief agents in promoting the advance of Romanism in England, Cardinals Newman and Manning :

> But it is very doubtful whether there was anything personal in Manning's opposition to Newman.
>
> The personal feeling was probably stronger on Newman's side. For Newman was, as Manning said, " a good hater ". He had the cruelty of a fanatic, and could never forgive those who opposed him. Manning, on the contrary, was a thorough man of the world, with the tolerant temper of a statesman and organizer. He had joined the Church of Rome as the greatest and most powerful religious institution, and with a true instinct, became an uncompromising Papalist. In Newman he saw, and saw truly, a subtly disintegrating influence, which, if it were allowed to prevail, would prevent the triumph of Ultramontanism [i.e., Italian, Papal supremacy], and stamp English Catholicism with a strongly national character. Whether he saw in Newman the patron saint of a Modernism not yet born is doubtful ; for Manning had no understanding of philosophy ; and Newman himself would have cheerfully sent the heretical disciples who revere his memory to the stake.

Manning, a " thorough man of the world," a man who had joined a certain Church because it is " the greatest and most powerful religious institution." Newman, a good hater, cruel, fanatical, unforgiving, a " subtly disintegrating influence " (notice the feature of subtlety), and one who would have sent men to the stake " cheerfully."

Make such deduction as you please from this estimate and the question will still remain as to *whose* influence was secretly at work in employing two such men as chief agents to pilot the Church of England back into the darkness of the Middle Ages and paganism.

The same craft often marks the ritualizing clergyman. He introduces an ornament here, an image there, a posture, a practice, until what had been an evangelical church is subtly turned into a Romish church. I stayed with a High Anglican clergyman I had

known in India as a government official, then a sincere and open witness for Christ. I asked the origin of the eastward positon in public worship. He gave the true answer that it derived from the heathen practice of worshipping the rising sun. This practice he had often watched in India. I then inquired why he and his brother ritualists followed a heathen custom. Again he gave the true answer, possibly assuming I should be aware of it. "We say that, after the consecration of the bread and wine by the priest, our Sun of righteousness is on the altar in the east of the church and therefore we turn to the altar when we address Him." Very logical; quite seemly IF their falsehood were a fact: but how often do these men plainly tell their ordinary Protestant hearers that the doctrine of transubstantiation is the essence of the eastward position? No; they play on their ignorance and get a pagan practice adopted as being something non-material, though they hold it to be vital.

I pointed out to my host (1) that Moses had been reared in the pagan worship of Egypt, marked by the adoration of Rā, the sun god. I have visited most of the temples of that land and remember only one (that of Luxor) which is not so placed that the sanctuary is in the east of the temple. (2) That, when Moses, taught by God Himself how He was in that age to be worshipped, made the Tent of Meeting in the wilderness, the structure was placed in precisely the reverse position—it was centred at the east, and all worship of God was directed towards Him in the sanctuary in the west (Exodus 26 : 22, 27, the rear westward; 27 : 13–16, the entrance gate eastward). (3) That when the temple of Solomon at Jerusalem replaced the former Tent as the centre of the worship of God, it also faced the east and God was worshipped in the Holy of Holies in the west of the building. (4) That when God showed to Ezekiel the abominations on account of which He was about to give up that temple to destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, the last and worst of them was that Israel's leading men worshipped the sun towards the east and therefore necessarily had turned their backs towards the God of Israel (Ezekiel 8 : 16–18). (5) That the future temple at Jerusalem, shown to Ezekiel in much detail, will be placed as its predecessor, facing east (Ezekiel 47 : 1).

I asked the clergyman how, in the face of God's express condemnation of the eastward position, he could imagine that it could be acceptable to the Most High. But this supreme consideration did not seem to weigh with him. Thus for a hundred years English churchgoers have been trained to think *that* to be well-pleasing to God which He has expressly reprobated, and they have been led back into pagan superstition and practice.

But there is more and worse to be noted. In 1850 Newman, speaking about the Tractarian Movement of 1833, said distinctly that " Catholicism was the real scope and issue of that Movement " (*Apologia* 270, ed. Dent). Yet with this object in mind he remained in the Church of England for twelve years, writing, preaching, and working to lead men back to Catholicism. By " Catholicism " he meant Roman Catholicism, the Church he had joined in 1845.

Now of the many matters involved in the Catholic system two are held by Catholics to be of first importance, namely, the supremacy of the Pope, and the Real Presence of Christ on the altar, transubstantiation. To these, therefore, among other things, Newman was seeking to lead men. Yet twice—at his ordination as deacon and again as priest—he had solemnly sworn in the name of God this oath of the Royal Supremacy:

> And I do declare, that no foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath, or ought to have, any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Pre-eminence, or Authority, Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, within this realm. *So help me God.*

As regards the doctrine of transubstantiation and the sacrament of the Mass, at his ordination as priest the bishop had asked him this question:

> Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, *and as this Church* [i.e. of England] *and Realm hath received the same*, according to the commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your Cure and Charge with diligence to keep and observe the same? (My italics.)

Again he had invoked the divine Name when he answered:

> I will do so, by the help of the Lord.

The same promises on oath had been made by all the Anglican clergy in that Movement, and they all knew right well that this Church and Realm had most firmly abjured the doctrine and form of the Mass. They had all subscribed Articles 28 and 31, the former declaring that Transubstantiation " is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions "; and the latter describing Masses as " blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits." Here " the Latin in its literalness is also noteworthy; 'blasphemous figments and pernicious impostures'." (W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., *The Principles of Theology*, 416.)

Now I personally deplore the union of Church and State, and should most resolutely refuse to acknowledge any man, King equally with Pope, as head of God's church. I decline absolutely to admit that the State has any voice whatever in affairs spiritual. Over this society, which is the "house" wherein God dwells on earth at present, the Son of God, Jesus Christ glorified, is the sole Head (Hebrews 3 : 6). To own any other head of the church of God is for me, as for the Covenanters of century seventeen, a traitorous surrender of the crown rights of Christ as Head of the church. And if in support of these views those Anglican clergy, and their successors, had given up their positions, dignities, and salaries, and had at once left the Church of England, they could be honoured as sincere men. But to continue in the Church, taking its pay and using its opportunities, while deliberately undermining its known position and laws, was, as I think, to be guilty of treachery and perjury, and is so even more to-day, seeing that the subject has been discussed for a hundred years and they cannot be ignorant upon it. Truly I am no man's judge, yet I know not how such clerics think to escape the searching sentence, "Jehovah will not hold him guiltless who taketh His name in vain" (Exodus 20 : 7).

In Tract XC, Newman endeavoured to show that the Articles of the Church of England are capable of a Catholic meaning, including those on the Mass. In his *Development of Doctrine* he laboured to prove that the seemingly non-scriptural features of the Catholic system were in fact only divinely intended developments of apostolic teaching and practice. I would that these treatises sufficed to exonerate him from the charge of insincerity, but to me they simply give point and force to his remark quoted above, "casuistry is a noble science".

But further. It is to be observed that by the sworn promise quoted the priest obliges himself to minister both Doctrine and Sacraments "as this Church and Realm hath received the same." Now could it be demonstrated that the wording of the Articles warranted the alleged Catholic and pre-Reformation sense, this would not alter one iota the fact that from the Reformation onward the English Church and Realm had not received them in that sense, and indeed rejected that sense. This is shown by Newman himself. In 1840, five years before he joined the Roman Church, he wrote: "I cannot disguise from myself that my preaching is not calculated to defend that system of religion which has been received for 300 years," and he justified the Heads of Houses at Oxford for holding that his sermons were "calculated to undermine things established. I cannot disguise from myself

that they are" (*Apologia*, 135). It is evident that he was consciously violating his sworn promise *so* to minister doctrine and sacraments as the law of England requires.

This is equally the case with all Anglo-Catholic minded priests and bishops, and to-day they are the vast majority in the Established Church. That they know right well that their masses and the reservation of the Sacrament are contrary to the law is plain from the fact that they made strong attempts to get the law altered. The two questions now mentioned were the crux and essence of the Revised Prayer Book for which they sought Parliamentary sanction in 1927 and 1928. With this attempt in itself one can sympathize; it was the right constitutional course; but the fact that they sought to get the law changed shows conclusively that they knew it was against their practices. Yet they have been followed contrary to law for a hundred years. And so far has this opposition to law gone that, when Parliament twice refused to sanction the proposed new Prayer Book, and so its use was definitely illegal (for the law requires explicitly that the older Prayer Book alone shall be used in the Church of England), High Church Bishops, in defiance of the law, sanctioned its use by their clergy.

That fight in the House of Commons drew the attention of all men to the matter of the clergy and their attitude to the law. Men little interested in the ceremonial matters noted this public side of the controversy. Thus the celebrated archæologist, Sir William Flinders Petrie wrote to *The Times* (February 13th, 1928) as follows (italics mine):

> SIR,—Now that the revised Book of Common Prayer is before Parliament, the time has come for every man to notice the national point of view. We have had plenty of ecclesiastical comment, much of it assuring us that it will make no difference if clergy do what has been hitherto expressly prohibited. *But the serious subject of the clerical conscience must be noticed. The disturbing changes are obviously made to gratify those who do not scruple to reverse the terms on which they were ordained.* We hear clergy talking of celebrating Low Mass and High Mass, and boasts to the English Church Union of the use of the Latin service of the Mass, so obscured as to hide the deception. Yet the English Church calls these services "blasphemous fables". We see fasting Communion enforced, while in the Homilies (authoritatively defining the mind of the Church) the two homilies on fasting never mention the Communion. *If in any secular matter a man accepts the position and emoluments of an office, the national conscience expects him to deal honestly, and not to glory in breaking his engagements. Is the clerical conscience less exact? Is this the "wholesome example and pattern" which was*

vowed at ordination? Such clashes of ecclesiastical and national conscience were known before in England, about pluralities and the burning of heretics. A clerical conscience is not infallible.

The irrelevance of many pleas for change is painful. That of a help to devotion would cover all forms of Roman devotions. The beauty of comprehensiveness should lead to accepting those who use the present Book—the Wesleyans. The necessity is urged upon us to accept disputable changes because they are put along with welcome improvements; but *such ingenuity of drafting would be called gerrymandering in a secular business.* We have seen in the past many honestly following their conscience, such as the old Catholic families in the face of their disabilities, or those who walked out to poverty in 1662. Such a call of conscience is most honourable; but a *conscience that keeps a position while defying its obligations* is a national danger, especially when those who follow it claim to educate the conscience through the Confessional.

Yours obediently,

Rome. FLINDERS PETRIE.

Worldly craftiness too often dictates the policy of the High Anglicans. At one time I lived in a small seaside town. There were six Church of England buildings. One was as nearly Roman as it could be made. The parish Church was High, as were three others. The sixth was Low. Yet it was in the gift of the High Church vicar of the parish church! But it was left Low simply because it was known that otherwise the Low church folk would go to a vigorous Nonconformist cause in the town. But when selecting a man for this Low church care was taken that he should not be a militant evangelical who might make them trouble, but one of the too many easy-going men who would be content with conducting a quiet decorous service and make no stir about ritual and popery. Yet such crafty men protest that they are servants of Him who was without guile (Hebrews 7 : 26; 1 Peter 2 : 22).

Or again. In the last century a great Prime Minister was a High Churchman and regularly appointed High Church Bishops. His political Evangelical supporters in a certain diocese notified him that they should vote against him at the next election unless he appointed an Evangelical to their see, then vacant. He delighted them by appointing a well-known Evangelical, but chose a man of so weak and compliant a nature that the High Anglican clergy snapped their fingers at him, and under him the diocese became one of the most ritualistic in the country.

A powerful Movement nurtured with deceit, managed by craft, manned by men who break promises, disregard oaths, defy the law—what can its general influence be but to defame religion and lower morals? Like priest, like people.

II. THE HIGHER CRITICISM AND MODERNISM

Having set going the movement that should corrupt the *worship* of God the great Enemy set to work to destroy faith in the *Word* of God.

As soon as our first parents had wandered from God by disobedience He graciously hastened after them to recover and restore. His method was that *He spoke to them:* "Where art thou? . . . What is this thou hast done?" (Genesis 3 : 9, 13). Their future depended wholly upon the attitude they might take to what God spoke. If they would believe and obey, that would mean returning and restoration; if not, of necessity they would wander further from God and at last reach eternal estrangement from Him.

Thenceforward and at intervals God still spoke to men directly and personally, but His general plan was to speak thus to selected individuals, the prophets (which word means *to speak for another*), putting His words in their mouths to be repeated to men at large. He empowered these messengers with His Spirit of truth that the hearers might feel and know that it was indeed the message of God, the truth, which was spoken, and so become morally responsible to believe and obey, if they would. And upon this *their* future depended, as with Adam and Eve.

The greatest of these prophets was Jesus Christ, the Son of God become man that He might continue the work of God begun in Eden, by seeking and saving that which was lost (Luke 19 : 10). And His method was the same; *He spoke* the words of God; and He made the future of His hearers to depend upon how they treated His message, saying, "He that heareth my word, and believeth Him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life"; and, "the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day" (John 5 : 24; 12 : 48).

When Himself about to leave the earth the Lord guaranteed to certain chosen followers that He would shortly send to them the Spirit of truth, to indwell them and guide their minds into "*all* the truth" God intended to make known to men, which would include the events of the far distant future (John 16 : 13). This having been duly fulfilled it resulted that no further revelation of the mind of God would be granted, and in fact none has since been given. No one has revealed any additional truth, though

the same Spirit of truth continually enables the obedient to open up more fully what was thus revealed.

Now in the good providence of God that revelation of His mind and purpose given through prophets, through the Prophet, and completed through His apostles, was committed to writing, which writings have been preserved to later generations in the Bible *and nowhere else*. It is simple fact that what God spoke through those His messengers is not otherwise available. If the Bible is not the record of it, it is not now to be learned. One may wander far over the earth, as has the writer, yet will he meet no person who knows the teachings distinctive of the Bible who learned them otherwise than from the Bible, or from some person who, or book which, drew them from the Bible.

The Old Testament describes periods in Israel's history when that people lapsed into ignorance, wickedness,and public misery. This condition commenced always by neglecting God's message, either written or spoken. And every period of reawakening, moral purification, and general betterment set in by re-attention to God's words.

It has been thus all through the centuries since Christ. Of this there is happily available a condensed yet comprehensive account in E. H. Broadbent's most instructive volume *The Pilgrim Church*.[1] It shows from historic sources that every period of religious awakening and moral quickening has come by some persons returning to the Bible, believing it, obeying it, spreading its teachings. This is the method by which the Spirit of truth sees best to enlighten, purify, elevate both individuals and peoples. Let any man sincerely believe the teachings and steadily practise the precepts and he will soon be assured that Christ spoke truth when He said, "The words that I have spoken unto you are SPIRIT and are LIFE" (John 6: 63). For he will find his inner man energized by a new spirit and invigorated with a new life, and will know the eternal truth of these further words of the Great Prophet: "For I spake not from myself; but the Father which sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is LIFE ETERNAL: the things therefore which I speak, even as the Father hath said to me, so I speak" (John 12: 49, 50).

Millions upon millions have proved this, millions are proving it; at times whole countries have exhibited the general benefits of it; all scornful sceptics and all crafty critics to the contrary notwithstanding.

[1] Pickering and Inglis, Glasgow and London, 10/6.

In spite of its deficiencies and imperfections the Great Reformation was in essence such a return to Holy Scripture. Before the Council of the Empire Luther took his stand on the Word of God, saying, "I can do no other, so help me God." The Reformed Church of England declared by Article VI that "*Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary* to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

The Wesleyan revival bore the same hall-mark. Its preachers explained the Scriptures and appealed to them habitually. As to the Brethren, the chief historian of that Movement wrote: "The Brethren sought to effect a fresh start without authority, precedent, or guidance beyond the letter of Holy Scripture" (Neatby, *A History of the Plymouth Brethren*, 3). And another able and outside observer said in 1900:

> The Plymouth brethren, with all their divisive, exclusive, and sometimes controversial tendencies, have with uncompromising hostility fought for the *Word of God* as the final rule of faith and practice, for a *simple apostolic worship*, and *a literal obedience to Christ's teachings*. They have done as much as any class of disciples to promote *practical separation from the world*, and must not be forgotten in the general estimate of the factors contributing to the great final result, a sanctified and peculiar people for God. (A. T. PIERSON, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century*, 11.)

It being thus the case that God's method of rescuing man from the Devil is *to speak* to him, it is of necessity the Devil's method to nullify that Voice. As far as he can he prevents men from ever hearing the message of God. The testimony of His works to His eternal power and divinity (Romans 1 : 20) Satan early nullified by the pantheistic philosophy already considered; even that Nature does not bear witness to a God distinct from itself, and who can *speak* to man; no, it *is* God, and so man is his own god.

When the message of God through the completed Scriptures began to exert power in Europe, Satan shortly caused it to be overlaid with human tradition, and superseded the authority of the Book by an alleged authority in "the Church".

Over large areas the Reformation and subsequent evangelical Movements largely broke that false authority and diffused light as to God and salvation. Particularly, in this connexion, the translating, printing, and circulating of the Book itself proved disastrous to the kingdom of darkness; for earnest seekers by

thousands heard in its pages that authentic Voice of God speaking to conscience and heart.

To counteract these alarming modern attacks on his dominion in the souls of men the Father of lies launched the higher critical attack upon the Book itself, the fount from which light and knowledge flowed. He had so attacked it before. The Roman Empire and later the Roman Church had made it a criminal and capital offence to read or own the Book. And the Roman Church would re-enact these laws, if it could. About 1901 I spoke with a Church of England girl who had announced her intention to join the Church of Rome. I pointed out that she had been reared in a Church where Holy Scripture was read regularly in public and where she herself was free to own and read it, and warned her that in the Roman Church she would find it the reverse. She replied that I was entirely mistaken; she had asked Father Troak about that, and he had replied that theirs was the Church that *insisted* upon its children reading the Bible! At that time, even in Protestant lands, this was a black lie, and I begged her to ask the Father why it was, if they insist on the reading of the Bible, that one of his fellow-priests, only a few weeks before, having led a mob to break up an open-air gospel meeting in Cork, had burnt a Bible in the open street! That made her waver; she felt she had been deceived; and the next day she reached peace of conscience by faith in Christ according to the Bible.

But the power of Holy Scripture had to be broken in Protestant spheres. Burning the Book, its teachers and readers, being at present not possible, recourse was had to the device of the questioning, criticizing, falsifying, denying, that characterize the Higher Criticism. In this the arch-Deceiver, the ancient Serpent, followed his first subtle tactics. To our common mother Eve he addressed the specious question, "Yea, hath God said . . . ?" (Genesis 3 : 1). "Yea." Is it quite certain, is it positively the case that God has spoken? May there not be a doubt about this matter? But if perchance God has spoken, what did He say? Did He actually say, "Ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden?"

Now the Tempter knew very well that God had said something entirely different to that, even "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat," with one exception. God's permission was positive in form and generous in scope: "thou *mayest* eat . . . of *every* tree [save one] . . . *freely*." Satan's question was negative: "Hath God said thou shalt *not* eat?"; it was restricted, "not eat of any tree." The skilfully phrased question had on Eve's simple mind the same effect as many a cunning question

by counsel has had—and been designed to have—on unskilled witnesses in court; it "beguiled," confused, hoodwinked her. This her answer showed, for she corrupted God's statement in all the three ways by which only a statement can be corrupted. (1) She *omitted* from it, by leaving out the word "freely," thus diminishing the thought of the bountifulness of God. (2) She *added* to it the words, "neither shall ye touch it," making the command more stringent than it was, thereby importing the notion that God made things difficult, severe. (3) She *changed* God's words. The penalty of disobedience as He pronounced it had been "thou shalt surely die." Eve softened the certainty into only a possibility by saying "lest ye die."

Having thus, first, raised a *doubt* as to God's word, thereby inducing Eve thoroughly to *corrupt* that word, the great Liar went on boldly *to deny* God's word, by assuring Eve, "Ye shall *not surely die*"; on the contrary, God knows the exact opposite will be the result of eating that fruit, for you shall become a nobler creature than you are, and God, who knows this, is unkind enough to keep you out of it! This multiform attack on God's word had the desired effect of destroying Eve's confidence in God and obedience to Him. She was now separated from her Creator, darkened in mind concerning Him, distrustful of Him, and would have remained in the chains of her fell Captor had not God in His mercy come after her and spoken again.

If any one will now consider with care the spirit and sophistries of all scepticism, higher criticism, and modernism, ancient or present, in relation to the Bible he can discover the sign manual of the Serpent of Eden legible everywhere. There is a steady flow of specious queries, such as these:

Did the universe have a personal Creator or not? Was it a special creation in time, or did it always exist? If there was a Creator, does He ever intervene in creation? or did He not rather start it going under certain laws, and thenceforth leave it to itself? Supposing that He may have communicated with men in ancient days, what does this matter to us? The times have changed, and an ever-changing message would be needful. Is it quite certain that these ancient Hebrew writings are the record of what God may have said? In any case, did He not speak to other early sages and races? Are not their sacred books also a word of God? Why, then, should we not make a new and composite book of God by combining the best elements from them all, including the Bible? In any case, are there not in the Bible manifold unhistorical narratives? Is not much of it myth,

fable, legend, fiction? Did not some alleged writers fraudulently attach to their own writings the names of great heroes of the past, so giving to their books a false authority and antiquity? In any event, is the Bible *the* Word of God, or does it only *contain* a word of God? And so on, and so on.

Thus by interminable and subtle queries, and by ignoring positive proofs and reasons, a general atmosphere of doubt and confusion of thought has been created in the modern mind, as in the mind of Eve, as regards the Word of God.

Now confidence gives strength, and doubt is weakening, and upon this enfeebled state of mind the Enemy pressed bold denials, as he did upon Eve. No history, no doctrine, no prophecy has escaped definite contradiction and open ridicule. The general effects of this thorough, detailed, unscrupulous campaign have been devastating. In England it has been maintained unceasingly for eighty or ninety years, since *Essays and Reviews*, and Colenso's attack on the first six books of the Bible in 1862. By thousands of books, by tens of thousands of articles and pamphlets, by hundreds of thousands of sermons and lectures public thought has been saturated with unbelief in God and His Word.

The Universities were captured, and became almost poison-gas chambers where living faith in the living God was hard to maintain. I speak from observation.

The theological colleges were mostly captured. Some forty years ago I called on the then Principal of the Western College, Bristol, where Congregational ministers were educated. As a young preacher I hoped to draw from his years and learning what might help my ministry. But he would talk only of semi-pagan German philosophers, and my attempts to get him to speak of Paul and John met no response whatever. It made credible what a Congregational minister had assured me, that three-fourths of their ministers were infected with higher critical views.

About that time George Adam Smith was professor of theology in the Scottish Presbyterian Church. In the annual Assembly Dr. John Brown moved that Dr. Smith be not re-appointed to that chair because of his higher critical views on the Bible. Of the more than 700 ministers who voted on that straight issue more than 500 were in favour of the critic.

In the same period I attended a public session of the Baptist Union. The most notable Baptist at that time was Dr. John Clifford. He boldly spoke of Christ as "our divinest Lord." It was no unintentional slip, for he read from his manuscript and also threw on the superlative "est" a rhetorical emphasis such as so able a speaker knew how to do. Not a single protest was

raised, though obviously the term was a flat contradiction of Paul's words that, though there are in heathendom "lords many; yet to us [Christians] . . . there is *one* Lord, Jesus Christ" (1 Corinthians 8 : 5, 6). The adjective was wholly destructive of the Christian Faith, and no one would so speak who had not first accepted critical views of the Word of God, as Dr. Clifford had done.

It was little wonder that a company of Baptist leaders acted as follows. It was resolved to erect new premises for the Baptist College at Bristol. To finance this the former premises in Stokes Croft were sold. The highest offer was from the Christian Science body. It was protested in the Committee that Christian Science denies every truth of the Bible and is wholly anti-Christian; but the financial consideration was thought more important, and fundamental error has since been taught in the building where formerly the venerable Dr. James Culross trained men to preach Christ. At the time in question Benjamin Gibbon was a Baptist minister in Bristol and on the Committee. His son assured me that his father had been the only member to vote against the sale. Had those men been in subjection to the Word of God they would not have acted thus traitorously. But Higher Criticism had captured the Baptist Union. Not even Spurgeon's powerful influence had been able to dislodge it.

But, say the Critic and the Modernist: We must not be narrow, but charitable. But, as Spurgeon well said, The truth is God's property, not ours; and he who is charitable with another's property is a thief. Certain it is that the Higher Critic and the Modernist have robbed men in general of what respect they once had for the Word of God and what reverence was formerly shown to God Himself. I can remember days when if you showed an ordinary man that the Bible said so and so, he assented that therefore thus it must be, even though he did not personally act upon it. To-day the average man in this country has no real interest in what the Bible may say, nor any real concern as to the will of God.

All too terrible has been the fulfilment of Wellhausen's forecast quoted, that if his views should prevail people would lose faith in the Old Testament. Dr. Marcus Dods was a prominent Higher Critic. On New Year's Day, 1902, he wrote:

> I wish I could live as a spectator through the next generation to see what they are going to make of things. There will be a grand turn up in matters theological, and the churches won't know themselves fifty years hence. It is to be hoped some little rag of faith may be left when all's done. For my own part I am sometimes entirely under water and see no sky at all. (*Later Letters of Marcus Dods*, 67.)

This poor man had trained many Scottish ministers in the critical unbelief; now he is sinking in the dark. Yet he had once been, as his earlier letters show, a vigorous believer in the facts and verities of the Christian life as set forth in the Word of God. He is a personal example of the ravages of the false criticism that destroyed his own faith, robbed him of peace and joy, and which has done the same on a world-wide scale. Had his wish been fulfilled, and he had lived till now, he would have had cause enough to mourn the effects of the destructive work in which he shared, by seeing that people in general have no "rag of faith" to cover the nakedness of the soul or protect their hearts from the bitter, perishing blasts of unbelief, fear, despair that are sweeping a shuddering world to-day.

This desolating work has covered the world. As far back as 1910 Brahmins in India would say to us, that it would be time enough for them to attend to our Book when our own teachers believed it, and would cite Higher Critical theologians. In that year the older native pastors of the American Congregational Churches in the Bombay area jointly demanded of the American professors in the theological college in that city that they should declare whether they believed in the fundamental teachings of the Bible or not; because they were finding that the new generation of pastors, sent from the college to join them in the work, did not believe as they believed. And the professors were obliged to acknowledge that they did not hold the views formerly considered Christian. Thus has the work of the truth in remote lands been hindered.

When G. W. Foote, the atheist, re-issued in 1901 Tom Paine's *Age of Reason*, of course he had no difficulty in citing modern "Christian" professors and theologians as teaching about the Bible what Paine had taught. He quoted Farrar, Driver, Gore, Bruce, Cheyne, Reuss, Sanday.

But Satan's attack on the Book was but a means to an end. His true objective was to attack the Person to the knowledge of Whom the Book is the material means. To destroy men, now and for ever, is the Devil's delight. As Christ said: "The thief cometh not, but that he may steal, and kill, and destroy. I came that [the sheep] may have life, and may have it abundantly. I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep" (John 10: 10, 11). Therefore does the Thief hate the Shepherd and dread His kindly work. To keep the lost sheep from hearing and trusting the Shepherd is indispensable to the Thief.

Now Christ accredited the Old Testament; therefore to discredit the Book was to discredit Christ and to prevent men from trusting Him. Thus does Satan serve a double end: he at once decries his hated Conqueror and robs Him of some for whom He laid down His life. It is not the Book by itself that saves sinners, but it saves by directing man to the Saviour and telling him to trust that Saviour, as a lost lamb trusts the shepherd that finds it. As one wrote who knew by experience both the Book and the Person: "The sacred writings are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Timothy 3 : 15).

This outcome of their work as critics, that they discredit Christ and make faith in Him unreasonable, has been faced by the critics in England for eighty years at least, for in 1866 it was discussed at length by Dr. Liddon in his celebrated Bampton Lectures of that year, *The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* (453ff.). The attack on the Old Testament was pressed with full knowledge that it would of necessity lead to the discrediting of Christ and the New Testament. The specious plea that nothing vital to Christianity was involved in the critical challenge of this detail and the other must be held to be insincere.

Thoughtful non-believers take note of such insincerity, which is patent to such as have any acquaintance with the Scriptures. They note also in this case, as in that of the Romanizing clergy, that the critical Professors and preachers take salaries from funds known to have been provided for maintaining the very views as to the Bible and Christ which they undermine or deny. Ordinary honest men think this dishonest. They know too that many teachers of unbelief preach these views in buildings the trust deeds of which provide that it is certain specified evangelical doctrines alone that shall be there taught. To the specious subtleties by which it is argued that these provisions and doctrinal statements can be construed to mean the opposite of what they say, these observers think appropriate Petrie's term about similar clerical arguments—they are "gerrymandering."

The correspondences between the methods and morals of the Roman Church and the Higher Critics reveal in both the one guiding mind of the Enemy of truth and honesty. We give a final illustration. That Church, to which many Romanizing Anglicans have gone over, requires its priests to swear at their consecration that they will interpret the Holy Scriptures only according "to the *unanimous* consent of the Holy Fathers." The Higher Critics have been insistent in talking of "the *unanimous* results of the Higher Criticism." This bold invoking of *unanimity* has a subtle influence upon incautious minds: it inclines them

to take for granted that what is being advanced is true. But Chiniquy, a Roman priest for twenty-five years, has shown that there is no such thing as an unanimous consent of the Holy Fathers upon the Holy Scriptures;[1] and corresponding to this is the fact that there are no unanimous results of the Higher Criticism. Through the hundred years and more they have contradicted and overturned the theories of each other, until it is utterly wearying to try and follow them.

The effect of all this moral obliquity upon people in general has been desolating. They ask (if unconsciously), If professors and preachers of religion so act, what is the use of religion? What is the use of attending public worship to hear men talk about a Book they do not believe? Why should we be truthful and honest if such men need not be?

Oh, for a multiplying of such preaching as drew a certain sceptic to be a regular hearer, on the ground that it does any man good once a week to listen to a man declaring what he really believes; and, added he, "Mr. Brown preaches as if the Lord Jesus Christ stood at his elbow!" And this of course was the fact! (Matthew 28 : 19, 20).

III. EVOLUTION.

Concurrently with these two attacks on Truth and Faith, the Enemy launched a third. This was not directed openly against the *worship* or the *Word* of God, but was concerned with His *works*. The officers that led this offensive were not ecclesiastics or historians but "scientists". Darwin issued the *Origin of Species* in 1859.

Sixty years ago, when I was a boy of twelve or thirteen, a lad from a near-by school we were playing at cricket astonished me with the wondrous information that we were descended from monkeys! Their teacher had told them so, and the proof was this: that the small bones at the bottom of our backs had once been tails turning outwards; but our ancestors had taken to sitting down, and in time the bones had turned inwards, and the monkey grew into the man. *Q.E.D.*

I thought it silly then, and I think it silly now. It seems (though nobody quite knows why) that millions upon millions of years ago there were tiny tadpoles in tiny ponds. In the course of ages the tadpoles became (though nobody quite knows how) frogs croaking at the river's edge. After more ages the frogs in turn became (though still nobody knows how) monkeys chattering

[1] *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, ch. xvi.

in the trees and swinging by their tails. And lastly, after more uncountable years, the monkeys changed (though still nobody knows how) into men. This is the nonsense that at one time held the field, and he who did not assent was decried as "unscientific," a hopeless back number.

Of course, I do not write as a "scientist." I am not one, not by any means. I am merely a plain man of the street who has lived a long life among other men of the street, and I outline the theory as it has reached the street, and as it has poisoned the street, and has helped largely to blind and benumb the man of the street and make him indifferent to his Maker, which is the end the Enemy of mankind designed.

Certainly not all true men of science assented. One, long since dead, who only missed being a wrangler at Cambridge by illness, told me that in his day front-rank men like James Clerk-Maxwell did not assent to the doctrine. But a thousand propagators of the notion, like the higher critics, blew their own trumpets so noisily and long, asserting boldly that all men of note agreed, that the rank and file once again mistook noise for proof, and gave up thinking for themselves. Likewise, too many feeble theologians, who could not endure to be dubbed "unscientific", abandoned the clear meaning of Genesis as to the creation of man and resorted to tortuous attempts to make the account mean what no plain man of the street ever read there.

Here again the ordinary looker-on sees a sheer dishonesty in religious men, who are paid to teach out of a certain Book, subtly perverting its plain sense and twisting it to mean what they please. And he thinks that the men and their Book can well be ignored.

Let us go to church. In stalls, apart from the body of the congregation, sit a few men and a number of boys, adorned in what old John Ploughman from the field might call white smocks. These young cherubs turn their angel faces to the roof and sing the opening hymn.

> The earth with its store of wonders untold,
> Almighty, Thy power hath founded of old.

The prayers include the well-known words, "We thank Thee for our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life; but above all for thine inestimable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ; for the means of grace, and for the hope of glory."

The minister goes to the lectern and reads from the Bible the words of Genesis 1 : 26, 27, the account of the creation of man:

"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. . . . And God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him."

The angel voices in the choir stalls now sing:

O Love, Who formedst me to wear
The image of Thy Godhead here.

The minister ascends the pulpit. His sermon tells the audience that man is a noble creature, the product of long ages of evolution. Beginning with protoplasm in the slime, he has ascended, by long processes and eliminatory struggles, through various gradations, until at last he passed from the ape stage, and became human. At first, indeed, he was a low-grade anthropoid, with fierce passions, bestial instincts, and low intelligence. But the "ascent of man" is a wondrous phenomenon. By natural selection, by the strong crushing out the weak, he has developed to what he is, and but a few further struggles and stages and the base survivals of his ancestry will die out of him and he will become divine. Glory be to man!

And now those little cherubs put off their smocks, and with them their piety, and scatter down the street hurling bad words at one another! Why not? They have gleaned from the sermon this at least, that boys are but superior young monkeys: how, then, can it be so very naughty to assail one another with naughty words? Do not little monkeys chatter and snarl at one another? The minister has not driven into their hearts these other words of the Book:

> The tongue can no man tame; it is a restless evil, full of deadly poison. Therewith bless we the Lord and Father; and therewith curse we men, *who are made after the likeness of God:* out of the same mouth cometh forth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be. Doth the fountain send forth from the same opening sweet water and bitter? Can a fig tree, my brethren, yield olives, or a vine figs? neither can salt water yield sweet (James 3: 8–12).

Of such a preacher Spurgeon's satire was surely justified. A relative of mine heard him speak thus to his students upon the Lord's Prayer: "'Our Father who art in heaven.' Our evolutionary friends, my brethren, cannot offer this prayer; they would have to say, Our Father who art *up a tree*."

The foregoing is no caricature of a clergyman. There are

such, though, thank God, by no means all are like it. I know well an official in the Colonial service with a four-figure salary. When he was a godless youth in a London office he used to get another clerk to mind his job for an hour each Thursday while he slipped round to a high church and earned a guinea by singing at the mid-day service. If the small boys had not done their part well, the vicar afterwards in the vestry would cuff and curse them. Why not? Do not grown-up monkeys get angry and fling *their* bad words at one another?

Nor was it clergy only who swallowed and vomited this poison. Nonconformist pulpits spread the evil widely.

The contradiction between Evolution and the Bible is irreconcilable. The one says that man is a rising creature and the evils in him are the relics of his former baseness. These he will in time throw off by his own efforts and rise to his full possibilities. The Bible says that man is a fallen creature; that the finer traits in him are the relics of his former greatness; that he can do nothing of himself but fall lower and fall for ever; that he can rise only by availing himself of that "redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ" provided by the free favour of God. The antagonism is so obvious, so absolute, that the question arises as to whether the attempt to reconcile it must not result from either Satan-infused perversity or Satan-imposed blindness.

In his brilliant allegory, *The Holy War*, Bunyan tells that the town of Mansoul had in its market-place, and also upon the gates of the castle, an image of King Shaddai.

> This image was so exactly engraven (and it was engraven in gold), that it did the most resemble Shaddai Himself of anything that was then extant in the world. This Diabolus basely commanded to be defaced, and it was as basely done by the hand of Mr. No-truth . . . he likewise gave order that the same Mr. No-truth should set up in its stead the horrid and formidable image of Diabolus, to the great contempt of the former King, and debasing of His town of Mansoul.

Here is the true and reasonable explanation of man's greatness and baseness.

An evolutionist is not necessarily an atheist. Darwin did not *deny* the existence of an original Creator. Huxley professed ignorance upon the point, calling himself an agnostic, one who does not know, which term Darwin accepted for himself. But essentially the theory does involve Deism—that if there be a God, He placed creation under fixed laws and leaves it to the outworking of these.

One result of this view is to forbid the prospect that God will intervene some day with a drastic and final and cataclysmic judgment. This theory of the inflexibility of the laws of nature is very ancient. It is dealt with in 2 Peter 3 : 3–7 :

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

To answer this argument it became needful to the Deist to deny the fact of the Deluge. To this end geology was involved, and further perverse attempts were made to show that the Bible narrative does not mean what it says. But, in the good providence of God, from this ditch the geologist has been driven by the archæologist.

The theory of Natural Selection makes much of the feature that in nature the weak are crushed out by the strong.

