

THE HOUR OF TEMPTATION

Br. Leon Norby

As you might have assumed, our text is Revelation 3:10: "Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth." We learn from the 7th verse that this is addressed to the church of Philadelphia, and I think that most Bible Students, as well as Bible scholars in general, would agree that the church of Philadelphia is the sixth stage of the church, the next to the last--and it preceded the second presence of our Lord. The church of Philadelphia is assured that they would escape the hour of temptation. The implication, then, is that the last stage of the church, Laodicea, would catch the full brunt of this experience, this hour of temptation. But, as we shall see, there are compensating blessings, too--a special feast which God has prepared to sustain the church of Laodicea which would be in this great time of distress and trouble which shall come upon the whole world.

One of the last articles that the Pastor wrote, "The Hour of Temptation," is dated November 1, 1916, one day after his death. I always thought there was special significance in this article and also something of great importance to the church. I would commend the entire article. Reprints 5981). In it he starts out with the trouble upon the world--and our text does say that this hour of temptation "shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth." So while writing about the conditions in the world peculiar to this time, he then goes on to a description of the temptations coming upon the church, which is of most interest to us and most important. We will follow his cue and start by considering the effect upon the world.

Brother Russell made certain predictions concerning the trouble that would develop in the world. These are briefly summarized in Reprints 2334: "The four exhibitions of the Lord given to Elijah, represent, we believe, four manifestations in which the Lord is about to reveal himself to mankind--the first three of which will prepare men for the final one in which will come the desired blessing, to all the families of the earth. They are: (1) The mighty winds rending the very rocks. Blowing winds seem to be used in Scripture as a symbol for wars....(2) An earthquake. Throughout the Scriptures an earthquake seems always to represent revolution....But severe though those revolutionary experiences will be to the world they are not sufficient to prepare men to hear the voice of God. It will require (3) The fire from heaven;--an epoch of divine judgments and chastisements upon a maddened but unconverted world wild in anarchy, as other Scriptures show us. The results of their wars and revolutions and anarchy--the failure of their schemes and the

lessons of divine judgments--will, however, have an exhausting and humbling effect and prepare mankind for God's revelation of himself in (4) The still small voice. Yes, he who spoke to the winds and waves of the sea of Galilee will, in due time, 'Speak peace to the peoples.'"

Bible Students are all quite familiar with that interpretation of the vision to Elijah, and this episode has caught the attention of even secular writers. You often hear about the wind, the earthquake, the fire, and the still small voice even though they don't make an accurate application of it, yet it is such a graphic picture of revolutionary conditions. So we should certainly pay even more attention to it, shouldn't we? And I think as we do we will find that it is rich in meaning for us.

Specifically, the Pastor had pointed out that Socialism would be the second phase of the trouble. I am afraid that a lot of brethren have missed this--they have missed this peaceful revolution, this Socialism that the Pastor spoke of so frequently. Some places he said, "war, revolution and anarchy." Other places he said, "war, Socialism and anarchy." In other words, Socialism is synonymous with the earthquake or revolution. Maybe we think of revolution as only being violent--but that is not necessarily true. That is not the basic thought in the word "revolution". Revolution simply means "to turn over." A wheel revolves. That does not mean that the spokes fall out. You turn any-thing over, what was on top is now on the bottom--that's a revolution. And it does not necessarily imply violence either. There have also been a number of violent revolutions in this period.

We would like to read some excerpts here. There are many others, but these few will suffice. This is taken from the Fourth Volume, page 486: "We have reason to believe that Socialism will make great progress during the next few years. But frequently it will not be wisely or moderately advanced: success will intoxicate some of its advocates, and failure render others desperate, and as a result impatience will lead to calamity. . . Rulers, capitalists and clergymen, with few exceptions, will seize upon the first extremes of Socialism to assault it and brand it with infamy, and temporarily throttle it, encouraging themselves with specious arguments which self-interest and fear will suggest. (We want to call attention to the fact that he doesn't say that people are opposing these changes entirely from self-interest, though that is a big part of it. It is also a fear--a fear of our whole way of life being destroyed, particularly religion if the world goes Communist. So there is a basis for genuine fear, and the Pastor always recognized these different elements and motives.) As intimated the movement will be crushed under the combined power of Church, State and Capital and later lead to the great explosion of anarchy, in which, as indicated in the Scriptures, all present institutions will be wrecked;-- 'a time of trouble such as was not since there was a nation.'"

