

810224 Outline of Prophetic Histories Dan 2 Rev 12 Part 1 HLH

This is on the system, we could apply it to the man, because if after five were fallen, that includes Napoleon, you have one that is and only one more to come, and that one more is the seventh, and the one that is is the sixth.

And if the seventh one is also the eighth, and there is no one between the sixth and the seventh in the scripture, then this one must be before six and seven, and after the five that are fallen, because there was no other restoration during that period of the five.

And interestingly, it was between Napoleon and Mussolini that there was a German restoration of the Roman Empire, a Protestant restoration, dual, there have been two parts regularly.

What we will see for the future is now, I think, up for our comment.

But before I come to that, let me state that in Daniel chapter seven, these successive restorations of the Roman world are horns.

In Revelation 13, they are horns, and after three are uprooted, there are seven left.

And the remarkable thing is when you come to Revelation 17, there are now heads.

Mr. Armstrong was the first one in the story of the Church of God study, who was able to perceive that the seven heads of Revelation 17 are the last seven horns of Daniel 7.

And it is a whole new system.

It's one of the original seven heads of Daniel 7 in Revelation 13.

Yet it is a whole new system, because it is a Christian culture.

It is a new concept, not the old pagan religions.

And yet it is of them, and yet it is not.

It is as different as an eighth is from the seventh, the Roman head, and yet it is of it because it is the idea of the Roman world, the need of organizing Europe and preserving those great traditions of the Roman republican empire in the Greek culture.

But what we have now is an interesting story in Revelation 17.

Let me just read now briefly, where we're focusing in on one, we're not focusing in on all of it.

You have a beast that ascends.

You have a description here in the story that the ten horns are ten kings who have not received yet royal power.

But they are to receive authority as kings for one hour together with the beast.

Now verse 12 may well represent that the final restoration of the Roman world takes place at a time when kings are out of favor.

They fell out of favor in 1918.

There's a book titled *The King's Depart*, which is the story of how many royal families departed in 1918.

There were many kings, however, still extant in Europe, Scandinavia, the British Isles, in the Balkans, and they have all disappeared as a result of the Second World War events.

Until today, you really have nobility only in the Low Countries, part of Scandinavia and in the British Isles.

You simply have no nobility any longer in the Balkans, or Germany, or Italy, or France, or Portugal, you have it in Spain, restored there.

These kings now receive power.

That implies that we're dealing with a period of time in which there is coming to be a need for a certain continuity, not the election system as we know it, but a continuity of government, the need of royalty, similar to the state of affairs in Spain.

Franco realizing that after his departure you could not have traditional parliamentary government among Spaniards.

You had to have an heir to the throne who could provide continuity when government collapses as recently had between one Prime Minister and another.

Now in this picture, we have an interesting story about the nature of the beast and the horns.

We are told the following, that they give their power and authority to the beast and they make it possible for the beast to be what he is.

That is when you look at this story, you have an interesting picture that is quite different from the earlier accounts of the Roman world.

Now let me read you specifically here, I want to catch the thought here.

The ten kings, here we are, which you saw, the ten rulers, the ten horns are ten kings but haven't yet received royalty, they are to receive authority.

They are of one mind and give over their power and authority to the beast, so we want to emphasize verse 13.

They give over their power and authority to the beast.

This is interesting because what we see today is something very strange, quite different than the last 180 years.

Napoleon founded the French Empire, Mussolini founded the Italian Empire, the new Roman Empire, the Kaiser for that matter, he was a leader who founded the empire, Hitler was a leader elected in 1933 and promised after his 34 election to have a German Reich that would last a thousand years.

It fell a little short in his goals, it's good to have big goals, you also want to have them right goals.

Did you notice that all of these are men of prominence who create an empire, but the implication that we have for the future is something different, it is an empire searching for a leader.

What is coming is essentially an empire searching for a leader.

This is the implication of men who have one mind and give their independent power to a ruler who in turn creates from his imperial throne, dynastic lines to give continuity to each of the separate entities making up the structure.

We had the coal and the steel community and the gradual expansion from the French and the German alliance after the war, the Schumann plan, until it incorporated six nations, then it spread to nine and now they are blessed with Greece, ten.

There are Protestant ministers today who say, these are the ten nations prophesied.

The church of God says these are not by any means the specific ten nations prophesied.

And I would say that without a question.

These are not by any means the ten nations prophesied, it may include some.

Some of the British went out, we have reason to think they will either get out or be booted out.

The Danes already went out.

The French will probably wish they had wanted out, but it will be too late.

In any case, it is an interesting story.

We have ten and there may be more than ten.