This appeal to nature for guidance ignores that creation is in a state of corruption and disorder, with malignant agents and destructive forces at work. To follow these is but to aggravate the disorder and destruction ; in no wise can it lead to escape from misery and a re-establishment of order. To reach this consummation man must be born into a new creation and live earnestly according to the laws there ruling. Only so can the kingdom of God be enjoyed, that order of things characterized by righteousness, peace and joy, in the power of the Spirit Who is holy (Romans 14 : 17).

Upon this false theory, drawn from Nature, Nietzsche and Hitler based the teaching that war is necessary, right, beneficial, and should be waged with the utmost ruthlessness. It was this doctrine that was used to justify sterilization of the unfit and poison-chambers for the feeble. Along this line Nietzsche wrote to a correspondent : " If what I publish is true, a feeble woman like you would have no right to live " (*Friedrich Nietzsche*, M. A. Mügge, 31). And because Christian teaching opposes this doctrine with its declaration of the love and compassion of God, he called it " the greatest of

all conceivable corruptions . . . the one great curse . . . the one immortal blemish of mankind" (*ibid* 66).

It is no wonder that under the widespread influence of such cruel, such hellish teaching the human heart has of late become harder and crueller, and that just when the fond dreamers thought that civilized man might reach the top rung of the ladder and spring thence into the ether, he suddenly pitched backward, and, with a horrid splash, plunged deeper than ever into the foul swamp of barbarism.

Yet the two men who principally, in the name of science, foisted upon the modern world this desolating doctrine have been honoured by the world. The busts of Darwin and Huxley were given positions facing each other in the entrance hall of the Natural History Museum at Kensington, and Darwin was granted burial in Westminster Abbey. On the other hand, a man who had done far more than most to rescue the vicious and relieve the wretched, William Booth of the Salvation Army, was refused burial in the national shrine, which led his biographer, Harold Begbie, to pass this caustic but sadly true comment on the Abbey, that if the Bible was in the reading desk the *Origin of Species* was in the pulpit.

Even after examining *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* by his son, there is for me still something unclear and sinister about the origin of this Evolution campaign. There are conflicting accounts. Lady Hope gave this widely-spread report of intercourse with Darwin in the closing months of his life:

> I made some allusion to the strong opinions expressed by many on the history of creation, and then their treatment of the earlier chapters of the book of Genesis. He seemed distressed, his fingers twitched nervously, and a look of agony came over his face as he said. "I was a young man with unformed ideas. I threw out queries, suggestions, wondering all the time over everything; and to my astonishment the ideas took like wildfire. People made a religion of them."

This distress and agitation are consistent with the marked fluctuation in his opinion as to the existence of God which Darwin confessed (*Life and Letters*, ed. 2, 1, 304, 312), and only the year before his death he expressed his "inward conviction . . . that the Universe is not the result of Chance" (*ibid* 307). In 1885, three years after Darwin's death, the Duke of Argyll wrote that he spoke to him concerning "the wonderful contrivances" for certain purposes in nature and said that "it was impossible to look at these without seeing that they were the effect and the expression of mind.

I shall never forget Darwin's answer. He looked at me very hard and said, 'Well, that often comes over me with overwhelming force; but at other times,' and he shook his head vaguely, adding, 'it seems to go away'" (*ibid* 315, note). This supports Lady Hope's account. It shows also that it is harder to regain faith than to let it slip away.

But is this view of the matter attributed to Darwin himself in harmony with the facts? When the *Origin* was published in 1859 he was not a young man, but fifty years of age. It was not a matter of "queries, suggestions, wonderings," but of a highly reasoned and elaborate treatise. Nor was it a new and unformed idea to him or others. The theory of Natural Selection was first "clearly conceived" by him in 1839, twenty years before the *Origin* was published. For seventeen years, since 1842, he had been writing in private extended drafts of his views, had corresponded with other scientists, and had discussed the matter with leading men like Sir Charles Lyell, the anti-Biblical geologist, and Sir J. D. Hooker.

Moreover, Edmund Gosse in his infamous[1] book, *Father and Son*, has given from his own knowledge a quite different account of the matter. He was the son of the celebrated naturalist, Philip Henry Gosse. In ch. V he gives a significant account of developments in the world of science which led to the issue of the *Origin* in 1859. It reads:

> This was the great moment in the history of thought when the theory of the mutability of species was preparing to throw a flood of light upon all departments of human speculation and action. It was becoming necessary to stand emphatically in one army or the other. Lyell was surrounding himself with disciples, who were making strides in the direction of discovery. Darwin had long been collecting facts with regard to the variation of animals and plants. Hooker and Wallace, Asa Gray and even Agassiz, each in his own sphere, were coming closer and closer to a perception of that secret which was first to reveal itself clearly in the patient

[1] It is deliberately that I describe this autobiography as "infamous." Its real and ultimate object is not stated till the very close, in the paragraph commencing "Let me speak plainly." This is followed by a long and fierce tirade against "evangelical religion, or any religion in a violent form." Very well; evangelical religion has survived much sarcasm and invective. But when a man wishes to ridicule a certain religion, or any other subject, it is surely infamous that he should fasten his own deceased father in the pillory and make him the central butt of his infidel mockery. By such as still regard respect for parents as a virtue such conduct will be thought incredibly indecent. It is an individual instance of that hardening of nature before noticed as induced by the doctrine of evolution, with which doctrine Gosse evidently sympathized. And it is a painful illustration of that prophecy of Holy Scripture of a time when men should be "without natural affection" (II Timothy 3 : 3).

> and humble genius of Darwin. In the year before, in 1856, Darwin, under pressure from Lyell, had begun that modest statement of the new revelation, that " abstract of an essay ", which developed so mightily into *The Origin of Species*. Wollaston's *Variation of Species* had just appeared, and had been a nine days' wonder in the wilderness.
>
> On the other side, the reactionaries, although never dreaming of the fate which hung over them, had not been idle. In 1857 the astounding question had for the first time been propounded with contumely, " What, then, did we come from an orang-outang ? " The famous *Vestiges of Creation* had been supplying a sugar-and-water panacea for those who could not escape from the trend of evidence, and who yet clung to revelation. Owen was encouraging reaction by resisting, with all the strength of his prestige, the theory of the mutability of species.
>
> In this period of intellectual ferment, as when a great political revolution is being planned, many possible adherents were confidentially tested with hints and encouraged to reveal their bias in a whisper. It was the notion of Lyell, himself a great mover of men, that, before the doctrine of natural selection was given to a world which would be sure to lift up at it a howl of execration, a certain bodyguard of sound and experienced naturalists, expert in the description of species, should be privately made aware of its tenour. Among those who were thus initiated, or approached with a view towards possible illumination, was my father. He was spoken to by Hooker, and later on by Darwin, after meetings of the Royal Society in the summer of 1857.

If Gosse is to be trusted, his account makes abundantly clear that it was no question at all of throwing out queries, and wondering at their acceptance, but a deliberate and consciously worked-out plan to attack the known, the evangelical, the plain teaching of the Bible upon the creation, nature, and history of the human race. As Gosse puts it, a *revolution* was being *planned*, and steps were taken privately and in advance to gauge what support might be expected.

To-day, after nearly a century, these three open attacks on the Bible and its teachings have passed their climax. All along they have been opposed vigorously by scholarly and by popular champions of God's truth, and a reaction has begun, increased by the painfully evident futility of these errors, their utter uselessness under the overwhelming misery induced by the false principles of Humanism in every form. But untold mischief has been wrought. God does not count in the lives of multitudes ; the Word of God is largely forgotten or repudiated. The rising

generation is almost wholly irreligious, with the fearful menace for the future this involves.

I was standing in a village near a poster on which was a text of Holy Scripture. Near me was a smart lad of twelve, an evacuee. I asked him if he knew the text before him. He did not. Did he know from what Book it was taken? He did not. When I named the Bible he exclaimed scornfully: "The Bible! no one believes that book now." Such is the work that Satan has wrought all too thoroughly, till it has left the boys and girls without fear of God or of judgment, without moral restraint, the prey of every passion and moral disorder. As B. G. Sandhurst wrote in 1946:

> The horrors of this war have completed the work of disintegration begun in 1914. All certainty as to the existence of moral standards has gone. The persistent neglect and denial of Christian dogma has been followed by the destruction of the principles which follow from it, and from it alone. Civilization based upon materialism has at last shown itself for the ghastly failure it is. (*How Heathen is England*, 29.)

In Germany this loathsome disease of unbelief broke out into Nazi-ism. What shall be its next outbreak, and where?

CHAPTER VIII

FURTHER FACTORS OF WEIGHT

SOLOMON WAS A SAGACIOUS OBSERVER. HE WROTE: "BECAUSE sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them [emboldened] to do evil" (Ecclesiastes 8 : 11). This observation includes three items: (1) that evil is dealt with by God judicially; it is *sentenced* to due penalty; (2) that the execution of the sentence may be deferred; (3) that men abuse this delay to increase their wickedness. An example of this, later than Solomon, has been mentioned in ch. III. King Nebuchadnezzar was sentenced in heaven to condign chastisement for his wickedness. He was given notice of the decree and a year's respite was granted. He abused this delay and then the sentence was executed (Daniel 4).

This holds true for peoples as well as persons. As remarked above (ch. III), God could not with rectitude dispossess the Canaanites so early as the days of Abraham because their iniquity was not yet full. It did not become so for four centuries (Genesis 15 : 13–16).

This negative consideration has a positive counterpart. Rehoboam, king of Israel, had acted like a stubborn autocrat and fool, and had lost five-sixths of his kingdom. But "when he humbled himself, the wrath of Jehovah turned from him, so as not to destroy him altogether: and *moreover in Judah there were good things found*" (2 Chronicles 12 : 12). Similarly, Jehoshaphat had incurred the holy wrath of God by helping the wicked Ahab; yet that wrath was moderated on the same ground: "Nevertheless, *there are good things found in thee*, in that thou hast put away the Asheroth [obscene idols] out of the land, and hast set thy heart to seek God" (2 Chronicles 19 : 3).

English law has adopted this principle of clemency, in hope of reformation, as in the First Offenders Act, Remand Homes, the Borstal Institution, or in a culprit being "bound over" to come up for sentence if called upon, that is, if he should offend again.

It is, therefore, of the greatest importance to learn what are "good things" in the sight of God which, being found in a nation, may prolong its tranquillity and defer judgment. The divine histories make this plain.

1. THE KING. As a father elevates or degrades his family so does a sovereign his people. Before the King of kings and His angelic subordinates the king of a country is its official representative, and it is a general principle of any well-administered realm that, so long as the acting head of a region behaves properly and efficiently, and so long as those under him are benefited by his rule, he is supported by the central authority, and his people are treated with favour.

Before Israel entered upon national life in Canaan, God laid down in advance His view of what a king should be and do. These instructions are found in Deuteronomy 17 : 14–20. The features required in a sovereign were :

1. God was to be consulted as to the choice of a king (verse 15).

2. He was not to be a foreigner, but one of the race he was to rule (verse 15). This should assure understanding of and sympathy with his subjects.

3. He was not to rely on foreign military resources : " horses out of Egypt " (verse 16, Comp. Isaiah 31 : 1–3), or his confidence would not be in the help of God.

4. He was not to be a sensualist, or he would induce sensuality in his people instead of social purity (verse 17).

5. He was not to hoard a personal fortune, or his heart would cease to trust in God. He would not be able to serve God and Mammon (verse 17).

6. On his accession he was to write out a copy of the law-book of God left by Moses. This was to be always at hand and to be read by him continually throughout his life. Thus would he learn to fear God and to obey His good laws without deflection (verse 18), and

7. Thus would he be preserved from pride and from being oppressive.

Upon these features being found in the king, he could count upon the blessing of God upon himself and the royal family.

The requirements here mentioned will be found in essence and perfection in God's final Sovereign for Israel and the world, even His Son, Jesus Christ, the Lord of heaven and earth ; but any diligent reader can trace out in the histories of *Samuel*, *Kings*, and *Chronicles* that so far as the kings of Judah were of this type the promised blessing of their God attended them and their people, and as far as they were not so, it was withheld. This was because in the degree that they were such men and rulers their subjects were furthered in the fear of God and in the ways that He can bless ; and the reverse also was true. A godly king is himself

one of God's chief blessings to a nation, and a wicked king a chief cause of mourning.

It would be most instructive and helpful if some competent student of history, who reveres Holy Scripture, were to write from this point of view a comparative study of the godly kings of Judah and the pious sovereigns of England. It would be found that such as David, Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah were far from perfect; but the bent of their mind and ways was to honour God, and so, in spite of their evident failures, there was a fulfilment of the assurance, which applies indeed to all men, but was given first to a chief ruler, "them that honour me I will honour" (1 Samuel 2 : 30).

It was the same with such as Elizabeth, Cromwell, and William III. There were very obvious defects of character and failures in practice; but under the first the land was settled on Protestant lines, the Word of God being declared the true authority (Article 6); the second commenced the toleration of the Jewish people in England, whence they had been banished for 350 years; the third assured freedom of religion. Thus did they, like David, serve the counsel of God for their generation, and prosperity attended their land.

Of Queen Victoria this was obviously true. She studied to keep her court clean morally. Presonally she was a sincere believer on the Lord Jesus Christ, and there is on record a case of her inquiring of a young girl if she was a Christian and of her praying with and for her that she might be born again. The prayer was answered not long after. The facts have been authenticated by a friend of mine who was intimate with the girl and had the account from herself. The incident took place while Her Majesty was visiting a cottage on her estate at Cowes. In the sight of heaven there is here a scene very notable indeed: the Sovereign of the mightiest empire of all ages bowing in a humble cottage before the Almighty Ruler and asking for the eternal welfare of one of the lowliest of her subjects.

In the Royal Proclamations there was regularly a reverent acknowledgment of Almighty God.

A sovereign who in private and public honoured God was appropriately honoured by Him, and her realm was thereby prospered.

The great Queen's son, Edward VII, did not follow the godly example of his royal mother. It was a mercy to the realm that his reign was not long, though personally he was an able ruler. At the time of his accession it was observed that his first Pro-

clamation omitted the established acknowledgment of God; and it was not surprising that sudden sickness developed a few days before the coronation was to have taken place and the grand ceremony had to be postponed. In the Proclamation that followed His Majesty's recovery God was acknowledged.

His son, George V, most happily followed in the steps of his grandmother. In the Sheringham district it was common report that, when His Majesty took Holy Communion at the parish church, he would not be the first to go forward, but would wait for some of lesser rank to go before him. Such humble acknowledgment by the greatest king on earth that at the table of the King of kings earthly status gives no precedence, would not pass unnoticed in heaven.

The generality of Englishmen resident in India gave the Hindus and Moslems just occasion to conclude that the English have no religion, and especially so by disregarding the day of rest. In the *Bombay Guardian* of November 28th, 1914, the Rev. F. W. Hale wrote as follows concerning the royal visit to India:

> But the King proclaimed a real Sabbath on the Lord's Day in the great Durbar in Delhi. The King and the Queen attended divine service in the camp themselves, but made it well understood that they expected Christian officials, at least, to follow their example. The whole Durbar stood still that day, even ceremonial calls not being in order anywhere.
>
> When the King left Delhi for his shooting tour in Nepal, his train was stopped on the Sunday morning, and waited in a siding while he walked on foot through crowds of Hindus and Muhammedans and Christians and non-Christians, to the service at a little Mission church close by. As some of the vernacular papers put it: "He entered the church without ceremony, walking alone to his chair, just an ordinary chair, and then before he, the Shah-in-shah—the King of kings—presumed to sit down, he knelt before the chair and prayed to Almighty God." When in the bazaar they tell me, as before, "Oh, your people have no religion," I can at least say, "But what of the King?"
>
> One of the most blessed of the visible signs connected with His Imperial Majesty's visit to India was his reverent obedience to the Fourth Commandment.

The foregoing statement was read and approved by the king, and this simple picture of royal piety is worth preserving in a period of general profanation of the day of rest, and the more

so as it will not again happen in India. It is conduct that by the powers of heaven is reckoned to the account of a monarch and to the benefit of the people he represents.

The history of the kings of England contains undeniable proofs that godliness does not run in the blood, that no man is "born a Christian." This gives point to the statement that the children of God are "born, *not* of blood, *nor* of the will of the flesh, *nor* of the will of man, *but of God*," by a new birth through the Spirit of God using the word of truth (John 1 : 13 ; 3 : 5, 6 ; 1 Peter 1 : 23).

Perhaps nothing more remarkable in the history of royalty ever took place than that the sovereign of the greatest empire the world has yet seen resigned his crown for such a reason as he gave. But those who see the hand of God in human actions were grateful that Edward VIII thus made way for the throne to pass to His present Majesty, who walks in the steps of his royal father ; and they held with reason that the Almighty Ruler had not yet cast Britain wholly out of His favour, in spite of much national misconduct that might well provoke Him to do so. For during the last war George VI personally and alone called upon his people to wait upon God, himself setting the example. During Their Majesties' official tour of South Africa the press gave pleasing accounts of their attendance at Divine worship on the Sundays, sometimes in remote places where many would omit this duty, thus following the example of His Majesty's father as mentioned above.

So long as God grants to a kingdom such sovereigns, to represent it officially before Him, their subjects may rightly pray—

GOD SAVE THE KING.

2. PRINCES. Next to the King in official responsibility, and to-day commonly before him in actual authority and influence, are the leading statesmen. Sometimes the great nobles, officials, or statesmen have been God's instruments to check the wickedness of the sovereign, as when the barons forced King John to grant Magna Carta. But more often they have led the way in evil ; as when the chief officials of Persia beguiled King Darius and forced him to cast Daniel to the lions (Daniel 6) ; or when we read of the weak Joash, king of Judah, who had worshipped Jehovah while the godly Jehoiada lived and led him, but then hearkened to his princes, "and they forsook the house of Jehovah, the God of their fathers, and served the Asherim and the idols :

and wrath came upon Judah and Jerusalem for this their guiltiness" (2 Chronicles 24 : 18).

Of what quality Godward are the "princes" of England to-day? The great nobles, who formerly had vast influence, scarcely count now. Of the powerful personalities, of any political party, who now dominate the counsels of the nation, which is known to the public as a man who greatly fears God? Which of them makes upon the observer the impression that Oliver Cromwell made on Thomas Carlyle?:

> A solid substantial inoffensive Farmer of St. Ives, hoping to walk with integrity and humble devout diligence through this world; and, by his Maker's infinite mercy, to escape destruction, and find eternal salvation, in wider Divine Worlds. This latter, this is the grand clause in his Life, which dwarfs all other clauses. Much wider destinies than he anticipated were appointed him on earth; but that, in comparison to the alternative of Heaven or Hell to all eternity, was a mighty small matter. (*Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, Intro.: A.D. 1631.)

Nay, we will not ask to what front-rank leader of any party such words apply, but which of them would *wish* such words applied to him? Which of them impresses his contemporaries that he acts in the light of *Eternity*?

It has been mentioned above that the calls to public seeking of God during the late war were issued by his Majesty alone. Why did the then Government take no official part in that vital matter? Clearly enough, if men are not known as those who pray they cannot call upon others to do so. It would be mere hypocrisy.

Here is a *spiritual* record of one of England's most influential men to-day. He is one who by diligence and devotion has justly won the commendation of even political opponents; but our question is, how do the following features appear to Almighty God, the Holy and True?

1. In January, 1927, he spoke to working men on the matter of the then recent (1926) general strike, and said: "The one essential fact that emerged from it all could be expressed in one word—discipline. When trouble was on, the central authority must be obeyed, right or wrong." The thoroughly immoral principle declared in the words "right or wrong" must be noted. It was laid down that obedience must be rendered to a central authority even when it orders acts that are wrong. The speaker has lived to see much bitter fruit grow from this foul seed.

2. Early in the late war, addressing men over whom he had authority, he said: "And if I tell you to work on Sunday, do not argue, but go and do it." Thus did he tacitly claim right to cancel God's command and require others to do so. For this, alas, he had evil precedent. During the 1914–1918 war the then Archbishop of Canterbury and the then Prime Minister joined to urge that farming and gardening on the Sunday were justifiable. As far as I know, farmers in general disregarded this bad advice, but any modern suburb or town allotment will show to this day the profanation of the day thus recommended.

3. On another occasion this leader defended in the Commons, bravely and fairly, the rights of the conscientious objector to military service which had been granted by statute. But he urged that, if the Tribunals were not satisfied with a man, then he felt the man ought to accept the situation and go into the forces. But this shows a serious lack of understanding as to conscience. For conscience is *imperious*. It cannot bow to outside dictate; or, if it is forced to, it will be seared, deadened. When a young man told me that, if the Tribunals refused him exemption, he would go into the army, I told him to go and join up at once, for he had no *conscience* against military service but only a *preference*.

4. In June, 1946, on the eve of an important foreign conference, the same statesman said: "I am always hopeful, and it is all in the lap of the gods, and I hope the gods are kind this time." Here is just that same facile use of pagan sentiment which was noticed above in Hitler and Rosenberg, evidencing a paganized mind.

5. In December, 1946, this leader said: "The permanent instrument to which we look for the salvation of the world is the United Nations."

The best comment on this from the side of God (Whom the speaker wholly ignored, as is the almost universal case with leaders to-day, of every school of political thought), is His Word to Israel of old:

> Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help, and stay on horses; and trust in chariots, because they are many, and in horsemen, because they are very strong; but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek Jehovah! Yet He also is wise, and will bring evil, and will not call back His words: but will arise against the house of evil doers, and against the help of them that work iniquity. Now the Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses flesh, and not spirit: and when Jehovah shall stretch out His hand, both he that helpeth shall stumble, and he that is holpen shall fall, and they all shall fail together (Isaiah 31: 1–3).

Thus this one statesman (1) annuls the moral law by cancelling the distinction between right and wrong as a rule of conduct; (2) claims the right to supersede the commands of God; (3) has no just conception of conscience; (4) reveals an instinctive paganism of thought; and (5) sets his hope of world betterment on a wholly ungodly organization. Yet in early manhood he was a confessed and baptized follower of Christ, a Sunday school teacher, and an earnest witness for his Lord in the open-air. "How is the gold become dim!" (Lamentations 4: 1).

For with regard to the United Nations, what can be expected but that God shall blow upon the scheme? One of its most important departments is obviously the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the Director-General of which has defined its task as the eliminating of world illiteracy and "as the biggest job since the abolition of slavery." And who is the man that the United Nations have chosen to direct this most influential Department? He is one of the most avowed enemies of God that England holds to-day—Dr. Julian Huxley. Here are some of his blasphemous utterances, quoted by Dr. R. E. D. Clark in *Scientific Rationalism and Christian Faith* (52). Basing his views on the baseless dogma of Evolution, Dr. Huxley states that:

> Because of the universality of natural law and its automatic and inevitable workings, such a god is reduced to the position of a spectator . . . of the workings of the cosmic machine. . . . Natural science has pushed God into an ever greater remoteness, until his function as ruler and dictator disappears and he becomes a mere first cause or vague general principle. . . . God is simply fading away as the devil has faded before him . . . a faint trace of God, half metaphysical and half magic, still broods over the world, like the smile of a cosmic Cheshire cat.

It is this man, whose ribald enmity against God is very well known, whom the United Nations have appointed to direct the culture of the world, and it is upon that godless organization, the United Nations, that godless statesmen set their hope.

In essence the views of Huxley are those of Rosenberg, and his appointment by the United Nations is parallel to the appointment by Hitler of Rosenberg as Director of German education. If this policy and influence be continued, the result can only be that the United Nations will sink to the same condition of wickedness and misery to which the Nazis dragged Germany and the Bolsheviks sank Russia. Like these they may aim at the stars, but in the end will join Lucifer in the pit.

Another of England's most active Ministers to-day was, in his

earlier years at least, an avowed atheist and a lecturer for the Secular Society.

Other statesmen are pressing for a grouping of Western Europe as a counterbalance to dangers from Eastern Europe. It is difficult to see why this should succeed where its predecessors of the kind have failed. Fifteen centuries have shown that Teutons and Latins do not cohere for long.

But what place has God in this last scheme more than in any other such schemes? Has the Word of God anything to say upon it? It has. Twenty-five hundreds of years ago it foretold a period of fierce conflicts in the Mediterranean area (Daniel 7). Four raging "wild beasts" should convulse that region. In *The Revelation of Jesus Christ* (120, 121, 165, 166, etc.) I have sought to elucidate this prophecy. It must suffice now to say that neither in this passage nor in any other does the Word of God forecast any such Western *bloc* as a ground of hope for world peace. Like all merely human plans it will miscarry.

A writer of wide outlook has recently pointed out that the great British statesmen of the last century were mostly men who served their country without personal profit but rather at considerable sacrifice; that they were mainly God-fearing men, some in advanced degree, who regarded the Bible as a sacred Book, men "to whom it would never have occurred that anything solid could be built except upon that foundation"; but that now a large number of leaders (as well as of the people) are convinced agnostics, and are men who have found politics of great personal advantage, a very profitable profession (*Review of World Affairs*, March, 1947).

There is surely food for thought when a journal of high repute will insert a letter asking "How many politicians, in this and in other countries, tell the people the truth without having an eye firmly fixed on the ballot box?" (D.T., 3rd January, 1947).

Thirty years ago a far-seeing professional man remarked to me that this was going to be a land of only small men, which, said he, is not good for a land. The fulfilment is already far advanced.

One who seeks the mind of God will observe such facts as to any land as signs of His increasing disfavour. Ominous as the situation then appears it becomes a reason for prayer unto Him for mercy and respite. It was at a time when Jerusalem was in acute military peril that the king sent his chief household officers to the prophet with the request "Wherefore lift up thy prayer for the remnant which is left" (Isaiah 37 : 4), which prayer was answered. It was at a time when Rome was ruled by fearfully

wicked men that the apostle exhorted Christians to pray for kings and all rulers (1 Timothy 2 : 1–5).

That the king of England fears God is matter for praise ; that most of England's " princes " do not is cause for prayer, as also for giving good heed to these two divinely inspired maxims : " Put not your trust in princes. . . . It is better to take refuge in Jehovah than to put confidence in princes " (Psalm 146 : 3 ; 118 : 9).

3. THE JEWS. It appears that under the strain of two awful wars godless western democracy is breaking down and breaking up. The Living God is the fountain whence all life flows. Detach the vessel from the fountain and life fails ; this induces exhaustion and collapse ; for the inward man loses spirit, courage, reserve force, and the strain of affairs proves unbearable. Multiply the number of individuals of whom this is true and inevitably the body politic they form must degenerate and die.

This dread process is already far advanced in England and in America. Time will complete it, will inevitably complete it, unless there be a timely, sincere, general resort to the Fountain of Life, the living God. But there is this ground for some hope, that, as yet, there are still " good things " found in these countries. One of these is that, so far, their official policy is to be favourable to Israel. Were this to be abandoned their national dangers would multiply rapidly.

Nineteen centuries before Christ, when making His first covenant with Abraham, God included this assurance and accepted this responsibility : " Be thou a blessing : and I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse ; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed " (Genesis 12 : 2, 3 ; 27 : 29 ; Numbers 24 : 9). This double guarantee has been in process of fulfilment through three thousand and eight hundred years. It is a key to international history. At the beginning Pharaoh " cursed " Israel and God " cursed " Pharaoh : of late Hitler " cursed " Israel and God " cursed " Hitler.

Cromwell was probably not too skilled at foreign policy, yet God blessed him in that realm and he made England to be respected in Europe. It was Cromwell who began in this land to restore freedom to the Jew.

To-day it is only England and America that at all steadily or seriously help Israel. As long as they do so God will keep the promise He made to Abraham. No doubt their political motives for this policy are more selfish than pious, such as their desire

to retain hold on the oil in the Middle East. But the Most High has reasons of His own for His actions, and He can and will bless those who bless Abraham and his descendants. It is true that the selfish motive of nations is duly punished by Jerusalem proving to be "a burdensome stone to all the peoples; all that burden themselves with it shall be sore wounded" (Zechariah 12 : 3). Witness England's present experiences. In these two Western countries, as in others, there are powerful influences seeking to turn peoples and rulers against the Jew. Should these prevail one of the "good things" of which God can take knowledge would be removed, and His final judgments on the sins of England and America would draw nearer.

But *what* are God's reasons for this line of action? It is not at all that the Jewish people ever has been, or is, personally worthy of His favour. Most emphatically they are not, and God stated this categorically at the very beginning of their history as a nation. Early in his magnificent closing oration Moses said to them:

> Speak not thou in thine heart, after that God hath thrust them [the nations of Canaan] out from before thee, for my righteousness Jehovah hath brought me in to possess this land: whereas for the wickedness of these nations Jehovah doth drive them out from before thee. Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go in to possess their land; but for the wickedness of these nations doth Jehovah thy God drive them out, and that he may establish the word which Jehovah sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. Know therefore that Jehovah thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness; for thou art a stiff-necked people (Deuteronomy 9 : 4–6).

But what was there in the first ancestors of the Jews that caused God to love and bless them? Did not Abraham and Isaac lie? Was not Jacob a deceiver? There were indeed very human features and failures in them; but this they had, that they trusted and honoured God in an age and in surroundings when the entire human race rejected Him.

Abraham had been formerly an idolater, one of an idolatrous nation, as were almost all men at that time (Joshua 24 : 2, 15). God made overtures to him that, if he would fly in the face of public opinion, disown the religion of his people, forsake his country and prospects, and trust Jehovah as to the future, then God would do great things for him in another land to which He would lead him, though no indication of its whereabouts was then imparted.

In simple faith in this bare promise he left all, ventured all, gained all: he walked with God as a wanderer on earth, stood for the true God amidst races whose conduct was so vile and cruel that it was a pain and a peril to be among them, maintained this life of trust for ninety years, and died in sure and certain hope of possessing the promised land, though to the day of his death God had not given him possession of a foot of it, and even the sepulchre, which was all of the land that he held, he had bought.

What should God do but love and honour a man that had thus stood alone for Him against all the apostate world? Would not any king esteem and reward a faithful subject who stood loyally for him, alone and in peril, in a rebel land? Nor would it be surprising if he extended his royal favour to that man's family and descendants.

Abraham was the great typical believer on God after the Flood; and every man since who has been well-pleasing to God has become so by exercise of the same faith as Abraham, who is thus the "father" of the whole company of subsequent believers (Romans 4: 16–25). It is for his sake that God still forbears with his descendants; but it is only those of them who show the faith in God of their forefather that do actually inherit his covenanted blessings (Romans 2: 28, 29). The apostates of Israel are cut off in judgment, and will not share in the coming fulfilment of the covenant of God with Abraham. This purging out is always in progress, and it has been seen of late on a vast scale. It will continue until that stage is reached foretold by Isaiah seven centuries B.C. in the words: "Except Jehovah of hosts had left unto us a *very small remnant*, we should have been as Sodom, we should have been like unto Gomorrah," that is, exterminated utterly (Isaiah 1: 9).

That very small remnant of the Jews shall be taught by bitter experience not to trust in man but in God (Isaiah 10: 20–23); a new heart and spirit will be given to them (Ezekiel 36: 26, 27); a new covenant will be made with those of this new heart (Jeremiah 31); and it is to this small but utterly renewed and righteous remnant that God will fulfil His covenant with their first ancestors, for then, and only then, will it be possible to carry out the divine purpose that through Abraham all the families of the earth shall be blessed.

This purpose is the second ground why God continues to work with Israel: they are to be His instrument for good to all the earth. After the Flood Satan seduced the whole race, and it seemed that God would be utterly robbed of His rights in mankind: but God will recover the lost ground, the lost inheritance

of the earth. He gained His rights in Abraham personally; He continues to recover them in all who follow the faith of Abraham, both Jew and Gentile; He will at last, through wrath and mercy, through severity and goodness, drive the Usurper from the hearts of men, and establish His rule of righteousness and peace under the sceptre of Him who pre-eminently is Abraham's Seed, Jesus Christ.

Thus with the past in remembrance and the future in view God blesses those who bless Abraham's seed, for such are so far in the line of His purposes; and He curses those who curse them, for these are working against His purpose, even though unintentionally they serve it.

The survival at all of a small, scattered, defenceless, persecuted people itself creates a presumption that God has for them a future of importance. As Saphir said: Pharaoh tried to drown them and they would not drown; Nebuchadnezzar tried to burn them and they would not burn; and Haman tried to hang them and they would not hang: the history of Israel is the history of miracle and the miracle of history! Men may rest assured that the displeasure of God shall still be upon all who try to drown or burn or hang them.

It is very noteworthy how nearly Hitler, in his early years, came to see the Divine purpose for Israel, but missed it. He wrote (M.K., 69):

> From being a feeble cosmopolitan I had become a fanatical Antisemite.
>
> Only once more—it was the last time—there came to me with deepest concern anxious or pressing thoughts.
>
> As I considered carefully the influence of the Jewish people through long periods of human history, there suddenly rose in me the anxious question whether perhaps inscrutable Fate, on grounds unknown to us poor mortals, by eternal unchangeable decree wishes the final victory of this small people. . . .
>
> But as I deepened my knowledge of the doctrine of Marx, and so undertook a calmer and clearer observation of the influence of the Jewish people, Fate itself gave me its own answer.

Hitler saw rightly that the views of Marx could never triumph, for they disregard individuality and must therefore prove unworkable. But it was confusion to identify the plans of God with the opinions and doings of Marxist-minded Jews of to-day. Would that he had seen the essential morality of God's plan for the Jews and the benefit to mankind which they shall yet be made. It

might have altered his career. But he had already blinded his eyes to truth as revealed by God.

4. LIBERTY OF RELIGION. I was conversing in Bristol with a Hindu physician studying for the Diploma of Public Health. He said that his work was taking him into the slums of the city and he thought that, so long as our land had such areas, we really need not be so zealous to bring our Christian message to his country. There was plenty of scope here. I knew intimately those very slums and could appreciate his view; but I replied that our *Guru* (religious teacher) had not directed us to keep at work in any place till all there were persuaded, but had commanded us to go into all the world and spread His message everywhere. With the Hindu reverence for the *guru* he replied that, in that case, it was our duty to obey.

It were to general advantage that the situation as to full liberty of religion should be recognized clearly by rulers. Its essential features are these:

(1) Christ definitely claimed for Himself absolute authority in heaven and on earth, saying: "All authority has been given unto Me in heaven and on earth" (Matthew 28 : 18). See also chapter 11 : 27, "all things have been delivered unto Me by My Father": and John 3 : 35; 13 : 3; Acts 10 : 36, "Jesus Christ is Lord of all": Ephesians 1 : 20–22; Revelation 5 : 13. This is the uniform claim of the Word of God for the Son of God.

(2) His commissioned agents, the apostles, directed their converts to be obedient to human rulers in all matters committed to those rulers by God. See Paul in Romans 13 : 1–7, and Peter in 1 Peter 2 : 13–17. In this they were applying the principle of Christ's words: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" (Matthew 22 : 21; Mark 12 : 17; Luke 20 : 25).

But those same law-upholding apostles absolutely and uncompromisingly refused to obey rulers when the latter invaded that realm of life and duty in which the Supreme Ruler has granted them no place or right, that is, the realm of religion. In that connexion the apostles said: "Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye . . . we must obey God rather than man" (Acts 4 : 19; 5 : 29). To this they adhered unflinchingly, and endured the utmost violence by the authorities, even unto death, rather than concede the claim of rulers to regulate or restrain in matters concerning man's relations with and duties to God and His Son. In this they acted upon Christ's further directions in the same place as above: "Render unto God the things that are God's."

(3) Exercising this His universal and supreme authority, the Son of God added this particular command: "Go ye *therefore* and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them . . . [and] teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matthew 28 : 19, 20). Thus the followers of Christ have two inescapable duties: (i) to spread His message among all nations; (ii) to train disciples in obedience to all His instructions. This latter work includes of necessity all that is involved in the organizing and ordering of Christian churches composed of such as believe His message. Of this society, the church of God, the house of God, Christ as the Son of God is the Head, the only head, even as the human body has only one head (Hebrews 3 : 6; Ephesians 1 : 22, 23); and any acknowledgment that any secular ruler has any rights in this society is a rejection of the sole right of the Son of God, is a "not holding fast the Head," as Paul expressed it in Colossians 2 : 19.

In all ages and countries rulers have violated the rights of Christ by invading this realm which God reserves for His own exclusive rule. The first world-emperor, Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, did so (Daniel 3), and his impious example has been followed to the present day. But Nebuchadnezzar was forced to own that the God whom he had defied was supreme, and all rulers will at last be compelled to the same admission. In Scotland, in the seventeenth century, for twenty-eight years the Covenanters fought a bitter battle against the king and bishops of England to maintain "the crown rights of Christ as Head of His church." In England the authorities did not retire from the conflict of centuries until the Act of Toleration of 1689. Even then the *right* of every man to freedom in religion was scarcely acknowledged, for it was an Act of *toleration*: the State and its Church agreed to *tolerate* what they could no more suppress.

The liberty thus gained made possible, without opposition from rulers, the mighty spiritual movement connected with Wesley. That in its turn provoked the vast modern efforts to obey Christ's final command and spread His message among all nations. The official policy of England being one of religious liberty, it was possible for God to preserve this country from such a devastating ordeal as the Revolution was to France, and then to permit England to open the world to commerce, to travel, and so to the spread of the gospel. It is not that the gospel has to thank England for freedom to spread, but that England has to thank the gospel for the spirit of freedom.