Notice Socialism will fail or be crushed, and reform being thwarted along that line, the result will be "the great explosion of anarchy." You see there will be a period of time between the revolution and the anarchy, and it is during anarchy that all present institutions will be wrecked. Socialists don't want to destroy the system. They want to reform it--modify it.

This is another reference, the 1910 Foreword to the Fourth Volume, page xvi: "The masses will seek relief through the ballot and the peaceful readjustment of earth's affairs for the elimination of evil, for the placing of monopolies and utilities and the supplies of nature in the hands of the people for the public good. The crisis will be reached when the hitherto upholders of the law shall become violators of the law and resisters of the will of the majority as expressed by the ballot. Fear for the future will goad the well-meaning masses to desperation, and anarchy will result when Socialism fails."

Who are the "hitherto upholders of the law"? At the time this was written the laws were mainly to protect property rights and the upper classes, what we call the "have" classes. They were strong for the law to protect their interests. Now laws have been changed. We have laws protecting human rights more now. There is more emphasis on that than on property rights. We see the change in emphasis during the riots. They often forget about the damage to property-- just don't kill anybody. So we have laws now that have benefited the masses.

The Pastor says the crisis will be reached when the hitherto upholders of the law (the privileged classes) shall become the violators of the law, seeking to set aside these laws, liberal laws, civil rights, and things of that nature, getting around it in one way or another. That's when we reach the danger point. Another place he calls it "sitting on the safety valve." (D Fore. xiii). If you do that without turning off the heat, you know what's going to happen. Even you sisters know about that with the pressure cooker. And they are not turning off the heat, but they are beginning to sit on the safety valve--but we are getting ahead of our lesson.

Notice, "anarchy will result when Socialism fails." That is the sequence of events. Socialism will be tried to a large extent. It will fail--it will be sabotaged and frustrated, and the result will be violent revolution, destruction, anarchy.

We have another reference, Reprints 4144, second column, near the bottom. I believe this gives us the best outline of how the time of trouble would develop of anything that I have come across. Getting down to the pertinent part we read: "Then Socialism will appear to

the masses the *only peaceable way* (the words "only peaceable way" are in italics so the Pastor is stressing the fact that this will be a peaceful movement) for obtaining social and financial equality; then Socialism will spread like wildfire. But Socialism will fail; because money and brains will cooperate against it from selfishness and fear. Then, maddened by their failure, Socialists will en masse turn anarchists, and the direct results will ensue: 'A time of trouble such as was not since there was a nation.'

Socialism is not the remedy: "Our reason for keeping track of the progress of Socialism now is, that we expect that it, or something akin to it, is about to deceive the world into looking for a Millennium of it's own, and lead them unconsciously to, and then over the brink into the anarchy and 'time of trouble such as was not since there was a nation.' We cannot wonder that this 'will O' the wisp' should attract and ensnare many of 'the groaning creation'...We sympathize...but after seeing the divine plan ...(paraphrase) dangerous to become engulfed in Socialism." R 3141

"The present step is the war of the nations. The next step will be Socialism--an attempted Socialism--among the people. Then the third step, anarchy will gradually come on." R 5632:1

Where are we on the stream of time? In the first place we want to note some great changes that have taken place in the world. Maybe some of you remember this picture. It appeared in LIFE magazine a few years ago. It is called, "1913 the Last Years of Splendor," and we have a picture here of the funeral procession of King Edward VII of Britain. It says nine rulers of Europe came to bury Edward VII. This was in 1910. It starts out on this side, the riderless horse, and here you have Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany with all his pomp. You have the new king of England in the middle and his uncle on the right. Look at all that splendor. Look at all the decorations and the color. That's just the beginning of the procession. Over here you have a continuation. Starting here we come on down through these kings and notables of the nations until we come to the end of the procession--and who do you think we find there?--the representative of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt. He manages a high silk hat but that's all, and he is at the end of the procession.

What a change has taken place! Practically all of these kings have bitten the dust, as they say--and whereas the United States rated last in that procession, the President of the United States is now the most powerful man in the world. A frightening situation, too, isn't it, with access to the push buttons that could destroy the world? Do you realize what a precarious position we are in? Suppose there would be a meteoric shower from the direction of Russia, and our early warning system picks up these specks of fire coming in.