Now one of these may become one that is now three, Holland, Belgium and Luxembourg, as Mr. Armstrong has said, describing it as a block of nations, nations or groups of nations as his terminology, like Benelux.

There may be twelve before it is over Spain and Portugal may come in by 1984-1985, according to the normal routine of things, that is the drift of things.

But there is no leader.

It is an amorphous economic community.

Now you know what nations are in there here, the Irish and the English and the Danes, and the French and the Dutch and the Belgians and the Luxemburgers, and they have invited the Germans and the Italians, so to speak, putting it in a term like that.

The Greeks, of course, have wormed their way in, but it is essentially an economic enterprise, primarily of Israelite nations on the shores of the English Channel and the North Sea that's gradually extending itself little by little to the Mediterranean.

It is an unusual structure so far.

Now, the church was aware that Germany, East Germany in 1953 had a revolt in Berlin, the Hungarians in 1956.

The Poles have had revolts off and on, the Czechoslovaks in 1968, and every one of these nations has tried but failed.

The Poles are trying it again, and one should remember that north of Poland is the Baltic Sea with the Russian fleet, west of Poland is East Germany, south of Poland is Czechoslovakia, east of Poland is Big Brother.

There really isn't very much the Poles can do.

They're doing a lot, but one has to realize that we saw each of these countries, we saw a fighting pope, we saw each of these countries trying to revolt, and none of them individually got anywhere.

None of them individually got anywhere.

It is our judgment that in the end they have to act in unity or not at all.

And now we turn back to Daniel chapter 2, and there are five toes on one foot and five on the other, and it is very probable, therefore, that what we should see and look for in our picture is not separate nations from time to time breaking away, but rather a picture in which Western Europe will take new shape, that out of the ten may come twelve and then a disintegration of some, a way in which perhaps in the West Benelux would act as one.

Now the Church has consistently said it is inconceivable at this stage that no nation of Eastern Europe, that nations of Eastern Europe should all be outside the confines of this system.

It is rather the understanding that we have had as a Church, that Mr. Armstrong has had, that some of the nations of Eastern Europe inevitably must play a role.

And now with a Polish pope, a man who has been raised up as a sign to the peoples of Eastern Europe who are Roman Catholic, this man is a very important individual because he represents the hope of Eastern Europe, west of the Soviet Union.

In this area we have a Catholic Poland, a Catholic Czechoslovakia, a significantly Catholic Hungary but not by any means predominantly, as the other two countries, we have Romania which has a minor Catholic population, Bulgaria is outside, and this area that is called Comic Con, there is the Soviet Union also, there is East Germany which is 95 or 8 percent Protestant, I guess 98 percent, and there is Cuba.

I do not perceive that Cuba will be linked up or that even Bulgaria would be, and certainly not the Soviet Union what I am picturing.

Nor do I perceive that East Germany is necessarily going to be, it is unimaginable knowing the West German view that there are 18 million hostages there and they have let the West know that, we only had 53, they have 18 million.

Strauss said that the Germanese must be put together again.

The lock to prevent it is in Moscow and the key is Western Europe, to unite it, to force the turning of that lock to release those peoples of Eastern Europe.

But if the two Germanes link up, and Haneker who represents East Germany has just this week said that he foresees the need of West Germany linking up with East Germany and becoming a new German state, that is good propaganda because he does not want the East Germans claiming that and he does not.

He wants to be sure that he is one of the first ones who has said it even though he does not want it yet.

But it is like saying that the East Germans are seriously going to think that if the Poles can get what they can, why should not we be linked ultimately with the West? But what could happen is that Comic-Con, made up of these four primary states of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Romania,

could link up with Yugoslavia, which is a socialist communist state, west of the Iron Curtain, and that those five could link up.

And in the West, now this is offering observation, possibilities, may not turn out to be exactly those five we have yet to see, or what role Greece shall play.

Because we are talking now politics, we are not talking about religion.

Then the West, there is almost surely going to be a breakdown of the present structure.

What role Italy and Germany and France will play remains yet to be seen, especially France, with respect to the Iberian Peninsula, will Spain and Portugal really get in? It would be important, of course, if they could, in terms of the role of the Mediterranean.

We don't know what five in the West there shall be, but I suspect that the fact that there are five toes and five toes simply means that there are going to be five nations or groups of nations that will survive in the West, and five that will come out from behind the Iron Curtain with a deal with the Soviet Union in the East, and these five will make up ten, and an empire will be created, a realm that's looking for a leader.

The present leader isn't any leader, a remarkable woman, a Jewish from France, who is the president of the common of the European Parliament, which has no power, no teeth, has a tattoos from the Second World War on her arm, by no means is she the beast.