As long as England and America continue this freedom *in reality*, not only in theory and on paper, so long it will count as a "good

thing" such as God can recognize. For it will be in line with that part of His present purposes which is furthered by the making known of His message of mercy. But if this "good thing" shall be restricted or destroyed a substantial barrier to the wrath of God will have gone.

Of this restricting of freedom to evangelize there is a danger, especially by favouring the exclusive claims of the Roman Church in certain areas.

Indeed, for a very long period there has been on the part of the British Government one very serious limitation in practice of the freedom that is theoretically allowed. Of this we now speak.

5. MOHAMMEDANISM. Mohammed lived in the seventh century after Christ. In this particular his religion differs from the other great religions, for they preceded Christ. In consequence, their religious books do not mention Christ, whereas the Koran does and it mentions Him to deny utterly His claim to be the Son of God. The other religions are in fact incompatible with Christ's claims, but Mohammedanism rejects His claims *pro forma*. On the surface they are non-Christian; whereas Islam is *anti*-Christian, avowedly and fiercely *anti*-Christian.

Therefore as a religion it is peculiarly and emphatically under the ban of God as the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, and is peculiarly and emphatically under the blighting influence of God's Enemy, the Devil. An Englishman, born in India, lived there a long life in a district where Hindus and Mohammedans dwelled side by side. He said to me there: "The Moslem social system is the vilest thing on earth; far worse than heathendom." Naturally so! Where all sunlight is deliberately blotted out disease and corruption will abound.

In the thought of God the entire universe exists for Christ, the Son. Before it was made He was appointed to inherit it (Hebrews 1 : 2). As we have just seen, He is the Owner of it. As a fixed purpose and fundamental law of all things the Father has determined and decreed that "all shall honour the Son even as they honour the Father," and therefore "he that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father that sent Him" (John 5 : 23). These are not words of another about Christ, but Christ's own word about Himself.

It is therefore in vain that Mohammed, or any other Unitarian, may profess to honour God while denying that God is a Father and asserting that He cannot have a Son. He robs God of His chief pre-creation dignity and joy, His fatherhood.

In consequence it is a most serious offence that a nation should

openly and officially sanction Islam. It is an outrage against the Father and the Son, being a supporting of a religion which opposes the will of God that the Son shall be honoured equally with Himself. Of this offence the British Government has been persistently guilty over a long stretch of time. In general its agents have been helpful when it has been a question of the spread of the gospel among heathen people, but in Moslem countries ruled by England the opposite policy has been followed. Government officers seemed determined to hinder the work as far as possible, short of an official cancellation of religious liberty. Instances of this could be given from my own experience, as well as from that of many others.

The ground of this policy may seem intelligible from the point of view of worldly prudence, but it is without excuse in the sight of God. The Moslem peoples are excitable and their religion makes them fanatical. England has had half or more of the Moslem world under its control or influence, and it has pandered to their religion in the hope of avoiding disturbances and securing their support. That a Government should protect all its subjects in the free exercise of their religion is very proper: that it should hinder some of its subjects in seeking to enlighten the others as to the truth of God is to invite the indignation of God. I have never known English officials to hinder the Moslems from spreading *their* religion.

When in 1883 Lord Cromer took control in Egypt an American of very long residence in that land said (or wrote) to him that the Moslem will accept with complacency anything that comes to him with something of the finality of a Divine decree, but he very well knows how to exploit weakness. It was weakness, for example, that led the British to acccept the Moslem Friday as the official closing day for Government offices, thus as good as telling the Moslem that the Christian day of rest is immaterial. The pursuing of this weak policy has encouraged the Moslem to be more and more exacting in his demands and insistent in his pressure. It is yet more serious that it has largely forfeited the blessing of the Almighty upon the British administration in those countries. Whatsoever a Government sows *that* shall it also reap, and to-day Britain has to pay the bill for its false and God-dishonouring policy towards Islam. It sowed the wind, it is reaping the whirlwind. In India, Egypt, Palestine, and adjacent Moslem lands it is Islamic peoples that are to-day causing Britain its major anxieties and hastening the diminishing of its empire and prestige.

Surely in the judgment of heaven this policy must be a serious offset to the protection of the Jews.

6. THE GODLY of a land are a factor of great weight in determining the dealings of God with that land. He does not put the dough in the fire until the leaven of evil has corrupted it fully. It is the God-fearing who are the salt which retards that corruption and so defers the judgment. To his avowed disciples Christ said, "Ye are the salt of the earth" (Matthew 5 : 13). The wicked do not appreciate what they owe to the godly.

Unspeakably vile as was Sodom, its destruction would have been averted had there been in it ten righteous persons (Genesis 18 : 32).

The godless Jehoram of Israel was faced with the revolt of a subject people, Moab. He led forth his army to subdue the rebellion, and secured the co-operation of the God-fearing Jehoshaphat of Judah. When they arrived at the region to be reduced they were halted by lack of water and were in danger of annihilation by the rebels. Very mercifully the great prophet Elisha was at hand. A prophet could meet an emergency with which no kings could deal, and he was entreated to secure the guidance and help of Jehovah. To the godless king of Israel he said sternly that he would neither regard nor even see him were it not for the presence of the God-fearing king. For Jehoshaphat's sake deliverance was granted (2 Kings 3).

Long ago a tempest-battered ship was drifting to destruction in the Adriatic Sea, with 276 souls aboard. When all hope was gone, this assurance was given to a great servant of God : "God hath granted thee all them that sail with thee"; and they were saved without exception (Acts 27 : 24).

The end of this present age of human affairs will see such an orgy of Satanic and human fury that "except those days had been shortened no flesh would have been saved : but *for the sake of the chosen ones* those days shall be shortened" (Matthew 24 : 22).

Therefore so long as a country protects the people of God it protects itself. Persecution of Christians is coincident with, and a sign of, that moral degradation which demands Divine judgment.

At the close of this age the last world-Emperor will determine to destroy Jerusalem. Christ has already directed His followers to escape from the city before its encirclement is completed. Their removal will withdraw the last hindrance to its capture and destruction (Luke 21 : 20, 21 : "when ye see Jerusalem *being encompassed* . . . then flee").

About the same time the Medes of the West Caspian district will advance to destroy that Emperor's capital, the city of Babylon. The urgent call will then be given : "Come forth, My people, out of her, that ye have no fellowship with her sins, and that ye

receive not of her plagues" (Revelation 18 : 4, 5). Upon their flight Medes and angels will destroy Babylon.

So with the world at large at that awful epoch, God will suddenly remove His chosen from the earth and immediately begin to overwhelm the nations with His judgments. "When they are saying Peace and Safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them" (1 Thessalonians 4 : 13 – 5 : 11). For sufficient reasons God permits the wicked to afflict His people; but at last He acts swiftly and the godly are saved and the godless perish (Luke 18 : 1–8). The King of heaven will withdraw His ambassadors and send forth His armies.

Trade unionism is driving the conscience-ruled out of its ranks. When this is completed its corruption, already far advanced, will deepen and its doom will hasten. And so with all societies and all peoples. Remove the salt and the meat will stink and must be thrown away.

7. PRAYER. The subject has the right to petition the sovereign. If he does not use the right he cannot complain if the sovereign does not act. God has "granted unto us His precious and exceeding great promises" (2 Peter 1 : 4). If men do not apply to Him for the fulfilment of these promises God does not act. He says: "Ye have not because ye ask not" (James 4 : 2).

A friend of mine obtained a five-pound Bank of England note about a hundred years old. On taking it to the Bank of England the five pounds were paid. He said to the cashier: "Is this all you will give me? You have had the use of this money for a century, and at five per cent. compound interest it is worth about six hundred pounds!" The cashier smiled, shrugged his shoulders, and said: "*Our doors have been open every day!*" No one had asked; no one had received.

A prayerless people is an affront to heaven. It thus tells the Almighty that it can do without Him, and at the last He leaves it to do without Him, to its undoing. An elderly Christian told me this experience from his youthful days. He was a gardener's boy and went some distance to work. On the way there lay a small triangular field of wheat. One spring day he heard the farmer's man say to the farmer, "That's a nice piece of wheat, master!" "Yes," was the reply; "that will be all right if the Almighty will let it alone!" Though not a pious lad, the boy thought this very profane, and he watched the field all the summer. It grew to full ear, but when harvest came there was not a kernel in any ear on the field. *The Almighty had let it alone.* This so deeply affected the lad that he was moved to seek God for himself, lest

he should be let alone, and be lost, as all the labour on that field had been lost.

Of the Jewish people we read : " there is none that calleth upon Thy name, that stirreth up himself to take hold on Thee ; for Thou hast hid Thy face from us, and hast consumed us by means of our iniquities " (Isaiah 64 : 7). Thus Israel was let alone by God, and its own sins burnt the life out of the nation.

Woe unto any nation that, forsaking God, trusts in armaments, " but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek Jehovah " (Isaiah 31 : 1). This is already the general state of affairs in England. Its leaders are mostly prayerless men, and the masses of the people also. In late national emergencies its King called for public prayer. His statesmen mostly ignored this, as did the vast majority of the people. On the first occasion, at the very hour appointed on the Lord's day, I saw some strolling off as usual, tennis rackets in hand. Were the angels of wrath standing by with their *swords* in hand expecting to be sent against this godless nation ?

During the disputes with the American colonies in the eighteenth century the affairs of England looked threatening and gloomy. Days of public humiliation and prayer were appointed. Let Wesley's *Journal* tell how they were then observed :

> *February 27th*, 1778. Was the day appointed for the National Fast, and it was observed with due solemnity : all shops were shut ; all was quiet in the streets ; all places of public worship were crowded ; no food was served up in the King's house till five o'clock in the evening. Thus far at least we acknowledge that God may direct our paths.

In that period the outward life of England was wicked enough, God knows ; but the people in general were not *so* wicked as to ignore prayer and so tell the Almighty that they did not need His help. And in His mercy the nation was brought through and set on the road to greater prosperity. To-day it is prayerless and is travelling fast down a steep decline to a decay that may prove irretrievable.

What, now, shall the godly do ? *Pray the more !* If *they* do not appeal to God for rulers of all ranks and men of all sorts, then the case must go by default. The word for to-day in all lands is that which Jeremiah was caused to write to the captive Jews in Babylon six centuries B.C. : ". . . seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captive, and pray unto Jehovah for

it; for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace" (Jeremiah 29 : 7). They were not told to try and govern Babylon, or to improve its system of life, but to be men of peace in its midst and men of prayer for its welfare. Neither are the people of God to-day exhorted to rule the world or to labour for its corporate betterment; but we *are* bidden to be peace-makers in a world of strife and to pray for men. In these high duties we have been none too diligent: let us mend our ways, and cry unto God day and night; nor for one nation only, but for all men, without exception of race or of relationship to the land in which one may live (1 Timothy 2 : 1–6).

Here may be stressed a feature of true prayer of the highest importance, namely, that to secure the fullest response from God it must be offered in the name of His Son, Jesus Christ. In His closing instructions to His followers before His death Christ emphasized this six or seven times (John 14–16). He who takes his own cheque to the bank asks for the money in his own name, that is, by personal right; but he who takes another's cheque asks in the name of the other, so acknowledging that he has no personal right, but only the right given by the other; and the bank honours that other name in disregard of the personality of the applicant.

The prayer for the blessing of God attached to the Royal Proclamations would be still more acceptable to God if offered in the name of the Son of God. If it be said that the King represents many subjects who do not acknowledge the Son of God, such as heathen, Moslems, or other Unitarians, it must be urged that a sovereign who takes the Christian position has a duty to pray in Christ's name. It is not for him to slight that Name by accommodating his public prayer to the ignorance or hostility of some of his subjects. It is rather his duty to enlighten and to lead them. In the human realm a petition to the Crown must conform to the regulations relating to petitions which have been appointed by the Crown, or it may be refused consideration. These remarks apply to such a prayer as that in which President Roosevelt led the people of the United States during the war. In that instance the omission of the Name seems to have been deliberate, for he had been asked specifically to offer the prayer in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

In the estimate of heaven the use of the Name of the King of heaven elevates the prayer to an immeasurably higher status and value, always providing that the actual petitions be for such things as may be rightly connected with that holy Name by being in harmony with the character and will of the Holy One. For it is

useless to petition a king to do what is contrary to his own laws or dignity.

The practical insufficiency of a belief in the existence of God without faith being placed in Him through Jesus Christ His Son is seen strikingly in no less terrible a man than Himmler. Trevor Roper writes that :

> The effect of the Generals' plot [on Hitler's life, July 20th, 1944] was decisive. It was both personal and political. Personally the plot achieved a notable success ; it brought Himmler to God. In April, 1945, he described to a friend this signal conversion. " I know," he said, " that I am generally regarded as a heedless pagan, but in the depths of my heart I am a believer ; I believe in God and Providence. In the course of the last year I have learnt to believe in miracles again. The Fuehrer's escape on the 20th July was a miracle. . . . "

Yet this change of sentiment did not hinder him from continuing his fearful cruelties or from self-murder at last. Similarly, a renewed acknowledgment of God and His justice did not prevent Dr. Ley from committing suicide in his cell. But if these unhappy men had reached faith in God as the Giver of His Son for their personal redemption through His atoning death, that would have wrought a change of nature and of life. And therefore Christ said : " Let not your heart be troubled. Ye believe in God, believe *also* in Me " (John 14 : 1) ; and they who do so find it indeed the cure for trouble and fear, for thenceforth they know God as Father.

But let rulers and peoples take to heart the awful possibility that a nation can reach a state of moral and religious wickedness when at last the Hearer of prayer refuses to hear further appeals from His praying servants, and says to them :

> Therefore pray not thou for this people . . . for *I will not* hear thee. . . . Though Moses and Samuel stood before Me, yet My mind would not be toward this people : *cast them out of My sight*, and let them go forth (Jeremiah 7 : 16 ; 15 : 1).

And again, when God speaks of His sore judgments attacking a land by famine, wild beasts, war, or pestilence, He declares three times that, though there were in that land three such champions of righteousness as Noah, Daniel, and Job, yet these should save their own lives alone, and the rest should not be spared for their sake. That is to say, the factor just before mentioned, that the

presence of the godly operates to the advantage of the godless, has a moral limit, and therefore a time limit, and a degree of iniquity can at last be reached by a nation when this restraint upon the wrath of God ceases to operate and public evil is answered by public ruin (Ezekiel 14).

The principle is recognized by Shakespeare in the lines :

> There is a tide in the affairs of men
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune . . .
> *And we must take the current when it serves,*
> *Or lose our ventures.*

I thank God that He, and not I, is the judge of nations. But were it mine to form an opinion as to the present state of England before God, I should tremble lest perhaps this country has passed that stage when the tide is favourable and has entered upon a course of apostasy from which there will be no general recovery. But I do not *know* this. I will rather hope still in His mercy, that mercy which He takes pains to show to even His bitterest foes.

Mention has been made of two of these outstanding enemies of God—Tom Paine and Lenin. Of the last days of the former that eminent Quaker, Stephen Grellet, wrote as follows :

> I may not omit recording here the death of Thomas Paine.
>
> A few days previous to my leaving home on my last religious visit, on hearing that he was ill, and in a very destitute condition, I went to see him, and found him in a very wretched state ; for he had been so neglected, and forsaken by his pretended friends, that the common attentions to a sick man had been withheld from him. The skin of his body was in some places worn off, which greatly increased his sufferings. A nurse was provided for him, and some needful comforts were supplied. He was mostly in a state of stupor, but something that had passed between us had made such an impression on him, that some days after my departure, he sent for me, and, on being told that I was gone from home, he sent for another Friend. This induced a valuable young Friend (Mary Roscoe), who had resided in my family, and continued at Greenwich [near New York, U.S.A.] during part of my absence, frequently to go and take him some little refreshment suitable for an invalid, furnished by a neighbour. Once when she was there, three of his deistical associates came to the door, and in a loud unfeeling manner said, " Tom Paine, it is said you are turning Christian, but we hope you will die as you have lived " ; and then went away. On which, turning to Mary Roscoe, he said, " You see what miserable comforters they are."
>
> Once he asked her if she had ever read any of his writings, and

on being told that she had read but very little of them, he enquired what she thought of them, adding, "from such a one as you I expect a correct answer." She told him that when very young his "Age of Reason" was put into her hands, but that the more she read it, the more dark and distressed she felt, and she threw the book into the fire. "I wish all had done as you," he replied: "for if the Devil has ever had any agency in any work, he has had it in my writing that book." When going to carry him some refreshment, she repeatedly heard him uttering the language, "O Lord! Lord God!" or "Lord Jesus! have mercy upon me!"

It is well known that during some weeks of his illness, when a little free from bodily pain, he wrote a great deal; this his nurse told me; and Mary Roscoe repeatedly *saw* him writing. If his companions in infidelity had found anything to support the idea that he continued on his death-bed to espouse their cause, would they not have eagerly published it? But not a word is said: there is a total secrecy as to what has become of these writings. (*Memoirs of Stephen Grellet*, I. 143: Preface to first edition, dated 1860.)

As to Lenin, a Russian Christian told me in Warsaw that his niece, an earnest Christian witness, had been selected to nurse Lenin in his last illness.

Thus does the God of all grace love to show his goodwill to the last hour even to His worst enemies. It is possible that He may visit England again in widespread conviction of sin and general turning to righteousness, but there is no guarantee of this, nor is there any present sign of it. Yet the godly can pray. Of the two robbers crucified beside Christ one was saved at the last hour, so that we must not despair of anyone; yet the other died in his sins, which forbids presumption.

CHAPTER IX

EGYPT AND THE MIDDLE EAST

THE MIDDLE EAST WAS THE CRADLE OF THE HUMAN RACE, both at the creation of man and at the new start after the Flood. It was therefore the original centre of mankind and thence the various families migrated to develop into the nations. The history of those migrations is obscure; but the peoples that remained at the centre, that is in Mesopotamia and Persia, dominated the ancient world, and their history is now moderately well known. The discoveries of archæology have strikingly confirmed in detail the histories contained in the Old Testament. And the conditions of those countries for the past two thousand years have equally strikingly confirmed the *prophecies* of those ancient Israelitish writers.

Yet one prominent general feature of those prophecies for a long time showed no sign of fulfilment, namely, that there would be a time when the Middle East would resume its place as the centre of the world. The last century and a half, however, has witnessed the commencement of this movement, and it is continually accelerating.

Perhaps it was Napoleon who gave to this movement its most definite impetus. I cannot now trace the book, but I have read that that Satanically far-seeing man said that whoever held Babylon held the key to India and the world. In the second edition of *The Great Prophecies* (1885, p. 175) Pember quoted a letter to himself from W. Greene, C.E., saying that in the French War Office he had examined various surveys made for Napoleon and " among them had found a survey of the river Euphrates. It contained a plan for a new Babylon, with quays, river walls, and other arrangements necessary for a large commercial city."

It may be presumed that it was with Mesopotamia in view that Napoleon undertook his Egyptian expedition in 1798. " Reading and reflection had convinced him that Egypt was one of the keys to the world." He had said, " Only in the East can one do great things." But, under God, the British foiled him. On August 1st that year Nelson destroyed his fleet at Aboukir, and the next year Sir Sidney Smith frustrated him at Acre. Of the latter he said:

"That man made me miss my destiny." (For these three quotations, see E.B. xvi, 87). These significant remarks seem to indicate that his colossal ambition had been to rule the wide world from Babylon, as Alexander the Great had intended to do.

From Napoleon's time the powers of Europe have taken ever-increasing interest in the Middle East; its political and commercial revival has advanced continually, and its vast supplies of oil are a prize which the western and northern nations wish to control. This involves ceaseless friction and international danger and makes urgent the problem of what the future holds. One who wishes to master this problem must consider attentively the following forecast by Isaiah the prophet about 700 B.C. It is chapter 19 of his book.

> The oracle concerning Egypt.
> Behold Jehovah rideth upon a swift cloud, and cometh into Egypt: and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence, and the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it. And I will stir up the Egyptians against the Egyptians: and they shall fight every one against his brother, and every one against his neighbour; city against city, kingdom against kingdom. And the spirit of Egypt shall be made void in the midst of it; and I will destroy the counsel thereof; and they shall seek unto the idols, and unto the charmers, and to them that have familiar spirits, and to the wizards. And I will give over the Egyptians into the hand of a cruel lord; and a fierce king shall rule over them, saith the Lord Jehovah of hosts. And the waters shall fail from the sea, and the river shall be wasted and shall become dry. And the rivers shall stink; the canals of Egypt shall be minished and dried up: the reeds and flags shall wither away. The meadows by the Nile, by the brink of the Nile, and all that is sown by the Nile, shall become dry, be driven away, and be no more. The fishers also shall lament and all they that cast angle into the Nile shall mourn, and they that spread nets upon the waters shall languish. Moreover they that work in combed flax, and they that weave white cloth shall be ashamed. And her pillars shall be broken in pieces, and all they that work for hire shall be grieved in soul.
>
> The princes of Zoan are utterly foolish; the counsel of the wisest counsellors of Pharaoh is become brutish: how say ye unto Pharaoh, I am the son of the wise, the son of ancient kings? Where then are thy wise men? and let them tell thee now; and let them know what Jehovah of hosts hath purposed concerning Egypt. The princes of Zoan are become fools, the princes of Noph are deceived; they have caused Egypt to go astray who are the corner stone of her tribes. Jehovah hath mingled a spirit of perverseness in the midst of her: and they have caused Egypt to go astray in every work thereof, as a drunken man staggereth

in his vomit. Neither shall there be for Egypt any work which head or tail, palm branch or rush, may do.

In that day shall Egypt be like unto women: and it shall tremble and fear because of the shaking of the hand of Jehovah of hosts which he shaketh over it. And the land of Judah shall become a terror unto Egypt, every one to whom mention is made thereof shall be afraid, because of the purpose of Jehovah of hosts which he purposeth against it.

In that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan, and swear to Jehovah of hosts. One shall be called the city of destruction [or perhaps, the sun].

In that day shall there be an altar to Jehovah in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to Jehovah. And it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto Jehovah of hosts in the land of Egypt; for they shall cry unto Jehovah because of the oppressors, and he shall send them a saviour and a defender, and he shall deliver them. And Jehovah shall be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know Jehovah in that day; yea, they shall worship with sacrifice and oblation, and shall vow a vow unto Jehovah, and shall perform it. And Jehovah shall smite Egypt, smiting and healing; and they shall return unto Jehovah, and he shall be intreated of them, and shall heal them.

In that day shall there be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria; and the Egyptians shall worship with the Assyrians.

In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth: for that Jehovah of hosts hath blessed them, saying, Blessed be Egypt, my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance.

1. The accurate description of these three lands as "in the midst of the earth" is to be observed. This they are, geographically and politically.

2. It is significant that this series of predictions has not had fulfilment. The proof is:

(*a*) There has never been a time when the land of Judah has been a terror to Egypt. The reverse was frequent of old (verse 17).

(*b*) Nor have five cities in Egypt used Hebrew as their language (verse 18).

(*c*) Nor has there been a continuous highway from Mesopotamia into Egypt through Palestine (verse 23).

(*d*) Nor have the peoples of these two lands unitedly (or at all) worshipped the God of Israel, Jehovah (verse 23).

(*e*) Certainly these three peoples have never been a conjoint blessing to the earth, though often a source of misery (verses 24, 25).

3. In the time of Isaiah, Assyria, Judah, and Egypt were the central powers of the earth, the first and the third aiming at world supremacy. He and other prophets boldly foretold the overthrow of these three powers, and gave much detail of how this would be effected in each case. It may be thought not to demand much courage to predict the downfall of these empires, for all kingdoms come to an end in turn. But it did require divine foreknowledge to describe the differing circumstances of their overthrow, and still more so to declare in advance that a time would come when they would revive *simultaneously*. The three lands experienced the precise destructions foretold, and long after the prophet's day, and now we see the announced resuscitation of them all going on before our eyes.

Egypt and Iraq have been set on their feet as sovereign powers, and Palestine is in process of recovery after the centuries of spoliation by Romans, Saracens, and Turks. A highway, and a railroad, are in use from Egypt to Palestine; motor traffic from the latter to Assyria is in operation, and a railway is projected.

4. There is thus rational ground for expecting the rest of Isaiah's predictions as to these lands will be fulfilled, possibly in the not too distant future. And the final and happy issue will be that they will be "a blessing in the midst of the earth" (verse 24), centres from which will radiate to the nations the mercies of Almighty God. This is a consummation devoutly to be desired. The same prophets give much detail as to this restoration, even as they did to earlier desolations. The precise fulfilment of the latter guarantees the exact fulfilment of the former.

There are indeed writers on these themes who deny to the Jewish race any national future, and aver that the Old Testament prophecies concerning them are being fulfilled in the present bringing of Jews and Gentiles to faith in Christ. These writers teach that the church of God of the New Testament is the sole inheritor of the promises to Israel in the Old Testament.

Let such writers face the exact terms of the divine announcement before us. Israel is expressly conjoined as "a third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth; for that Jehovah of hosts hath blessed them, saying Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance." If "Israel" is to be evaporated of all meaning and distinctiveness by being merged into quite another society of mankind, known as the church of God, what race and nation is to be the "third" with the other two peoples named?

They who thus expunge Israel must also expunge Egypt and Assyria; they must declare that these names also have no meaning;

that the whole prophecy has neither sense nor fulfilment; that the declared purpose that these original world centres shall be the final world centres, but then centres of divine grace to the whole earth, will never be fulfilled. They must also ignore the present and evident trend of events in those countries, the apparent providential overrulings laying a foundation for the future here plainly predicted. On their view they ought to offer an adequate explanation of why God has preserved Israel for nineteen centuries as a racial entity, in spite of devastations sufficient to have destroyed any small people.

5. But the prophecy predicts a dark night to precede the radiant morn. The main features of this period of distress are deeply significant for all nations, for the general proceedings of the law and judgments of God are alike in all cases.

In a former generation a Judge of Assize was informing a suitor that he had come to the wrong Court. He mentioned several kinds of legal proceedings that were available, and added that, should the suitor say that he could not afford such costly litigation, he must inform him that this is not a land in which there is one law for the rich and another for the poor! Sardonic as to the then law of England, since the rich could seek redress but the poor could not. But it is strictly and righteously true of the law of God. Riches give no advantage in His Court, neither to the wealthy person nor the wealthy nation. The proceedings He will take against Egypt, as declared in this prophecy, are such as He takes against any nation when its time for judgment arrives. The following features are prominent:

(i) "Behold, Jehovah rideth upon a swift cloud and cometh into Egypt (verse 1)." For long periods, perhaps centuries, the rule of heaven over lands is left to the angel authorities before considered (ch. III). But at crisis hours God Himself intervenes personally. Various instances are found in His Book, of which we cite three early examples.

(*a*) Genesis 11. Two thousand or more years B.C., when the human family was still one society with one language, they resolved to build a city and a tower which should be a permanent glory and a centre round which they should cohere. Thus they would defy the command of God to replenish and subdue the whole earth. To deal with this rebellious scheme "*Jehovah came down* to see the city and the tower" (verse 5); and again, after perhaps returning to confer with that counsel of rulers before described, He said, "Come, *let us go down* and there confound their language" (verse 7).

(*b*) As before noted (ch. III), some centuries later, when the

recommendation was put forward that Sodom and Gomorrah should be blotted off the earth, the supreme Judge said, "*I will go down* now and see" (Genesis 18 : 20, 21).

(*c*) Four centuries later again when the time had come to bring the descendants of Abraham, enslaved in Egypt, into possession of the land granted to their ancestors, God appeared to Moses in the burning bush and said, "I have surely seen the affliction of My people . . . and *I am come down* to deliver them" (Exodus 3 : 7, 8). One detail of the ensuing proceedings should be noted: "against *all the gods* of Egypt I will execute judgments. I am Jehovah" (Exodus 12 : 12).

In ch. 19 of his prophecy, here in view, Isaiah foretells that at the close of the present age Egypt is to experience a repetition of that early and awful visitation: "*Jehovah cometh* into Egypt." Malachi 3 : 1–6 shows that the land of Israel will be visited at the same time: "the Lord whom ye seek will *suddenly come* to His temple. . . . behold, *He cometh.*" And the effects will be as in Egypt, even severe purifying judgment and resultant worship and blessing.

"It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" (Hebrews 10 : 31), as Israel found in the days of David (2 Samuel 24 : 14). Seventy thousand of the people died in one day. It is a fearful thing for a land when the Great King takes the field in person. His movement is sudden and irresistible. It is a *swift* cloud of holy wrath upon which He rushes invisibly upon His hardened foes. The storm may gather long, but it bursts suddenly.

(ii) When God thus intervenes in wrath one of His first objectives is any *false religion* that He finds deluding and debasing the people: "*the idols* of Egypt shall tremble at His presence." We have just before noted that, when He visited Egypt of old, judgment was executed against its *gods*, as well as its king, princes and populace.

According to the Bible prophecies of the End Days, idolatry will then prevail in Egypt, Palestine (Isaiah 2 : 8, 18, 20; Zephaniah 1 : 4–6) and Assyria (Isaiah 21 : 9; Jeremiah 50 : 2; 51 : 17, 47, 52).[1] At present these lands are Mohammedan. This requires either that by then Islam will have ceased to be the religion of these countries, or will have itself succumbed to idolatry. The early Arabian tribes out of which it emerged were idolaters. Such a change would be no more than an extension of the reverence paid to the Black Stone at Mecca, which has always been the central point of Moslem worship.

[1] For a full proof that Babylon will be rebuilt, and be the world-centre at the close of this age, see my *The Revelation of Jesus Christ*, chapter XII. The discussion is also available as a pamphlet.

But the term "idols" here can scarcely mean the blocks of stone or metal. A human conqueror may show his spite or contempt by smashing these, as the kings of Assyria did of old (Isaiah 37 : 18, 19); but God will not directly deal with these mere symbols of religion. It is the vital element at which He will strike, which is as follows :

A primary objective of Satan and his kingdom is to rob the Most High of the devotion and worship which are His sole right and to attract it to themselves. In the idol, as a visible symbol, there lurks and works a fallen spirit. Intelligent heathen understand this very well. In South India I inspected one of the thousand wayside shrines. Within there sat a rudely carved block of wood robed in tawdry tinsel. Every year the devotees provide a new image and hold a ceremony invoking the demon to abandon the image of the year just closed and take up his dwelling in the new. Behind the shrine lay several of the discarded idols, no longer sacred, but again mere blocks of wood, since the demon had forsaken them.

This is the regular explanation of idolatry given in the Bible, and given by men familiar with the matter. Fourteen centuries B.C. Moses said : "They sacrificed unto demons, which were no god" (Deuteronomy 32 : 17). Some centuries later a psalmist wrote : "They served their idols . . . yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto demons" (Psalm 106 : 36, 37). Fifteen centuries after Moses, Paul said : "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice unto demons, and not to God" (1 Corinthians 10 : 20).

This explanation of idolatry is common to all races and all periods. And it is rational. It requires some singularly powerful inducement to constrain parents to murder their own children. To honour a block of wood were insufficient for this, but to propitiate a demon that is feared for its malignity, or to obtain its urgently-needed help, is a more reasonable motive and spur to the atrocity.

The Roman Catholic offers essentially the same explanation when he avers that he does not direct his prayer to the picture or image, but through these to "Mary" or "Gabriel" or "Peter." Nor is there any other explanation of the powerful, all-pervasive influence of the system upon untold millions of men, including persons of high intelligence. No heathen of old supposed that the oracular advice or orders given at Delphi came from the *image* of Apollo, but from Apollo himself.

Therefore when Jehovah said that He would execute judgment upon the *gods* of Egypt, He meant that He would deal with the *fallen spirits* who dominate mankind through this system of

worship. This also the ancient world would understand better than the modern westerner, for they knew that in early times there had been a rebellion against the supreme Deity by angels they called the Titans, and that these had been cast down from their high realms to the deepest and most dreadful part of the underworld, called in Greek *Tartarus*. This the New Testament certifies as being in its essence historic. " God spared not angels when they sinned, but cast them down to Tartarus, and committed them to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment " (2 Peter 2 : 4). And so Jude : " Angels which kept not their own principality, but left their proper habitation, he hath kept in everlasting bonds under darkness unto the judgment of the great day " (verse 6). Jude then compares their sin to that of the men of Sodom in " going after strange flesh," as when men gratify their lust with beasts (Leviticus 20 : 15, 16), and as angels did with women both before and after the flood, as recorded in Genesis 6 : 1–7. This abomination precipitated the judgment of the Flood and the destruction of the giant races of Canaan. This is the meaning of angels " leaving their proper habitation," that is, abandoning the heavenly form in which they are by nature clothed, and assuming a human form for the evil purpose indicated.

It is to this condign judgment of angel princes that God refers when expostulating with other angel rulers long after. For their injustice as judges He threatens them thus, unless they amend their ways :

> I said, Ye are gods,
> And all of you sons of the Most High,
> Nevertheless ye shall die like Adam,
> And *fall like one of the princes*.

That is, like one of those former angel princes (Psalm 82 : 6, 7).

Thus shall it be with the demon gods of Egypt at the time when God shall again visit that land of idolatry. And the public effects of this drastic disturbance in that scene behind the scenes must needs be tremendous, comparable to what would result in a land were its Cabinet and Civil Service, the instigators and organizers of public affairs, suddenly and wholly paralysed. Public life would immediately be in confusion, and the consequent uncertainty would produce consternation and general alarm. And thus Isaiah declares that when, in that coming day, the gods of Egypt tremble, then, " the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it " (19 : 1). The latter is the natural accompaniment of the former.

For in human affairs there are two chief stabilizing and consolidating factors, the family and religion. To defend these

men have always gone to the extreme of effort and sacrifice. In his *Lay of Horatius* Macaulay showed well how these two influences interest and inspire men.

Then out spake brave Horatius,
The Captain of the Gate:
"To every man upon this earth
Death cometh soon or late;
And how can man die better
Then facing fearful odds,
For the ashes of his fathers,
And the temples of his gods,

"And for the tender mother
That dandled him to rest,
And for the wife who nurses
His baby at her breast,
And for the holy maidens
Who feed the eternal flame,
To save them from false Sextus
That wrought the deed of shame."

Father, mother, wife, baby are the family; temples, gods, consecrated maidens, the eternal flame are the religion. With consummate art the poet *interwove* these two realms of interest as *combining* to impel the Captain to unreserved self-sacrifice.

When the northern barbarians broke up the Roman Empire it was the Church, that is, religion, that remained the cohesive element of society, surviving the tempest and forming the rallying centre for a new era.

When in 1917 Almighty God visited Russia in judgment, the Revolutionaries, who were His unconscious and unwilling instruments of wrath, set themselves deliberately to destroy family life and the Church (the Greek Orthodox). In consequence the cohesion of the race was impaired and a new religion had to be imposed, namely, the worship of "the State," concentrated in the worship of Lenin deceased, that is, hero-worship.

It had been so a century earlier when God in righteous wrath visited France; the Revolutionaries set themselves to destroy a false religion (the Roman Catholic Church). They were not so foolish as to suppose they could create the new France of their dreams so long as the old religion prevailed.

Thus it will be in Egypt at the time that Isaiah foretells (ch. 19). God will drive from power the invisible rulers, who use religion as a chief means to control the people. This sudden removal of

the organizing, consolidating force will produce disorganization and dismay: "the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it" (verse 1), and "the spirit of Egypt shall fail in the midst of it" (verse 3). Now a dereligionized, demoralized, decentralized people will be a disconcerted and dispirited people and will succumb to whatever terrors attack it.

(iii) Verse 2. Another measure which God takes in judgment is to incite family, social, and civil strife: brothers, neighbours, cities, and kingdoms within an empire find themselves at variance. Antagonisms and contentions, native to the selfishness of mankind, assert themselves when the co-ordinating and restraining influence of common religion is destroyed, as just before noted.

(iv) A further measure God takes is to destroy the natural resources of a land. In the case of Egypt this means a failure of the Nile. Cultivatable Egypt is simply the strip of land fertilized by its one river. Should this fail, the land would quickly be as the vast deserts that surround it. In Upper Egypt not far from Assuan is the little island of Sehili in the Nile. I have seen on it the rock inscription which tells that for seven successive years the Nile failed to flood and of the famine that resulted. Scholars put this inscription at about 1700 B.C.; the era of Joseph (Genesis 41). What has been can be again, and in this passage God says that it will be. The "sea" (verse 5), is still the term by which Egyptians speak of the Nile. I have heard it used, and when the river overflows in August and September, and the shallow waters are miles in width, the term is quite appropriate.

The immediate and disastrous effects of this failure of the river will be want of fish; destruction and prevention of crops; lack of reeds and flags for roofing, baskets, fuel, and weaving of clothes; with consequent breakdown of industry, unemployment, and famine. A disastrous situation indeed.

Why did England think it worth while to spend blood and treasure in driving the Italians from Abyssinia? Was it not because, had the latter held the mountain lakes whence the Nile flows, Egypt would have been at their mercy? When the time of God to do this comes, no Great Power shall prevent it.