They would look like bombs, wouldn't they? Suppose the President got on the line with Russia and said we see what looks like bombs coming in. Are you sending bombs over? What would you expect them to say if they really were sending bombs? What would a denial amount to? It wouldn't amount to anything. The President couldn't afford to wait to find out what these things really were. He would have to push the button. It's now or never. The same would be true in a real attack. That's the precarious position we are in, and that's the power that one man wields today.

Anyway, I don't attach too much significance to the kings as such because Rome was a republic at one time and France, who hadn't had a king for 150 years, hung on to her colonies more tenaciously than most of the other countries. I think it is world dominion through colonialism that is represented in that Gentile image more than anything else. That power over the other nations has to be broken so that these other nations can line up with the new order of things. I don't believe the nations will be completely destroyed as nations, but their control over other nations will be broken down. When Nebuchadnezzar became a universal ruler, he was pictured in the image. The nation had existed long before that but not as a universal ruler--and that is stressed--succession of these four universal empires. (Daniel 2 and 7). So we find that this colonialism has now been largely broken. I think that is the important thing.

We know nations will not be completely destroyed as nations because it says that "many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." (Micah 4:2) Nations will still exist. Also some of them will still be rebellious. Zechariah 14 says that the nations which will not come up to Jerusalem to worship, upon them shall be no rain. After that treatment, if they still don't come up, he says upon them will be a plague. And then, isn't it interesting that he singles Egypt out which had built up such antagonism toward Israel? You can imagine they would be about the last one to come up--and it says "if the family of Egypt go not up." Isn't that interesting that he seemed to foreknow this great struggle and hostility between Israel and Egypt? Anyway, the Lord will take care of that--but the nations will still exist as nations. They will, however, have lost their universal dominion and colonies and domination of other nations (that is a minimum fulfillment) permitting these other nations to join up freely with the new order, which we are assured they will do.

"The kings have had their day," and here we have a cartoon, "A Well-Known Italian Boot." Italy is shaped like a boot, and here it shows them kicking out the king--another

graphic description of the trend of events, the destruction of these hereditary rulers which were the main strength of the old order of things that existed prior to 1914.

Now the question is, has this predicted Socialism come about? I came across this document in the late 1930's which shows that under the New Deal President Roosevelt carried out the major planks of the Socialist platform of 1932, the year that he ran for office. The husband of a cousin of mine happened to mention that Roosevelt was a Socialist--that he was carrying out the Socialist platform. That rang a bell because I was aware of what the Pastor had expected along that line, and this was news to me. Certainly Roosevelt didn't carry that label. So I said, "Where do you get that?" He said, "I have a magazine some place that shows the comparison of the platforms, and really to read the Socialist platform, that describes the New Deal." I got all excited then and said, "Can you find this magazine?" He said, "I may have it some place." Sure enough, he turned it up. Now this is a blown up copy from 8 1/2 X 11. This is from the Scholastic Magazine, a school paper--and they try to be impartial. They are not like newspapers. The newspapers, you know, usually promote one or another party--but a school paper impartially gives the platforms of the Republican elephant, the Democratic donkey, and the Socialist arm and hammer. (You can probably see at least that much from the audience.)

This is dated September 24, 1932, about six weeks before the election in November. Supposedly Roosevelt was running on the Democratic platform, but the Republican and Democratic platforms are just like two peas in a pod. You can hardly see the difference. But, of course, the Socialist platform was radically different. You may say that was complete deception. Hardly, because he ran on a slogan more than he ran on a platform. What was the slogan? "Let's have a New Deal." When you analyze that expression, anything could go, couldn't it?--a New Deal. I suppose they mean a new deal in cards where everything is reshuffled. Well, that could be a revolutionary slogan if you wanted to make it that--and he did, he made it that way.

I would just like to read some of the planks in the Socialist platform of 1932. The big problem was unemployment at the time. This is what the Socialists proposed: "A federal appropriation of \$5 billion for immediate relief for those in need to supplement state and local appropriations." You know \$5 billion doesn't sound like so much today, but do you realize what it was at that time? Well, to start with, a dollar was still worth a dollar. The entire national debt was only \$20 billion at that time--\$20 billion--now it's about \$350 billion. And Hoover said if the Government spent anything in relief we would go bankrupt. But against that backdrop the Socialists proposed spending \$5 billion for immediate relief. And, you know, that's what we had. We had just about that much money doled out—one-quarter of the total national debt.