There is going to be election in 1982, which might be significant in terms of the role of the European Parliament.

But what is needed is an important figure.

Now if you look at the map, you will discover that in these potential nations to the East, in Comic Con, and the nations to the West, and the common market, you have the whole H-O-L-E of Switzerland, which is always the area where everybody sends its representatives to spy during a time of crisis.

So you want an independent area like Switzerland in order that you can spy out what other nations are doing.

That's just the way things operate.

But there is also an interesting country of Europe that has its independence on one condition, that it does not link up with the common market and remains independent of Comic Con.

One country that must be neutral, the Swiss don't have to be, they can make their own mind up, but one country is already locked into neutrality, and that's Austria.

The Russians gave up part of Austria on condition that Austria remains out of the common market and never joins.

Now if you're going to have a political ruler, the French would prefer not to have a German.

The Germans would definitely not prefer a Frenchman.

And if you have an Italian pope, let's not have an Italian politician.

And you wouldn't want to trust anybody from Eastern Europe because you really wouldn't quite be sure what those people who've lived under communism really think.

It is very likely that out of Austria will arise a man who's neutral in the sense that I'm using the term, who does not have a powerful state behind him like a German state or a French state or the British or the Italians or even Poland or Romania.

One of the weakest nations in all Europe is Austria.

It is coming to be, Vienna, the new headquarters of the United Nations.

Gradually it is shifting that many of the great buildings of the United Nations are being erected in Vienna.

It will not permanently be New York, by the way.

Those people who plan and have foresight realize that Western Europe is the land of the future.

The foresight in this world.

And it is not Brussels where the common market is headquartered.

The logical place is Vienna.

In my judgment, that's where we shall find the ultimate headquarters of Western Europe and certainly of the United Nations.

That's the direction the things are going.

Our news bureau would tend to respond that way.

Now, while we have just a bit of time, let me turn to Daniel, chapter 11, to describe this man.

Jesus said that ultimately there should come a man on the scene who would surround Jerusalem with armies and would create that final three and a half years supposedly of bringing peace to the world.

That brings the world to the climax of everything that human beings have done and should do.

This man is referred to clearly as doing what he will do in chapter 11.

It says specifically that, you know, let me catch where it is.

I used another Bible this morning in chapter 11, verse 30, the Roman fleet will come against him and he will take action against the Holy Covenant, verse 30, and he will turn back and give heed to those who break the Holy Covenant.

And he shall profane the temple and the fortress, take away the continual bird offering.

This is Antiochus Epiphanes, of course, and set up the abomination that makes desolate.

All of this is what Jesus said, that if you read Daniel, read it with understanding that you're going to find that Antiochus Epiphanes is the type of the last man.

Who was Antiochus Epiphanes? What is he like? He's described here, verse 21, in his place, the former ruler shall arise a contemptible person to whom royal majesty has not been given.

A contemptible person.

That's not a nice word.

What he does, he does without warning, and he obtains the realm by flatteries.

He's contemptible, he takes rapid action, he does things by flatteries.

Verse 23, he acts deceitfully, and he starts out with a small people in support of him.

He's not someone of a major power.

And what he does, he does without warning, this is the RSV, very effective translation here.

He comes into the richest parts of the province.

It's an interesting way of describing him.

And then, of course, you see in verse 32, he will seduce with flattery those who violate the covenant.

He is a man susceptible to flattery, he flatters others.

He is contemptible, he is deceitful, and what he does, he does without warning.

This is 1981.

It's one thing to look on the world scene in the 1960s and to find no other people of consequence in Germany but a Strauss.

But let us, and I will go this far and not go too far on it, let us say that having met Strauss, having sat at his right hand in the faculty dining room, having listened to him, a man who has publicly never changed his mind about the intent of communism, who has never tried to soft-pedal where he stands in order to be elected, who, when a lady said in one of the recent elections, Herr Strauss, I pray every night that you will be Germany's new chancellor.

He says to her, Frau, pray that it will never get so bad, I will have to be.

It's a very important view.

Strauss is not a man that in any sense of the word can be described as contemptible.

He is the most brilliant man who has held various portfolios in the German government.

He is a person of distinguished ability.

He is a man who is not flattered by what other nations would like him to believe when he knows what their intent really is.

At this stage, I would have to draw the conclusion that it is wise to keep our minds open as to who this ultimate person shall be.

And just because we have a vigorous Polish pope, an Otto of Habsburg who has become a citizen of Bavaria, that he might work within the European Parliament to create the idea of the importance of a united Europe, a Strauss who has stood against communism and the weaknesses of German socialism, these are three very important figures whose need today is imperative if Europe should save itself from the West and ultimately build a foundation that is prophesied.