It is more difficult than some think to decide whether this or that disturbance of the seasons is a judgment by God. But if the 1947 frosts and floods in England were not a *judgment* they were at least a *warning* of what the Creator and Controller of the universe can do to a godless nation. Has the warning been taken to heart? Certainly not by such as that public person who at the time complained of "this beastly" weather, or by those statesmen and officials who blamed the winter for disturbing their plans

for fuel and food but blamed not themselves for their godlessness.

(v) But not only the common people, such as the tradesmen and artisans, are afflicted; the great men also are visited. The masses may be foolish and times may be hard, but wise statesmen have frequently steered public affairs through storms into calm. But when the people become quarrelsome and demoralized and then the princes prove foolish, what hope of steadiness and recovery is left?

And God here says that the princes, the wisest counsellors of state, those who should be the corner stone of national affairs, the foundation upon which the security of the public structure depends, shall become "brutish," that is, as ignorant, stupid, obstinate, and brutal as a brute beast.[1] Becoming fools and being deceived, they in turn lead the people astray in every work, devising useless measures, until the situation is as distressing and disgusting as when a drunken man staggers about in his own vomit (verses 11–14).

(vi) This miserable helpless state is brought about by Jehovah mingling a *spirit of perverseness* in the people (verse 14). As mingled strong drink induces the giddiness of intoxication, so does a perverse spirit disturb and impair the judgment. Perception is blurred, the sense of distance and proportion is destroyed; events that are certain and near are thought improbable or remote; and the wise fool refuses counsel, stubbornly hastens on where angels might fear to tread, and so rushes to his doom and drags many to ruin.

We have remarked before on this perverseness in Hitler, and its tragic consequences for Germany and the world. But need the British cross the Channel to find this dread element of mind and action? It will be seen shortly that I have some acquaintance with English working men. I believe that still, in spite of the hardening influence of war, the more part of them would stoutly defend women and children and the sick from attempted injury. Yet we have witnessed of late the strange and alarming feature that vast numbers of these normally kind and decent men will, for the sake of securing some small and selfish advantage, deprive hundreds of thousands of women, little children, and invalids, as well as the aged, of most necessary foods, as, for example, of milk. That enormous quantities of food must spoil matters nothing; that they break contracts, defy their own elected leaders, and also the Government which they themselves helped to put

[1] See Psalm 49: 10; 73: 22; 92: 6; Proverbs 12: 1; 30: 2; Jeremiah 10: 8, 14, 21; 51: 17; Ezekiel 21: 31.

into office, is all of no moment; that they and their own families must share the need and trouble which they cause does not seem to weigh with them.

Moreover, it is seen that masses of men will take this rough and senseless course about questions with which they have no direct concern, such as disputes occurring hundreds of miles away, and which men of sense would leave alone. Nor are they deterred by such sharp experience as Solomon described in the words: "He that passeth by and vexeth himself with strife belonging not to him, is like one that taketh a dog by the ears" (Proverbs 26 : 17). Only a fool would seize an oriental cur by the ears.

Now, the most sinister feature of this most unreasonable and unrighteous conduct is that it seizes vast numbers, even tens of thousands, of men at one time, and suddenly, and in areas remote from one another. What sufficient explanation can be offered other than that of unseen spirit beings spread over wide regions, directed by a common plan, acting secretly and urgently upon the minds of myriads at once? It is a movement similar to that incident when, by the permission of the Son of God, a legion of demons entered suddenly into two thousand swine and drove them over a precipice into the sea (Luke 8 : 33).

But England is witnessing something which may prove still more harmful to the public weal. A Government is using its huge majority in Parliament to force upon the nation vast social changes which must deeply affect the whole people and the whole future for good or ill. It has been doing this with the most reckless haste and the most ruthless disregard of a large and important minority of the nation. Apart altogether from the ultimate benefit or harm of the measures themselves, surely it is the most foolish perversity to depart from the traditional and rational principle of compromise by agreement in such general and national affairs. It is difficult to conceive of any course more likely to provoke that dissatisfaction and civil contention above referred to as one of the conditions leading to public disaster. And surely this peril of internal strife is imminent, and, indeed, is deliberately provoked, when a principal Minister of State uses such coarse and provocative language as this: "We know the organized workers of the country are our friends . . . as for the rest they don't matter a tinker's cuss."

Only a few days before the same Minister had spoken in a way that he must have known would deeply distress every lover of Christ, not to say other decent-minded people; for he took the tender prayer for His enemies uttered by the Reedemer when in the agonies of death and applied it flippantly to some whose

complaints about his own actions he resented. His official superior, the Prime Minister, was given in the Commons more than one opportunity to condemn such offensive speech, but, as far as I know, neither he nor any other fellow-Minister did so publicly. It may be confidently assumed that the great Prime Ministers of the last few generations would have compelled a public apology from any subordinate who had used such indecent language, or would even have cashiered him.

It is reliably reported that another principal Cabinet Minister lately swore at a deputation of employers who waited upon him. It is deplorable that public men thus revive the vicious habit of speech of former generations which the fear of God had made disreputable in England.

Alas for a land when God allows it to choose for rulers men hard of heart, vulgar of speech, and with no fear of Him before their eyes. When such have been long enough under the debasing influence of wielding power they can easily become tyrants, and there shall be provoked a repetition of the history, " I have given thee a king in Mine anger, and have taken him away in My wrath " (Hosea 13 : 11).

Thus in both the masses and the rulers there is seen just now a spirit of perverseness. Is this to subside and a right and rational spirit to prevail again? or is the Most High abandoning to an evil spirit this people that has so largely abandoned Him?

(vii) This leads on to the further blow that God will inflict upon Egypt for its chastening, humbling, and ultimate blessing. " I will give over the Egyptians into the hands of a cruel lord; and a fierce king shall rule over them, saith the Lord, Jehovah of hosts " (verse 4). This may be the Antichrist (see pp. 235–237).

Tyrants seize power by craft and force: this is the human and outward side. But God uses them as instruments of His holy wrath; He so manipulates affairs that a wicked people is inescapably shut up into the power of a godless and violent ruler: this is the divine and secret side. The direct purpose for which God has ordained human authority is the support of virtue and the restraint of vice (Romans 13 : 1–7; 1 Peter 2 : 13–17). Rulers often reverse this and promote injustice. For so doing God duly punishes them; yet at the same time, by allowing evil to display itself fully in oppression by a cruel ruler, He creates a general recognition of its true nature and some revulsion from it towards righteousness and order. In wrath He remembers mercy.

This process has had, and is having, large fulfilment in modern history.

In century eighteen France was oppressed by a cruel king and the aristocracy. But the Revolutionaries were yet more cruel; and the nation was then shut up into the hand of one harder of heart than them all—Napoleon Bonaparte.

Let the reader look into the eyes that glare from any portrait of Hitler, and notice also the knit brow and thin lips, and he will see that modern Germany was indeed given over into the hand of a cruel lord, who has gone down laden with eternal infamy.

But before Hitler rose to view Russia had been handed over to such cruel and fierce leaders. The Romanoffs and the Russian aristocracy were callous enough, but the three great Revolutionaries who destroyed them far exceeded them in ruthless and wholesale barbarity. Does history record any such Triumvirate as Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin? Has such extensive and horrible oppression been known before or since? Has such avowed, determined, thorough, atheistic revolt against the Most High God ever defied high heaven and crushed mercy and morality?

Lenin and Trotsky are gone to render account to the God and the Judge Whom they blasphemed. Stalin remains. His atheism is a definite rejection of Christian witness, for his own mother "fearlessly and faithfully confessed her Christian faith even as she died." *The Times* (November 30th, 1928) wrote of "his brutal and uncompromising desire for autocratic power." That article showed that even Lenin distrusted him. On December 25th, 1922, only thirteen months before his death on January 21st, 1924, he wrote: "Comrade Stalin as the Secretary-General has concentrated a formidable power in his own hands, and I am not at all certain that he will always know how to use this power with the necessary prudence," and ten days later he recommended that he be removed from that place of influence.

But Stalin prevailed. Lenin died, Trotsky was driven to exile and death, but not before he had charged Stalin with "the cruel massacre of the Chinese proletariat." Cruelty has indeed been the very breath of his life.[1]

The world has been nauseated with the horrors of German concentration camps, but who will describe the equally fearful

[1] See Bernard Pares' *Russia*, 144: "The question became a personal feud between Trotsky and Stalin, on both sides regardless and ruthless. . . ." Of the first Five Year's Plan (1928–1933): "Its success, in all its earlier phases, depended upon pitiless compulsion. . . . Stalin was from primitive Georgia, where, if they think necessary, they shoot on sight. His method in the suppression of opposition was extinction of the presumed opponent, and anything was done to prove the presumption. Russia had had a partial holiday from the Terror, but now it returned in full force."

horrors of the wholesale banishments to frozen Siberia, the ruthless cruelties of slave labour in northern forestry, the brutal eviction of Christian farmers and peasants driven from their homes in rags to die of starvation?

> We are chased with dogs . . . they take all gold teeth out of the mouths of people, they tear men to pieces, some of our brethren have already suffered the death of a martyr, some have been tormented on the rack [literally, stretch-beds]. . . . Almost all have lost their right to vote and that means death of hunger. . . . The great plan of the Government is to introduce the so-called Collective Economy, which means that all family life has to be given up, with all its consequences.

Thus wrote sufferers in letters in the winter of 1929/1930. According to the *Reader's Digest* for May, 1947, condensing a forthcoming book, *Nothing but their Chains*, not less than fourteen millions of men are to-day toiling and dying in enforced servitude, under the most brutal and degrading conditions.

Most determined efforts were made to deprave morals. There was an organization for this foul purpose. In one district this end was not being reached sufficiently quickly to please the authorities. A band of young men was sent to the area and in six months the doctors had to report that fifty per cent. of the unmarried girls were with child. The continuing effect of this debauching of youth is seen to-day in the appalling violence to women by Russian soldiery in occupied territories.

The virtual atheism of pantheism was the root of the dreadful doings of the Nazis. In Russia the root was *avowed* atheism, violent, aggressive atheism. In 1929 the Constitution was altered expressly to combat religion and to forbid its being propagated, yet to sanction *anti*-religious propaganda. There was an Association of the Godless for the express purpose of extirpating all religion. In 1938 its Leader publicly declared this objective and predicted that by 1967, the jubilee of the Revolution, "the whole Union, with its 230 millions of inhabitants, will be completely godless. Churches, cathedrals, and the like will then be merely mementos of bygone times." Of course, this attempt has failed and will fail; but such is the character of Bolshevik rule; and of this vicious, ruinous system Stalin has been the chief remaining instigator and personification.[1]

This is the man that was praised by the obsequious new Acting

[1] The above information and quotations I gained at the time in Poland and Germany from reliable Christian sources.

Patriarch of all Russia when in 1944, for political reasons, he allowed a resumption of public services by the Greek Orthodox Church. The Patriarch said he was "a wise leader placed by the Lord over our great nation." And we may indeed regard him as having been granted power by the God he abhors, but surely it is as a "cruel lord" empowered for the execution of the righteous judgment of heaven.

This is the tyrant with whom, and with his like-minded associates, Western statesmen have been unwise enough to make compacts and to support with vast material supplies. Better it would have been for the West and for the world had the two anti-God powers, Germany and Russia, been left to exhaust one another yet more completely, instead of the Russian rulers being now in a position to defy and delay every attempt to re-establish general order and peace. The Western statesmen are experiencing a bitter fulfilment of the Hausa proverb, that the lamb got its deserts by going to dinner with the hyena, or of the English proverb that he who sups with the devil needs a long spoon, or he gets nothing out of the meal.

As before mentioned, Jehoshaphat, the God-fearing king of Judah, made a treaty of alliance with the idolatrous Ahab of Israel, and joined him in war. His life was spared in battle, though what he lost in men and munitions we are not told. The prophet of Jehovah reproved him with the challenging words: "Shouldest thou help the wicked, and love them that hate Jehovah? for this thing wrath is upon thee from Jehovah" (2 Chronicles 19: 1, 2).

Jehoshaphat appears to have taken this to heart, for when thereafter a vast army from beyond Jordan invaded his land, he did not turn to human alliances, but proclaimed a fast before Jehovah. The whole nation responded, God answered their public cry, rewarded their united confidence in Him, and granted complete deliverance (2 Chronicles 20).

In this he followed the example of his royal father, Asa, who had similarly appealed publicly unto Jehovah when attacked by an overwhelmingly superior enemy. God had then granted a decisive victory to the inferior force that had relied on Him (2 Chronicles 14).

Both these monarchs later declined in trust in God and therefore turned to alliances with the godless. Asa was faced with attack by his near neighbour, the king of Israel. He sent to the next neighbour, the king of Syria, bribed him to break faith with the king of Israel, obtained his help, and the king of Israel left the field. But God sent a prophet who reminded Asa of the former deliverance because he had then relied on Jehovah, and

told him that his present lack of faith had cost him the loss of victory over Syria, which was really his enemy, though for the nonce it had helped him; as also that for want of the protection of Jehovah from whom he had turned, he should thenceforth have wars. "For," said the prophet, "the eyes of Jehovah run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him" (2 Chronicles 16). The reference to the whole earth shows that this concern as well as the activity of God apply to all nations. Israel is an example by which God teaches universal principles.

Similarly Jehoshaphat forgot the former reproof and the former encouragement to rely on God and entered into alliance with Ahaziah, the wicked son of the wicked Ahab, which sin God visited by the destruction of his navy (2 Chronicles 20 : 35–37).

Would that of late years England had been ruled by men who themselves were ruled by the fear of God and inspired with real confidence in Him; then could they and this people have faced German aggression with quietude and courage, without turning to God-hating men for help; then the Almighty could have interposed more notably; then the after-war complications with these godless and treacherous "allies," who are really enemies (as was Syria to Israel), could have been avoided. But "without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing unto God, for he that cometh to God must believe that he exists, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him" (Hebrews 11 : 6). They who do not seek Him are left to their own poor resources and devices. England is finding out that Russia is to her what Egypt was to Israel of old, "a bruised reed, whereon if a man lean it will go into his hand and pierce it" (Isaiah 36 : 6).

How vivid are these oriental similes; how living are these ancient histories! Happy are they that heed them!

CHAPTER X

EGYPT AND THE MIDDLE EAST (CONTINUED) ENGLAND AND THE CRUEL LORD

SINCE THE WHOLE EARTH IS THUS VISITED BY THE DEALINGS of God, what of England? Surely there are signs that the Most High is acting in the same way with this people that has turned from Him. Is not the land being quietly but effectively handed over to the power of a cruel lord called MONOPOLY? Is this not evident in the three chief realms of commerce, labour, government?

1. *Monopoly in Commerce.*

Fifty-five years ago, in my youth, it was already a saying that a limited company has no soul. I could name a man, proprietor of such a company, who boasted that he would shut down every shop in his line in that area. With one exception he succeeded. What trusts and societies have accomplished in this way is common knowledge, as are the ruthless methods often employed and the ruin of many involved. The specious plea offered was that reduction in competition would reduce costs and prices, to the benefit of the public. In some cases it may have so worked for a time, but the general effect was not this, but the increase of profits to the combines.

In a large market town the butchers had an understanding not to bid against each other at market; so that each bought cattle from the farmers at a low price, and then they all sold to the public at high prices. A ring of hardware manufacturers had a monopoly in various household requisites. A retailer of high character told me that if he should buy outside that combine any line that one of these manufactured, he would be unable to get such goods as they alone made. Travellers and merchants remember how inconsiderate railway companies were until road competition compelled some change. Human nature is seldom able to resist the greed and heartlessness almost inseparable from monopoly. How many a village tradesman has been known to retire from business early when he was the sole supplier of his line of goods. When such men, makers or sellers, combine the evil is intensified.

It is no doubt true that some concerns have grown large without trampling on justice and mercy; but the temptation to degenerate

is constant and severe, and usually is held in check only by one or two upright men, at whose departure selfishness too often prevails in the boardroom.

In the modern world this blood-sucking Vampire, Monopoly in trade, has swollen prodigiously ; and to meet it some theorists are pressing the plan of transferring monopoly to " the State." We shall look at this closely a little later. Here it will suffice to ask whether human nature becomes more tender and generous by being aggregated ? Is a mountain less hard than separate stones ?

2. *Monopoly in Labour.*

This subject I approach with sympathies naturally with workers rather than with masters, for I am one of the former class as to earthly status. My grandfather was an ordinary man of the country-side, differing from his fellows only in exceptional strength of body. He left to my father three things, but these were of priceless worth —an honest name, a delight in work, a magnificent constitution.

Thus sufficiently endowed, at the age of twelve my father left his North Devon home, alone, for London, a journey then, in 1850, of two days and a night, by coach and rail. Some time before leaving, though so young, he had colour-washed the outside of the two-storied house where the family lived, and had also taken to pieces, cleaned, and *put together again* a grandfather clock. It remained in our family, and kept good time, for nearly a hundred years.

He went to the big city as apprentice to a firm of drapers on the south-east side. As was common with apprentice boys, he slept under the shop counter. At school he had not been taught many of the things that to-day are stuffed into young minds, often to little practical profit, but he had been trained in three items of real value—respect for and obedience to superiors, to figure accurately, and to write a beautiful copperplate hand.

He remained with that firm for fifty years and saw it become a wholesale business turning over three-quarters of a million a year. By honesty, capacity, and industry he had long risen to be head of the counting-house. When the ever-increasing pressure of that responsible position began to tax his powers, he retired (with no pension) and earned a sufficient income by keeping the books of small firms. At the ripe age of eighty-two he wrote to me that he had just relinquished his last bit of accountancy work, and he added, " for the first time in seventy years I find myself out of employment."

To-day wiseacres who did not live in the Victorian period affect to despise it. This is in order to extol their own notions and measures as being of superior quality. My father was one

of very, very many who showed that, even under the undoubted difficulties of a hundred years ago, a youth without any advantage from birth, wealth, or education, but of grit and integrity, could secure an honourable career and bring up a family of seven in sufficient comfort.

I have spoken lately with just such another, a man of seventy-nine years. At eight years of age he started as a half-timer. Eldest of a family of fourteen, at twelve years he left school and worked for several years under hard employers. This developed character, and by hard work, perseverance, and integrity he made his way. He studied chemistry, rose to be managing director of a smelting works, and ended with a salary of £1,000 a year. It is only a few years since he retired. He, too, brought up a family well.

In the present boastful age such families are seldom reared. In many cases there are no doubt good reasons, such as the physical condition of one or both parents; but the plain reason usually given is that parents cannot afford it. This seems to show that, with all the increase of material comforts, conditions of life have not improved in essentials, but have deteriorated.

But there is another feature which my friend just mentioned and my father would have stressed as easily the dominant factor of their careers, namely, the fear of God. Sometime in his teens my father was brought to a personal acquaintance with God through faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Before me lies a good-sized Bible. It is elegantly inscribed as follows:

> Presented to G. and S. LANG by their Sons and Daughters, as a token of their sincere affection, With their earnest prayer to its Almighty Author that by the aid of His Holy Spirit they may receive with meekness the engrafted Word; which is able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ, our Lord.

This inscription of fifteen lines was done by my father with the pen, with nine varieties of ornamental lettering, and with exquisite flourishings. He was then nineteen years of age. It reveals much. It shows that before he was twenty he already had some understanding of the respective parts taken by the Father, the Son, and the Spirit in the work of salvation; that this knowledge comes to man through the Word of God, the Bible; that the message must be received with meekness and faith; that this faith must be placed upon Jesus Christ, and upon Him as our personal LORD, the One to Whose authority we submit; and that earnest prayer to God as the Almighty is the privilege, the resource, and the duty of man. These prayers by the children were duly answered by God in the enlightenment and salvation of their parents.

I am painfully aware that the whole series of ideas here presented will be unintelligible and uninteresting to the majority of folk to-day, but upon any who may have a heart to heed I press this example, known to me personally, of a man, a type of a vast number of men, in the ordinary walks of life, whose influence through a long career was wholly for good. In business life, in home and social life, in arduous private voluntary labours among the poorest in the slums of London, he adorned his religious profession. Such men are truly salt and light, retarding corruption and diffusing vital knowledge, to the benefit of society and to the eternal welfare of individuals. Such men are not produced by pantheism, atheism, evolution, or political theories; they are a work of God's Spirit, by a new birth of the inward man, upon faith in Christ Jesus. From increasing lack of them society in many lands is degenerating rapidly into the state of ignorance of God, wickedness, and barbarism which is inseparable from godlessness. One day they will all be removed suddenly, and the age will terminate in ruins.

I have spoken of having some acquaintance with working men. The principal of my last school was a Christian and an excellent mechanic in metal and wood. Technical schools were in their infancy, but any boy who chose could use his workshop. There was no complaint that wood was wasted and tools blunted; he was only too pleased to train us in the use of our hands. Also he taught us how to take the elevation of the playground front of the school-house and to make a scale drawing of it. A local builder adjudged the first prize to my drawing for accuracy. I use still the book won, *Every Man His Own Mechanic*. Another local builder saw this drawing and offered to take me into his office. My father had not intended that I should leave school at thirteen, but the family was growing, and he assented. For two and a half years I worked alone with the clerk of the yard, and was constantly in and out of the shops. The clerk was uniformly gentlemanly and kind with the small boy and helped me all he could. I am still grateful to him. But he was an atheist, and, for that period, an advanced Socialist. Thus by the time I was sixteen I had some practical acquaintance with workmen, atheism, and Socialism.

Nowadays legislation which deprives even good parents of their God-given duties and rights towards their children prevents boys from beginning early to qualify for usefulness. For most boys and girls I think that it is in general a mistake. I speak of book knowledge. In arts and crafts, and for those who are clever with their hands, the extra time in technical education may very

well be a gain, and for a few walks in life the highest education is necessary. But as to books, the boy that really loves knowledge will gain enough of it for general life in his spare time, as did my father and myself, for example: whereas one who does not love learning for its own sake is not very likely to profit by the drudgery of extra years of compulsory education. In addition, the discipline of office or workshop is far better for forming useful habits than that of most schools. I speak from experience of lads of varying grades of education who came in under me in my later office life.

At any rate, by the time that most lads usually leave public or secondary schools, with more or less knowledge of books, I knew a good deal of *men* and *affairs* (of which knowledge they are generally destitute, though it is much the more valuable), and by the time I was twenty or twenty-one I was already in charge of the principal spending department of a small insurance company—the claims department. Now that military service is to be compulsory the age at which a youth can become really fit for trade or business is to be still later, which is wholly injurious.

My first wage was five shillings a week; my highest salary seventy pounds a year. In those days, though living from home, I found no difficulty in supplying all my own modest needs, and had some little over for non-personal affairs in which I was interested. But, by the grace of God, I wasted nothing on liquor, tobacco, sport, or gambling.

My service at the builder's was terminated summarily by dismissal without notice on a false pretext, the real reason, as I believe, being that he wished his own son, who had been in the shops, to sit on my stool and learn office routine. This did not endear masters to my young heart. Nor did I love them better when a few years later the managing director of a company I was with tried to force the staff to work an extra half hour a day without extra pay. The attempt was defeated by united protest, headed by the chief clerk, without any trade union to back it.

From my twenty-fifth year I spent nine years in religious and philanthropic service in a great city slum. I know how the poorest of the poor lived in those days, and I know also the wretched part that the liquor trade plays in furthering misery and vice. I knew of the iniquitous wages paid to seamstresses and makers of match-boxes, under conditions that moved Kingsley when he wrote *Alton Locke*.

Later again I lived for sixteen years in a remote village, and visited the poor, the sick, the dying in the remaining relics of dilapidated thatched cottages under conditions that the same writer depicts in *Yeast*.

I have sojourned with the peasantry in many lands, frozen and

torrid. I have lived with Russian peasants in their tiny two-roomed houses; I have slept in the lean-to attached to a poor dwelling in south India, where the coolie toiled for fourpence a day to keep his family; and I have stayed in Egyptian villages where the *fellah* slaved in the burning heat for sevenpence a day, while the princely owner made one hundred thousand pounds a year on sixteen thousand acres of land.

Allowing as I do most fully for the many honest and generous employers, the Cheeryble Brothers of to-day, who greatly adorn and soften the world of commerce and industry, it will be understood that my natural sympathies lie rather with the toilers and the poor.

For fifty years I have watched and pondered these matters and movements, and now, as an old and sympathetic observer, what do I see? I see the effects of a conflict that was presented acutely in an American pamphlet which came into my hands in those early days in the builder's office. It purported to be a heated discussion between an employer and a workman. One pregnant sentence by the workman arrested me, and remains: "When labour unites, let capital look out for itself!"

Well, Labour has united, and what is it doing? It is killing the goose that lays the golden egg, for it is obvious that capital is as indispensable to production as labour; large industries demand that large monies be held by someone. Moreover, what is far, far worse, in the process Labour is suppressing conscience, smothering kindness, and slaying morality. Alas, alas! what shall the end be if not the slavery and misery of Germany and Russia? Organized Labour is demonstrating in England that it can be as ruthless and tyrannical as organized Capital. Fallen human nature is alike in us all, irrepressible, irremediable, implacable, and intractable.

Let me illustrate this from my own observation.

Long years ago there lived in Ayrshire a railway signalman named Kerr, a sterling, resolute Christian respected by all men. In obedience to the injunction to Christians not to be yoked with unbelievers (2 Corinthians 6 : 14 – 7 : 1),[1] Kerr would not join a Union, and never did. He knew well the secretary of the Ayrshire Miner's Union, and, as he told me, he said to him,: "Suppose there is a man whose conscience will not let him join your Union; but he recognizes that he gets some benefit from Union action, and so he is willing to pay the same amount as the Union subscription to some fund for widows or orphans—what would you do?" The secretary replied, "We should leave it at that."

[1] See my pamphlet, *The Unequal Yoke*.

But to-day the Unions will not leave it at that; nor would all of them do so at that former time. Here is an example.

Garnet Thomas was a Welsh miner, by no means pious. When in 1904 the powerful religious awakening swept Glamorganshire, Thomas was one of the thousands renewed and revolutionized. He changed right over from the world to be on the side of the Lord Jesus Christ. No one spoke to him about the matter, but at once he knew in his very heart that he could not remain united in the Union to the enemies of his new Sovereign, and he ceased his subscriptions. The Union delegates found him convinced and resolute, and soon the manager sent for him. The following conversation, as Thomas repeated it to me, ensued:

"Thomas, I hear you have ceased paying your subscription to the Union; why is this?"

Thomas explained it, and the manager continued:

"Well, you are placing me in an awkward position, because the men say they will down tools this afternoon unless you rejoin or are dismissed."

"Are you satisfied with me as a workman, sir?"

"Quite."

"Well, I am quite satisfied with you as a master: what is the trouble?"

"The trouble is what I say, that the men threaten to stop work. What am I to do?"

"You will do as they tell you, sir, and show that you are not really the master here."

"But, Thomas," continued the manager kindly, "you are acting very foolishly. On this line you will be left at the mercy of the world."

(Let it be noted what estimate this man of the world had of the mercy of the world. It is an echo of Proverbs 12: 10: "the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel.")

"That, sir," replied Thomas, "is where you are mistaken. I shall be left at the mercy of my heavenly Father!" And through the long years he proved that God's "tender mercies are over all His works" (Psalm 145: 9).

Or take this case. In the 1914–1918 war a young carpenter went to prison rather than violate his conscience as a Christian by entering the army. When the war was nearly ended he obtained work with an important firm of builders. The same principle that forbade his being yoked in a national organization, the army, naturally hindered him from joining a trade organization, a union. I went to the yard and asked the foreman if I might see him. He assented readily, and said, "Do you know, sir, that there is trouble

here to-day over C.?" "No," I replied. "I am only in the city for an hour or two." "Yes; C. says he is a Christian, and cannot join a Union, and the men say they will down tools at five o'clock unless he joins or leaves."

C. said what I expected, that there would be no trouble, for he would leave and find another job. I told this to the foreman, who was relieved, and then said: "I do not see why a Christian cannot be a member of a Union. I am a Christian and have been a member of a Union, in this same job, for twenty-three years, and have never had any trouble."

To this I replied: "If you never had it before, you have it to-day; for you are obliged to take sides with these ungodly men in driving from employment your brother in Christ for conscience sake."

Shortly he added: "I dare say, sir, that you are right, and that all of us Christian men will presently have to take the stand that C. is taking." I then said: "Your Unions are more tyrannical than the Government they are out to fight; for Government will let a man have a conscience, and will put a conscience clause in even a military service Act, and this at such a time of national peril as the present; but the Trade Unions will not let a man have a conscience at any price."

For the whole Labour movement this is a sorrowful and dangerous position. Expel conscience and you destroy morality. "Göring . . . closed with the significant words: *I have no conscience. My conscience is Adolf Hitler*" (*Hitler Speaks*, 84). Such is the abyss of depravity to which blind devotion to a leader can sink a man. But let the following case illustrate the unique value of a man with a conscience.

When I knew him Thomas Lambert was foreman engineer in a large factory where he had worked for long years. He never joined the Union, but when the men wished to approach the firm they would ask Lambert to be spokesman, and the directors knew that if Lambert would take up a matter there was something into which they ought to look. Thus this honest, decided Christian held the balance between the masters and the men, to the peace of the factory and the advantage of all. So greatly was Tom respected that when he died the directors, though they openly rejected his religious beliefs, closed the works at their own expense in order that they and the whole staff of four hundred men and women might attend the funeral.

In the row where Lambert lived there was a neighbour who was utterly atheistic. They had nothing in common and had no more intercourse than to pass the time of day. The atheist reached his

death-bed, whereupon his irreligious but superstitious wife became distressed that her man should die and nobody "make a prayer to him," as she put it. She begged him to have a clergyman, but, with some consistency, he replied that he had lived without the parson and he would die without him. However, to pacify his wife he at length said, "Well, if you must have somebody let it be Tom Lambert." He had watched Tom for twenty years. He knew he worked hard all the week like himself; yet twice every Sunday he had seen Tom go past to chapel, Bible in hand. He knew the steady, happy, holy life of his neighbour, and that there was something in religion worth while. Tom led that man to faith in Christ, to peace of conscience, to assurance of the pardon of God for his sins, and he died at rest as to eternity.

What atheistic Socialist is any use at the death struggle of a neighbour? Oh, I have watched the death of the godless, with his godless friends sitting by, heartless and helpless, before the King of terrors; the one going out into the darkness, the others remaining dark and callous. My friend F. is a retired locomotive driver. One time he had put with him a stoker named Fred, a rabid Socialist, who, with a perseverance in itself praiseworthy, dinned his opinions into the driver at every possible moment. After some weeks the latter said: "Now, mate, have you said all you want to say on this subject? If not, carry on; I'll listen." But Fred thought he had no more to urge, whereupon the driver said: "I've one question to ask you: What good will Fred D's socialism be to him ten minutes after he's dead?" That compelled Fred to face eternity, and led him to secure his everlasting welfare by faith in the Redeemer of sinners.

Let us in fairness apply the question otherwise and ask: What good will his Toryism be to "my lord" ten minutes after his death?

I know not whether any Labour leader will read these friendly reflections. If such should, I would implore him to ponder the Eastern proverb, Begin nothing without considering what the end will be! Trade Unionism has come far upon essentially the same road as Hitler. Commencing by the attempt to remedy wrongs, it has advanced to the suppression of rights. It must either withdraw its demand that all workers must join its ranks or be denied opportunity to work and live, or it must inevitably become a complete and brutal tyranny, as cruel a lord as ever crushed the weak. And when this stage is reached the overwhelming wrath of the Almighty is at hand. The justice of God demands and secures that monopoly shall be destroyed, whether

it be that of Capital or Labour, of an individual, a body corporate, or the State, and as much in England as in Germany or Russia.

3. *Monopoly in Government.*

The constitutional history of England for almost nine hundred years—that is since the Norman Conquest in 1066—has included as a prominent feature an ever-recurring conflict between the Crown and the subject to establish, to preserve, or to recover their respective privileges, or rights and liberties. So insidious is the corrupting influence of power that the Crown and its officers have continually encroached on the rights of the subject. It was this that constrained the barons to unite to compel King John to grant the Great Charter in 1215; and in the midst of the modern outcry for the destruction of the aristocracy, or at least of their influence, it ought in fairness to be remembered that it was the great nobles who then secured for the people at large, and for seven hundred years, the benefits of the Charter. It was this same encroachment that precipitated the civil wars in the Stuart period, and which led to the accession of William III and the restoration of the liberties of the people at that time.

In modern England the authority of the king personally is little more than nominal. The battle to-day concerns the powers of the chief Executive Officers as against the rights of the people. It is all too little appreciated that since 1940 the subject as against the Executive has *no* legal *rights*, either of person or property, and only so much *liberty* as the Executive sees fit to allow. By the Emergency Powers Defence Act of May 22nd that year the long-drawn conflict was decided wholly in favour of the Executive, and that Act is still in force.

Describing this Act when it was passed *The Times* said that it

> comes near to suspending the very essence of the Constitution as it has been built up in a thousand years. Our ancient liberties are placed in pawn for victory: nothing less than the destruction of Hitlerism can redeem them.

It is several years since Hitlerism was overthrown, but the liberties of the people are still at the mercy of the Executive.

Introducing this Act the Deputy Leader of the Commons, now Prime Minister, said:

> Every private interest must give way to the urgent needs of the community . . . it is necessary that the Government should be given complete control over persons and property—not just some persons or some particular class of the community, but over all persons, rich or poor, employer or worker, man or woman, and all property. (D.T., May 23rd, 1940.)

And that journal added:

> What the measure does, is to place the entire resources of the nation, both human and material, at the disposal and control of the Government.

This Act was introduced, and rushed through both Houses, in a few hours, immediately upon the formidable military disaster at Dunkirk. But it is difficult to believe that so comprehensive and revolutionary a Bill had been suggested by that emergency and promptly drafted to meet it. It was but the extension and climax of similar earlier legislation, and was, it may be supposed, sprung upon Parliament and the country in that crisis, so that the sense of danger then existing should assure its passage into law without opposition or serious discussion. We take it to be a good example of the art with which Executives contrive to increase their powers —powers which once having been gained they are always slow to relinquish. It is within living memory how reluctantly Government abandoned the Defence of the Realm Regulations after the 1918 war terminated.

We need not say much concerning the wideness and often arbitrariness with which the Executive used its unrestricted powers in late years. There was great resentment at treatment endured. Nor do we discuss whether these powers, and deeds done under them, were really indispensable as war-time measures. We will even assume that this was generally so, as it certainly was in some matters, such as where supplies of food were affected. For our purpose it is enough to note how suddenly and completely this country was placed under despotic rule.

It is, however, to the purpose to observe that the very leaders who formerly proclaimed themselves champions of the liberties of the masses against aristocratic and capitalistic oppression have zealously employed these autocratic powers and are maintaining them.

For example, in 1939 one of these leaders (then in Opposition) spoke against the proposal to give to the Home Secretary power to detain persons at his discretion (Regulation 18 (*b*)). He very justly said:

> I am not going to use the argument usually put forward as a matter of courtesy that we do not believe the present Minister would be wicked but we are afraid his successors might be. I think that any Minister is capable of being wicked when he has a body of regulations like this to administer. (*Hansard*, vol. 352, col. 184.)

Yet when, shortly after, this same speaker became Home Secretary in the Coalition Government he not only administered these arbitrary powers, but hotly defended them on the two occasions when the House of Commons was asked to cancel or restrict them. He even threatened to resign if they were withdrawn. The then Prime Minister supported him, and Regulation 18 (*b*) was retained. As many as 1,428 persons were in detention at one time (August, 1940) without warrant of arrest, without trial, without redress. The House of Lords ruled that it had no power to interfere with the discretion of the Home Secretary when he acted under the said Regulation; that the rule of *habeas corpus* no longer applied, and that the Courts had no authority to order the Home Secretary to produce a person detained, in order that the Court might review the case. He was completely in the power of the Home Secretary.

In 1938 I listened in Germany to two friends discussing the harsh treatment of a German by the frontier police of a neighbouring country. I remarked that they should not be surprised that the democratic lands preferred their system of life; for in England they, though foreigners, would be better protected from the English Secret Police than they were from the German in their own land. "Here," I said, "you can be arrested, and detained indefinitely, without any escape. No Court can protect you from the Gestapo. Dr. Niemöller was virtually exonerated by the Court and set free, but Himmler has re-arrested him and he has no remedy. In England, on the contrary, unless a man is caught committing a crime, or is reasonably suspected of being about to do so, before the police can arrest they must get a warrant from a magistrate, and then must forthwith bring him before a Court on a definite charge. If this were not done, application can at once be made to the High Court for a writ of *habeas corpus*, and the Court will order the immediate production of the person and will deal with the matter." I then told of a case which had occurred only three weeks before, when two detectives had been ordered to pay £800 damages to a man whom they had wrongly arrested. My friends were amazed that even the police were under such legal control and liability.

Since May 22nd, 1940, I should not be able to draw this pleasant contrast in favour of England, for though Regulation 18 (*b*) was withdrawn when the war ended, the Executive could re-enforce it to-morrow if they wished, and they have actually retained all other such powers as they find convenient.

It has been said that in England Parliament retains control over the working of the Defence Act and can cancel it, so that the

officers of the Crown are not possessed of absolute power, and that in this respect the position here differs from and is superior to that lately in Germany. In theory this argument is invalid, for Himmler, the head of the Gestapo, was similarly subordinate to Hitler and could be removed by him, or his rules or actions could be cancelled. In fact, such supervision in either case was scarcely more than nominal. The true distinction between the two cases was that in Germany the powers were exercised most brutally, in England more humanely, but in nature and extent they were the same. Not even Hitler and Himmler could get more than *complete* control of *all* persons and *all* property.

