



The three frog spirits and humanism(1)

Richard Mellows

“And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty. Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame” (Rev. 16:13-15).

THE PROPHECY of the sixth vial concerning the three unclean spirits like frogs is familiar to us. The purpose of these three articles is to examine the way in which the influence of these spirits is at work today. The standard Christadelphian interpretation of this prophecy applying it to the French Revolution and its outcome will be endorsed. It will then be argued, by an examination of documentary evidence, that the frog spirits pervade modern society through the philosophy of humanism. We shall finally note the implicit warning of the danger that the effects of these unclean spirits may have on the ecclesia.

French Revolution origins

Our purpose here is not to make the case in detail for the French connection of the prophecy. This has been done many times elsewhere in Christadelphian writings, and is endorsed by the present writer. The interpretation that puts forward the Frankish origin of the frog as an heraldic symbol, and its association with the early Frankish king Clovis, is sound. But here we simply note the threefold cry of the Revolution: Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. Notice that the frogs symbolise “unclean spirits”. The word translated “spirits” is *pneuma*, the Greek for ‘wind’ or ‘breath’. It is the means by which speech is possible in the literal sense, and when linked with the Greek *hagion*, ‘holy’, refers to the mechanism of inspiration of the Word of God. Here in Revelation 16 the import is precisely the opposite; it refers to unclean teaching, as opposed to the wholesome teaching of the Word.

Notice also that this unclean teaching emerges from three separate mouths. Interestingly and significantly, there are four other mouths mentioned explicitly or by implication in Revelation, as follows:

- 1 **The dragon or serpent.** “And the serpent cast out of his *mouth* water as a flood after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood” (12:15);
- 2 **The sea beast.** “And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the *mouth* of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority . . . and there was given unto him a *mouth speaking* great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he *opened his mouth in blasphemy* against God, to blaspheme His name, and His tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven” (13:2,5,6);
- 3 **The earth beast.** “And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he *spake* as a dragon” (v. 11);
- 4 **The image of the beast.** “And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both *speak*, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed” (v. 15). This point of detail is important. In Daniel 7:4-8, where the beasts are introduced, there are a total of seven heads (lion, bear, four heads on the leopard, and one on the fourth beast) and eight mouths (the little horn on the fourth beast also

has a mouth). In Revelation too there are arguably eight heads in one sense (one beast goes out of existence and then is brought back to life as the eighth), and therefore eight mouths (see Rev. 17:8-11). The important point is that the unclean teaching referred to in Revelation 16:13 is associated with, and of the same character, as other things 'Roman' in the last days of the ecclesia and Gentile times.

Frogs and freedom

It is also interesting to note the Scriptural origins of the frog. The creature is first mentioned in connection with the second of the plagues brought on Egypt: "Then Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron, and said, Intreat the LORD, that He may take away the frogs from me, and from my people; and I will let the people go, that they may do sacrifice unto the LORD" (Ex. 8:8). This first mention of the frog is in the context of a promise of freedom, but of a freedom that is illusory.

This is precisely the kind of freedom that was promised by the cry of 'Liberty' at the French Revolution. It is a cry that propounds man's freedom to act as he wishes; a freedom that is illusory because at best it ends in the eternal bondage of death, and which may also bring terrible consequences along with it, even during life.

Note also that in their Scriptural origins frogs are associated with uncleanness, which is picked up in Revelation 16. According to Exodus 8:3, "the river shall bring forth frogs abundantly". A related Hebrew word for "abundantly" is used in Genesis 1:20 and applied to "the moving [mg. creeping] creature", and under the Law of Moses such creatures are unclean (Lev. 11:20,23). This completes the link back to the unclean spirits of Revelation 16 and their association with the French Revolution.

Freedom is the cry of modern societies, it is trumpeted by those who defend democracy and the freedom that it brings; people must be allowed to act and think as they wish, provided they do not directly harm others. Essentially this is the underpinning doctrine of humanism, which pervades the social, political, educational and religious systems of the Western world. But its origins go directly back to the French Revolution. We shall now trace that history and show that humanism is the modern manifestation of the threefold cry of the unclean frog spirits of the French Revolution.

Documentary history—the French Revolution

Firstly, let us consider the official declaration of the French Revolution, known as the *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen*, approved by the National Assembly of France, 26 August 1789. The following extracts are from the prologue and Articles 1, 2 and 4:

The representatives of the French people, organized as a National Assembly, believing that the ignorance, neglect, or contempt of the **rights of man** are the sole cause of public calamities and of the corruption of governments, have determined to set forth in a solemn declaration the natural, unalienable, and **sacred rights of man** . . . Therefore the National Assembly recognizes and proclaims, in the presence and under the auspices of the Supreme Being, the following **rights of man and of the citizen**:

Article 1: Men are born and remain **free and equal in rights**. Social distinctions may be founded only upon the general good.

Article 2: The aim of all **political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man**. These rights are **liberty**, property, security, and resistance to oppression.

Article 4: **Liberty** consists in the **freedom** to do everything which injures no one else; hence the exercise of the **natural rights of each man has no limits except those which assure to the other members of the society the enjoyment of the same rights**.