But I would not necessarily draw the conclusion that any of these men are the final figures of history.

They are all absolutely necessary.

In their present states of mind, it would be difficult having known that some of our staff have met Otto of Habsburg, and I'm in possession in my briefcase of a letter from his secretary, written to one of our members in Australia, an Otto of Habsburg who should like to speak at our campus, if he were invited, that's a truism, and Strauss who has, and when he appeared with Herbert Armstrong on the cover of the Plain Truth and his socialist critics, said that he was hobnobbing with cults in America, he merely publicly reminded them that they themselves had visited our campus, and he was not embarrassed or ashamed with his contact.

I think you have to understand that, that whatever views we may have had, indeed, we have to realize that this is not 1960s, you know, the 1980s, and these men are getting older.

The two political figures, in fact, all three of them are in their 60s, the youngest, the pope is 60 now, and the others are moving along.

I don't know the exact age, Evans, do you know? He's 65.

Strauss? Yes, he's exactly a few a day, ten years older than I am, so I remember that.

Oh, I see.

He just got there before you did.

And Otto of Habsburg? I'm not sure, but I think he's probably maybe two, three years older.

That was my impression, yeah, that's my impression.

The picture I have here are of men who, if in time of peace, were to create a system, it might not at all take the form that it would in prophecy, but under the stresses in which this is taking place, in which many nations who could ameliorate it are out.

There is no Norway, no Sweden, no Finland, there's no Switzerland.

These nations all could change the complexion of the thing.

But you have a situation in which today we simply have to wait to see.

And I am anticipating a restructuring of Western Europe, step by step, with a more prominent role of the European Parliament, and the conception of an empire, but that there shall be two parts to it.

Then before, there will be one leader and not more than one.

Not a Hitler and a Mussolini, not a Habsburg and a Napoleon, or the Habsburgs and the Byzantines.

There will be one leader linking the two parts, and that's why it's called Babylon.

Because Babylon was an absolutely authoritarian system with one power.

And that Babylon, that is to come, is what's coming after 2,520 years, have elapsed since the old Babylon fell in the autumn, late summer, in 539 B.C.

But what is going to take place from all that we have described in Revelation 17 is a political structure that looks for a man who is harmless, that no one would have felt that they could be concerned about, that he would not tip it over in favor of either France or Germany or Italy, someone who would, that they all could agree on, because it couldn't agree on anybody else, and who offers them his best services, who flatters other people, who is in that sense a contemptible individual.

One might have used the term contemptible for a person like Hitler, in terms of his policies, as enunciated in my account.

But even, Ms. Armstrong has said, that Adolf Hitler was brilliant, like a fox is clever.

But these other men are not contemptible.

In any sense of the word today, that we see on the world scene.

But there is coming an innocuous man in that sense that wouldn't upset other people, that people feel that they can trust the office to him.

And it is a terrible miscalculation of judgment.

And he has grand plans, and great ideas, that will only come to be known after he gets that power.

Now, I should stop. At this point, there might be a few questions.

I don't know if that's the custom, is it in the class that questions are posed.

Anyway, I'll allow a few, and then you can have a chance to get home.

Yes.

We've always thought in the church, for a very long time, that the EEC is the some kind of foundation, yes, for what is made in the current political organization.

You used the word restructuring. But from what you told us this evening, it sounds impossible that the EEC can be involved into the kind of political structure that was attracted by the EEC. Attracting may not be the word.

The Europeans are attracted by anything that lies west of the Soviet Union.

But none of these nations in my judgment will escape without the Russians making a deal.

As Napoleon dealt with the Tsar, as the Kaiser realized it was important, and finally was persuaded not to realize the importance of it, Bismarck warned of it, as Hitler realized that it was important to deal with Stalin, it does seem clear from our perspective, as we have said for years, that a leader in the West, or a group of nations in the West, will come to terms in a private way with the Soviet Union, whereby the nations of Eastern Europe, that the Soviet Union has in its possession, will be released to link up with Western Europe, released as distinct from individually breakaway. There I would say we are in the 80s, quite distinct from what was happening in the 50s. The Russians will ask in return for this loss, which is a tremendous loss. It puts the armies of the West on the border of the Soviet Union. That's a very, serious change. It can only be worth it if they have access to the Indian Ocean and to determine the future of China, and to be able to bring pressure on Japan and to take into its sphere Iran in return for which Europe would be given a general free hand throughout Africa to handle the Palestinian problem and oil. The Russians aren't dependent on Middle Eastern oil to the same extent, and above all to do the Soviet Union a favor.