Now the Defence Act was but the pushing to the extreme of similar powers which the Executive over a long course of time had been accumulating to itself by various statutes. And since the process has gone on steadily over a lengthy period it is not a matter which concerns one political party more than another, and it will not be altered merely by a change of Government.

Short of such bloody measures as civil war or revolution there has been only one real, one permanent check upon the encroachments of the Crown and its Officers, that is, the inherent power of the High Court to protect the subject against violation of the law by the Executive. Of this there is a famous illustration in German history. The visitor to the former palace of Frederick the Great used to be shown the mill at the confines of the park the noise of which annoyed His Majesty, and the land of which, Ahab like, he wanted for a garden. " The miller sturdily refused to sell it. ' Not at any price ? ' said the King's agent. ' Could not the king take it from you for nothing, if he chose ? ' ' Have we not the Kammergericht [Supreme Court] in Berlin ? ' was the answer." (E.B., ix, 718.) And Frederick did nothing.

In England there were times when the king endeavoured to overcome this check on his activities by tampering with the judges. Happily in modern times any such nefarious move would have resulted in the fall of any Minister or Ministry that had attempted it ; but the Executive has largely secured the same end by subtler means. The method employed has been, and is, to secure the insertion in an Act of clauses giving to the Minister power to make Rules for administering the Act and to enforce them under penalty ; and, lest the subject feeling aggrieved should apply to the Courts on the ground that the Act has not been properly applied, a further power is given to the Minister to certify that the provisions of the statute have been fully met, and his certificate is declared to

be final and conclusive evidence of the point. In this way the Courts are precluded from all inquiry into the matter.

Thus if the subject complains that he has been treated wrongfully, the Minister becomes both defendant and judge of the case; if the Minister complains that the subject has transgressed the law, the Minister becomes both plaintiff and judge of his own case. As between two private parties such a system would unhesitatingly be declared the negation of justice, a glaring iniquity. Yet there exist scores of statutes, involving most of the Departments of Government and covering a vast and ever-widening field of activities and interests, in which the people are deprived entirely of the protection of the Courts and are placed at the mercy of the Government Department concerned.

As far back as 1929 this aggrandisement of the Executive at the expense of the people, and by ousting the Courts, had become so extensive that Lord Chief Justice Hewart took the step, most unusual for a Judge while in office, of publishing a discussion and exposure of the matter. He gave it the significant title *The New Despotism*. But the process which he exposed was not checked, and as recently as 1945 Dr. C. K. Allen, K.C., Doctor of Civil Law, sometime Professor of Jurisprudence in the University of Oxford, issued a fuller and equally unsparing exposure of the system entitled *Law and Orders, an Inquiry into the Nature and Scope of Delegated Legislation and Executive Powers in England.*[1] In this careful and complete treatise the question may be studied at length.

It is hopeful that in this year (1947) there has been passed an Act, long agitated—The Crown Proceedings Act—which affords to the subject extensive rights to sue the Crown in the Courts. This is a step in the right direction. But, as far as I can master its effect, it does nothing to mitigate the injustice mentioned above. Indeed, it has a section similar to those above mentioned; for by Section 40 (3) any Secretary of State can, it would seem, bar proceedings in the Courts on the ground that the liability alleged in the action "arises otherwise than in respect of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom." Upon this question of fact the Secretary's certificate is to be conclusive, and the Courts will not be able to test this point. In this way the obnoxious principle referred to is maintained.

That this Act does not diminish the afore-stated powers seems clear from the fact that at the same time (May, 1947) a Bill was introduced into the House of Lords (The Preservation of the Rights of the Subject Bill) expressly to deal with this matter. The Government opposed it, and it is not likely to become law at

[1] Stevens, Chancery Lane, London.

present. On July 23rd, 1947, the Attorney General, addressing a legal Society, declared that "Administrative law has come to stay." (D.T., July 24th, 1947.)

The statesman before quoted was justified in the fear that the exercise of arbitrary power tends to make men "wicked". There have been examples enough in all ages and lands, including England, and modern England. For example, in regard to cases where the Crown is a litigant, Dr. Allen writes:

> . . . the State, when challenged in the Courts, frequently adopts harassing and obstructive tactics to which no honest man would resort without damage to his good name (268) . . . the conduct of the Government throughout this long litigation can only be described as an abuse of the process of the Courts (269). . . . Incredible though it may sound, the Postmaster-General sued the Corporation [of Liverpool] for the damage which had been caused by his own default. . . . Lord Shaw said that "in the ordinary relations of men, the proposal would be monstrous, and if carried into practice would of course plainly be a tyrannical and unjustifiable act." . . . The total amount of damage at stake in this case was £40. Because the Corporation disputed it, with every reason, it was threatened with, and eventually subjected to, thousands of pounds of costs in the Courts. Once again the technique can only be described as terroristic, and few private citizens could face the menace which a powerful Corporation was able to defy and defeat (270). . . . But censures which would place a lasting stigma on any private person find "neither a body to kick nor a soul to damn" in the great elusive impersonality of the State. . . . The system goes on unperturbed (273).

A large number of senior Judges and other legal authorities are quoted to the same effect in the book referred to, and of numerous examples of this iniquitous system there given the following may be cited:

> . . . Between 1933 and 1939 the English Milk Marketing Board alone imposed penalties amounting to £45,462 for 1,739 offences while the Potato Marketing Board imposed penalties amounting to £5,336 for 1,568 offences . . . the present position is so unsatisfactory as to violate elementary principles of justice. . . . When it is remembered that the defendant may be ruined by the revocation of his licence (and if he trades without it he is liable to prosecution in the ordinary Courts), and that his judges cannot possibly be regarded as impartial, since they are themselves producers pecuniarily interested in the finance of the whole scheme, it is difficult to imagine a greater travesty of a "judicial" proceeding or one more contrary to all accepted notions of procedure and fairness (56).

This system of Departmental and virtually irresponsible government has been increasing during the past forty years. Whereas, therefore, the blame for its existence cannot be placed upon any one political Party, all Parties are responsible for having supported and extended it. The warning of the Lord Chief Justice given in 1929 is much in point :

> If there were any great extension of the system of giving uncontrolled and arbitrary powers to public officials, it is as certain as that night follows day that corruption might creep in. We might then be cursed with the corrupt bureaucrat. The bureaucratic despot we already have. (*The New Despotism*, 40.)

This long series of protests and warnings has been maintained to the present day. In October, 1947, the Marquess of Reading said :

> There seemed to be a steady and deliberate policy to oust, wherever possible, what the Government would regard as the interference of his Majesty's judges. (D.T., October 16th, 1947.)

As to corruption, waiting for a bus the other day a most respectable and intelligent man of my acquaintance plainly asserted that it took place to his knowledge, but as I cannot check his statements I do not repeat details. Yet the mere fact of such allegations indicates how public confidence is weakened to-day ; and when rulers cease to retain the confidence of their subjects they will of necessity be driven to rule by force and to become tyrants.

The " wicked " Minister is the more likely to develop seeing that the standard of morality in this country has been and is steadily declining ; and there is danger that each such Minister will prove to be a " cruel lord ".

Government Monopoly in Commerce is another element in present developments.

This condition virtually exists in finance from the fact that the Treasury possesses power to direct the National Bank (Bank of England), and also power to direct it to direct other banks. By this means one Minister of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, is the potential dictator not only concerning the national purse but also of the whole banking system of the country.

Such monopoly exists, or it is intended shall soon exist, in the large industries—coal, iron, transport, gas, electricity. And even when full monopoly is not vested in the Government, there is a vast measure of ramified control in farming, food, paper, etc.,

in consequence of which the private trader is greatly hampered and distressed.

The conducting of such vast enterprises must needs impose on State officials great perplexities and a severe strain. Individual hardships are inevitable: they will arise however well and kindly public affairs are conducted, and complaint on that ground alone is not reasonable. But will human nature in officials endure such tests and not be hardened? Can such enormous powers be possessed without corrupting those responsible for their exercise? May they not become "wicked"?

Recent tests are not encouraging. Take the sudden suppression in February, 1947, of some 500 public periodicals at the order of one Minister of the Crown. It led one old-established and respected religious journal to write:

> There is irony in the fact that whereas the efforts of the enemy during the war never once prevented publication of *The Christian*, it has been left to "the powers-that-be" in our country to deny to us, and some 500 of our contemporaries, the right to function in a normal manner. . . . This recent revelation of the ease with which a Government Department can close down overnight a considerable section of the Press has shocked all who cherish our essential freedoms. . . . Two Government spokesmen . . . in the House of Lords . . . declared that the Government has authority to ban newspapers under Defence Regulation 55. But such an answer only serves to deepen public disgust. It is intolerable that a Defence Regulation should be invoked to suspend responsible journals in peace time, for no offence whatever, but merely as a measure of administrative convenience. (*The Christian*, March 6th, 1947.)

This journal further drew attention to the discrimination drawn against *religious* periodicals by asking:

> Why were the weekly newspapers with far away the largest circulation—we allude to the Sunday Press—left entirely alone?

Why indeed? What if the deepest reason was to be found in the atheistic spirit of the Minister who acted? If this should be the fact, it becomes a matter for solemn consideration as to the reasons why God permitted such great power in this irreligious land to become vested in one of His enemies. Later in this same year (1947) further limitation of the Press has been imposed, leading persons high and low, political and religious, to urge the plain fact that this restricting of public journals is an essential feature of tyranny and of totalitarian rule. Perhaps it may be useful to any concerned to repeat here a joke that was current in

Germany in 1938. It was told me there that Hitler had expressed the wish that his lank hair stood up straight like that of President Hindenburg, the Prussian: upon which someone said that if he would give the Press its freedom for forty-eight hours, his hair would stand on end all right! Dictatorship sows in the hearts of the people the seeds of its own undoing.

It is pertinent to emphasize the danger inherent in the complete and legal monopoly of radio in England by the B.B.C., and the absolute censorship exercised. It is in its power to exclude all news and all views, civil and religious, to which its Control may object and to disseminate what they approve. There have already been complaints, public and private. It is common knowledge how the Nazis utilized to their own ends this powerful agency and suppressed severely any other use of it. This was a necessary adjunct to the same rigid control of the Press. How long will the B.B.C. officers be able to resist the danger of becoming "wicked"? Are they any nobler than a Minister of State? If the latter may become "wicked," shall they be always superior to this temptation? In any case, a totalitarian, or a totalitarian-minded, Government will certainly succumb, and will thus misuse this agency when an emergency seems to warrant it.

In the United States the multiplicity of broadcasting Companies prevents this dangerous monopoly.

Or take one other example of the possibilities that confront England at the present time.

No one surely can have moved about the country, and talked with all sorts of people, and not have marked the dissatisfaction of very many with one essential fact of the coal situation. The Government has seized here an absolute monopoly—it is at once producer and distributor; it fixes as it pleases quantities, qualities, and prices. What an outcry there has been—often justifiable, no doubt—against Combines and Trusts that even approximated to such monopoly in trade. Now the Government has exceeded them all in this matter. It used to be a principle with honest traders that if the quality of an article depreciated the price fell; but under Government control the reverse has been seen in the case of coal—while the quality is seriously worse the price has risen exorbitantly. And if anyone cannot or will not pay the price arbitrarily fixed by the producer he must go without coal—a cruel alternative forced on the consumer by monopoly.

No doubt under present public conditions all ought to be grateful to obtain coal at all. There may yet be a serious shortage of supply. Pepys, the diarist, tells that at midsummer, 1667, a

cauldron only of coal fetched in London £5 10s. And money then was worth many times its present value. The cause then was that all coal came to London from Newcastle and by sea, and the Dutch were at war with England and held the seas. What has been can be again, whether from the same cause or others. Several years ago the Miner's Federation was threatening a general stoppage. In a cartoon its Secretary was pictured standing at the door of a workman's small house and saying: "It's a shame, my good woman, that you have to pay such a price for coal: I must look into it: *I'll see that you don't get any!*" But in spite of this unhappy possibility, such is the dreadful ingratitude of the human heart that many look only at the high price of a poor article, and, rightly or wrongly, the present situation is widely regarded as immoral trading on the grand scale.

The reaction of many people without any Christian principles is certain to be disastrous, as already pointed out. One effect is to foster a deep distrust of the rulers who so act. An instance of this was forced upon my attention lately when an able, respectable, religious young man, with no political bias whatever, stated that he had no belief in the official statements as to the difficulties in building houses; for, said he, it is certain that were the military to demand a hundred thousand buildings, they would be provided quickly enough. Whether this is so I cannot say; but the remark is a further illustration of disbelief in the honesty of statesmen. This attitude is prevalent, and it augments disrespect for authorities, which is dangerous to the public weal.

If these instances are fair illustrations of what is to develop under the present system, it is to be feared that State Monopoly will prove to be a "cruel lord."

Of wide and ceaseless application are these words of Mark Twain in reference to Mrs. Baker Eddy's dictatorial control over the Christian Science movement (*Christian Science*, 212):

> Vast concentrations of irresponsible power have never in any age been used mercifully.

The truth of this may be enforced by the following sentences from *The Last Days of Hitler*:

> No man can escape the corruption of absolute power (p. 3).
> Absolute power brings its own corruptions (13).
> The obvious corruption of power (58).
> Then came distrust and its attendant neuroses; the corruption of power reinforced [in Hitler] by the fear of treachery (p. 61).

A despot corrupted by the exorbitancy of unchallenged power (85).

The opposite doctrine to this [that of Carlyle, "that power should be entrusted unconditionally to great men"] is the doctrine summarised by Lord Acton in his famous aphorism, "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely": the doctrine that power is not merely the expression of a fixed character, but can affect and alter the character which exercises it. The history of Nazi-ism suggests that this doctrine is true.

The following utterances have reached me:

The representative of a large manufacturing firm, whose area covers one of the chief industrial districts of England, wrote:

Controls and quotas put energy and initiative at a discount, I fear.

A member of the staff of one of the greatest industrial concerns in the country said:

The present system makes for inefficiency.

An elderly farmer, who in his day controlled 2,000 acres of arable land, said:

There is no skill needed now in buying and selling on the market.

The acting head of a business requiring exceptional knowledge and judgment said:

Competition is the very life of business.

If these opinions are well-founded, then this country has been handed over to a system that diminishes (1) energy, (2) initiative, (3) skill, (4) efficiency, (5) business vitality. Such a system will prove as painful and ruinous to a land as does a cruel lord.

Nor am I concerned here with the political features of the situation, and therefore have I avoided names of persons and parties. It is of no moment to praise or to blame the transitory. Politicians fall or die; parties disappear. Their real importance is how they influence the moral and spiritual condition of the people. When the mind is transported to the heavens, and one seeks to see earth's affairs as they appear to God and His angels, as opened up in God's Book, the men who strut about the political stage awhile, often noisy and assertive, are seen in their true Lilliputian smallness, and their real significance lies in the way they are secretly made by the

Most High to serve *His* ends, of mercy or of judgment, ends of which all but a very few of them have always been profoundly and dangerously unconscious.

The true follower of the Lord Jesus Christ observes that the Son of God, when on this earth, took no part in the political affairs of His race. He declined to support the popular movement against the foreign tyrant then crushing His people (John 6 : 14, 15). He drew the attention of the Roman governor to the fact that He was not leading His followers in fighting for Himself, as proof that His kingdom is not of this world (John 18 : 36). He endured patiently the hardships and wrongs He met, making it His business to show to men that the secret of peace and joy lies outside of the conditions met here, and doing to them all the good in His power, irrespective of race or social status.

But the Son of God did observe constantly what *His Father* was doing, so as to co-operate with Him. He said : " The Son is not able to do anything from Himself, but only what He may see the Father doing ; for whatever He may do, this the Son also does in like manner " (John 5 : 19). Therefore when He was on trial for His life, before an unprincipled Governor, His eye was upon the action and purpose of His Father in permitting Him to be in that dangerous situation. To the judge He said : " Thou wouldest have no authority against me except it were given thee from above " (John 19 : 11). As Pilate had been permitted that power by God, the Son of God submitted, for He could not resist the permission of His Father.

It is from this point of view that the present discussion is written. The true Christian accepts quietly that which God permits in the affairs of nations. If he would follow Christ he cannot be a rebel, or even an agitator. Like Christ he may on occasion openly denounce injustice and hypocrisy, and warn evil-doers of the wrath of God ; but his own path lies in patience and doing works of mercy.

But, also like Christ, the true Christian studies the ways and works of God His Father and desires to enlighten others thereupon. Hence the present inquiry as to whether current events may indicate that the Most High God is dealing with England as He will yet deal with Egypt, and is handing over this people to the dominance of a " cruel lord."

For it looks at present as if the system that has been so long growing, and has been mightily augmented by the dire circumstances of two devilish wars, has come to stay, seeing that the party now in opposition in Parliament has announced that it has no intention of annulling the monopoly measures now being thrust

upon the nation but only of modifying them as may seem expedient. Nor is it difficult to see, from the standpoint of worldly foresight and prudence, that, should the country be plunged suddenly into another ghastly war, it would be an advantage for whatever Government might have to cope with the emergency to be already in control of vital industries and institutions, rather than to have to acquire control, with the delay that would be dangerous.

Thus does war become a "cruel lord" which God uses to chastise peoples laden with iniquity (Ezekiel, chs. 5–7, etc.), and which compels oppressive measures, in themselves odious, iniquitous, and calamitous.

Public men talk much of the certainty that England will recover from present adverse conditions because of the sterling qualities of the race. May it be so, if God permit; but they will do well to look closely into this, lest, when there may come again the strain of war, they find the rope in which they trust prove to be merely tow singed by the fire, so that in the tempest the cable will snap and the ship of State drift to doom.

Thus it was in Germany in 1918. According to Hitler (and it may well be that in this he was right), Socialistic doctrines had sapped the imperialistic spirit, munition and general strikes followed, morale in the army weakened, and the collapse came (M.K., ch. 7). It may be wise to remember also that purity and pride of race was the keystone in the arch of Hitlerian philosophy. It failed badly in Germany: the whole arch collapsed. May it not fail in England, if weakening influences are at work?

(i) The foolish burke facts, the wise study them. Man is what his food is. Those whose interest it is to say so assure us that England is quite well fed. Such statements diminish confidence in the integrity of the officials who make them, for the people know that it is otherwise, even while some thank God that supplies are what they are, and are grateful to the Department that has so far secured this. Body and soul interact, and underfed bodies seldom hold spirits with fire and stamina. Feebleness of body induces listlessness.

Still more is this so when the soul itself is ill-nourished or poisoned, as is the case with the present generation. The twin incentives of religion and family life are either absent or are at least negligible. The vast majority are far more irreligious than the heathen or the Moslem. And family life has ceased to bind vast numbers. The arbitrary dispersing of youths and maidens during the war took them out of the home, and destroyed in very

many the sense of the sacredness and joy of home. Especially is this disastrous in the case of girls and young women. It is reflected in the freeness with which divorce is accepted.

Writing of the increase of crime in 1946, as revealed in the Report of the Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis, a leader writer in the *Daily Telegraph* (July 11th, 1947) said truly that—

> There is a general lowering of social standards, by no means confined to habitual criminals, which it would take a stout-hearted optimist to deny. . . . The distressing evidence of a fresh growth of juvenile criminality indicates that crime has no difficulty in enlisting thousands of new recruits each year. We shall for some time to come reap the harvest of ill-discipline and lack of social training which resulted from war-time infringements of normal family life.

The Report of "The Church and Youth," published in June, 1947 by the Church of England Youth Council, declares that young people preparing for married life

> are up against the false romanticism sedulously propagated by the cinema and the easy disillusionment propagated almost as sedulously by the radio.

Two months earlier the Bishop of London wrote (in the *Practitioner*, April 1st, 1947) concerning Hollywood films, that from them the young

> learn that love is an overwhelming impulse without rhyme or reason which must at all costs be obeyed. It does not matter, apparently, if it implies stealing someone else's husband or fiancée.
>
> Anyone, whether parent, guardian, husband, or friend, who would dare to put an obstacle in the way, is regarded not merely as a spoilsport, but as a positive enemy of the human race. . . . The rising generation has been led to fear "inhibitions" as their grandparents feared sin. To be completely uninhibited appears to be the goal of modern youth's desire.

Will Horatius spring forward to defend the bridge if he care neither for altar nor for home?

(ii) The Bishop touches another vital matter. He adds:

> Certainly we must have freedom somewhere. A generation that has suffered two world wars and has entered into a social revolution by which it is subjected to controls of every kind, asserts the last relic of its pride in this claim to moral irresponsibility.

Personal freedom is another of the natural and priceless possessions for which men have gladly dared all. But of such freedom the rising generation knows practically nothing. The Emergency Act mentioned reduced the whole country, population and property, to the legal status of slaves of the Government, for " complete control of all persons and of all property " is the very essence of slavery: it is exactly the claim of the slave-holder, as much if he be a moderately reasonable owner as if he be a ruthless barbarian, such as Legree of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, or the Russian Government.

Personal freedom as the older of us knew it is not known by the younger generation. They have grown up accustomed to being tied hand and foot by innumerable regulations; to being ordered hither and thither by petty officials; to being " directed " as to school, home, work, food. And, which is the worst feature of the case, the more part of them seem not to fret at the shackles: if their backs be covered, bellies filled, and there be money enough and leisure enough for cigarettes, drinks, lipstick, sport, and films, then for weightier matters large numbers have little or no concern, not to say enthusiasm. Can great causes ever rely on serfs? Such must be *driven* to their tasks.

Deploring the present marked apathy to public affairs, as shown by the smallness of the polls at parliamentary and municipal elections, a political leader writer said lately:

> If the country were riding upon the crest of a wave of prosperity this lack of interest on the part of the electors might be regarded lightly. In fact, the country is facing the greatest peace-time crisis of its history. To say, as other correspondents do, that the people have no confidence in any political party is to say, by implication, that they have no confidence in parliamentary government, that they are ripe for some form of dictatorship. That is possibly the most depressing conclusion that can be drawn from the facts. (D.T., September 27th, 1947.)

(iii) The above-mentioned subtle disintegrating influences are at work. There are also at work other such influences the effects of which may be disastrous. One of these was the stern imposition during the war of silence upon matters public. It may have been necessary, at least in measure, but the effect was that people were largely afraid to talk about public events. I noticed it continually on trains and elsewhere. Now few persons are so inwardly reflective by nature as to be able to maintain keen interest in a subject upon which they may not speak. One of man's chief distinctions from the beast is the power of speech, and he rapidly loses interest in vital matters upon which he is not permitted to talk.

The atmosphere thereby engendered is most unhealthy, resembling that which was general under the Nazi system or in Russia. Of the period which followed the attempt on Hitler's life in July, 1944, Trevor-Roper writes: "A universal suspicion suppressed all healthy conversation and multiplied the effects of every setback" (L.D.H., 62). In 1935 in Vienna, about a year after the murder of Dr. Dolfuss, the Premier, I asked a resident if they now had quiet. He answered: "We have quiet so long as we are silent." In England the constant warnings, not to say the prosecutions, produced a similar frame of mind, with both fear to speak and the ensuing indifference.

(iv) Another factor is that the present generation has been reared to dislike hard work. It has been poisoned by the false and pernicious notion that if one man does less work there will be more for others to do, and that therefore restricted output will mean less unemployment. This notion is fallacious, for the opposite is the fact. The greater the number of bricks which are laid in a day the more insistent will be the demand for woodwork, for doors, floors, and windows, and for ironwork, for girders, and baths, and for all accessories. Now the said Report on "Church and Youth" testifies, after careful and wide enquiry, to the "fantastic growth of gambling" in industrial spheres, and it quotes an observer who describes what happens to a lad entering a large engineering firm:

> He may have been taught by church, home, and school that there is dignity in labour and that a fair return for a fair wage is right. Everything about the factory contradicts this.
>
> Everybody expects him to dodge as much work as possible. If he works steadily during the day he is regarded as an oddity, a despised "master's man," toadying and sucking up to the bosses.

But the maintenance of any great cause demands serious and sustained effort. How shall they rise to the occasion who dislike strain and toil?

(v) History repeats itself, and there is too much resemblance in England to-day to the days when the Roman Empire was sinking to ruin. Let the serious inquirer compare the deeper elements of to-day with the picture of Roman life given in ch. xxxi of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. First, the moral decline of the nobility; then the disdain of the common people for the dexterous and laborious use of their hands, that is, a dislike of hard work; so that "they sunk under the reign of the Cæsars

[a despotic reign, be it remembered] into a vile and wretched populace." To pacify these decadent folk there were daily doles of *rationed food*, obtained by *presenting a ticket*, and the nearly free provision at public cost of luxuries and of splendid bathing establishments. Lastly, "the most lively and splendid amusement of the idle multitude depended upon the frequent exhibition of public games and spectacles," and these were marked by "licentious farce, effeminate music and splendid pageantry." Those who most attend the cinema will know best how far this description applies to modern films, and how far these are an opiate to pacify decadent folk.

Thus it is to-day in principle. Public policy is to ensure that every person of a race declining in moral vigour gets an equal share of all things: wages are such that a minimum of work provides all that large numbers desire, so that they will work no more than provides this minimum: and this means of pacifying the masses is provided out of the public purse by taking toll of industry and commerce. And money, borrowed from abroad, is squandered in part by providing for the importation of such unnecessaries as tobacco and such moral corrupting of the people as American films.

It seems too plain that the principles and conditions which, according to the infidel Gibbon, led to the fall of Rome are at work to-day in England and America. If the reader will inquire further, let him read what Gibbon says in ch. xliv upon the freedom of divorce, and note his comment that a

> specious theory is confuted by this free and perfect experiment, which demonstrates that the freedom of divorce does not contribute to happiness and virtue . . . the matron who in five years can submit to the embraces of eight husbands must cease to reverence the chastity of her own person.

(vi) Or, again, peace, prosperity, security depend upon respect for authority, for law. They imply discipline, deference to superiors. The present generation has been largely brought to repudiate this habit of mind. It too much detests the superior, because he *is* that, and reverences nothing, neither age, nor ability, nor law, nor even Almighty God.

This attitude has been greatly augmented by the enormous multiplying of crimes caused by the excessive increase of Regulations. It used to be fair to assume that if a man was convicted in court he had done something morally blameworthy, because, broadly speaking, the law was at least aimed at what was inherently wrong. But to-day a hundred offences are against Regulations,

not against things essentially immoral, and it is no more proper to assume that a man has done *evil* because he has been convicted in court. Not even the best-intentioned person can be sure of acting within the law. Thus the stigma attaching to conviction is reduced and the law is brought into disrepute by being divorced from morality.

Such despising of the law induces general despising of authority; this increases lawlessness, decreases discipline, and makes ready response to the call and command of leaders less certain.

Dr. Allen wrote to the same effect:

> The English system of criminal justice could not work unless the community as a whole supported it. The reckless multiplication of offences undermines this public sentiment. It brings the whole system of justice into disrepute and robs the law of all dignity (*op. cit.*, 277).

On June 7th, 1947, no less experienced and responsible a body than the London Chamber of Commerce addressed to the Government a memorandum dealing with trade controls, in which they said:

> In the practical everyday conduct of business, circumstances inevitably arise which could not be foreseen when these detail controls were drafted. The fact that, in these instances, the regulations are unworkable tends to undermine respect for the law on the part of nearly all law-abiding citizens, and this in itself is a very insidious and far-reaching evil.

When the American troops were sent to this country on their way to Europe, their official book of instructions directed them to remember that the British were a law-abiding people, and it stated that in any big American city there was more crime in a year than in the whole United Kingdom. How long will this comparison endure? The frightful increase of crime by juveniles argues for a steady and speedy decay. It infects countryside as well as city. As mentioned above, a village constable recently deplored to me that most of the crime he met was by youths under eighteen. Thus does the stream of young life from the country into the city become like sewage pouring into a cesspool.

(vii) In all walks of life it used to be an accepted maxim that one volunteer is worth two pressed men. Modern life is suppressing that principle. In 1917 I asked a young bank manager, recently conscripted for the army, what he thought of the change.

He answered that, so far, he was enjoying the relief from responsibility, for he had little occasion to think for himself, but had only to do what he was told. This spells enfeeblement of moral fibre. The process has been vastly hastened of late. Not only millions in the armed forces, but millions in industry have been directed, controlled, restricted. And the general public have been compelled to conform to endless regulations touching almost all activities of life.

The voluntary principle was formerly a most vital force. It impelled parents in training their children, and youth in choosing congenial employment; it animated business, enterprise, scientific research, the military world, philanthropy, religion. To-day freedom of personal action is severely restricted. Private benevolence is to be degraded into public charity, as by voluntary hospitals becoming public institutions; and in general personal freedom and voluntary activities are being curtailed. This will diminish healthy ambition, initiative, promptness, alertness, and tend to reduce the people to puppets who will move only when an official pulls the string. It will weaken the sense of self-reliance, hinder the development of personal capacity, and, worst of all, it will crush the sense of personal responsibility for one's state and one's activities, seeing that these are dictated and the actor is little better than an automaton. Human nature is all too ready to evade a sense of moral guilt on the immoral plea that I did it because I was ordered and the responsibility is with my superior.

These influences poison the very roots of character. Are there sufficiently powerful antidotes at work to nullify their demoralizing effects? If not, and if this nation is to continue corporately, what can be the measure at last employed save *despotism*, which *forces* the masses to toil or to fight? What, indeed, but the totalitarian system of rule which is the negation of liberty, the enthronement of tyranny? Then would come true Hitler's prophecy that, even if the democracies won the war, they would be obliged to adopt his principles of rule.

This question we will now proceed to examine, adding only this reflection: that, in the very nature of the thing, the one corrective of irreligion and its baneful effects is religion, the one antidote to lawlessness and ultimate anarchy is the holy fear of the holy God. When the *shepherds* reject these green pastures they must not be surprised that their flock is unhealthy, unsatisfied, wilful Western sheep that must be driven, not Eastern sheep that can be led.

CHAPTER XI

THE STATE AND THE SUPER-STATE

THE STATE—WHAT IS THIS? ACCORDING TO THE DICTIONARY it is an "organized political community with government recognized by the people." This is the meaning assigned to the *word*, but what is the *thing* itself? We answer that, in the sense now common, this thing is a no-thing, a non-entity. In words already quoted, Dr. Allen speaks of the State as having "neither a body to kick nor a soul to damn." But that which has neither body nor soul is not an entity, and therefore he adds the description "the great elusive impersonality of the State" (*op. cit.*, 273). This is warranted; it indicates the fact of the matter.

In May, 1947, the Minister in charge of a certain Bill declared in the House of Commons that "the State must be supreme." The doctrine used to be that *the King* is supreme. That was at least intelligible, for a king is an entity, a person, having a single mind, judgment, will, able to assert his will, claiming supremacy within his own territory. But this is not so in a "political community." Within the forty millions that form the people of England there are very many minds, vastly varying judgments, greatly conflicting wills and policies, none of which is supreme. The most that can be said is that the majority of a community may conceivably be of one mind and be able to domineer over the minority. But this is not "the State" being supreme, but only a section of it.

Even in this last supposed case how can, say, twenty-five millions of persons in England reach and express and enforce their one mind? The answer is by choosing a small number of representatives and authorizing these to act on their behalf. In the result it is this small executive body that is actually supreme, not "the State," the whole community. And it makes no essential difference in the result if this executive reaches power not by choice of the people, but by craft and force, as in modern Russia. The Executive is supreme as long as it can maintain its position and can dominate the populace.

But should this Executive, whether many persons or one person, act in its own name and impose its own will on the community, it would too easily be seen to be a tyranny, which would provoke

resentment and at last rebellion. To avoid this difficulty, and placate the crowd, the Executive would naturally employ the device that it was acting on behalf of "the State"—that is, as agent—for this "great elusive impersonality, the State." For a longer or shorter time this deceit would act as an opiate, soothing the masses by the notion that it is *they*, the State, that are supreme. The love of power and the exercise of power by the members of the Executive would thus be screened by this petty fiction that "the State" is supreme, and their own selfishness and ambition would be veiled, and the more effectually so if they were careful to confer on the people some measure of material well-being. By this means the populace could be pacified and would scarcely hear the rattling of its chains; while the few who value freedom more than pleasure would be regarded as disturbers of the peace, as enemies of "the State."

In this connexion let the thoughtful ponder these remarks in Trevor-Roper's study of the collapse of Hitlerism:

> Irresponsibility of the ruler causes irresponsibility of the subject; the conception of the commonwealth no longer exists outside propaganda; and politics become the politics of feudal anarchy, which the personal power of an undisputed despot may conceal, but cannot alter (L.D.H., 2, 3).

All this can be seen in Russia. Obviously it is not the 240 millions of mixed races that rule: it is a clique of some fourteen men who sit in the Kremlin who are supreme. The real inward nature of an idea can be seen best in its extreme development, and in Russia it can be recognized that the logical, complete outcome of the doctrine of the supremacy of the State is the totalitarian State.

Lenin and his coadjutors acted drastically, thoroughly. The old order of society in Russia was swept away utterly. It may be useful to note some vital features of the change and profitable to consider whether and how far public affairs in England are moving in the same direction. Perhaps it will appear that ends which in Russia were attained suddenly and by the most brutal methods are in process of being attained in this land by quiet and subtle measures. And it is possible that this process is being furthered by some persons, of differing schools of thought, who do not intend it, at least as a main objective, and by measures designed for better ends. For we must ever bear in mind what has been shown in ch. V, that there are cunning *invisible* rulers who serve *their* evil ends by influencing men who think that they are serving *their* good ends, or ends which they think to be good. Peter meant

well, but Christ said to him, "Get thee behind Me, *Satan*!" (Matthew 16 : 23).

1. *The Source of Power.*

In the first place, in Russia the radical notion of the source of power was changed. From the democratic point of view the basic idea of Revolution is that authority is vested in the people and that rulers acquire right by the will of the people. This is involved in the definition first above quoted: "An organized community with government recognized by *the people.*" The supremacy of "the State" was the ground of the complete overthrow of the former imperial system.

Obviously this was but the logical extreme of the doctrine of all democracy (*demos* the people ; *kratos* power, rule), the sovereignty of the people ; and it obtains in England as in other democratic lands. It was laid down categorically in Article I of the Constitution of the German Republic in 1919 : "The executive power proceeds from the people."

2. *Royalty.*

In consequence royalty was abolished, as had been the French royal house in 1793 : the Romanoffs were assassinated, as were Louis XVI and his queen.

By the mercy of God England has thus far been preserved from such atrocities. There remains much respect to the Crown as the symbol of empire unity and much loyalty to their Majesties personally ; but how far is this as universal as was formerly the happy case ?

I know not how wide may be the desire that England should become a republic, but I heard a working man, of quite superior type, say openly in a train that for himself he believes in a republic, but that as in England the King does not interfere in government, affairs might be left as they are.

3. *Aristocracy.*

In Russia, as in France a century and a half earlier, the nobility were massacred or driven into exile. In Germany, under the Socialist and Nazi governments, their power was effectually reduced by less harsh measures. As to England, in olden times that reduction was sometimes secured under the feudal system. In theory the Crown owned all land ; the nobles held their lands from the Crown ; when one of them became obnoxious to the king he could be arraigned for treason and, justly or unjustly, be

executed, when his estates reverted to the Crown. Of later years the great estates have been broken up by the milder but sure method of heavy duties, which, with exorbitant taxation, has made the aristocracy almost negligible, especially as the House of Lords has little more than a delaying influence upon legislation. Time will show whether it is a true gain to a land that a large proportion of its finest brains, trained minds, learning, and culture should be removed from public affairs. This at least I know, that very many who live in the country are sure that the loss of the great landlords is a very real loss. I have heard more than one capable farmer say definitely that he would rather rent under a good landlord than own his own farm. It was usually easy for one with eyes to see when he had passed from a vast well-ordered estate, with its buildings, walls, and gates well maintained by the landlord, to a region of small men, without money for capital outlay or sufficient repairs, or perhaps without any proper pride in this matter. Years ago an estate owner assured me that such as himself were content with 1½ per cent. interest on their capital value. The period was one when all good investments made 5 per cent.

4. *Parliament.*

Under Hitler the Reichstag was merely a perfunctory assembly to register his decisions. In Russia the same is true of the Central Committee. In 1941 Bernard Pares wrote :

> The Party itself—and the State as well—is governed by a Political Bureau (Politburo) of nine persons. It will be manifest that this Party is all-powerful. It is to it that goes first any question of legislation or policy. The Party and the Soviet Government do what they are told. (*Russia*, 132.)

