

Is the time now ripe for the disappearance of the Mohammedan "little horn"? Instead of merely saying *yes*, it is better that the answer should be found in history, and in present political conditions. The wasting away of the Mohammedan "little horn," the head of which for centuries has been the Turkish Empire, was predicted under the figure of the "drying up of the waters of the river Euphrates, that the way of the kings from the sunrising might be prepared" (Rev. 16: 12). Now what does history give us of the *wasting away* of the once great Ottoman power? At the end of the seventeenth century, the Turks were expelled from Hungary. In 1817, Servia revolted, and subsequently gained her freedom. In 1829, Greece became independent. Then Montenegro, Roumania, Bulgaria, Bosnia, and Herzegovina escaped one after another. Egypt, Algeria, and Tripoli came under the protection of Britain, France, and Italy respectively. Only recently, the Balkan States turned with wrath upon their murderous oppressor and wrested the remaining European possessions from his grasp, leaving but Constantinople as the seat of empire, and a narrow strip of land along the Dardanelles to the Aegean Sea. Need I ask why Constantinople was not also taken by the victorious allies? Of course they knew it was a danger spot among some of the chancellories of Europe; but there was a more potent reason than that—a Providential one. The time was not yet quite due, the "Time of trouble"—God's controversy with Christendom—had not yet begun. According to Daniel's prophecy (Dan. 11: 44, 45), the seat of government of the Sultan—the representative of the Mohammedan political power—was to be transferred to Asia Minor *during* that "time of trouble," and would end at that time; so European diplomacy is seen to be one of the natural causes that prevented the Sultan's exit before the appointed time. The present war of the nations is unquestionably a part of that "time of trouble," which includes Armageddon, and which is to close the age of wars.