Knock out the United States and Canada. That would be worth it.

That's the picture that I see that may not even come to the world's attention until the final events suddenly unfold, because it will be a conspiracy.

Even though the nations may be linked and it might be viewed as a great victory for the West, it would be a disaster, because we don't know what's in the mind of the leadership or what role this

power in Europe will play linked to the military power as I perceive it's possible in the Soviet Union. After all, the Soviet armies as well as Hitler's armies moved into Poland in 1939. Not one, but both. And in the same way, it is very possible that the Soviet system around the world will be linked with Western Europe in order to deliver that fatal blow rather than wholly separate, that they would offer their services. But that remains to be seen.

Any other comments or questions? Yes, all the way back.

Well, one at a time, knowing you, one at a time.

Is the United States supposed to, during this time, be aware of what's going on in the United States? Well, undoubtedly the United States would welcome the breakup of Eastern Europe.

You see, one, we don't know, that's in the future. All I can say, if I were doing it, I would want to have a link with the West so that we have a knowledge of where the American military is under the sea, in the air, and on the land. I would not want to lose my NATO links yet.

So, it may well be a private decision that when it is executed under the table leads to something on the surface in Eastern Europe, but the rest of the story is untold till later. Let me tell you what you may not know. Do you know why Mussolini invaded Ethiopia? We say, what kind of a man is he to do this? What right did the Italians have? Now, the Austrians, the Italians and the Germans were all linked before the First World War.

To break Italy away from that alliance, the British promised that the Italians should have a free hand in Ethiopia. Now, it's never made public till years later, and the Italians demanded it. And then the British screamed when they did, but they didn't want to do anything about it because privately they had promised it.

And that's why they let it happen. You would be surprised what kind of deals nations make.

And those things can be kept secret and unknown until the time comes.

And I suspect it is something like that. Now, we'll have one question at a time. You can always call me, as I know you will. Yes. One thing that I have always been curious about, although I've never taken any time to research it, the Russian Tsars had a title that was, of course, derived from the term Caesar. And you see the leadership of Russia doing much of the same type of expansionism.

Culturally, the Tsars wanted to be the heirs of the Byzantine Caesars.

But I would draw attention to something that cannot be overlooked.

The word Tsar was already the title in the centuries before Jesus of the great rulers of the central area that we call Central Asia in the Soviet Union.

No historian has ever been able to understand why the Roman historians would use a term, certainly a millennium before it would arise.

But in describing the rulers of the Masegatae, the great dominant power, this word is used. The Tsar was the title for the man and Tsarina for the woman who was the queen.

It is my judgment, therefore, that these terms go back to a Semitic origin, which means ruler, with the Slavic form. And in fact, our ancient titles, known in the area, though they were, let's say, re-incorporated by the Muscovites, who were the tax collectors for the Turks.

When they became prominent, but they really chose a title that was traditional to the region, even though they made a claim. This is a good question. They made a claim to be the heirs of Greek and Roman civilization. Having been to the Soviet Union, in my judgment, they are the heirs to nothing. They didn't know what that civilization represented. They simply have inherited their own traditions. And in the biblical sense, that is not the story. But it is a valid question to ask, to understand. Harry Evans. Napoleon was from Corsica, who descended from one of the royal families that ruled Byzantium. He was not a Frenchman by blood. There's some strange things like that. Although in the end, most Austrians derive from Germany, they are, for many, many centuries, essentially a separate group of people. Yes. I'd like to say that Caesar was the surname of Julius. Yes. And it had nothing to do with the title of emperor until he became emperor.

That's right. And then the other, does the sentence carry on that title? Yes. That's correct.

It doesn't do with the word czar at all. No. The concept of modern historians is that czar, as a Russian form, for that title that was a family name that was taken by the emperors.

But I would agree with that. They should not be seen in the same light at all.

All right. I will stop with that.

The second part for what it's worth of the remarkable movie of Evita Peron is tonight on Channel 4 from 9 to 11. It was a little lewd, if you saw it last night, but very true to Latin culture. Mr. Hongana saw it with us. He had never seen the like before on TV, but he had never seen Latin culture quite like this. And it probably is one of the most remarkable stories. And I would suggest if you had the chance to see it this evening on Channel 4, it might well be worth your time. It's the second half of its two-hour session.

Evita Peron was the woman who seduced a man and seduced a nation at the end of the 30s, who ultimately died of cancer. This is the story of the rise of the Peronistas in Argentina, who were pro-fascist. All right. I want to thank Mr. Blackwell publicly for the opportunity and the fact that I could be present with you. I should leave, and if you do need to see me, maybe you could drop a note sometime or give a call.