In England a Select Committee took evidence in 1931 upon Procedure on Public Business. Men of the greatest experience gave evidence. Dr. Allen summarizes this in the following significant statement :

> Perhaps the most striking feature of this body of evidence, the authority of which can hardly be questioned, is its unanimity of opinion that the traditional relationship between the legislature and the Executive has been reversed, and that it is with the latter that the real government now rests. Thus it is an elementary lesson of constitutional history that Parliament " controls expenditure ". The guileless will be astonished to find one witness after another stating that this has ceased to be true and that Parliament really has very little control over the public purse . . . Professor Ramsay Muir described the power of the purse as " wholly unreal ". This last witness was more emphatic than any other in his estimate

> of the decline of Parliament's place in the Constitution. "There is no country in North Western Europe in which the control exercised by Parliament over the Government, over legislation, taxation, and administration—is more shadowy and unreal than it is in Britain. Parliament is no longer in any real sense the sovereign power in the State." If this is thought to be an exaggeration, then the same must be said of the blunt opinion of a man who, at this moment of writing (1945), has a larger memory of Parliament than any other in England. In answer to the question whether he wished to make Parliamentary control more effective, Mr. Lloyd George replied: "Well, it has not got control. I am speaking now after forty years of experience: Parliament has really no control over the Executive; it is a pure fiction." (*Law and Orders*, 128, 129.)

That which was recognized by competent observers seventeen years ago can be seen by the blind to-day. The present Executive, with its numerically irresistible and compliant majority, carries what measures it pleases. If it is answerable or amenable to any people at all it is not to Parliament, but to the Trades Union Council or to the Labour Party.

This position, by which in England as in Russia and Germany, Parliament is reduced to a recording machine for ratifying decisions of the Executive and giving to these formal validity, was developing for many years, but was plainly avowed in 1931 and since. I quote Dr. Allen again (*ibid*, 292–294). He is dealing with the opinion of a foreign dictator that in twenty years time [from some time before the war] there will be no legislative assemblies in Europe, and he asks:

> As a practical measure of government, what is the first step in this admired form of political evolution? Invariably, in all totalitarian countries, it has been, as indeed it was bound to be, the aggrandisement of executive power. This is the apt instrument of swift, "strong" government. Laws give place to decrees, deliberative processes to *faits accomplis* [i.e., deeds already done], the give and take of conflicting views to arbitrary will, representation to submission. Wherever the "total" State has established itself it is by this means that it has laid the foundation of its power. . . .
>
> It is a philosophy that is not peculiar to any political party. It comes from both the Right and the Left. . . . One of the witnesses before [the Committee on Procedure on Public Business in 1931] was [a well-known British Fascist]. . . . He proposed to the Committee a scheme which was based "upon the belief that rapid and effective action is required from Government." The essence of the scheme was the passing of a General Powers Bill which "would confer on the Government of the day wide powers of

action by order in relation to the economic problem." Orders were to be subject to Parliamentary approval for ten days only. All that was required of Parliament was a " yes " or " no " after a brief debate and with no power of amendment. The power of Government was to be vested in an Emergency Cabinet of five members, with a larger Cabinet in the background " for less frequent meetings in order to assure proper co-ordination and consultations between the departments of Government." . . . [The reader will observe the precise correspondence of this with the facts as to Russia before mentioned, and also that it is the effect of the Ministerial readjustments in the present British Government effected in October, 1947, by which four senior Ministers have all Departments under them in groups. These changes have put into a senior position the writer of the quotations next given by Dr. Allen.]

This was totalitarianism from the Right. Let us compare some ideas propounded, under the title " Can Socialism come by Constitutional Methods ? " . . . in a volume of essays called *Problems of A Socialist Government.* The objective, we learn, is " to seize power from the ruling class and transfer it to the people as a whole." [Here is a Socialist leader, to-day a principal Minister of State, setting forth the exact fiction before noticed of " the people as a whole " governing.] The manner in which popular government is to be vindicated is that " from the moment when the Government takes control rapid and effective action must be possible in every sphere of the national life. . . . The Government's first step will be to call Parliament together at the earliest moment and place before it an Emergency Powers Bill to be passed through all its stages on the first day. [It will be noted that this is exactly what took place on May 22nd, 1940, as before considered.] This Bill will be wide enough in its terms to allow all that will be immediately necessary to be done by ministerial orders. These orders must be incapable of challenge in the Courts or in any way except in the House of Commons [That is, the Second Chamber is to be put out of action.] . . . If " the capitalists " did not yield, the Government " would be justified in overriding any obstruction it found placed in its way. . . . It would probably be better and more conducive to the general peace and welfare of the country for the Socialist Government to make itself temporarily into a dictatorship until the matter could again be put to the test at the polls." " Legislative output " is to be maintained and increased, and discussion in the House is to be curtailed, by Statutory Rules and Orders. [It is plain how thoroughly Government to-day is fulfilling this outline written before the war.] As for any judicial review of them, " this power must be taken from the Courts, and the sole right to challenge such orders must rest with Parliament." . . . Each year there is to be one main Planning and Finance Bill. " Once this Bill is passed little other

> legislation by Act of Parliament will be required. . . . It will be made impossible, by appropriate resolutions, to rediscuss the merits of the Plan once the Plan has been decided upon." Finally, we are told that " it will be impossible to guarantee the peacefulness of the change. This must depend upon the action not only of the Socialists but of the capitalists too. . . . The decisive blow at capitalism must be struck while the people's mandate is fresh and strong. That blow can be delivered constitutionally; if unconstitutional means are used to resist it, those who use unconstitutional means must not complain if they are met with force." A plainer hint of the concentration camp it is difficult to imagine. . .
>
> This is totalitarianism from the Left. Like its counterpart of the Right, it seeks to reduce the function of Parliament to a humiliating fiction, and it places all power and government in the hands of the Executive, which it elevates above any restraint of law. I conclude by inviting the reader to look on this picture and on that, and to ask himself whether they are not in reality the same, though they are painted by such different hands, and whether they would not both, in practice, resolve themselves into the same form of tyranny.

For the reason already explained (p. 202) I have omitted the names of these writers quoted by Dr. Allen. But the second is a very able lawyer, and must know quite well that the constitution of England was never intended to take in practice the form that he proposed, and which the present Government is steadily following. Yet he sees that the changes can be made without a violent dislocation of the constitution or setting it aside summarily, as the Russians did in their case. It is an example of that art by which able Executive officers secure their desired ends at the expense of the people while professing to serve them. It is " Your obedient servant " who rules his master, the public.

Of this art and policy Hitler gave a fine instance. It is very evident that the Socialist framers of the Weimar 1919 Constitution for the German Republic never envisaged any such state of things as the Nazis set up. In practice the latter regime was the death of the former, yet outwardly Hitler worked under the Weimar Constitution, in the sense that he never abolished it formally. In 1938 I pointed this out to a friend in Germany and showed him that Article 48 of that Constitution itself gave to Hitler all the power needed to annul it in practice. For that Article, in the case that the safety and order of the realm should be seriously disturbed or endangered, gave to the President full power to take all needful steps to restore order and safety, even to the use of the armed forces. And with that restoration in view he was expressly authorized to treat as null and void Articles 114, 115, 117,

118, 123, 124, and 153, which Articles established the foundation rights of freedom of the person, the inviolability of the house of a man, the secrecy of post, telegraph, and telephone, the right of free expression of opinion by word or in print, the right of public assembly, of forming Associations, and of private property otherwise than as provided by law.

Hitler needed no more authority for the accomplishing of his purposes, just as the present vast changes in England need no more than dexterous and determined application of the special powers conferred on the Executive by the Emergency Acts or the general processes of Parliament. The authority given to the President to abolish the Articles mentioned is parallel to the power given to Ministers of State in England to dispense with express directions of certain Statutes when the Minister thinks these will not work well. Thus, in these instances, the law places the Minister above the law. Examples of such statutes are given by Lord Hewart and Dr. Allen, and a fresh and glaring example is the Supplies and Services (Extended Purposes) Act of August, 1947.

This Statute was not passed hurriedly under a sense of danger and panic as was that of May, 1940. That was understandable though not justified. Here there was debate, criticism, warning, protest. Yet with eyes open the servile supporters of the Government added to the almost unlimited powers already possessed by the Executive the extension granted by clause (*c*) of Section I (i) which reads :

> Generally for ensuring that the whole resources of the community are available for use, and are used, in a manner best calculated to serve the interests of the community.

The Times (August 13th, 1947) justly described this Act as " A Blank Cheque," and said :

> It is difficult to conceive of any political or economic project, however remotely related to the urgent national need the Bill is ostensibly drafted to meet, which could not be brought within the ambit of this clause . . . the powers are totalitarian . . . they involve assumption of a potential dictatorship.

Parliamentarians who will thus renounce to the Executive their legislative rights and personal liberties, as well as the rights and liberties of the whole people, evidently set no value on individual freedom and do not deserve to enjoy it.

The " inviolability of the house of a man " guaranteed to Germany by the Weimar Constitution is one of the most precious of freedoms. All tyrants have suppressed it. It is seriously curtailed in England to-day. The Marquess of Reading stated in October,

1947, that no fewer than 13,000 Government officials had the right to enter and search private premises. If this right of entry were for the purpose of detecting and punishing deeds wicked in their nature, the public might accept it as they do the right of the police for this purpose. But the two situations are very different: (1) The police can enter only to deal with conduct generally accepted as *wrong*; but the 13,000 can enter merely to enforce *Regulations* on matters not inherently wrong: (2) the police must first satisfy a magistrate that they ought to enter, and they must obtain his warrant; the 13,000 can enter by virtue of the will of some Governmental and Departmental official. The magistrates the public trust as protectors: the officials are largely distrusted; and their agents are regarded somewhat as were those of the Inquisition or the Gestapo, who had similar extra-judicial and irresponsible power of entry.

5. *Real Estate; the Land.*

The Russian revolution, professing to be for the liberation of the populace from tyranny, really re-adopted the feudal principle of land tenure, merely substituting "the State" for the Crown as owner; the real possession being with the small Executive, acting through a vast army of subservient bureaucratic officials, profiting personally by their positions and powers. Thus the masses merely passed from being under one form of tyranny to another.

Indeed, they became worse off. For under the later Czars, by the reforms introduced by Alexander II in 1861, the former serfs "acquired rights and privileges such as were enjoyed at that time by no other peasantry in Europe" (E.B., i. 564), one of these rights being that each peasant became the freeholder of a certain piece of land formerly part of the great estate upon which he may have worked as a serf. This right of ownership the Soviet government cancelled: all land became the property of "the State," and the occupier (if he were not one of the unfortunate myriads massacred or banished) was to till the land and three-fourths of the produce belonged to the Government. Of course, this soon worked out that much of the land went out of cultivation, since the holder had no incentive to toil in cultivating three-fourths of the soil.

A similar result has followed in measure in England upon the extension of income tax to working men. To my knowledge the field labourer, for example, became unwilling to work overtime, for he argued that it was not worth his while to work the extra time for half the wage, since the Government would take the other half for income tax. No doubt this is so in other trades also.

It is vain to attempt to defeat human nature, which is the essence of the effort to crush the profit motive in industry and trade.

Thus far in England *confiscation* of land has not come, for the Government has awarded some compensation. But the principle has come of the arbitrary transfer of land to "the State." For war purposes the Executive acquired as much land as they determined, with or without the consent of the owners. For example, over 600,000 acres of agricultural land alone were seized. Or again, by the compulsory purchase of the mines the Coal Board now owns over 1,000,000 acres of agricultural land, and is the largest land owner in the country after the Crown; and more land and premises will pass to the State with the acquisition or nationalization of other great undertakings.

But far more than this is intended. The Labour leaders have in view "to obtain at the next general election a mandate to bring all land under public ownership and control . . ." (D.T., May 27th, 1947), and on that date, addressing the Labour Party Conference, the Prime Minister declared that the third item in the Government programme is "the control of land" (D.T., May 28th, 1947).

6. *The Family.*

It has been before remarked how the family realm has been invaded, and largely broken up, by war measures. Thus has been accelerated a movement in the direction of the policy followed in Russia by force of law, decree, and severity.

7. *Trade.*

The degree to which agriculture and business have been brought under control of late years, and are likely to remain so, has moved trade in England well in the direction of the collective farming and regulated trading of Russia. The large measure of bulk purchasing by Government, and internal trading by them, as in coal, can easily prove a transition to the more complete system as in Russia. The individual has ever less incentive and scope, and in the measure that he ceases to press forward, trade must correspondingly become collective under Government control. This seems the more inevitable with the extensive control of finance before-mentioned.

8. *Individualism.*

As remarked above, individual and personal liberty has been withdrawn as regards the position in law; the Government holds legal control of all persons. This is precisely the position in Russia. No doubt even there most people go about a hundred

personal matters without actual official interference, as is the case here. But neither here nor there is there *security* of this liberty. A sense of insecurity, even if latent, militates against concentration and efficiency. As many have found to their cost, official interference is as possible in this land as in Russia, even though it has not taken the brutal, terroristic forms experienced by millions there. No personal complaint is involved in this statement. On the numerous occasions over many years that I have had contact with officials of various departments they have invariably justified their description of *civil* servants. But many have had a different experience.

To quote again from *Law and Orders* (226, 227):

> It would be quite impossible to estimate the total number of prosecutions for "emergency" offences, but—to take a sample—up to the end of 1941 the Ministry of Food alone had instituted 39,927 prosecutions, and in 1942 it added 33,791 to the score. . . . The vast majority of these offences are sins of ignorance, in circumstances in which it is very difficult not to be ignorant. Again and again traders have simply to take their chance of being on the right or the wrong side of the law.

The Home Office *Criminal Statistics* show that during 1939–1945 no less than 1,275,889 persons were convicted of offences against Defence Regulations. On October 24th, 1947, the Chairman of the Magistrates' Association said: "Respect for law, the very foundation of our national life, had been impaired by this accumulation of new offences." Urging the abolition of controls he referred to the "savage penalties" connected with these prosecutions. (D.T., October 25th, 1947.)

If unwillingness to work hard increases, while the national necessities also increase, what measure will meet this except a revival of the "directed labour" known during the war? And this has been authorized by the Supplies and Services Act above mentioned. What is the difference in principle between this and the compulsory labour in Russia? Before 1861 there were millions of serfs; now there are millions of slaves. Such is "the freedom for the proletariat" achieved by revolution and a totalitarian State. The individual exists for "the State."

Even Hitler knew and taught better than this, however degenerate the practice in Germany became. He wrote:

> The People's State has to care for the benefit of its citizens, since in general and in detail it acknowledges the importance of the worth of the individual (*Person*) and therefore in all spheres it introduces that highest measure of capacity for productive results which assures the highest measure of return to the individual (M.K. 500, Chapter IV, "Personality and the Ideal of the People's State").

9. *Religion.*

It was not merely by personal preference that the great Russian Revolutionary Triumvirate declared the Russian State to be atheistic: it is indispensable to the totalitarian State. As has been said in Chapter VI, "the State" asserts the claims and usurps the prerogatives of God, and these two cannot exist side by side. God says: "Thou shalt worship Jehovah thy God and Him only shalt thou serve" (Matthew 4: 10): "the State" rejects this high demand and claims for itself the complete devotion and obedience of the subject. On October 4th, 1938, the then Archbishop of York said:

> The totalitarian State involved a conception of personality incompatible with the Christian doctrines of God and of man. . .
> The man existed for the State, which was itself regarded as the community organized as a self-conscious unit. Such a theory conflicted directly with the conception of man as having his ultimate meaning and value in his direct relationship to God. Some forms of this new or revived heresy acknowledged the reality of God, but for all purposes, except the devotional life itself, the State was interposed between God and the soul as effectively as ever was mediæval priest or Pope. As the totalitarian theory militated against the Christian doctrines of God and man, so it was only by renewed apprehension of those doctrines that human liberty could be preserved or made worthy to be preserved." (*The Times*, October 5th, 1938.)

This last sentence is to be deeply pondered. It points to the only possible means by which this or any land can be preserved from lapsing into the degradation and wretchedness into which some lands have fallen, even a genuine and widespread revival of the fear of God, with acknowledgment of the Divine rights of the Lord Jesus Christ. Such as by voice and example contribute to this revival are in fact doing more for the good of the community than all other persons and measures. Lord Elton did no more than stress solid fact when he wrote in the *British Weekly* of March 27th, 1947, that:

> The key to statesmanship, as to all human activities, is to be found in the New Testament. *Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you* is a paradox which is borne out by all history. For the men who have most lastingly promoted the social, economic and political welfare of their fellows are precisely those who did seek first the Kingdom of Heaven. The great men who made the middle ages, Cromwell and his Puritans, Wilberforce and the Evangelicals, who abolished the slave trade, Wesley and his friends, to whom so many of the reforms of the

> nineteenth century can be traced back—all these were men who thought first (and most) of the hereafter, and as a sort of by-product, so to speak, of their other-worldly activities, conferred immense material benefits upon humanity. And by way of contrast, the last two centuries, during which man has concentrated as never before on achieving material prosperity, have resulted in a world-wide aggregate of poverty and suffering unprecedented in history.

We have already remarked (Chapter VI) the total ignoring of God to-day by the vast majority of English people of all classes, which is practical atheism. And we have noted and deplored that avowed atheists are among the Ministers of State.

In May, 1947, in the House of Commons, a member said:

> My fundamental objection to this Bill is that it assumes that the State is God, with power of life and death, not only over the bodies and minds of its citizens but over their souls as well. That is the Nazi doctrine of the State god. It is not the Christian doctrine. I believe that man owes loyalty to the State, but I believe that he owes a higher loyalty to God.

Faced with that specific issue the Minister replied:

> Mr. —— said that under the Bill the State is supreme. Without trying to be irreverent at all, the State must be supreme. After all, though we all close our eyes in prayer, though there is an Almighty to whom we all of us pay reverence, the Administration of the nation is in the hands of the State, and the State must take the necessary steps.

The House accepted this and voted 234 for the Bill and only 46 against it (D.T., May 29th, 1947).

Here is the same fiction that "the State" administers the nation, which contains the confusion that the State administers the State or that the nation administers the nation. Here also is an authoritative assertion in the British Parliament of the modern policy of the supremacy of the State. Now it is as certain as that black is not white that there *cannot* be two *supreme* authorities; therefore according to the Minister, and to the voting on that plain issue, God is *not* supreme, for it was asserted and accepted that "the State" is supreme. "The Almighty," therefore, to whom the Minister said all men pay reverence, is not almighty, for he is not supreme; he is not the God of Holy Scripture, the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ; he is not *God* at all, but a false deity, a figment of man's invention, as direct a challenge to the solitary rights of the living God as was Baal or Moloch, as are the golden sovereign or the almighty dollar.

That all men pray is simply a gross exaggeration. Only five

days before that debate in the Commons its Speaker was publicly deploring that the attendance at the prayers which precede the daily debates "is not always what it should be" (D.T., May 24th, 1947). Not more than five per cent. of the people attend public worship.

That such men as the Minister above-mentioned are in authority by the choice of the mass of the people, shows how very far England has already travelled on the road to becoming an atheistic totalitarian State.

The issue confronting the nations was recently stated quite distinctly by the Prime Minister of Canada. He said that

> While it might be true that people in Europe and Asia were seeking a new way of life and a new social and economic system, it was not true of Canada.
>
> When the war was started by totalitarian forces, he said, it was the free democracies, Canada amongst them, which saved freedom wherever it now existed. He agreed with those who saw the real division in the world between freedom and totalitarianism, rather than between Socialism and capitalism.
>
> In Canada, he continued, there were no trends towards dictatorship or imperialism. The Dominion had become increasingly democratic, and had not lost its identity in any imperialistic system. (*The Times Weekly*, September 10th, 1947.)

Such a statement by such a statesman may surely make thoughtful men think. If Canada and the United States remain anti-totalitarian, and if Britain goes nearer to totalitarianism, what may become the relations between Canada and Britain on the one hand, and Canada and the United States on the other hand? For totalitarianism is the major political issue of our times.

Since the foregoing was penned a public voice from outside the political arena, has stressed the present situation. On September 25th, 1947, in his fourth Visitation Charge, the Archbishop of York said:

> I feel that planning is being carried to such an extent that it may presently deprive the individual citizen of freedom, responsibility, and initiative.
>
> I question if it is really necessary, when we are crying out for labour, to employ an army of 570,000 clerks and secretaries in the Civil Service. I question if it is necessary to send out a constant stream of forms with long lists of interrogations while at the same time paper for the use of the Press is drastically reduced.

In this last particular England has long moved toward the practice of some foreign countries. Some years ago, in so mis-

ruled a land as Roumania, I was confronted in a passport office with a form containing over ninety questions, over sixty of which applied to unfortunate me. Yet some time after, when I was again at the passport headquarters in that land, they could find no record of me, though I had been several times there! Is it not pretty certain that a similar fate attends the vast majority of Government forms in this country also? That is, are they not mostly sheer waste?

The Archbishop continued:

> Gradually, almost imperceptibly, these permits and restrictions, few of them in themselves of great importance, wind themselves round the farmer, the builder, the industrialist, the man of business, until he finds he has lost all freedom and is in the position of Gulliver bound by the strings of Lilliput.
>
> But even more dangerous to liberty is the increasing practice of Ministers acting by administrative orders, most of which have never been discussed in Parliament. In this way the power of the Executive grows at the expense of Parliament.
>
> If the present tendency to increase restrictions and to multiply forms continues unchecked, the sense of personal responsibility will be weakened, initiative will be discouraged, and freedom gravely threatened.

But evidence is not lacking that many minds in America are moving in the direction of totalitarianism.

The power of the Courts of Law to protect the public has had two striking illustrations in modern life; only not against oppression by the Crown, but against aggression by Trade Unions. In 1926 a general strike was called in England which was calculated to paralyse the whole country. The High Court declared this strike to be illegal. Its promoters were therefore liable to penalties. The strike collapsed and the country was delivered. Twenty years later, in 1946, The United Mine Workers of America struck, the mines being then worked under a war-time agreement with Government. In this case not America alone, but also all the lands aided by America with food and other help were seriously affected. The Courts held that this strike was illegal and imposed on the Union and its President such colossal fines as brought about an immediate resumption of work and delivered the public. Another powerful association of workmen, the National Maritime Union in America, called upon all labour to support the United Mine Workers.

It is evident that the nearly one and a half million of miners in America, or the almost half that number in England, can hold a pistol to the head of the country, so long as coal is indispensable. The remark before quoted from America, "When labour unites

let *capital* look out for itself," can be extended to read, "Now that labour has united let the *country* look out for itself!" How shall a country do this? What if these masses of workmen defy the Courts? Self-assertion can reach even that abuse of power. In America this is within sight.

To strengthen the law a Bill was introduced in June, 1947, (Labour Relations Bill) designed to declare such strikes, and some other measures, wholly illegal. The President, though endorsing its design, vetoed this Bill, principally on the ground that it was of the nature of totalitarian tyranny, a "dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy." Without discussion, and by the overwhelming majority of 331 to 83, the House of Representatives overrode this veto and affirmed the Bill; and a few days later the Senate affirmed this decision, and the Bill became law. The wisdom or otherwise of the law is not here the question, but it is clear that, under a sense of the public menace of the Unions, a very large number of responsible persons in the leading democratic land are prepared to face totalitarian interference with liberty, as a lesser evil than being dominated by a few leaders of one class only of the community.

But note well the temper of the men as revealed in the following sentence which I have italicized. The correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* (June 21st, 1947) wrote:

> One of the officials of the Miners' Union said to me to-day: "Lewis [the President of the Miners' Union] can tell the miners to go fishing and they'll go. *No law will prevent them.*"

Now when masses of men, with or without what may be thought morally adequate grounds of hardship or right, openly defy the law, what can be done? They cannot be all arrested, fined, imprisoned at once. And what if they resort to violence? The Socialist Minister before quoted envisaged the possibility that the capitalist class might do this. It has been much oftener seen that the opposite class have done so. To meet this, most deplorable as despotism is, will there be any alternative?

The French Revolution swept away the "upper classes," vested all power in the proletariat, struggled through morasses of trouble, accomplished little by six years of bloodshed and misgovernment, till at last the populace surged upwards in revolt. In Carlyle's vivid picture, it

> bursts out along the Southern Quai Voltaire, along streets, passages, treble-quick, in huge veritable onslaught! Whereupon, thou bronze Artillery Officer—?[1] "Fire!" say the bronze lips.

[1] Napoleon.

> Roar and again roar, continual, volcano-like goes his great gun . . . go all his great guns;—blow to air some two hundred men . . . and the thing we specifically call *French Revolution* is blown into space by it, and become a thing that was! (*French Revolution*, Book VII, Chapter VII.)

Alas, are the Western nations fermenting to such an outburst? Is Russia's desire and design to this end to become most awful reality? Can man find no way out of his tangles and distresses? Must the violence of exasperated revolt be met evermore by the violence of totalitarian despotism, in ruinous alternation? No! say voices to-day; there is another, a better way: let us construct the

SUPER-STATE.

Let us induce all nations, at least as many as possible, to unite in one organization, under agreed international law, with a Supreme Council entrusted with the duty, and controlling the necessary combined military forces, to assure that no nation enters upon aggression against another nation.

As to questions internal to each country, this super-national Council will so control raw materials and manufacture, finance, and trade as to eliminate poverty and secure to every one abundance of prosperity and peace. Thus will it become to the advantage of any peoples who do not at once join this Combine to do so; or if not, they can be kept in order by superior force, political, economic, or military.

Such, in mere outline, is the scheme. Its dominant idea is good. A central government, with adequate resources to control all the earth, is a *desideratum*. But can men bring this about? Here are some questions.

1. The plan is colossal. Can man create, and thereafter sustain, this vast structure *without God*? What if there be a world-wide fulfilment of the ancient observation:

> Except Jehovah build the house,
> They labour in vain that build it:
> Except Jehovah keep the city,
> The watchman waketh but in vain?
> (Psalm 127: 1.)

2. Nationalism was a judgment imposed by God upon mankind after the Flood with the express purpose of *preventing* a *universal* combined opposition to the Creator (Genesis 11: 1–8). Thus it was a merciful measure to limit evil and so to reduce the wickedness of man and the wrath of God upon him. Man has perverted this institution to selfish ends by cruel means; but as it is in itself a Divine arrangement, will man be able to nullify it?

3. The measure that thus divided the race into nations was the

imposition of distinct languages. This is a barrier to universal intercourse that cannot be removed. Only a small minority are able to learn other languages than their own. Thus effective international co-operation by the masses as a whole is impossible. The many will remain dependent upon the few as instructors and controllers. Not even Basic English will surmount this obstacle.

4. The fount out of which all human trouble arises is the corrupt nature of man—of every man without exception. This selfish nature no man can alter, neither as to himself, nor therefore as to his neighbour. An aggregating of cancerous cells cannot make healthy flesh. The cause of contention in family, village, town, city, nation, and between nations will exist in the proposed Super-State. Indeed, the larger the sphere the greater the inducement for ambitious men to make it subserve their own glory.

The inherent futility of human schemes for betterment is shown pungently in the following extract from *Collier's Magazine* which came to me from America in 1929 :

i was talking
with an insect the
other day about the
hard time that
cockroaches have to
get a living every
man's hand is against them
and occasionally his
foot meals
are few and far between
why in the world says this
insect do you not
go to the country and become
grasshoppers if
living in town and being
cockroaches is getting
too difficult for you
i was astonished
at the simplicity of the
solution but as i thought it
over it occurred
to me that
perhaps it sounded more
statesmanlike than it really
was how i asked
him are
cockroaches to become
grasshoppers
that is a mere
detail he said which i
leave to you for
solution i have outlined
the general scheme for your
salvation so do not ask
me to settle the mere
details i trust to you for
that you must do
something for yourself
we philosophers cannot do
it all for you unaided
you must learn self
help but alas i fear
that your inherent stupidity
will balk all efforts
to improve your condition
boss i offer you
this little story
for what it is worth
if you are able to find
in it something
analogous to a number
of easy schemes for
the improvement of
the human race you may do
immense good by printing it
yours for reform
archy.

" This little story " does verily go to the heart and root of the whole problem of human efforts. The sinner shall change himself into a saint at the very same time that the cockroach shall change himself into a grasshopper *and not a day sooner*. It is the ancient problem stated thus by the ancient prophet: " Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil " (Jeremiah 13 : 23).

Fifty years ago the *Law Times* reviewed a plan for the improved conduct of a certain charity, and concluded with the pertinent and indubitable reflection that " unfortunately this excellent scheme will depend for its working on *defective human nature*." Precisely!

There may be still living a few who remember when, in the eighties of the last century, Mrs. Annie Besant, atheist, secularist, socialist, was spending herself freely in toil for the poorest of the poor in London slums. How many of those whose opinions, endeavours, objects are as hers then were, and who pursue them with the same sincerity, have read her summary of that stage of her stormy career? Let it be read now:

> Ever more and more had been growing on me the feeling that something more than I had was needed for the cure of social ills. The Socialist position sufficed on the economic side, but where to gain the inspiration, the motive, which should lead to the realization of the Brotherhood of Man. Our efforts really to organize bands of unselfish workers had failed. Much indeed had been done, but there was not a real movement of self-sacrificing devotion, in which men worked for Love's sake only, and asked to give, not to take. Where was the material for the nobler Social Order, where the hewn stones for the building of the Temple of Man? A great despair would oppress me as I sought for such a movement and found it not. (*Annie Besant: An Autobiography*, 338, 339.)

These words are not those of one who had abandoned Socialism for Christianity and might be thought prejudiced against her former views. The writer became a Theosophist, which system is a more insidious and therefore a more deadly foe of the Christian faith than atheism itself. They read as a genuine acknowledgment of the experienced insufficiency of the system of sociology and politics that dominates thought to-day. Surely the intervening half century has seen the ideal recede further. Where are the longed-for " bands of unselfish workers . . . the movement of self-sacrificing devotion . . . the men who work for Love's sake only . . . who ask but to give, not to take "? All the federations of masters and of men would fade away were their members to be ruled by the desire to give and not to take. The Temple of

Man still remains the same elusive idea, still unrealized, indeed, unrealizable, just because it puts man in the place of God and would build him a temple where he shall be worshipped in the place of God. The agglomerating of hundreds of millions of self-centred mortals into a Super-State will but aggravate the disease and its dangers, as we shall see.

5. Thus this grand scheme is foredoomed to failure from its inherent weakness, like a child born with inherited disease. Yet is the conception good in itself: a central government, with universal authority is essential to the welfare of the nations, with one further proviso—if it have *a competent supreme ruler!* But where shall *he* be found? Men, good and bad, with great genius as rulers, have arisen, as Moses, Nebuchadnezzar, Julius Cæsar, Cromwell, Napoleon. But no one of them succeeded in controlling more than a small portion of the population of the earth. Such men have been rare, have appeared only at long intervals, and to-day are wanting; unless we mention Stalin, dominating two hundred millions or more; and what man who loves justice and mercy would want *him* as the world's overlord? Moreover, with the tremendous increase of population the problems to-day are so vast and complicated that no human brain seems capable of grasping them, not to speak of mastering them, and they will become greater in proportion to the greatness of the empire co-ordinated.

Here enters the necessity for the SUPERMAN. But if he is to be developed (as Nietzsche and the Evolutionist suggest) by the slow process of natural selection and culture, the whole scheme at once becomes useless as regards the present and urgent needs of mankind. For there is not the slightest ground for the idea that the human race is progressing in capacity, unless it be in capacity for cruelty and devilry; and so this Superman remains a need, a longing, a mere mental conception with no prospect of ever being realized.

Yet if the need of the world is to be met this Man *must* be found, and found he will be; but not by the choice of mortal men. Two such Men are to appear. The Devil has a nominee—Antichrist; and God has a nominee—JESUS CHRIST, the Lord. The future revolves around these two rulers. We will examine this in successive chapters.

CHAPTER XII

ANTICHRIST

THE COVENANT WHICH GOD MADE WITH ABRAHAM ABOUT 1921 B.C., as mentioned above (ch. VIII, sect. 3), included this further guarantee: "Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies" (Genesis 22 : 17 ; 24 : 60). He who could capture the gate of a walled city had the city in his power (Judges 9 : 44, 45.) Thus this promise implies the supremacy of Abraham's race.

This covenant was renewed to Abraham's descendant David about 1000 B.C. To him God guaranteed victory over all enemies and a kingdom that should be established for ever (2 Samuel 7 : 1 Chronicles 17). This included a specific undertaking that David's nation, Israel, shall dwell for ever in their own land, be no more moved therefrom, nor be further afflicted by enemies. Thus shall the covenant with their first father, Abraham, be carried out completely.

But as noticed in ch. VIII above, the fulfilment of this to Israel waits upon their becoming morally fit for this high honour of ruling the other nations for universal good. Thus far they have proved themselves wholly unfit morally. Magnificent natural abilities, such as the Jew has, may only make a man more capable of mischief and misery. When 400 years after David (about 600 B.C.) the kings of Israel had showed that they and their people were not ready to carry out the purpose of God to represent Him and be a blessing to mankind, the heavenly Overlord of the nations transferred the sovereignty of the earth from the Jew to the Gentile. Nebuchadnezzar the Great destroyed the Jewish State, and that period commenced which is known in Scripture as "the Times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21 : 24). These "Times" have a limit set by God, for in the same utterance Christ spoke of Jerusalem being "trodden down by the Gentiles until the seasons of the Gentiles be completed."

The duration of this period of Gentile supremacy is, of course, known to the foreknowledge of God, but it is determined on moral grounds. When Gentile rulers shall have demonstrated fully that they, too, are morally incompetent and unworthy to reign, because their rule is no more helpful, at that same time

Israel, sanctified by Divine chastisement inflicted by the Gentiles, shall have become morally suited to the high task, shall be restored to the covenanted supremacy, and shall hold it for ever.

That it might be made plain that neither Chance nor Fate rules affairs, but a moral and intelligent Governor, He declared in advance the course that the Times of the Gentiles would take and their broad political developments.

Daniel, ch. ii. The succeeding twenty-five centuries have followed the course thus indicated. Daniel, the Jew, was caused by God to announce to Nebuchadnezzar, the Gentile, that, beginning with himself, four great empires would follow each other. This was represented to the Emperor by a dream in which he was made to see a noble image in human form, having a head of gold, breasts and arms of silver, belly and thighs of brass, legs of iron, with clay-iron feet. The toes were ten in number.

The prophet, divinely illuminated, explained this as foreshadowing four kingdoms. First Nebuchadnezzar, the head of gold, an absolute autocrat (Daniel 5 : 18, 19). Then would come an inferior form of rule, as silver is inferior to gold; and history shows that the Persian kings were a limited monarchy, the great princes being able under the Constitution to put pressure on the king (Daniel 6). This would give way to a third, and still lower grade of government, as of brass. Greece followed Persia in world supremacy, and, though Alexander secured rapidly a wide dominion, it had neither cohesive energy nor central policy, and fell rapidly to pieces. Before long the Roman power proved irresistible and gained supremacy by ruthless measures, being hard as iron is hard and smashes other substances.

But the iron legs should degenerate into clay-iron feet, being at once strong and brittle, which is surely what is seen to-day in general government. There persists a strong element, which asserts itself in the extreme form as despotism; there is also a weak element, which snaps under strain. What but this mixed condition can result from universal franchise, as in democratic lands? Millions of persons, often young, inexperienced, incompetent to run even a small business, are given a voice in running a great empire. Popular opinion is ever unformed and fluctuating, the masses are fickle and frail. Recent history has added another instance of this. That England was carried through the late war was due, under God, to one statesman more than to any other one cause; yet as soon as ever the war was over, at the earliest opportunity, the people bundled him out of office as ungratefully, as unceremoniously, as if he had been proved a public disgrace

and menace. Did Mr. Churchill think of the word he had applied in *Great Contemporaries* to three or four leaders of the last generation—the word "disillusioned"? In the judgment of many his fall from power was not so much a reflection upon himself as a sign of the inconstancy of the masses in general, and it is small wonder if other peoples regard them as unreliable and not to be trusted very far.

In consequence of the masses being voters, aspiring statesmen must of necessity give first place to their needs, desires, whims, in order to reach office and to hold it; on which account *undue* preferences must be given to one class of the community at the expense of other classes, for the votes of that one class outnumber the votes of the other classes. This induces unfairness in rulers and dissatisfaction and disunity in the nation, which involves general weakening of the body politic. At last such grave disorders may be induced that despotism becomes the painful alternative.

Thus far the prophecy has passed into history, and the exact fulfilment of so much of its terms makes it unreasonable not to expect the fulfilment of the rest with equal precision. What remains is twofold. There will come a confederacy of ten kings, as the ten toes formed the basis and last stage of the image. Here is man's super-State. But at this stage arrives the close of the Times of the Gentiles—the image is suddenly smashed and ground to powder by a heaven-sent power, pictured as a boulder, untouched by hands, falling upon it from a mountain; and this conquering kingdom obtains universal supremacy and endures for ever. The one is the kingdom of Antichrist, the Superman; the other is the kingdom of Christ, the God-man.

The urgent question for the present day is as to the formation of this Super-State. It will not be brought about by clever negotiations, but through the pressure of fierce wars. This is revealed in:

Daniel, ch. vii. The prophet was given another vision supplemental to that of the great image. This showed four wild beasts following each other in destroying the earth. They were a lion, with eagle wings; a bear; a leopard; and a fourth unlike any known creature. As the closing stage of the image was of ten kings in confederacy, pictured as ten toes, so the closing stage of the beasts is of ten horns on the last beast; and the history of the beasts tells the story of the rise of ten kings who will dominate the last beast and through it the whole earth.

The locality of all the beasts is " the Great Sea." This term is used fourteen times in the Old Testament and refers always to the Mediterranean Sea. It is not in the East or the West that the Super-State will centre, but in the Middle East. Four stages are marked in its formation.