The triple cry of the frog spirits is immediately evident, especially in the words in italics. The words 'liberty' and 'free[dom]' recur, as does the word 'equal', along with the statement that all members of society have the 'same' rights. The concept of 'fraternity' is embodied in the linking of 'political association' with the preservation of rights. This defines the notion of 'fraternity' in a very specific way that we might not have readily thought of, and which is, of course, in conflict with our own way of life in Christ.

But in addition to this there are here a series of sentiments which link in very closely with the modern spirit of humanism. Firstly, there is the emphasis on 'man', the focus of *humanism*. Secondly, there is the repeated use of the phrase 'rights of man'. This is very much the spirit of

our age, when people are all too eager to go to law to assert their rights and claim compensation for alleged wrongdoing. Thirdly, notice that this concept of human rights is elevated to a religious plane; the ‘sacred rights of man’. This surely anticipates the currently prevailing philosophy of the Western world, which puts human rights above all else. It is not ‘politically correct’ to challenge the beliefs or behaviour of others, even if it is, according to Scripture, contrary to God’s law and teaching. Some adherents of the French Revolution cast doubt on the existence and supremacy of the God of the church and the Bible, though they could not in their day quite abandon the notion of “the Supreme Being”. Nonetheless this statement anticipates the sacred status that human rights now have, often in complete disregard of and in opposition to the Word of God.

Documentary History—The United Nations

These exact sentiments are carried forward with remarkable precision to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights “adopted and proclaimed” by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1948. What follows are extracts from the Introduction, Preamble and first four articles:

Following this historic act the Assembly called upon all Member countries to publicise the text of the Declaration and to cause it to be disseminated, displayed, read and expounded principally in schools and other educational institutions, without distinction based on the political status of countries or territories.

PREAMBLE: Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the *equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family* is the foundation of *freedom*, justice and peace in the world . . .

Article 1: All human beings are *born free and equal in dignity and rights*. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of *brotherhood*.

Article 2: Everyone is entitled to all the *rights and freedoms* set forth in this Declaration, *without distinction* of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on

the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3: *Everyone* has the right to life, *liberty* and security of person.

Article 4: *No one shall be held in slavery or servitude*; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.¹

Once again, the words in italics show that the triple cry of the froglike spirits has been carried through with precision. Now there is not even any lip service paid to the Creator. Human rights come by human birth. Freedom is a human right for all regardless of creed; it does not depend on faith, or redemption in Christ.

Of course, as brethren in Christ we do not object to some of the sentiments expressed here. We would never approve of slavery or the exploitation of our fellows, or seek to deny anyone the right to life, during which they have an opportunity to “Seek . . . the LORD while He may be found” (Isa. 55:6). But we should not be deceived by the underpinning principles, which are ungodly. They effectively deny the right of the Creator to determine who is worthy to live and on what basis. Implicitly this denies the existence of God, and places man as supreme on earth. These points are significant when we realise how important the UN is seen to be by many in determining the rights of nations to act in relationship to each other. This point has been highlighted recently in the debates over UN resolutions in relation to Iraq.

Notice two further points. Firstly, the principles set out here are to be “publicise[d] . . . disseminated, displayed, read and expounded”. This is consistent with the unclean spirits or breaths, which, as noted above, have to do with unclean teachings that would corrupt the nations. Secondly, they are to be propounded especially in schools and the education system. Indeed, these principles now pervade every part of the education system of the Western world, so that our own children are in danger of being indoctrinated unless we counter them with the wholesome and health-giving teaching of the Word of God.

1. <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>

Documentary History—The EU Charter of Fundamental Rights

We can trace the acceptance of the above principles very close to our own time in their acceptance in high places as the underpinning philosophies of our times. In 2000 the European Union (EU) adopted the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. Once again, this, as shown by the extracts quoted below, especially the words in italics, shows a common ancestry with the UN Declaration of Human Rights and the French Revolution. Indeed, the link back to the UN Declaration of 1948 is explicit.

PREAMBLE: *The peoples of Europe, in creating an ever closer union among them,* are resolved to share a peaceful future based on **common values**.

Conscious of its *spiritual* and moral heritage, the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of **human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity**; it is based on the principles of **democracy** and the rule of law. It places the **individual at the heart of its activities**, by establishing the **citizenship of the Union** and by creating an area of **freedom, security and justice** . . .

Article 1—Human Dignity: Human dignity is inviolable. It must be respected and protected.

In commenting upon Article 1 the EU stated:

The dignity of the human person is not only a fundamental right in itself, but constitutes the real basis of fundamental rights. The **1948 Declaration of Human Rights** enshrined this principle in its preamble: "Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the **equal and inalienable rights of all** members of the human family is the foundation of **freedom, justice and peace in the world**".

It resolves that none of the rights laid down in this Charter may be used to harm the dignity of another person, and that the **dignity of the human person** is part of the substance of the rights laid down in this Charter. It must therefore be respected even where a right is restricted.

Article 10—Freedom of thought, conscience and religion:

1) Everyone has the **right to freedom** of thought, conscience and religion. This right includes **freedom to change religion** or

belief and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or in private, to manifest religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance.

