

rule out coincidence. For instance, I've been told (I have not seen this) that in the-- that about 1900 there was a book about a ~~gi~~ new boat called the ~~Tix~~ Titan which was supposed to be the biggest boat ever made up to that time. Marvellously made and supposed to be the grandest thing yet. It told about its voyage and how it hit an iceberg and went down.

When in 1912 a boat called the Titanic was supposed to be the greatest boat ever made up to that time. In fact one of the crewmen said to somebody when they said, Do you think this boat will make it safely? He replied, Lady, God Almighty couldn't sink this boat! The sinking of the Titanic was a matter -- it was marvellous the way it happened. Because they hit an earthquake(?) and the earthquake(?) cut a hole -- iceberg cut a hole a certain distance. If it had cut it a little less far the boat would have stood. It just cut in far enough to sink it. When the boat sank there were at least 1000 people drowned.

But there was a coincidence. And you take Lincoln being shot by a southern sympathizer and succeeded by a southern senator named Johnson who was Vice President. And Kennedy being shot in the south and being succeeded by a southern senator named Johnson. And when you take the fact that every president of the U.S. since 1840 who has been elected in a year divisible by 20 has died in office, and only one other has. That's 11 different cases!

There are just so many coincidences in life that when you get down to the validity of the argument, the few cases that I am familiar with-- there are a few cases which are very striking and I think (give) tremendously good evidence. But there is an awful lot of prophecy which we cannot use very well in an apologetic way. That's why I don't get as enthused as he does about this particular subject. I have not discussed that with him at length, but you see the problems involved in it.

I went with the faculty -- with this class which had 3 faculty in it, and one thing we came to was the letters to the 7 churches in Revelation. I said the idea of saying that this is a picture of church history is utter nonsense. You have ~~half~~ half of all of church history combined under one of these seven churches and all the rest under the six, and the characteristics which they alledge to be this part and that part of church history could just as well fit other parts. Of course it does not say in the Bible it is a view of church history. That's an idea which somebody has thought of. But I've found members of the faculty who said, Why I've heard ministers give that so dogmatically they were really quite shocked!

Dr. Cohen who took his doctor's degree in Grace Seminary on the book of Revelation in his thesis follows that theory. I begged him to take it out. I don't know whether he did or not. But it's utter nonsense. But you see the problem. I think the good evidences we have in that line are well worth using. I believe there are evidences (there are a few of them) which are absolutely water tight. Tyre is one which I used to use a lot. I haven't used it so much lately. He referred to that.