Nowhere is another Socialist proposal: "A comprehensive and efficient system of free public employment agencies." Prior to that there were no free public employment agencies, and then we had the United States Employment Services.

Here is another proposal: "A compulsory system of unemployment compensation with adequate benefits based on contributions by the government and by employers." There is your Social Security--very little difference. "Old age pensions for men and women 60 years of age and over." We have that. "A federal appropriation of \$5 billion (another \$5 billion--another one-quarter of the national debt--a total of \$10 billion--one-half of the total national debt--was to be expended under the Socialist platform, and that's what we had, \$5 billion) for public works and roads." There's the WPA (Works Progress Administration) and the PWA (Public Works Administration). Here's another one--"Reforestation." You remember the CCC camps and the NYA (National Youth Administration).

Here's another one: "Slum clearance and decent homes for workers by federal government, states and cities." That was carried out under the FPHA (Federal Public Housing Administration) and the FHA (Federal Housing Administration). Also there were emergency loans for those that got into trouble. So many things developed under this bureaucracy under the New Deal. On economy the Socialists, of course, couldn't make any claims, could they? But this is what the Democrats promised to do. Remember the Republicans were spending very little. The Democrats in their platform proposed to save not less than 25 per cent in the cost of federal government--but against that platform promise, they adopted the Socialist platform and spent these \$10 billion as a starter--and that was but a small beginning.

Now, of course, on taxation the Socialists said: "Steeply increased inheritance taxes and income taxes on the higher incomes and estates of both corporations and individuals; a constitutional amendment authorizing the taxation of all government securities." You remember that the income tax was boosted. I don't know what the maximum was. It was practically confiscating income. I think it got up as high as 95 per cent on some of the higher incomes--think of it--95 per cent income tax. That was revolutionary. The rate is much lower now.

On agriculture it said: "The creation of national, regional and state utilization boards to prepare the way for agricultural planning on a regional and ultimately on a world scale." There's your AAA which took acreage out of production, killed the little pigs, and some of you older brethren remember how it developed in agriculture. We still have this to a

certain extent although it has been modified. That's the point we are leading up to. We are past the crest of Socialism, I believe, in this country and possibly in some other parts of the world.

Under public utilities, of course, the Socialists did advocate public ownership, and in that very fact the Socialists could not have accomplished much even if Norman Thomas had been elected. You know how long it takes to get appropriations through Congress. But what infuriated the business-men so much during the Roosevelt administration was the fact that the government didn't bother to buy anything. The businessmen had their money invested, and the government told them now to run their businesses--all business. That was under the NRA (National Recovery Act) an emergency measure whereby the government had control of all business. So we had more Socialism, more government control, than we could possibly have had under the Socialist party.

However, this next plank, a very short one, was what accomplished the revolution in this country. It put labor on top. Under labor: "The abolition of injunctions in labor disputes, the outlawing of yellow dog contracts, and the passing of laws enforcing the rights of workers to organize into unions." That was done under the Norris-LaGuardia Bill and the Wagner Act, and it put labor in absolute control in this country. Now this has been modified. The Taft-Hartley Law was intended to balance, but even now labor is a giant in its own right. Labor is on equal terms with capital now--but prior to that during the heyday of the New Deal labor was actually in the ascendency. You remember that Henry Ford with all his wealth and power and determination couldn't hold out against the union shop. The government forced him to recognize the union. They withheld government contracts until he did. As I say, this has been modified some under the Taft-Hartley Law which was passed in 1946. But between the time that the Norris-LaGuardia Bill and the Wagner Act went into effect until the Taft-Hartley Law, labor was in virtual control.

The Socialists advocated entrance into the United Nations, which was accomplished under Roosevelt.