(1) The first, the lion-eagle beast, has its wings plucked. May not this indicate a power being deprived of its fleet and air force, so crippling it from rapid movement, as Italy, for example, was in the late war? It is not here asserted that that strife was the fulfilment of the turmoil pictured in Daniel 7 as " the four winds breaking forth on the Great Sea," but, if it was not, it may illustrate it. It was foretold that a power with a wild and cruel spirit would ravage in the Mediterranean area; but that, upon its ability for swift movement being broken, it would develop a decent humane temper; " a man's heart was given unto it "; and that it would cease to roam around on bloody enterprises and " stand up on its feet as a man," and thus act in a limited sphere in a more rational spirit and manner. The present resuscitation of Italy may answer to this.

There will next emerge a ponderous, slower-acting power, like to a bear, which will ravage three lands (" three ribs are between its teeth," showing that they will have just been seized, not yet swallowed), and it will proceed to destroy much flesh. The bear seems an inappropriate figure for the hot-blooded, quick-thinking Latin races, and presumably they are not meant. The same applies to the Arab races. This will mean that some power not yet having a footing on the Mediterranean will obtain such footing and cause war there. I cannot declare that Russia will be that " bear "; but it is evident that her rulers mean to fulfil the plan of Peter the Great to obtain access to the Mediterranean; and it must be taken for granted that her irruption in that region will not be without bloody strife and fearful misery to much flesh. This *can* be fulfilment of the prophetic picture.

Then the fulfilment, whether it be this suggested as possible or something else, will be followed by a four-kingdom confederacy, marked by the grace, swiftness, and cruelty of the leopard. This beast may be a very apt symbol of the Mediterranean races, especially perhaps of the Greek type, with its love of beauty and culture, but with its innate cruelty and treacherousness. It is certain that people does and will resent the advent of Russia in their region. They are not like the Slav peoples, such as the Bulgarians and those of Yugoslavia, akin to the Russians in type and language, and therefore easily absorbed into the Russian system. This leopard already has its four heads when it rises from the sea, suggesting

that the fourfold union will have been effected before it begins fighting as a wild beast.

The idea of such a confederation is already working in that area. The secretary of the Arab League has lately envisaged such a scheme, possibly to include Turkey and Greece.

By the time this development has been reached the Middle East will have awakened thoroughly. By necessity of self-preservation, not to say love of power and dominion, those races will not be able to hold aloof from this confusion and peril at its doors, and there will be formed a ten-kingdom alliance which will display a concentration and intensifying of all the most awful ferocity that that region knew of old, as when Jenghis Khan and Tamerlane desolated those areas in centuries twelve and fourteen. The ferocity will be so terrible that no known beast could be found to symbolize this confederacy.

Nor will its ravages be confined to the Near East. It will turn westward and will trample upon the three beasts which it finds around the Mediterranean as before pictured, and thus greatly extend its territory and influence.

THE SUPERMAN—ANTICHRIST

The vision showed to the prophet another feature. There came a disturbance within the confederation of ten kings. A little horn pushed its way up among the ten horns, and in the process plucked up three of these by the roots; that is to say, a forcible person will gain a firm footing among the ten kings and will overthrow three of them in war. It would take too long here to indicate all that is revealed about this disturber of the unity of the Confederation. It must suffice to say that he will reach complete supremacy over the ten, and through their power, aided by his own vigour and craft, he will become the tyrant of the whole world. By Daniel these features are noted:

(1) "He had eyes like the eyes of a man"—human penetration, insight, and dominance, as powerful personalities dominate their fellows by their eyes. Hitler had such eyes, "the eye of a hypnotist which seduced the wits and affections of all who yielded to their power" (L.D.H., 78, and see pp. 77 and 83).

(2) He had "a mouth speaking great things"; he was an orator and boastful.

(3) "*He shall speak words against the Most High.*" He shall be the successor and climax of all atheists, blasphemers, God-haters.

(4) "*He shall wear out the saints of the Most High.*" He will

steadily and cruelly persecute all, Jew and Christian, who stand for the true God.

(5) "*He shall think to change the times and the law.*" He will impose on the world a new social order, in both its general arrangements and its law. What has taken place in Russia of late will be enforced in principle, if not in detail, upon the whole earth.

Of this great Ruler more particulars are given in the last book of the Bible, the *Revelation*, ch. 13 and ch. 17. We can still only summarize.

(6) *On his heads are names of blasphemy.* This declares his attitute to God and the truth. He will not, as are many to-day, be indifferent to both; he will not be tolerant of any and every religion, as was Rome of old, and as are many rulers, so long as the public peace is not distrubed. On the contrary, he definitely and openly blasphemes the true God. Of old, emperor worship occupied this relation to God, and His people were required to blaspheme God and Christ by sacrificing to the statues of the Emperor. This will be required by the coming World-Emperor, as this chapter 13 shows. Again, the penalty of death will be enforced against all non-conformers to the State religion.

(7) *His energy will be Satanic.* Daniel 8 : 24 : "His power shall be mighty, but not by his own power"; Revelation 13 : 2 : "The Dragon [Satan, the prince of this world] gave him *his* power, and his throne, and great authority." Nothing less than this will suffice for the task of ruling a world. Here is the meeting of the inadequacy of mere human effort by the infusing of super-human skill and energy.

(8) *His authority will for a time be universal.* "The whole earth wondered after the beast . . . there was given to him authority over every tribe and people and tongue and nation."

(9) *There will be control of trade and of life's commodities.* They that will not worship the Beast, and so conform to the established religion, will not be able to show the required sign of allegiance, and will be prohibited from trade and from obtaining food.

We of to-day should take serious note of the powerful centralizing motion of society all over the earth. General regulations increase in number and scope. National registration, central food control, membership in some trade or civic or national organization, all work in the direction of that final control of life above pictured. All these schemes and economic measures can be readily turned to a boycott of the godly. Russia has plainly illustrated it in advance.

For a time the rule of Antichrist will seem satisfactory to men. Universal authority will prevent local conflicts; men will cry

that peace and safety are come at last, prosperity is assured (2 Thessalonians 5 : 2, 3 ; Revelation 13 : 3, 4, 8). But it will not last. He will illustrate fully what was seen in Hitler, even " the ultimate inefficiency of dictatorial power, which causes the success to run dry " (L.D.H., 259).

His tyrannical and cruel actions will provoke revulsion and rebellion (Daniel 11 : 40–45). And though he will crush these outbreaks, yet shall he fail at last, for the God of heaven shall arise against him. He shall muster his whole forces for one final desperate battle with Christ at His appearing in glory, but being taken red-handed in rebellion, he shall " be cast into the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone " (Revelation 19 : 20). And they who have supported his cause shall share his doom.

Such, most briefly outlined, is the international program for the future, as set forth 2,500 years ago in the Book of God. Much has been already fulfilled ; part is in fulfilment before our eyes ; the wise will await fulfilment of the rest, and will shape their course accordingly. For of all merely human schemes the close shall be that of Antichrist himself : " he shall come to his end and none shall help him " (Daniel 11 : 45).

CHAPTER XIII

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND CHRIST

TO BELIEVE THE PROPHECIES OF THE WORD OF GOD IS eminently rational. Christ is the chief subject of them: "to Him bear all the prophets witness" (Acts 10: 43). The substance of their testimony concerns two great events in the career of Christ, one now past, the other yet to be fulfilled. They "testified beforehand (1) the sufferings which should come unto Messiah and (2) the glories that should follow them" (1 Peter 1: 11). And so they spoke in advance of *two* comings of Christ to the earth: one in humble guise to suffer; the other in glory to reign.

Here is a specimen:

Psalm 22, from about 1000 B.C. "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me (verse 1). . . . All they that see me laugh me to scorn (verse 7). . . . Thou hast brought me into the dust of death (verse 15) . . . they pierced my hands and my feet" (verse 16). This pictures the sufferings of crucifixion; but at verse 21 the strain changes, and the Sufferer, in oriental imagery, exclaims: "from the horns of the wild oxen Thou hast answered me. I will declare Thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the assembly I will praise Thee (verse 22). . . .Of Thee cometh my praise in the great assembly (verse 28). . . . For the kingdom is Jehovah's: and He is the ruler over the nations" (verse 28).

Or consider this example from

Isaiah 53, dating from some 700 B.C.: "He was despised and rejected of men (verse 3). . . . By oppression and judgment he was taken away . . . he was cut off out of the land of the living (verse 8). . . . Thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin" (verse 10). But again the strain changes completely. Though cut off prematurely by death, "he shall prolong his days . . . and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand (verse 10). . . . He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied (verse 11). . . . Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, because he poured out his soul unto death" (verse 12).

Here is another example, from about 500 B.C. In Zechariah 13: 7 God said: "Awake, O sword against My shepherd, and against

the Man that is My fellow, saith Jehovah of hosts." Here is the suffering of the God-Man. But in 14 : 4 the prophet says : " his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem . . . Jehovah my God shall come, and all the holy ones with thee (verse 5) . . . Jehovah shall be King over all the earth " (verse 9).

These are but samples of very many such prophecies, and it is to be observed that the same prophet conjoined predictions of the sufferings and the glories of the same Person. It is computed that in the Old Testament there are over 300 details of the former period of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. They were uttered or written over a period of a thousand years, beginning with Moses and ending with Malachi. Some 400 years elapsed between the last prediction and the coming of Jesus Christ to the earth, so that no prophet could at all influence the fulfilment of his words. Yet every one of these over 300 particulars was accomplished in the brief space of the thirty-three years of the life of Christ. The compound probability against this is so inconceivably vast as to make it wholly impossible that it should just have " happened." It could have been brought about only by the direct action of God.

Now the argument is this : If one giving me directions as to my road describes ten features of that road, such as turnings, crossings, inns, and churches, and as I go my way six of these features, one after another, are verified, I should have every warrant to expect the other four features to meet me. And inasmuch as the prophets did accurately and minutely foretell the first coming of Messiah, which they could in no wise have done apart from the instruction of the God who alone foresees the future, it is only rational to expect the same exact fulfilment of the conjoined predictions as to a second coming of Messiah to reign in glory.

Moreover, what shall we say to the fact that Jesus Christ most explicitly accepted and confirmed both classes of predictions as applying to Himself? Of His death He said : " The Son of man goeth even as it is written of Him " (Matthew 26 : 24) ; but He said also : " When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the angels with Him (compare Zechariah above : " Jehovah my God shall come and all the holy ones with thee "), then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory " (Matthew 25 : 31). After His resurrection He as definitely conjoined the two aspects of His career, past and future, by saying " Behoved it not the Messiah to suffer these things, and to enter into His glory ? " (Luke 24 : 26.)

He who does not expect the personal return of the Lord Jesus Christ to rule this earth nullifies the plain meaning of prophets

and apostles and of the Lord Himself, that is, of the Bible entire; and, there being simply no other guide to the future, he sails into coming international darkness and tempest with neither chart, compass, rudder, nor star of hope by which to steer or to be cheered. Yea, more and worse; he will be misled by man's unwarranted expectations which will utterly disappoint him.

To touch but briefly all that Scripture discloses of the reign of Christ over the earth would require a book as big as the Bible itself. This cannot be attempted here. In ch. III it has been shown from Luke 16 what Christ taught of the experiences of men directly after death. We will now consider what in the way of judgment upon the wicked He will execute at His visible return to the earth. We shall conjoin some very early prophecies with the last.

Fourteen centuries B.C. God said:

> If I whet the lightning of my sword,
> And mine hand take hold on vengeance;
> I will render vengeance to mine adversaries,
> And will recompense them that hate me.
> (Deuteronomy 32: 31.)

Perhaps five centuries later a psalmist said:

> Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O mighty one,
> Thy glory and thy majesty.
> And in thy majesty ride on prosperously
> In behalf of truth and meekness and righteousness:
> And thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things.
> Thine arrows are sharp:
> The peoples fall under thee:
> They are in the heart of the king's enemies.
> (Psalm 45: 3–5.)

Another six centuries pass and in Revelation 19: 11–16 there is this majestic scene:

> And I saw the heaven opened: and behold, a white horse, and he that sat thereon, called Faithful and True: and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. And his eyes are a flame of fire, and upon his head are many diadems; and he hath a name written which no one knoweth but he himself. And he is arrayed in a garment sprinkled with blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which are in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and pure. And out of his mouth proceedeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of

Almighty God. And he hath on his garment and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS.

Verse 2 of the Psalm quoted had described this Ruler thus :

Thou art fairer than the children of men,
Grace is poured into thy lips.

Beauty of character and graciousness of speech were seen in perfection in Jesus of Nazareth. Such an one can be trusted to execute the holy wrath of God, without miscarriage of justice by either failure or excess. It is restful to know that none less perfect than He is judge. When here, He scorched hypocrisy, but comforted those who mourned over their sins ; He condemned severely adultery, yet liberated the repentant adulteress and forgave the woman of the streets. By Him the dread but inevitable work of judgment shall be done effectively yet mercifully, and " the work of righteousness shall be peace ; and the effect of righteousness, quietness and confidence for ever " (Isaiah 32 : 17). He will destroy the destroyers of the earth, and grant possession of it to the meek (Revelation 11 : 18 ; Matthew 5 : 5).

As to the characteristics of His kingdom, they are summarized in Romans 14 : 7 in the words : " the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." Here are five features, one negative, three positive, and a fifth explanatory.

(i) In millennial times men will eat and drink, but this will be incidental, subordinate. Now men often live to eat and drink ; then they will eat and drink only to live. Now men are desperately " anxious, saying what shall we eat ? or what shall we drink ? or wherewithal shall we be clothed ? For after all these things do the Gentiles seek " anxiously (Matthew 6 : 31, 32). But Christ, Himself at the time poor and in need of these things, bade His followers (not all men) not to be anxious, but to remember that the God Who clothes lilies and feeds sparrows is *their Father*. He assured them that if they will concentrate upon doing what their Father thinks to be right, and will thus further His kingdom as the true interest of their hearts and the true end of their lives, then they would experience His divine care as to earthly, bodily needs. And following this counsel myriads of them have been enabled to live in righteousness, peace, and joy even in this present evil age.

In the days of Christ's visible reign this experience will be general. God, now to most men unreal, will become the great Reality, and trust in Him will banish fear of being in want to-morrow.

This will deliver the heart from greed, from hoarding, from stealing, from gambling, and all else that results from fear of the future. God will respond to this trust by making seasons fruitful and certain, and all men will have all things needful in abundance and perpetually. Isaiah 11 : 1–9 ; 65 : 17–25, etc., will have literal fulfilment.

(ii) Given a realm in which every person does only what is right to every other person, such a realm will naturally remain in peace, and to dwell there will be very joyful to all.

(iii) To secure this delightful state it is absolutely needful, simply imperative, that human nature must be changed in its essence. Man must receive a *new* nature, he must be born again with a nature from above, for otherwise he can never see or enter that kingdom of God which is from above. Christ taught a religious but still natural man that this is the work of the Creator Spirit ; and the Spirit effects this change when a man places his faith on Christ lifted up on the cross as his personal Redeemer.[1] Let the agnostic scorn this as he will, it remains the real experience of myriads of his fellow-sinners, and if he were a true scientist he would take serious account of this testimony of tens of thousands of his fellow-men whose testimony he has neither moral nor rational ground to deny.

At the appearing of Christ in glory men will see that He is indeed the very Jesus who was crucified for their sins, and such as do then and there receive and trust Him, will experience that renewing work of the Spirit of God, and in His inworking power will live in righteousness and know peace and joy. Ezekiel 36 : 25–37 ; Isaiah 44 : 3–5 ; 59 : 21 ; Joel 2 : 28, 29, will then have general fulfilment. Every real believer upon the Son of God has present experience of this, which is a foretaste of that future and a guarantee that it is possible, yea, sure. By this means the unbeliever to-day can test the future for himself, and can satisfy himself that it is rational to expect the accomplishment of what God has promised.

Old Sir Thomas More gave to the world his notions of what would constitute Paradise on earth, and he called his book *Utopia*, which means The Happy Place. But he could not change the spirit of men, and so neither he nor any other reformer has been able to create Utopia. For the man is what he is in his spirit : one of mean spirit will be niggardly ; one generous of spirit will be kindly. Now to them that obey Him God gives of His own Spirit of holiness and love ; into such Utopia enters now ; and by all men sharing this in Christ's day there will become an out-

[1] See my *The New Birth.*

ward general Utopia. Why the fulfilment of this seems deferred on the side of God we will touch on in the next chapter, but any individual can secure a genuine and present foretaste by the Spirit upon submitting to Christ as the LORD he means to obey.

Perhaps no sweeter or finer picture exists of that great era than the noble prophetic poem in Psalm 72. It reads :

Give the king thy judgments, O God,
And thy righteousness unto the king's son.
He shall judge thy people with righteousness,
And thy poor with judgment.
The mountains shall bring peace to the people,
And the hills, in righteousness.
He shall judge the poor of the people,
He shall save the children of the needy,
And shall break in pieces the oppressor.
They shall fear thee while the sun endureth,
And so long as the moon, throughout all generations.
He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass ;
As showers that water the earth.
In his days shall the righteous flourish ;
And abundance of peace, till the moon be no more.
He shall have dominion also from sea to sea,
And from the River [Euphrates] unto the ends of the earth.
They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him ;
And his enemies shall lick the dust.
The kings of Tarshish and of the coastlands shall bring presents ;
The kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts.
Yea, all kings shall fall down before him:
All nations shall serve him.
For he shall deliver the needy when he crieth ;
And the poor, that hath no helper.
He shall have pity on the poor and needy,
And the souls of the needy he shall save.
He shall redeem their soul from oppression and violence ;
And precious shall their blood be in his sight.
And they shall live : and to him shall be given of the gold of Sheba ;
And men shall pray for him continually ;
They shall bless him all the day long.
There shall be abundance of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains ;
The fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon ;
And they of the city shall flourish like grass of the earth.
His name shall endure for ever ;
His name shall be continued as long as the sun ;
And men shall be blessed in him ;
All nations shall call him happy.

Blessed be Jehovah God, the God of Israel,
Who only doeth wondrous things:
And blessed be his glorious name for ever:
And let the whole earth be filled with his glory.
Amen, and Amen!

Here are shown (1) the character of the King; (2) the universality of His rule; (3) the suppression of oppression, and the deliverance of the poor; (4) the increased fruitfulness of the earth; (5) the honour that shall be rendered to the King by all; (6) the perpetuity of His reign: "His name shall endure for ever"; (7) the eternal glory thus gained unto His God and Father [the closing doxology], who has thus "set His king upon His holy hill of Zion" (Psalm 2 : 6), in spite of all opposition, human and Satanic, and has so "set Him to be blessings for ever" unto all mankind (Psalm 21 : 6).

The third difficulty mentioned in ch. XI as barring a universal empire is diversity of language, as imposed at Babel. The removal of this in the times of Messiah may be hinted in Zephaniah 3 : 9, where God says, "Then will I turn to the peoples a pure language (Hebrew, *lip*), that they may all call upon the Name of Jehovah, to serve Him with one consent." This seems to imply the ability of all races to call unitedly upon the one God in one language. This agrees with Zechariah 14 : 16, which pictures all nations making an annual visit to Jerusalem to worship Jehovah.

This promise of the eternal glory of the Son of God, and the eternal felicity of His subjects, shows that the millennial kingdom will lead on to and will be perfected in an eternal kingdom. The transition to that perfected state will be by three stages.

(1) The great Tempter will be allowed a short term again to tempt mankind. Under God's King the earth will have known perfect government, permanent peace, unbounded prosperity. But ideal outward conditions do not of themselves create ideal beings. Children of the godly are not sinless. So that when spiritual incitement to evil is again active it will be seen that unregenerate human nature is unalterable by a favourable environment. This will be the last and the conclusive demonstration that the theory is false that the man can be changed by improving his surroundings.

Now at last the dread contest which commenced in heaven when Satan rose up against the Most High, is concluded by his being cast into the lake of fire prepared for him and his angels (Matthew 25 : 41). How glorious, how awful is the grandest

of all natural gifts, the freedom of the will. How indispensable to its right exercise is the humility of love that bows reverently to the will of God and trusts instantly to His supporting grace. But when love of self displaces the love of God the sure end is eternal ruin, unless grace can restore through repentance and faith; and a sinner, alas, can reach a state when these are no longer possible.

(2) There will be a second resurrection of the dead, when all shall be judged according to their works; when eternal bliss or eternal woe shall be assigned to each; when to be found having one's name still unerased from God's book of life shall be seen to have always been the prime factor worthy of all attention (Revelation 20 : 11–15).

(3) This assize concluded, the almighty Creator shall split every atom in the universe; heaven and earth shall be thus purged by fire; and there shall follow renewed heavens and a renewed earth wherein shall dwell for ever only righteousness, with her handmaids peace and joy, wherein redeemed men shall enjoy eternal holiness and happiness and God shall be all in all for ever and ever (Revelation 21 : 1–8; 2 Peter 3).

It will be a new idea to some that God has a programme already announced as to its general features and as to much detail. It is no invention of clever human brains, but has been standing in the pages of God's Book for nearly two thousand years. Many have seen it more or less clearly, more or less fully, and have walked by its light, rejoicing in the hope, pressing towards it as life's goal. Of it they have been assured by a reasoned faith; for the foretaste already enjoyed in peace and gladness of heart is the earnest of the perfected conditions promised, even as it is written that "we have the firstfruits of the Spirit" (Romans 8 : 23), and "the Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance" (Ephesians 1 : 13, 14). The youth who receives regularly the interest on capital is thereby assured that there *is* capital which he will possess fully when he comes of age. This is the hope that maketh not ashamed, for the love of God (which is the moral energy and glory of that coming eternity) is already shed abroad in the heart of the believer by the Holy Spirit Who is given unto us (Romans 5 : 5). Faith is not credulity; it is a reasoned confidence based on sound premises. He who holds fast the hope of the gospel will not be put to shame: every other hope will be confounded.

Note.—A good deal of this and the preceding chapter is quoted or condensed from my book, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ*, to which the inquirer is referred for fuller treatment.

CHAPTER XIV

HAS CHRISTIANITY FAILED?

THE ANSWER DEPENDS, OF COURSE, UPON WHAT CHRISTIANITY was designed by its Founder to accomplish.

But what is meant by "Christianity"? If the meaning assigned be that of a vast visible, organized system of religion, such as the great Confederated Church which developed in the second and third centuries after Christ, became the State religion under Constantine, and is now represented by the ecclesiastical systems into which it broke up, such as the Roman Catholic, the Greek Orthodox, or one of the many Reformed State Churches, or the incorporated Nonconformist bodies—if such a visible ecclesiastical Society be "Christianity," then we have but to remark that no such religious system was instituted or intended by the Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore we have but little interest in the question whether such have "failed" or otherwise. "For though it is indisputable that our Lord founded a church, it is an unproved assumption that that Church is an aggregation of visible and organized societies" (Dr. E. Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, Pref. 12).

This clears our question of a great mass of confusing and irrelevant matter. Neither possible benefits nor actual miseries resulting from these great organized systems of religion have anything to do with the success or failure of the church that Christ instituted, for they are not *that* church. In all of these miscalled "Christian" systems there are members of that true church which Christ is building, but the systems as such do not belong thereto. This will be seen clearly when at last the true church of God is seen in its heavenly state as designed by its Founder, for then all of these systems will have disappeared. It is a working of that crafty Enemy, some of whose skilful activities we have noticed, that the name of Christ has been attached to organized systems of religion, and so in many minds He has been held responsible for what is not of Him, indeed often utterly contrary to Him; in fact His holy name has been attached to much hellish work by His very Enemy.

The statement by Christ "I will build My church" is connected

with the immediately preceding confession by the apostles that Jesus is "the Messiah, the Son of the living God." This perception of the divine person of Jesus can be gained only by a definite revelation of this fact by the Father of Jesus, and it must be received individually (Matthew 16: 13–20). Therefore only those persons who receive and act upon this revelation, and who from their hearts, and in practice, accord to Christ the honour due to Him as being the Son of God, are built into and form His church. It follows that some classes of persons, such as infants, imbeciles, and moral living heathen who have never heard of Christ, are not part of His church. This does not mean that such are necessarily to be lost for ever, for other factors enter into that question, but as they have not known and confessed Christ to be the Son of God they are not of that society which is built upon that confession as a building upon a rock.

There is no uncharitableness in recognizing the obvious fact that the vast majority who form the organized Systems mentioned do not guide life by the principle of owning, by practical obedience to His precepts, that Jesus is the Son of God. The very Systems themselves, in varying degrees, disregard His revealed will as to the nature and conduct of His house, the church of God. Their differing form and their rules are all too largely based on what man thinks expedient in religion, not upon what Christ, as Son of God, ordained, as stated in His Word.

Therefore the true church of God on earth is composed of such individuals as know and own Jesus as the Son of God. Of these there is no visible universal society. They can only be recognized as individuals, the sign being that they study to obey (however imperfectly as yet) the precepts of Christ, and to walk by His Spirit. In any locality where some of them may live they will meet together to worship God and to strengthen each other in faith and obedience. Such as do thus meet form "a church of God" in that place: beyond this there is nothing corporate that man can discern. I speak of what is the mind of Christ about this church as stated in His Word.

A feature very material for the present discussion now emerges, namely, that the church of God, whether invisible and universal, or local and visible, is only *a portion of mankind.* This indeed is involved in the very idea of the word "church" (*ecclesia*), which describes a company of persons called together, not the whole mass of people. Thus in the Greek translation of the Old Testament the word is applied to the people of Israel when gathered together; they were the "assembly of Jehovah" in contrast to

the other nations of the earth who were not His people and were not summoned to His assemblies.

It is the same with the church, or assembly, of God to-day. The New Testament nowhere contemplates it as anything but a portion of mankind, and a small portion. As Christ said to His followers: "Fear not, *little flock*; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Luke 12 : 32). Therefore on the day of Pentecost His apostle did not offer the hope that all Israel would become "Christian," but cried to individuals in the words "*Save yourselves from* this crooked generation" (Acts 2 : 40). And on a later occasion another apostle said: "God visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name" (Acts 15 : 14).

This last statement is illuminating. James continued by declaring four stages in the purposes of God.

> (1) "After these things"—that is, after the just before-mentioned out-gathering of the people for the name of God;
>
> (2) "I will return"—that personal return of the Lord Jesus considered in the preceding chapter;
>
> (3) And I will build again the tent of David, which is fallen,
> And I will build again the ruins thereof,
> And I will set it up:—that before-discussed restoration of world sovereignty to the family of David and his people Israel. The question here is not the building of that *new* society, the church, but of rebuilding the ruins of something *old*, the house of David.
>
> (4) That the *residue of men* may seek after the Lord,
> And *all the Gentiles*, upon whom my name is called
> saith the Lord, who maketh these things known from of old.

Nothing surely can be clearer than that (1) the present work of God, the preaching of the gospel, is not intended by Him to effect the conversion of the whole race of mankind, but is designed to gather out from all the earth a limited company who are to bear His name, that is, to be known as His; (2) that *this* work being presently completed, the Lord will return to the earth and will restore the people and kingdom of Israel; and (3) that *then* is the period when all the nations will seek God and will enjoy His blessing.

James said that these things had been made known by God of old, that the prophets agreed with his view, which is fact.

Deuteronomy 32. Moses had described in moving terms the rebellion and chastisement of Israel which the centuries to follow his day should see, but he assured them that—

> Jehovah will judge his people,
> And repent himself for [that is, in favour of] his servants (ver. 36),

and will render vengeance to His adversaries who had oppressed His people. Then, after the description of this deliverance, comes the call :

Rejoice, *O ye nations* with his people.

It is not that Israel are to be merged with the nations into the church of God, but that the nations are to join Moses's people, God's people, Israel, in *their* rejoicing.

Psalm 22 gives first that pathetic account of the redeeming death of Messiah which has been before considered. Then at verse 22 Messiah is pictured as leading the praise of God in the midst of His brethren, the assembly. This verse is shown by Hebrews 2 : 10–12 to apply to the many sons God is now bringing unto the glory already the portion of His Son, that is, to the church of God. Then verse 23 calls upon *the seed of Jacob and Israel* to praise and glorify their God ; and, lastly (verse 27) :

All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto Jehovah :
and *all the kindreds of the nations* shall worship before thee.
For the kingdom is Jehovah's ;
and he is the ruler over *the nations*.

Isaiah 53, 54, 55. The same order rules these chapters. Chapter 53 is again a description of the rejection and death of the sin-bearing Messiah : ch. 54 is a call to *Israel* to forget her widowhood as cast off by her God, and to resume union with her Maker as her husband (verses 4, 5) ; and ch. 55 extends the call of grace to "*everyone* that thirsteth," for the world at large can enjoy the sure mercies guaranteed to David the king of Israel, for God has given him to be a witness and commander to *all peoples* (verses 3–5).

Psalm 67 is very distinctly marked by the same order of events.

God be merciful unto us, and bless us [Israel],
And cause his face to shine upon us ;
That thy way may be known upon earth,
Thy saving health to *all nations* . . .
God, even our own God, will bless us [Israel].
God will bless *us* ;
And *all the ends of the earth* shall fear him.

The idea that the business of the church of God is to save all the world, to remedy all social ills, to set up the kingdom of God on earth, is utterly foreign to the Word of God. It is a human invention. Therefore as this work, or anything of its nature, was not committed by Christ to His servants, that they have not accomplished it argues no failure on their part. That their message and example have been the chief ameliorating influence in human

life we have before shown, and this is an incidental testimony to the divine Person whose message they transmit; but the extending of this amelioration to an universal cure of earth's griefs was never their appointed work. This work has been the gathering out from mankind of that people, limited in number, of whom James spoke as above quoted. In *this* work Christ's servants *have* succeeded; wherever the message has gone some have heeded and have turned the back on the old life, and the old sphere of life, human society as without God; but the many have not done so. Thus judged "Christianity" has not failed, but has succeeded; it has served the purpose of its Founder.

This raises the question proposed above, even the part in the plans of God to be taken by this limited company, the church. Why is this the Divine objective of this age? Why is universal blessing deferred to the next age?

The answer is simple. The establishing of a great empire upon what has been hostile territory lately conquered, and its consequent permanent administration, demands a large body of trained and qualified officials, having full knowledge of the purposes of their Sovereign, and of the means by which they are to be served, and with enthusiastic devotion to His ends. Every great leader will train such men in advance of the actual conquest, so that they shall be at hand immediately the hour strikes. This is what God is now doing; this is His purpose for this selected company, the church.

With this high end in view they are put through a severe school of discipline of character, to train them to feel and to act like their King, and thus be qualified to co-operate with Him in His coming day. See ch. III above.

Another aspect of this purpose is that those who in this age love Christ well enough to share His present rejection by the majority of men will, in that coming age, be recompensed by sharing His glory in His kingdom. See ch. IV above.

A third element of the matter is as follows. As we have seen in ch. III, there exists a government of the universe conducted by great angels and their subordinates. Many of these have fallen from their original allegiance to God and prostitute their offices and powers to corrupt His realms. It is therefore inevitable that a re-arrangement shall come in that heavenly government. This will be effected by Christ and His glorified followers being invested with the whole of that heavenly authority. For it is written that "not unto angels hath God subjected the inhabited earth to come" (Hebrews 2 : 5).

This grand investiture was shown in vision to the prophet Daniel five centuries B.C. (see ch. VII). He saw a session of that heavenly court whose proceedings we have already considered. Before the Supreme Judge, the Ancient of Days, there was presented "one like unto a son of man," to whom was given universal and everlasting dominion (verses 9–14).

About the year A.D. 90 John was shown that same scene, with ampler details (Revelation 4 and 5). The One formerly "*like unto* a son of man" had now become truly man, the Man Christ Jesus, being now both the Lamb that had been slain, the Lion of Judah, and the Root out of which David the king of Israel had grown, to whom of old the government had been promised, as we have seen.

That Christ did not receive this formal investiture at His ascension is certain.

The angel explained to Daniel (7 : 26, 27) that the assize in question would sit to take away the dominion of the Beast (the last world Emperor, Antichrist) and consume it completely. Inasmuch as the Beast has not even yet arisen, it is clear that the judgment assize in question has not yet come and has not yet acted, and therefore the Son of Man is not yet invested with authority. It is His by gift and title, but He is not yet in possession.

This is confirmed by the fact that John (Revelation 4 : 1) was shown this royal occasion as still future some fifty or sixty years after Christ had ascended to the throne of the Father.

About 1,000 years B.C. David was inspired to write these words :

> Jehovah said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand,
> Until I make thine enemies thy footstool.
> Jehovah will send forth the rod of thy strength out of Zion :
> Rule thou in the midst of thy enemies.
>
> (Psalm 110.)

Christ endorsed the current Jewish application of this to the Messiah (Matthew 22 : 41–45), and therefore to Himself, for He accepted as true Peter's confession of Himself as being the Messiah, the Son of God (Matthew 16 : 16, 17). In Hebrews 1 : 3, 13; 10 : 13 this psalm is again applied to Christ and as a present attitude, which means that perhaps thirty years after the ascension Christ was still waiting for the time when His enemies should be subjected to Him. Nor has this time and event arrived till now, for some of His avowed enemies are in power to-day as in Russia, England and elsewhere.

Until that day shall have come it is the Ancient of Days who administers the universe through His angel princes and judges.

The chief present concern of Christ is the safeguarding, as their Priest-Advocate in that Supreme Court, the interests of the company, His church, who are being gathered and trained for service in His day, and this is also *their* present concern, in fellowship with Him "For God hath called us into the fellowship of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord" (1 Corinthians 1 : 9). Therefore not till their Sovereign takes over the work of governing should they do so. As long as He is rejected from the affairs of nations they accept the same position and its consequences, waiting, as He is waiting, for the day when God shall bruise Satan under their feet as under His (Romans 16 : 20 ; Genesis 3 : 15). Thus did Paul explain matters in 1 Corinthians 4 : 5–13.

Therefore when men find that consistent followers of Christ will not join in their affairs corporate they ought not to think it indifference or hostility. Christ and the instructed Christian are deeply interested in the welfare of every man and of the earth at large, only it is not yet their time for active intervention in these public affairs. While their Lord is rejected they know and feel themselves to be apart in spirit from this present age. They are sure from Scripture that human nature is irremediable and human problems insoluble apart from Christ. Their business is to offer to men the free pardon of the God they have neglected or even defied, to assure every man that God delights to meet every man with grace. Now no ambassador sent by his sovereign with a message of peace is at the same time sent with orders to fight the enemy, nor is authorized to accept the office of judge or ruler in the enemy country. If he would commend the *grace* of his king he must act on that footing alone. If the overtures of peace be spurned, then the ambassador may be commissioned to act as a soldier to fight or a judge to punish, but he ceases then to be an ambassador of peace. And even among men it is considered the extreme of insult and outrage that an ambassador should be ill-treated. Yet the ambassadors of the King of kings have been all too often outraged and killed, which will count heavily in the judgment inflicted at last by their Soverign on His enemies, as also in the reward that the wronged messengers of peace will receive.

All authority vests in the Son of God by appointment of His Father. This has always been so. It is the uniform testimony of Scripture (Hebrews 1 : 2 ; John 3 : 35 ; 5 : 22 ; 13 : 3 ; Matthew 28 : 18 ; Ephesians 1 : 20–22 ; 1 Peter 3 : 22). But upon becoming a man, though remaining the Prince of life and the Lord of glory (Acts 3 : 15 ; 1 Corinthians 2 : 8), He voluntarily divested Himself of these prerogatives (Philippians 2 : 5–11). Man

is not entitled to a seat on the throne of God. Yet it is as man that Christ is there. How is this? It is because the Father has recompensed His fidelity, obedience, and suffering as man by restoring to Him as man the offices and glories He renounced to become man. The following inspired statements declare this:

Isaiah 53 : 12. God through the prophet said in advance:

> *Therefore* will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, *because* he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors.

Philippians 2 : 8–11. An apostle explains that Christ,

> being found in fashion as a man humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. *Wherefore* also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name that is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Hebrews 2. This writer points out from Psalm 8, which is based on Genesis 1 : 26–28, that from the beginning God declared His intention that man should have dominion over all things. But he further observes that as yet this is not so. Indeed, it is not; for man lost his dominion when the Devil attacked and conquered him; but nevertheless, adds the writer, we do see this purpose of God in process of fulfilment in one representative man; "we behold *Jesus* crowned with glory and honour," and so crowned "*because of* the suffering of death" (verse 9).

Revelation 5 : 11, 12. With this the assembled hosts of heaven are in fullest accord. They cry

> with a great voice, Worthy is *the Lamb that hath been slain* to receive the power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honour, and glory, and blessing.

The whole resources of the universe and of God are rightly His.

The foregoing programme is confirmed as the teaching of the Word of God by the following further passages. They show that for the people of Christ as for Him the prospect, and the condition for sharing it, are the same.

Luke 22 : 28–30. To certain of the faithful of His followers the Lord said:

> Ye are they who have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Romans 8 : 16–18. Paul suffered for the cause of Christ more than most. He showed how powerful is the incentive of this prospect by writing :

> The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God : and if children, then heirs ; heirs indeed (*men*) of God, but (*de*) joint-heirs with Messiah, *if so be* that we suffer with him, *that* we may be also glorified with him.