2) The right to conscientious objection is recognised, in accordance with the exercise of national laws governing this right.²

*In addition it is helpful to note some of the chapter headings of this document: **Freedom** (Chapter II), **Equality** (Chapter III), **Solidarity** (Chapter IV), **Citizen's rights** (Chapter V).*

The triple cry of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity is there once again. The selected chapter headings shown are exact reflections of that cry. The emphasis on man and his rights is also there. Indeed, the 'individual', not God, is at the heart of things. But there are now some additional features that are worthy of note, and Scripturally highly significant. The peoples of Europe are creating an ever closer union, and share common values, it is asserted. Is not this an echo of the cry of Babel, sounding forth from a modern-day Babylon? This is linked with the "spiritual . . . heritage" of Europe. This refers, of course, to Europe's Roman Catholic spiritual history, the very epitome of unclean spiritual teaching.

But this seems to indicate that one of the main driving forces behind the adoption of this philosophy is the Roman Church. It has always been able to adapt to, as well as able to manipulate, the spirit of the times. It pays only lip service to the God of the Bible. It has adopted humanism, but not in a genuinely humanitarian sense. The freedom it offers is illusory; thus the spirit is froglike (see above). Whenever the Catholic Church has gained dominating power it has turned into a cruel dictatorship. Medieval history testifies to that. So also does modern history; for example, the Nazi-Catholic régime in Croatia in the Second World War, and the papacy's tacit support for, and deafening silence when invited to condemn, Hitler.

So, whilst as Christadelphians we appreciate the freedom of conscience we have enjoyed in the Western world for several generations, often based on such documents as those quoted, we should not be deceived. Those freedoms have in

2. http://europa.eu.int/comm/justice_home/unit/charte/en/about.html

general turned men away from God. Furthermore, the freedom they offer us could turn out to be illusory, even in this life. There is an interesting caveat (in effect, a reservation) on the Charter, expressed as below in a related document:

Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of public safety, for the protection of public order, health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. (*Caveat from European Convention on Human Rights, Article 9(2) added.*)

Such a clause could easily be used against a body such as the Christadelphians if the authorities decided that our preaching and principles threatened public order or challenged the rights and freedoms of others. Would we continue to testify against the papacy as the harlot woman of the Apocalypse if European (including British) society and government were dominated and influenced by the Catholic Church? Would we continue to testify that homosexuality was an abomination if forbidden to do so by the authorities of our day? Whether we shall ever be tested in this way we do not know, but it is wise to give thought to these matters, and to prepare ourselves now.

Documentary history—the Draft European Constitution

On 6 February 2003 the Praesidium of the European Union published the *Draft Text of the Articles of the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe*. Article 2 follows in exactly the same tradition as the documents quoted above:

[\(To be continued\)](#)

Not only do these sentiments chime in exactly with the cries of the French Revolution and the way in which those froglike spirits have pervaded society ever since, they also match exactly the godless and humanist focus of the age. Interestingly, the papacy is now recorded as objecting to the absence of God from this draft Constitution. *The Electronic Telegraph* reported on 19 February 2003 in its Eurofile section that the "Vatican [is] outraged as God is banished from Europe's rights of man". The piece records that the pope personally interceded with the President of the Convention to remind them not to forget the "cement of that extraordinary religious, cultural and civic heritage that has made Europe great down the centuries". It goes on to say that "Yesterday [that is, 18 February 2003] the Vatican said it was appalled by *the humanist text* [my emphasis] . . . deeming it completely unsatisfactory".

Whether the draft Constitution will be changed by this intervention remains to be seen. What is remarkable is, firstly, that this document (and by implication its antecedents dealt with above) is regarded as "humanist". Secondly, it is remarkable that the papacy has intervened publicly on this issue. Is not this the harlot woman riding and controlling the actions of the beast? It is highly likely that the humanist values of the froglike spirits will continue to pervade this document, but that they will be overlaid by religious sentiments to the satisfaction of the papacy. Probably a humanitarian veneer will be added, thus retaining the essentially humanist character of the document' but satisfying the religious authorities. In this way Revelation 16 and 17 will continue to be fulfilled; the froglike spirits will continue to lead the nations to Armageddon, and the papacy will continue to manipulate the EU, until they all go into perdition.

A Christadelphian funeral service

Brother Leroy and Sister Marian Canoles have produced a guide for conducting a Christadelphian funeral service as an aid to those who are faced with this difficult task and have little experience of doing so. The guide consists of three parts: **A president's guide**. This contains an outline funeral service and an outline graveside service. Suitable hymns, readings and prayers are included. **An organist's guide**. This reproduces the hymns used in the president's guide, including suggestions for ones to be played before and after the service. **A programme for the congregation**. This provides an outline of the service, and the words and music of the hymns. Hymns are taken from the 1964 Christadelphian Hymn Book with permission.

Available from Sister Marian Canoles, 2031 Hunters Trail, Norfolk, VA 23518, USA; m.canoles@worldnet.att.net. Price \$10 inclusive of postage.