Being aware of the Pastor's expectations and also what has happened even in this country, I was not so sure in previous times but what we might have out-and-out Socialism under its own name. But it seems now quite evident that we are past that stage. The militant revolutionaries are not clamoring for more laws. We have a lot of liberal laws on the books. But now there is government by demonstration--by power groups--which is incipient anarchy. It is without the law. They see that these laws, the liberal laws that were supposed to bring about such miraculous results, didn't work. Norman Thomas could see that. He even quit running for President. He abandoned politics and when asked why

he said, "Well, the Democrats have carried out most of my proposals." But not only that, he could see they weren't working. He was an idealist, and he saw it wouldn't work. Someone has said, "Socialism won't work as long as men are selfish, and when man isn't selfish you don't need Socialism." That is a true statement. In fact, you wouldn't want it. If man had love for his fellowmen, you would want to turn him loose to do all the good he could without any restraint--isn't that right? Socialism is only an attempt to control selfishness and self-aggrandizement, and it doesn't succeed. It is failing.

Not only did we have Socialism in this country, but before the war ended we had a revolution in Russia, and Russia and China today are marching under the hammer and sickle. What does the hammer and sickle represent?--the farm and factory workers. You know the public press doesn't stress that much. You get the impression that they are just a different group of millionaires and billionaires over there--which isn't true. They have a Socialist form of government, and many of the nations have gone into more or less open Socialism. Take the Scandinavian countries as an example. This is organized Socialism; but within the so-called free-enterprise nations we have Socialist trends. We have revolutionary elements within these governments, too. There are two different conditions. The fact is that Britain had a lot of Socialism under their Labor party and now the Tories are in. Australia and New Zealand had Socialism under its own name, and that has been abandoned. I was in Saskatchewan recently and got some first-hand information there (I had a hint of it before). The province of Saskatchewan had a Socialist government for about 12 years, and they lost out in 1968. These are all indications that we apparently are through this era of expected Socialism, and it has not been successful even though it hasn't been given a fair trial. It has been sabotaged by those elements which are so opposed to it as the Pastor predicted.

I am more confident now- - I am not dogmatic on this--but I am more confident, that this is a fulfillment, than I had been in the past because I think now we have incipient anarchy. But there was a question that came up. Why didn't the Republicans point out that the Democrats had skipped their platform and were carrying out the Socialist platform? As I say, I got this information in the late 30's--and year after year went by, and election campaign after election campaign, and not a word about this--not until 1946. Why did they wait 14 years? I tell you, it was like Brother Russell said, "Socialism would spread like wildfire"--it was popular. Even Congress became a rubber stamp to the President's ideas. They didn't dare oppose this legislation or the President's program--the people liked it. So if they had said, "This is Socialism," the people would have said, "Socialism? I thought that was so bad. If this is Socialism, let's have more of it." So it would have defeated their purpose to even have mentioned it. They couldn't scare them with that any more, so the Republicans didn't dare say anything about it--and the Democrats wouldn't

admit it, naturally that they had skipped their platform. And why would Norman Thomas even mention it, because if a major party was carrying it out, what chance would he have of being elected to start from scratch to carry it out? So nobody said anything about it until 1946. Then Roosevelt had died, and they thought they had Truman "over a barrel." He surprised them. You remember he "whistle stopped" through the country, he caught on, and got elected. But in the meantime there had been a sort of counter-revolution. Now this is what the Republican Chairman, Carroll Reece, said in 1946-- it finally comes out: "The Democratic administration which has been in power for 14 years was born of the unholy union of deceit and demagoguery, and the offspring has retained the characteristics of both parents. That administration came into power on a platform containing sound Republican principles. Then it ran up the flag of false liberalism and proceeded to administer the 1932 platform of the Socialist party upon which no party could have been elected."

They allowed a rebuttal on the side, and Robert Hannegan, the Democratic Chairman put next to "could not be elected"--1936? 1940? 1944? He skipped 1932. That's what the Republicans said that they could not have been elected on the Socialist platform in 1932, and the Democratic party wasn't denying that they carried out the Socialist platform--but when the Republicans said that they could not have been elected on that platform, Hannegan reminded them that they were re-elected on that three times in succession. Roosevelt was elected to not only an unprecedented third term but a fourth term as well. I believe that carried out what the Pastor said, that "Socialism would spread like wildfire" for a while--but that's largely over now.

This is typical of some of the advertisements you saw in the papers charging Socialism not only in this country but also in England. Here is a cartoon that shows the United States withholding a rope representing U. S. loans. Here is Britain hanging over the precipice of Socialism, and the United States says, "No Siree, I am not going to help him finance his old Socialism." Britain, you see, was considered Socialist at the time, and the United States was going to let them fall into regimentation and mare Socialism rather than give them loans.