2 Timothy 2 : 9–13. Again, at the close of his Christian conflict, he wrote :

> I suffer hardship unto bonds, [treated] as a criminal. . . . Faithful is the saying :
>
> For if we died with him,
> we shall also live with him :
> If we endure,
> we shall also reign with him :
> If we shall deny him,
> he also will deny us :
> If we are faithless, he abideth faithful,
> for he cannot deny himself.

To live *with* Christ means to share His place and glory, which is far more than eternal life *in* Christ by faith. Nor does Paul here attach this grand hope to the fact that *Christ* died *for* us, though truly it is the *basis* of every blessing : but he makes it to follow and to depend upon the *believer* dying *with* Christ. Notice the double " if " : " *if* we died . . . *if* we endure."

Revelation 3 : 21. This correspondence between the Leader and the follower the glorified Lord Himself emphasized by promising that

> he that overcometh [literally, the one overcoming, in contrast to those who may be defeated in the battles of the Lord], I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne, as I also overcame [conquered], and sat down with my Father in his throne.

To take these, and many other statements to the like effect, as meaning only that a believer in Christ is pardoned, justified, and has eternal life in Christ, being therefore eternally free from the wrath of God, is to nullify their sense, their urgency, their incentive. Eternal life is the " free " [χάρισμα unconditional] gift of God in Christ Jesus (Romans 6 : 23). These rich rewards are also a gift in Christ, but are conditional gifts, are prizes ; provided, indeed, by the Giver of the prizes without cost to the winner, save only the cost of running well to the end of the race, of fighting

faithfully till the campaign is crowned and closed by victory. Therefore said Paul as he reviewed his life at its close :

> I am already being poured out as a drink offering, and the time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day; and not to me only, but also to all them that have loved his appearing (2 Timothy 4 : 6–8).

Let each of us follow him, as he followed Christ, and as he exhorted Timothy, his younger fellow-soldier to do, saying,

> Suffer hardship with me as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. No soldier on service *entangleth* himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him who enrolled him as a soldier (2 Timothy 2 : 3, 4).

Affairs of this life no one can wholly avoid; but barbed-wire entanglements are dangerous to the soldier.

To gain that prize I toward that goal will struggle
Which God hath set before;
To gain that prize 'gainst sin and death I'll battle
And with the world make war:
And if it brings me here but shame and troubles
And scorn, if pain life fills,
Yet seek I nothing of earth's empty baubles;
My God alone my longing stills.

To gain that prize, to reach that crown I'm pressing
Which Christ doth ready hold;
I mean His great reward to be possessing,
His booty for the bold.
I will not rest, no weariness shall stay me,
To hasten home is best,
Where I some day in peace and joy shall lay me
Upon my Saviour's heart and rest.

(*From the German.*)

CHAPTER XV

THE TRUTH AND THE LIE

WHAT WAS DESIGNED TO BE A PAMPHLET HAS EXPANDED TO a treatise. It shall be concluded by a return to the starting point.

The root of all human sin and misery is a false idea of God and a consequent wrong attitude to Him. Therefore the one and only remedy is to gain a true knowledge of God and to adopt a right attitude to Him. A very ancient speaker gave this sage advice: "Acquaint now thyself with Him and be at peace" (Eliphaz the Temanite; Job 22 : 21).

They are no benefactors of the race, but rather its deadliest foes, who blur the absolute distinction between truth and error, who with the wicked Pontius Pilate ask scornfully, "What is truth?" (John 18 : 38). As said the prophet:

> Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter. Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight (Isaiah 5 : 20, 21).

In the nearly 1,500 pages of Hitler and Rosenberg I do not recall a single sentence expressive of diffidence or humility. They have earned the Woe upon the conceited and self-satisfied. The Wise King said:

> Pride goeth before destruction,
> And a haughty spirit before a fall.
> Better it is to be of a lowly spirit with the poor,
> Than to divide the spoil with the proud.
> (Proverbs 16 : 18, 19.)

The world is full of the wise in their own eyes and prudent in their own sight. It is mostly ruled by such, and therefore it hastens to collapse and destruction. Whoever would do anything really helpful must press the absolute opposition between the truth and the lie, so that each person must be compelled to decide which he personally will adopt and spread. God Himself emphasizes this incurable opposition in many passages.

Romans 1 : 18, 19.

> For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold down *the* truth in unrighteousness ; because that which is knowable concerning God is manifest in [among] them ; for God manifested it unto them.

God is indignant that a rational being should resolutely suppress the truth when he knows it. This is what our race did at the time here in question, that is, soon after the Flood.

But it is *the* truth which is suppressed. What truth ? In Greek, as in English, " truth " is an abstract noun that can have before it the definite article without emphasis, in which case it may be omitted in translating into English. But in both languages the word can be used without the article when truth in the abstract is meant, as when Christ said to His critics, " If I say truth why do ye not believe Me ? " (John 8 : 46). It must therefore be determined from the statement itself and its context whether truth in general is in view or some one truth in particular.

In Romans 1 : 18 the answer to the question what truth did men suppress in those early days ? is shown by the very next sentence, which speaks of truth *about God*, " that which is knowable concerning God." To men then, and to men now, the creation around us testifies to two facts as to its Creator, His eternal power and His divinity, His Godhead, so that in the ancient days, and now, men must either own God's being and rights, or must suppress in their hearts this knowledge, by refusing to submit to God. For example both Darwin and Huxley admitted that in earlier manhood they accepted the teachings of Scripture ; so that the primary question for such before God will be how in their hearts they treated that knowledge.

Further, the *historic* knowledge of God was brought over to the age after the Flood with ease, fullness and accuracy. For instance, Adam and Methuselah were contemporary, and Methuselah and Noah were so. Thus Noah could learn the facts as to God and the creation of man as easily as a man can learn from his father about his grandfather. Now, Noah lived 350 years after the Flood, and his son Shem, who was born seventy-six years before the Flood, and so was also contemporary with Methuselah, lived 502 years after that judgment ; so that mankind started afresh with true knowledge concerning God, knowledge further and solemnly enforced by the awful fact of the Deluge. This knowledge has been preserved for later generations in God's written Word.

How did men of that early era deal with that knowledge? Verses 21, 25 and 28 of Romans 1 will show:

> Knowing God they glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks; but became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened . . . they exchanged *the* truth concerning God for *the* lie [concerning God], and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator . . . they did not approve to keep God in their knowledge.

Mark the downward gradation: (1) Knowledge of God possessed; (2) failure to give to Him the glory due; (3) ingratitude for His benefits; (4) empty reasonings; (5) a stupid insensitive heart; (6) darkness of mind; (7) bartering the truth for the lie; (8) making a god of the creature; (9) deliberate and thorough exclusion of God from their thoughts.

Here is an express contrast between *the* truth and *the* lie, making both to be definite, not abstract; a particular lie is opposed to a particular truth. The truth is that of the real nature and rights of God; the lie is that the creature is divine and is to be worshipped and served. This exchange was not accidental or gradual, but was effected deliberately, and by a process of reasoning, so that it became a philosophy and produced an entire change of religion and of life. The personal Creator was excluded, the impersonal idea of God took His place in their minds; all things were God, God was one with all things; therefore all things were proper objects of adoration; therefore man, being the noblest of all beings, was pre-eminently to be honoured. As the result, atheism, pantheism, humanism have been the permanent, regnant religion of the human race; and presently Antichrist, as the highest development of man, the Superman, will demand and receive worship as being alone God.

And then?—then the tempest of the wrath of God against all this ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, sweeping away all this refuge of philosophical lies (Isaiah 28: 15, 17), clearing the earth of false views of God, followed by the rising of the Sun of righteousness, with healing in His wings (Malachi 4: 2).

The Lord Jesus definitely taught and pressed this same contrast between the truth and the lie.

John 8. Certain of His enemies had been brought by His teachings to an inward admission of His claim to be the Son of God, the messenger of His Father. Such mental assent must be encouraged, but also tested, and Christ proposed the necessary test, while He encouraged by a promise, as in verses 31, 32.

> If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples, and ye shall know *the* truth, and *the* truth shall make you free.

What truth? The Speaker continued (verse 40):

> Ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you *the* truth which I heard from God.

He explained as follows the disability of these would-be murderers which prevented them from grasping His teachings (verse 43). Let this be pondered by any who should be stumbled by the teachings of Christ. Let each inquire what his own heart attitude to Christ is. The disability is first moral, only secondarily intellectual. The terrible explanation given by Christ (verse 44) is:

> You [as to your moral nature] are out of the Devil [it is from him you draw your moral state]. He was a man-killer from the beginning [compare Christ's later words in John 10: 10, "the thief comes only that he may steal and kill and destroy"], and standeth not in *the* truth, because truth is not in him.[1] Whenever he may utter *the* lie he speaks out of his own [things, mental resources], because liar he is [by nature and habit] and the father of *it* [the lie].

Here again is emphatic contrast between *the* truth and *the* lie, and it is stated plainly by whom this lie was originated and by whom it was first instilled into human minds, and still is so instilled.

Satan had originated in his own mind the pantheistic idea when he said in his heart, "I will be [make myself] like the Most High": I will cancel the original and essential distinction between the creature and the Creator (Isaiah 14: 13). And later he proposed to man the same corrupting ambition by saying to Eve, "Ye shall be as God" (Genesis 3: 5). In the fatal reality man became like Satan, not like God.

The ages through, the issue has been clear and sharp: God has spoken to men imparting some sufficient knowledge of Himself and His will: what is the moral reaction of the hearer? Does he believe and respond to the knowledge imparted or does he refuse it because he does not wish to have the holy God in his knowledge? If the latter, then quite inevitably the situation becomes as follows:

> If our good tidings is veiled, it is veiled in those who are [already and inevitably] perishing: in whom the god of this age hath blinded the thoughts of the unbelieving, that the illumination of the good tidings of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them (2 Corinthians 4: 3, 4).

[1] Here is an example of "truth" with and without the article; first specific, then abstract.

We say that a son is the image of his father. It follows that one who has seen the son can recognize the father. Christ is the image of God, " the exact representation of His very being " (Hebrews 1 : 3) ; therefore He said : " He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father " (John 14 : 9) ; and therefore the man who meets Christ, presented to the heart in the good tidings preached, does actually, if he accept the message, get to know *the* truth, the truth as to the true God ; for Christ is " the Truth," as He said : " I am the way and the truth and the life " (John 14 : 6). Thus does He fulfil the promise, " ye shall know *the* truth, and *the* truth shall make you free," that is, free from the lie and its baneful consequences. Obviously and necessarily it is only the truth about a matter that can free the mind from error about that matter.

Important, savingly important, as this has always been, it will become pre-eminently urgent, vitally urgent at the close of this age, now perhaps hastening to meet us. For then the unresting, ever-advancing tendencies of human affairs will reach their dread climax and conclusion.

Concerning that awful crisis, and full development of blasphemy and defiance in the Lawless One, Antichrist, it is foretold that

> ye know that which restraineth, to the end that he may be revealed in his own season. For the mystery [secret power or principle] of lawlessness doth already work ; only there is one that restraineth now, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall be revealed the Lawless One, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of his mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of his presence ; even he whose presence is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and wonders of falsehood, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that are perishing, because they received not the love of *the* truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God sendeth them a working of error, that they should believe *the* lie : that they all might be judged who believed not *the* truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness (2 Thessalonians 2 : 6–12).

The issue is sharp, decision is unavoidable, the results inescapable. Either a man believes the truth or he accepts the lie. Either he worships the true and living God or he denies to Him the glory due. Either he welcomes and obeys the revelation of God given in His Son Jesus Christ, or he refuses to own the solitary lordship of Christ, in which case the wrath of God necessarily abides upon him (John 3 : 35, 36).

I beg the reader to face seriously the severe logic of this further statement :

> If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater : for the witness of God is this, that he hath borne witness concerning his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in him : he that believeth not God hath made him a liar ; because he hath not believed in the witness that God hath borne concerning his Son. And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath the life ; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life.

And let us take deeply to heart Whateley's pungent words :

> If your religion is false you are bound to change it ;
> If it is true you are bound to spread it.

In this matter, to suspend judgment, to sit on the fence, to be an agnostic, is to court eternal damnation. The ancient call is the call for to-day : " Prepare to meet thy God " (Amos 4 : 12). The wisest of all observers of human affairs wrote a treatise upon the vanity of all things under the sun, and these are his concluding sentiments :

> Let us hear the end of the whole matter : Fear God and keep his commandments ; for this is the whole [life] of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil (Solomon—Ecclesiastes 12 : 13, 14).

The Nazis rejected the truth and accepted the lie. The present result we see—ruin. Each of us is doing the one or the other, and thereby is settling for himself whether his *eternal* state shall be LIFE or—RUIN.

CONCLUSION

An old man of seventy-three years now lays down his pen.

Over many years I have written much on many subjects, but little on affairs public. Perhaps in this I have failed in my duty as a teacher of the Word of God. I am not an expert upon public matters, but perhaps it may be helpful that an ordinary, well-disposed, law-abiding member of the public should sometimes make articulate what many such think and feel, and in these pages the reader is offered some results of the observation and reflection of almost sixty years of this transit through time into eternity which we call *life*, but which all the journey through partakes painfully of the character of its end—*death*.

Against all unbelief in truth revealed in Jesus, whether it be active or passive unbelief, I oppose the result of *experience*, experience gained in a varied and long life, experience personal, uniform, progressive. I offer the reader the definite assurance that the following words of a first century Christian writer are not theoretic, but are strictly a statement, or rather a series of statements, of literal fact, fact which the reader can verify if he will seriously and sincerely apply the appropriate tests. From an acquaintance with Christ of, I suppose, about the same length as mine, only far richer than mine, John wrote as follows (1 John 5 : 20, 21) :

WE KNOW—we are *not* philosophers *seeking* truth ; we are *not* agnostics glorying in ignorance and uncertainty : *we know* !

THAT THE SON OF GOD IS COME in human nature, and has lived on this earth. By a new birth of our inward being He has infused into us a realized and effective share of His own divine-human nature. This is the secret of that inward change in our feelings, as well as of that outward change, from slavery to sin unto power for holiness, which we know and which others must recognize. If He were not Divine but only human, He could not impart the divine element which is new to our experience, by which, for example, we do genuinely and without effort *love* all men, even our enemies.

Therefore the man of to-day can receive personal experimental proof that the Son of God is come for He

HATH GIVEN US AN UNDERSTANDING. To us, as to men of old, this word is true: "Then opened He their mind that they might understand the Scriptures" (Luke 24: 45). The merely human teacher can present to the mind certain ideas, but he cannot give the pupil capacity to grasp them. Christ can and does do this latter. I have had the benefit of this secret operation; I have watched it take place in many others. The effect is a *new capacity* for comprehending what before seemed incomprehensible, and was so. The Teacher who so acts is, and must be, the Creator of our mind. *He hath given us an uuderstanding*

THAT WE KNOW HIM THAT IS TRUE: the True One, the One Who is the great dominant Reality, in contrast to all the merely seeming, unreal, deceptive, disappointing by which mankind is misled, and is kept "sadly contented with a *show* of things." We *know* God, the Father of the Son Who has made Him known.

AND WE ARE IN THE TRUE ONE: He is become the *sphere* of our inner, our true life. As the bird is *in* the air, the fish *in* the water, each in its own vital environment, so we are *in God*, for "he that abideth in love abideth in GOD and God abideth in him" (1 John 4: 16). It were preposterous for a creature that cannot live under water to deny the experience of a fish living in water.

But we are in God because we are

IN HIS SON JESUS CHRIST. In all the wide universe, since it first sprang into being by the Word of God, there never has been any medium of relationship between God and the creature except the Son of God. He has been, is, and ever will be the Mediator between the eternal Father and the universe. The Son declared an unalterable fact when He said: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one cometh unto the Father but through ME" (John 14: 6). Therefore he who would get to know God must draw near unto Him through Christ, by relying on His merit as the ground upon which a sinner can approach God.

In consequence, John in the first century knew what I in the twentieth century know, and what millions more have known or know, even that

THIS IS THE TRUE GOD. There is no God other than the Father known through the Son, the Son known by the Spirit, and the Spirit of the Father and the Son given to the believer on the Son (1 John 3: 24; 5: 7, 8). This is the One indivisible and true God

AND ETERNAL LIFE. Eternal life is not simply a life which will never end, but which also never had beginning. It is the uncreated, original, undiminishing, unchanging, holy life-energy

of God Himself. This life is imparted to the believer, the free gift of God, upon faith in Christ (Romans 6 : 23). This life-force already moves in the Christian, already asserts its strength against the tyranny of self, sin, death in him, and in resurrection it will abide triumphant, the *only life* he will for ever enjoy, " the life that is life indeed " (1 Timothy 6 : 19).

LITTLE CHILDREN, GUARD YOURSELVES FROM THE IDOLS, not only from visible images, but from " *every* high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God " (2 Corinthians 10 : 5).

Reader, if you know this true God, by knowing the Son of God, then *make Him known.* If you do not know Him, then I beg and exhort you to heed this call of an ancient prophet (Isaiah 55 : 6, 7) :

SEEK YE THE LORD

while He may be found, call ye upon Him while He is near : let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts : and let him

RETURN UNTO THE LORD

and He will have mercy upon him ; and to our God for

HE WILL ABUNDANTLY PARDON.

FAREWELL!

INDEX

Books and periodicals are given in *italics*. Consult also Table of Contents, pp. 5–8.

Aboukir 166
Abyssinia, 48, 175
Abdul Hamid, Sultan, 24
Achilles, 21
Acre, 166
Acton, Lord, 202
Adoption, 65
Adriatic Sea, 159
Aeschylus, 40
Agassiz, Prof., 139
Age of Reason, 36, 131, 165
Ahab, 44f., 83, 103f., 142, 181f., 195
Ahriman, 73
Al Capone, 99
Alexander II, 219
Alexander the Great, 167, 232
Alford, Dean, 66
Allen, Dr. C. K., 196ff., 209, 211, 214ff.
Alton Locke, 187
Apollo, 87, 172
Archbishop of Canterbury, 148
Archbishop of York, 222, 224ff.
Arminianism, 64
Argyll, Duke of, 138
Arnold, Matthew, 35
Antiquities of the Church, 32
Aphrodite, 33
Apologia pro Vita Sua, 61, 117, 120, 122
Arab League, Secretary of, 235
Ares, a god, 33
Armenians, 24
Aryanism, 14
Assyria, 47, 169, 172
Astarte, 32
Athene, 33
Attorney General, 197
Augustine, 57n., 60, 79
Augustus, 42
Autobiography of M. B. Eddy, 86.

Babylon, 50, 88, 159f., 161f., 166f., 171
Bacon, Francis, 90
Bank of England, 160, 198
Baptist College, Bristol, 130
Barth, Karl, 35
Bartlett (*Century Bible*), 66
Basic English, 228
Baur, 38
Beethoven, 42
Begbie, Harold, 138
Berdyaev, 35
Berlin, 37, 47, 105, 111
Berserk's way, 21
Besant, Annie, 114, 229
Bingham, Joseph, 32
Bismarck, Prince, 22, 87
Bishop of London, 205
Bloomfield, Dr., 66
Bombay, 131
Bombay Guardian, 145
Bondage of the Will, 60
Booth, William, 138
Bormann, Martin, 16
Bradlaugh, Charles, 59, 114
Brahman, 15
Braunau-on-the-Inn, 41
Brethren Movement, 115f.
Bristol, 79
British Broadcasting Corporation, 95f., 200.
British Treasury, 111
British Weekly, The, 39, 95, 222
Broadbent, E. H., 125
Brown, Dr. John, 129
Bruce, Prof., 131
Bryce, Dr. James, 32
Budapest, 27
Bunyan, John, 136

C., a carpenter, 189f.
Calcutta, 13
Calvin, John, 60, 64, 79
Canada, Prime Minister of, 224
Carlyle, T., 33, 147, 202, 226
Carroll, Lewis, 111

Cecil, Richard, 25
Century Bible, 66
Chandogya Upanishad, 29
Charter, the Great, 146, 192
Cheyne, Canon, 131
Chiniquy, C., 133
Christian, The, 199
Christian Science, 61, 78, 130
Christian Science (Twain), 86, 201
Church, the Churches, and the Mysteries, The, 32
Church and Youth, Report, 205, 207
Churchill, Winston S., 87, 194, 233
Clark, Dr., R. E. D., 17, 149
Claudius Clear, 39
Clerk-Maxwell, Sir James, 134
Clifford, Dr. J., 129f.
Cloister and the Hearth, The, 32
Coal Board, 220
Colenso, Dr., 129
Collier's Magazine, 228
Commissioner of Police, Report, 205
Communism, 11
Concise Oxford Dictionary, 15
Constantine the Great, 32
Continuity of Catholicism, 33
Coptic Church, 94, 116
Cork, 127
Covenanters, the 121, 156
Creation by Evolution, 91
Criminal Statistics (Home Office), 221
Croesus of Lydia, 56, 87f.
Cromer, Lord, 158
Cromwell, Oliver, 144, 147, 151, 222, 230
Crown Proceedings Act, 1947, 196
Culross, Dr. John, 130
Cyrus the Great, 87

Daily Telegraph, 16f., 42, 79, 101, 114, 150, 192, 197f., 205f., 220f., 223f., 226
Damkina, a goddess, 32
Danube, the 27
Darby, J. N., 68
Darwin, Charles, 89, 133ff., 257
Dawn, The, 101
Decline and Fall, The, 207f.
Delphi, 87, 172
Demaus, R., 101
Demeter, 33
Deserted Village, The, 114
Development of Doctrine, The, 121
Divinity of our Lord, Lectures on, 132
Dods, Dr. Marcus, 130
Doenitz, Admiral, 44
Dolfuss, Dr., 207
Doyle, Sir A. C., 107
Driver, Canon, 131
Dublin, 115
Dunkirk, 87, 193

Ea, a god, 32
Eckhart, Johannes, 15f., 29, 42
Edda, The, 23
Eddy, Mary Baker, 61, 78, 86, 201
Edom and Esau, 66f.
Edward VII, 144
Edward VIII, 146
Egypt, 30, 47, 50, 203
Elijah, 46, 103
Eliphaz the Temanite, 256
Elisha, 159
Elton, Lord, 222
Elizabeth, Queen, 144
Emergency Powers Defence Act, 1940, 192
Enchiridion, The, 57n., 60
Encyclopædia Britannica, 9, 15f., 21f., 36, 40, 167, 219.
England, Church of, 115f., 126f.
Epicureans, 40
Erasmus, 36
Eros, a god, 33
Essays and Reviews, 129

Faraday, M., 79
Farrar, Dean, 131
Father and Son, 139
Fifty Years in the Church of Rome, 133
Firstborn Sons, Their Rights and Risks, 64
Foote, G. W., 36, 131
Forward Movements of the Last Half Century, 126
Foxe, John, 101
Frederick the Great, 22, 27, 37, 195
Freemasonry, 23, 85
French Revolution, The, 226f.
Freyia, a goddess, or Frigg, 33
Friedrich Nietzsche, 137
Friedrich Wilhelm Museum, 47
Fritz, 22
Froude, J. A., 15, 90f.

George V., 145
George VI, 146
General Powers Bill, 215
Gibbon, Benjamin, 130
Gibbon, Edward, 207f.
Gilsing, Dr., 42
Gladstone, W. E., 79
Goebbels, Joseph, 14, 43, 82, 87
Goldsmith, Oliver, 114
Gore, Canon, 131
Goering, H., 190
Gospel Trumpet, The, 99
Gosse, Edmund, 139f.
Gray, Asa, 139
Great Prophecies, 166
Greek Orthodox Church, 32, 94, 174, 181, 246
Grellet, Stephen, 164f.
Green, John Richard, 25, 115
Greene, W., 166
Griffith, Gwilym O., 34
Gulliver, 225

Haldane, Dr. J. B. S., 17
Halder, General, 82
Hale, Rev. F. W., 145
Haman, 154
Hansard, 193
Hatch, Dr. Edwin, 32, 246
Havergal, F. R., 81
Hegel, 35, 37f.
Help and Food, 101
Henry VIII, 101
Herodotus, 50, 56, 88
Hewart, Lord Chief Justice, 196, 218
High Anglican Clergyman, A, 118
Hildebrand, 43
Himmler, Heinrich, 13f., 87, 163, 194f.
Hindenburg, President, 200
Hiroshima, 50
Hislop, Alex, 32
History of Morality, 25
History of the Plymouth Brethren, A, 126
Hitler, Adolf, 9, Chs. I, II, III ; 76f., 82f., 87, 94, 100, 105, 107, 118, 137, 148f., 151, 154, 163, 176, 179, 191f., 195, 200f., 204, 207, 210, 214, 217, 221, 235, 237, 256.
Hitler Speaks, 12, 190
Hollywood Films, 205
Holy Roman Empire, The, 32
Holy War, The, 136
Hooker, Sir J. D., 139f.
Hope, Lady, 138f.
Horatius, Lay of, 174
Hough, Alfred J., 92
How Heathen is England ? 141
Howard, John, 95
Hume, David, 38
Humphreys, 66
Huss, John, 34
Huxley, Dr. Julian, 91, 149
Huxley, Thomas, 79, 89, 91, 138ff., 257

Iliad, The, 23
Immortality of man, 18, 26
Inflation, the German, 105
Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church, 32
Inge, Dean, 118
Institutes (Calvin), 60
Interpreters of Man, 34
Inquisition, The, 36
Ishtar, 47
Isis, 15, 32

Jehovah, a demon (Rosenberg), 23
Jehoshaphat, 45ff., 142, 159, 181f.
Jenghis Khan, 235
Jerome of Prague, 34
Jesus Christ, deity of, 18
Job, 52
John Bull, 113
John, King, 146, 192
Journal of John Wesley, 22, 161
Julius Cæsar, 230
Juno, 32
Jupiter, 32

Kali, a goddess, 13
Karma, 40
Kerr, John, 188
Key Found, The, 81
Kingsley, Charles, 187
Kismet, 40
Koran, The, 78, 157
Krishna, 13
Krummacher, Dr. F. W., 38

Labour Party, the, 215
Labour Relations Bill, U.S.A., 226
Lambert, Thomas, 190f.
Lang, G. H., 184f.
Lang, G. T., 184f.

Last Days of Hitler, The, 12ff., 43, 82f., 87, 163, 201, 207, 212, 235, 237
Latimer, Bishop Hugh, 101
Law and Orders (Allen) 196f., 209, 212ff., 221
Law Times, The, 229
Lecky, W. E. H., 25
Legree, 206
Lenin, 164f, 174, 179, 212
Ley, Dr. Robert, 17, 39, 163
Liddon, Canon, 132
Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, 138
Life of Jesus (Strauss), 37
Liverpool Corporation ver. Postmaster General, 197
Logau, Friedrich von, 49
London Chamber of Commerce, 209
Lonely Nietzsche, The, 85
Longfellow, 49
Los Angeles, 101
Louis XVI, 213
Luther, Martin, 36, 60, 126
Lyell, Sir Charles, 139f.
Lyttleton, Hon. Dr., 79

Macaulay, Lord, 174
Magistrates' Association, 221
Magna Carta, 146, 192
Manning, Cardinal, 118
Manual of Christian Evidences, 25
Market Town, incident in, 108
Mary, " Mother of God ", 32
Marx, Karl, 154
Mecca, 94, 171
Medes, The, 159
Medical Officer for Somerset, 100
Mediterranean Sea, 234f.
Mein Kampf, 9, Chs. I, II, III ; 76f, 100, 154, 204, 221
Memoirs of Himself (Voltaire), 22
Memoirs of Stephen Grellet, 165
Messina, 50
Methodists, The, 25, 115
Metternich, 24, 99
Micaiah, 45
Middle East, 47, 88, 152, Ch. IX, 234
Milk Marketing Board, 197
Miners' Federation, 109, 201
Ministry of Food, 221
Mivart, Dr. St. G., 33
Moab, 159
Mohammedanism, 40, 157, 171
Moltke, von, 22
Moniteur, 77
More, Sir Thomas, 242
Morgan, Dr. Campbell, 72
Morning Post, 118
Moses as Ruler, 230
" Mother of God," a goddess, 32, 34
Mügge, M. A., 137
Muir, Prof. Ramsey, 214
Mussolini, 48
Mustafa Kemal, 48
Mystery Babylon the Great and The Mysteries and Catholicism, 32
Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts, Der 9, Chs. I, II, III ; 84

Naboth, 103
Napoleon, 24, 77, 99, 166f., 179, 226, 230
National Maritime Union of America, 225
Neatby, H. Blair, 126
Nebuchadnezzar, 47f., 142, 154, 156, 230, 231f.
Nelson, Lord, 166
Nemesis, 33
Nestorian Church, 94
New Despotism, The, 196, 198
Newman, Cardinal, J. H., 33, 61, 117ff.
Newton, John, 25
Niebelungen, Song of, 23
Niemöller, Dr., 194
Nietzsche, F. W., 18, 29, 73, 83ff., 89, 137, 230
Nile, The, 175
Nineteenth Century, The, 33
Nirvana, 27
Norman Conquest, 192
Nothing but Their Chains, 180
Nuremberg, 17

Odin, 21, 33
Odyssey, The, 23
Olympus, 74
Organization of the Early Christian Churches, 32, 246
Origin of Species, 133ff.
Osiris, 15
Owen, Prof. Richard, 140
Oxford Movement, 116ff.

Paine, Thomas 36ff., 79, 131, 164
Pan, a god, 33
Parables of the Kingdom, 72
Pares, Bernard, 179n., 214
Pember, G. H., 32, 166
Pepys, Samuel, 200
Peter the Great, 234
Petrie, Sir W. F., 122, 132
Pharoah, 67ff., 151
Pierson, Dr. A. T., 52, 126
Pilgrim Church, The, 125
Planning and Finance Bill, 216
Plato, 17
Plutarch, 15
Plymouth Brethren, 115f.
Polish Lady, Talk with, 111
Polish Treasury, 111
Pompeii, 50
Potato Marketing Board, 197
Practitioner, The, 205
Prayer in name of Christ, 162
Prayer Book, the Revised, 122
Preservation of the Rights of the Subject Bill, 196
Prime Ministers, 123, 148, 178, 192
Principles of Theology, The, 71, 120
Problems of a Socialist Government, 216
Procedure in Public Business, Committee on, 214f.
Progress Shown in Evolution, 91
Prometheus, 43

Queen of Heaven, The, 32

Ra, a god, 15, 32, 119
Raleigh, Sir, W., 90
Rauschning, H., 12
Reade, Charles, 32, 91
Reader's Digest, 180
Reading, Marquis of 198, 218
Reformation, The Great, 35
Regulation 18(b), 193f.
Renaissance, The 34
Reuss, E. G. E., 131
Revelation of Jesus Christ (Lang), 150,171
Review of World Affairs, 150, 245n.
Revolution, The French, 33, 37, 156, 174, 179
Revolution, The Russian, 174, 179, 212ff., 219, 222
Rheims N. T., 63
Robertson, Dr. Alex, 82
Roman Catholic Church, 23, 32, 94, 116, 127, 157, 174, 246
Roman Catholic Church in Italy, The, 82
Romanoffs, 179, 213
Rome, 82
Roosevelt, President, 42, 162
Roscoe, Mary, 164f.
Rosenberg, Alfred, 9, Chs. I, II, III,; 83, 148f., 256
Rotheram, J. B., 66
Roumania, 225
Row, C. A., 25
Russia (Pares), 179n., 214
Russia, 11f., 87, 174, 179ff., 207, 212f., 221, 227, 234, 236.
Rutherford, Samuel, 61

Samaria, 45
Sanday, Dr., 131
Sandhurst, B. G., 141
Saphir, Adolf, 154
Savonarola, 34
Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia, 39
Schellenberg, 87
Schleiermacher, 37
Science and Ethics, 17
Science and Health, 78
Scientific Rationalism and Christian Faith, 17, 149
Secret History of the Oxford Movement, 117
Secularist Society, The, 59
Sehili, Island of, 175
Shakespeare, William, 11, 164
Shaw, Lord, 197
Short History of the English People, A, 25
Short Studies (Froude), 15, 190
Smith, Dr. G. Adam, 129
Smith, Sir Sidney, 166
Sodom, 50, 111f., 153, 159, 170, 173,
Solitude, 111
Solon, 56, 88
Song of Siegfried's Death, 23
Spinoza, 15
Spurgeon, C. H., 130, 135
Stalin, 48, 179, 230
Statutory Rules and Orders, 216
Stoics, 40
Strauss, David F., 37f.
Suffering Saviour, The, 38
Suicide, 27
Sulla, 42

Superman, The, 85, 89, 230, 233, 235, 258
Supplies and Services (Extended Purposes) Act, 1947, 218, 221

Tamerlane, 235
Tartarus, 175
Theosophy, 229
Thomas, Garnet, 189
Thomas, Dr. Griffiths, 71, 120
Thus Spake Zarathustra, 84
Times, The, 107, 116, 122f., 179, 192, 218, 222
Times of the Gentiles, 231, 233
Times Supplement, The, 77
Times Weekly, 224
Tinker's Cuss Speech, 177
Tongues Movement, the, 85
Tongues, Speaking in, 83
Tract XC, 121
Tractarian Movement, The, 116, 120
Trade Unionism, 160, 225
Trades Union Council, 215
Transmigration, Doctrine of 27
Transubstantiation, Doctrine of, 78, 120
Trevor-Roper, H. R. See *Last Days of Hitler*
Troake, Father, 127
Trotsky, 179
Truth, abstract or concrete, 257
Twain, Mark, 86, 201
Two Babylons, The, 32
Tyndale, William, 63
Tyre, King of, 74

Uncle Tom's Cabin, 206
Unitarian, a converted, 55
United Mine Workers of America, 225
United Nations, 147f.
United States, The, 99, 200
Upanishad, 29f.
Utopia, 242f.

Variation of Species, 140
Vaughan, E. T., 60
Venus, 32
Vestiges of Creation, 140
Victoria, Queen, 13, 144
Vienna, 12, 207
Vikings, 21
Voltaire, 22, 36ff., 79, 96
Vulgate, The, 63

Waldenses, The, 42
Wallace, A. Russell, 139
Walpole, 25
Walsh, Walter, 117
Warsaw, 111, 165
Webster's Dictionary, 15
Weimar Constitution, 213, 217f.
Wellhausen, 38f., 130
Wesley, John, 22, 161, 222
Wesleyan Revival, 25, 126
West, Rev., J. O., 59
Western College, Bristol, 129
Westminster Abbey, 117, 138
Whately, Archbishop, 261
Wheat, A field of, 160
Wilberforce, William, 222
William III, 144, 192
Wollaston, 140
Wolff, L., 43
Wordsworth, Dr. C., 66
Wulf, 87
Wycliffe, John, 34, 63

Yeast, 187
Yorkshire Daily Paper, A, 12

Zeus, 32f.
Zoroaster, 73

Books for Mind and Heart

By G. H. LANG

★

THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST

H. L. Ellison, B.A., B.D., reviewing this book, described it as "probably the most important exposition of *The Revelation* published this century."

424 pp. 8/6 ; by post 9/–.

★

New Edition in Preparation

ANTHONY NORRIS GROVES

Saint and Pioneer

A Combined Study of a Man of God and of the Original Principles and Practices of THE BRETHREN with Applications to Present Conditions.

Second edition, 438 pp. 8/6 ; by post 9/–.

★

THE HISTORY AND DIARIES OF AN INDIAN CHRISTIAN (J. C. Aroólappen)

The Life-Story of an Indian Friend and Follower of ANTHONY NORRIS GROVES.

"God used this simple, loyal and earnest Christian man to do a great work for Him. The thirteenth chapter, on 'Tongues, etc.', is specially helpful." —*Indian Christian.*

220 pp., Cloth Boards, 2/6 ; by post 3/–.

★

EDMUND HAMER BROADBENT

A brief account of principles and practice in 50 years of Gospel Service in Europe and Russia. With portrait.

91 pp. 2/6 ; by post 2/9.

OF ALL BOOKSELLERS

Published by

THE PATERNOSTER PRESS

LUDGATE HOUSE, FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

REPRINTS

from

"The Revelation of Jesus Christ"

1. **ON SYMBOLIC AND LITERAL LANGUAGE**
2. **DID THE APOSTLES EXPECT THE RETURN OF CHRIST IN THEIR TIME ?**
3. **THE LATTER DAYS ARE THE CHIEF PERIOD OF PROPHECY**
4. **THE SEVEN LETTERS AND THE PROMISES TO THE OVERCOMERS.** Rev. 2 and 3.
5. **THE FOUR AND TWENTY ELDERS.** Rev. 4 and 5.
6. **THE SEVEN SEALS.** Rev. 6.
7. **THE WOMAN, THE CHILD, THE DRAGON.** Rev. 12.
8. **FIRSTFRUITS, HARVEST, VINTAGE.** Rev. 14.
9. **BABYLON THE GREAT.** Mystical and Literal. Rev. 17 and 18.
10. **THE BRIDE.** Rev. 19 and 21.
11. **THE GREAT WHITE THRONE.** Rev. 20.

Also

12. **GOG.** An Examination of Ezekiel 38 and 39, identifying Gog with the Antichrist.

6d., by post 7d. The 12 for 5/6 post free.

OF ALL BOOKSELLERS