Another cartoon describes that era. It shows union monopoly power, and up here is the employer, the employee, and you know who--Johnny Q. Public--on the other end of the teeter totter way up in the air, over-balanced by union monopoly power. Now, as I say, their wings were clipped to a certain extent under the Taft-Hartley law--but labor is still a giant in its own right. But there are other small elements on the outside looking in, and they are the ones getting the headlines today. The Pastor said that attempts would be made to throttle this.

Here is a statement in 1946 by Malcolm Bingay, and he said that Franklin D. Roosevelt saw the end of the New Deal. He could see that it wasn't working. This is what he said: "His record (that is Franklin Roosevelt) before entering the White House was that of a liberal in the old sense as was George Norris, Robert LaFollette, Theodore Roosevelt and Alfred E. Smith. After he took office he threw aside the Democratic platform and began his amazing eight years of experimentation with Socialist doctrine. He had surrounded himself with visionaries from whom he could not escape. In the early summer of 1944 he said that the New Deal had outlived its usefulness, that Dr. New Deal had been dismissed and it was time to call in a new physician."

We have here a cartoon showing the U. S. swinging to the right. Here is a map of North America. Here is the United States. It has shifted way out into the Atlantic Ocean. It is called, "A Swing to the Right--a View from Apollo 10."

Another cartoon I think is quite significant. It is recent--1971. This is a jibe at the militants. It shows a doctor and a nurse, the nurse holding a new-born baby. The doctor says, "Your orders are to slap him, Miss Morris, not deliver a formal apology for the world situation and national debt." This has a connotation, you see, of clamping down on these militants.. Don't apologize for the situation in the world--just slap them down and make them like it. A little humor in it, but it goes beyond that.

Again we have the trend of the Nixon administration. Of course, you know Agnew' is putting up trial balloons all the time to see what goes over and what doesn't. If it goes over, fine. If it doesn't go over, Nixon disowns the whole idea. But actually the administration is more extreme right than the President himself expresses it. Here is a pretty good description of Nixon, and it shows why he is going to pursue this anti-Communist policy. You remember he gained all his publicity in prosecuting the so-called Communists, Alger Hiss and others. That's how he got into the public eye, and he has been riding this ever since. That's what this editorial writer, Clayton Fritchey, says: "Nixon is sustained by his dedication to a policy formula. which has transformed him from a small town nobody into the most powerful ruler on earth. Who in history has ever parleyed a single issue, professional anti-Communism, into greater success? First to the House, then to the Senate, then to the Vice Presidency, and finally to the White House itself. He can hardly be blamed for believing in it so religiously." He continues by saying Nixon probably will stick to this line, partly because he believe in it and particularly because he has been so successful with it--and if that is true, this would be a swing to the right, a right backlash which could fulfil the Pastor's expectations, too. That could be dynamite. That can lead to violence--anarchy.

Nixon has accomplished more in this swing to the right than You realize--not in Congress but particularly in the Supreme Court. I have a list of decisions that have gone against labor and civil rights legislation. It isn't just the laws that you have but how you interpret the laws--and when he put Chief Justice Burger in as head of the Supreme Court he has accomplished more to offset this liberal legislation than changing the legislation itself. Anyone interested in looking these decisions up will see what a tremendous swing to the right has been made in the interpretation of liberal laws. Just recently you have heard that Nixon has decreed that suburban communities don't have to accept low-cost federal public housing. That's largely offsetting open housing. That's just a little indication. The result of all this could well be pictured, as in this cartoon--terror bombing, anarchy. Thinking people realize that we have incipient anarchy now--not that it is going to break out in the next few days or few months. It may actually teeter totter for a little bit. We don't know, but it could be later than we think.

There are two separate sets of prophecies--one of a disciplined host (D544) and another of disorganized mobs in the later stages (D550:3). The Pastor asked, "Where is this organized army that will defy the hosts in Christendom? Is it the German army? (That was the most disciplined in the world at the time he wrote). Is it the French army? Is it the British Army? Is it the Russian army?" (D544). Well, it turns out to be the Russian. You would hardly have supposed that the Russians would be the most disciplined host, but when you think of it, they were the only really oppressed nation in the group he mentioned. You could have expected a revolution there. He asked, "Where is the army that will stand up against the anathemas of Christendom, defy its missiles of shot and shells?" (D545:1). They are not only defying these powers, but they are even matching missile for missile, spaceship for spaceship

We get ahead of Russia on one point, and they get ahead of us in another department. We beat them in putting a man on the moon, and they are beating us to Mars. They have two ships on the way to Mars, and we only have one, one of them fell, and they had a head start. That's what it is, this struggle between the United States and the Communist world. It is something frightening. We are bankrupting each other even if we don't get into a hot war. And you have labor blown up so big some of the brethren seem to ignore that picture. They say, "Bro. Russell expected the struggle to be between capital and labor, but it's students and elements like that." Labor is so big in those nations, like a big headline you can't see because it's so big right in front of you. Labor is the giant here, too.

This has a bearing on the Lord's people because we tend to take sides in this struggle. I suggest you read Volume II, page 262, in which Brother Russell says that probably we would be the only ones of the conservative, order-loving people that would not be drawn into the side of supporting Babylon and the present order. This could be part of the "mark of the beast in the right hand." (Rev. 13:16). Because some of the fringe elements of the Lord's great army are so rough and violent and even dirty, they are repulsive to people in general. But we are to remember that this is part of the Lord's great army to destroy Babylon. As one brother put it, the Lord will use these revolutionary elements as a broom to sweep out Babylon and then he will burn up the broom. He can't use the Communists, Socialists or anything like them--any godless system. But specifically I would like to stress that we should not get involved. (A338-342, esp. 339:2; D550 bot.).

I would like to call to your attention what the Lord said about the peculiar deceptions of this "hour of temptation." In Matthew 24:24 we read: "For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." We are concerned about that, aren't we, in this hour of temptation lest we be deceived? And what is the particular point of the deception that the Lord is referring to? Notice verses 23 and 26: "Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or, there; believe it not....Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert go not forth: behold he is in the secret chambers; believe it not."

After Christ has returned there will be some claiming that he would be in this place or that place--this organization or that organization. And some would say, "Behold he is in the desert." In other words, don't have anything to do with anybody, any class or any organization--get out in the desert and become isolated. That's where we will have fellowship with Christ. He says, "Believe it not." If he is not in the secret chamber, or he is not here, or not there, where is he? He explains it in verses 27-28: "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the presence of the Son of man be. For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together." To the world it is a case of general enlightenment. You know it gets light an hour or two before the sun comes up. When the sun comes up then it will be with healing in its beams. That's the mediatorial reign. Don't expect the resurrection of the dead now. Death is the last enemy to be destroyed-- not the first enemy. (I Cor. 15:25,26). There are a lot of other enemies to be destroyed--but there is first a general over-all enlightenment of the world. That's the general picture, but now there is something special for the Lord's people. What is that?

We go back to our lesson concerning the church of Laodicea. He says: "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come into him, and will sup with him, and he with me." (Rev. 3:14, 20). If you don't hear the knock, he might as well not be there--but if you hear the knock, you get in on this special feast. Now, this you see, is speaking more plainly than the illustration of the carcass, but it is same thought, isn't it? What the carcass is to the eagles, this feast, the Truth, the harvest message is to the Lord's saints.

He also says in Luke 12:37: "Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them." In Matthew 24 he shows that he will use a servant in passing out those dishes that he himself has prepared.

Luke's account gives more details (Luke 17:20-24): "And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, Lo there! (a place, you see) for, behold the kingdom of God is among you....And they shall say to you, See here; or See there; go not after them, nor follow them. For as the lightning that lighteneth out of one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in his day." Note the emphasis. He is not in a place. everyone will want to line up in a place, and we are to have no part in it--"go not after them."

Note "in his day." General world enlightenment is one indication, but more specifically something else. This is mentioned in verses 34-37. Here we see he brings in the harvest work. He relates the harvest to this situation. "I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed (creed bed); the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. Two women shall be grinding together (in religious institutions preparing food); the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two men shall be in the field (out-and-out worldlings--they are not eliminated either, but they are a secondary consideration--not real harvest work--involves planting, too). And they answered and said unto him, Where Lord?" We want to know the answer to that, too. Where are we to be gathered in this harvest?

You ask the Papacy, "Where are the true people of the Lord?" "They are in the one true church--the oldest and the biggest church in the world.' You ask some of the other churches--a similar answer. You ask the JW's-"Why don't you know, it's the Society. That's the ark. Unless you get into the ark you will be destroyed in Armageddon and never be resurrected." In each case the place is stressed--the Lord is in a place. And how prone we are to put the Lord in some place, in some organization--you've got to lineup

here. If you are not cooperating you are a rebel. Where should the Lord's people be? The Lord answers their question in the 37th verse: "For wheresoever the body (the food) is, thither will the eagles be gathered together."

The Truth is the attraction rather than a place. You know, friends, we have the greatest tendency to fall for this idea of some place, some organization, some particular interpretation of the harvest message, some particular emphasis of one or another phase of it. Instead of feasting like eagles we are more like chickens. You know they grab a morsel and run off to one corner of the pen. Another one grabs another morsel and runs off to another corner of the pen, and others follow. It divides the Lord's people if you get away from the main body of the carcass--the whole message. It's right here under one cover now. That's the carcass. You can have that inside or outside a class. You can have it in some loose appropriate service organization. As long as it's the tail of the dog it's fine--but you have heard of the tail wagging the dog, too. And that of course, would be in violation of this idea. We must emphasize the food, the Truth, the carcass. That, dear friends, I think is the main test in this hour of temptation. I think it's pretty clear that that's what the Lord says it is. There are many other ramifications of this whole thing. It takes many different forms--deviations from the Truth. But let's not be discouraged.

There are one or two other points I would like to mention. You know the curse, sweat of face toil and the difficulties in child-bearing, these are a part of the curse on man and woman respectively, and these were added to the death penalty. Apparently it was optional. The Lord didn't have to add them, but he did. He did it wisely, too, because if man had not had to work hard he would have gotten into all kinds of mischief. History has proved that time and time again. The sin of Sodom was "pride, fullness of bread, and abundance of idleness," which led to its complete destruction. The same conditions brought about the destruction of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome--and you name it, it's the same situation in every civilization that has gone down. So the curse turned out to be a blessing, didn't it?--a blessing in disguise--but the Lord called it a curse. Now we have this curse being rolled away. This can be done before the ransom is available to lift the death penalty. The curse can be rolled away, and it has been largely rolled away--the sweat of race toil, etc.

Many of the Lord's people are confused on this point. They say, "You call these blessings? Look at all the trouble in the world as a result of these inventions. The automobile implements every crime in the book." That's not the fault of the automobile. We will have to admit that these potential Millennial blessings in many cases turn out to be a curse on this generation. But we shouldn't be fooled about this because the curse which turned out to be a blessing was called a curse. So the Lord saw these blessings which can

come in advance of the lifting of the death penalty (the application of the ransom is the only thing that will do that)--these blessings may turn out to be a curse, but God would call them blessings, wouldn't he? Let's use the Lord's language and not be confused on this. Let's recognize the fact that the Lord is working in the world, and these are some of the evidences.

Another thought is something we experience in our weather. Do you know what causes thunder, and lightning and hail? It is the approach of a fair weather system. It's the approach of sunny weather. You ask anyone who has had any experience in flying and they will tell you that you must avoid the front between the high pressure (the fair weather) and the humid low pressure areas. There must inevitably be a front, a collision between these two forces. And if there's a radically different barometric pressure it's going to mean an intense storm. It means that cold air coming in along the ground, being heavier, will drive the warm humid air high in the sky where it condenses and causes clouds, rain, thunder and lightning. And if its driven high enough you will have hail. All of these symbols are related to this time of trouble. The size of the hail stones means that these clouds are driven to tremendous heights. Isn't it reasonable that the symbolisms that are used in the Bible would be related to a cause in the natural way?

So it's the Sun of righteousness coming in and the eventual fair weather that he will produce that is causing the trouble in the world. And that's exactly what Daniel tells us. "And at that time shall Michael stand up." (Dan. 12:1). He is the "Prince of Peace"--won't we have peace? No--"there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation." But following that will be the fair weather.

If we are expecting the right things we will not be disappointed. The Pastor has projected these ideas, and of course they have come slower than we expected. Even the Apostles expected things to wind up too soon. We can't hold that against the Pastor without incriminating the Apostles themselves. But things are coming along in the sequence we have expected, and I find no occasion to make any radical changes in anything in the harvest message. May the Lord add his blessing.

(Discourse by Leon H. Norby, 70 Dyer Avenue, Clifton, N. J., 0701~.)