

A Critique by Frits Albers, Ph.B. of Damien Mackey's Paper on  
St. John's Book of Revelation:  
"The Bride and the Reject".

It is a great pity that this article was ever written, but even worse is that it ever took root in a Catholic mind. The views expressed in the brainchild of this mind are unrelated to each other. The whole purpose of Damien Mackey's paper is to make St. John an eyewitness to the contents of his 'Book of Revelation', because, according to the author of this paper, the Apocalypse was written before 70 AD, the year of the destruction of Jerusalem, and describes in detail what preceded that destruction. That way more than three-quarter of the *prophetic* value of St. John's Apocalypse has been destroyed, as Mackey makes St. John an *eye-witness* of the events. And the little bit of prophetic value left after the lead-up to Jerusalem's destruction but before its final fulfilment is exclusively concentrated on that destruction. So the Apocalypse has no value for any period after AD70. That Mackey had to resort to sheer nonsense in support of his untenable position is plain to anyone who takes time off to read this spurious manuscript. Never in the history of Catholic Tradition have the contents of a biblical book been crammed exclusively into a 35-year period to such an extent that its God-inspired value is declared useless and exhausted for the rest of mankind. For that very reason the assertions made in Mackey's paper are not supported by Catholic Tradition. That Our Lord made the destruction of Jerusalem a sign of the End of Times and of His Second Coming is totally neglected in the fraudulent exegesis of this paper. The graphic description of the destruction of the *sign* in contemporary Jewish history is useful for the lead-up to the Second Coming, and may have been used by St. John in his 'Book of Revelation' for the preparation of that Coming. But that gives *no one* the right, Catholic or non-Catholic, to destroy the whole of a biblical book, the Apocalypse, and much of the prophecies of the Old Testament to make them fit into a tunnel vision.

**Mackey's 'Introduction'.**

1. I take great exception to the fact that in the Introduction genuine papal and Catholic concern for the appearance of Antichrist are lumped together with the "loonies" who want to make the year 2000 the reason for mass destruction, simply because the author has an intense dislike for a late appearance of Antichrist. But nowhere does this document show by one single quote taken from the authority of the Magisterium or from Tradition, from the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, that "*the son of perdition*", as St. Paul calls Antichrist in 2 Thess. 2:3, *has already appeared*,

because the author is incapable of quoting a single one of those sources. Thus in this paper genuine concern is held up for ridicule and for rejection by association with lunatics.

Very cheap, and very, very offensive.

2. I am horrified to read that, on p. 2, the Book of Revelation has to be emptied out of all literal meaning and fulfilment simply “*to provide Catholics with a defence against unwarranted accusations*”. Over the last 2000 years no Catholic mind was in any need of this amputation. Modernism is *not* a “system of thought”! The object of any mind – Divine as well as created, human as well as angelic – is Truth. Modernists are the last to be concerned with the Truth, having rejected it. So their attack is *not* a ‘system of thought’ but is the clearest example of a systematic attempt at enforcing will over mind, and the author is laying himself wide open to the same accusation in this document. In the preparation of this scurrilous paper the author has been warned time and again not to tamper with the time-frame of Divine Revelation.

### **Mackey’s own time-frame.**

3. Never in the 2000-year history of the Catholic Church has any Pope or any Father or Doctor of the Church, or, for that matter, any Catholic dared to say in the Supernatural Light of his or her Catholic Faith, of a whole Book of the Bible that its prophecy ended on such and such a date as is done in this document. With the clear and express implication that from that date on the meaning of the book is to be taken as only allegorical or symbolic, but no longer as real. So it is fraudulent to quote Pope John Paul II as being in cahoots with this error because he once said what everybody knows: that St. John uses allegorical and symbolic language. But he never said what this paper says: that after a certain date the Apocalypse of St. John loses all its prophetic power. That would have flown right in the face of Christ’s warning to His whole Church:

**“Do not imagine that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets. I have come not to abolish but to complete them. I tell you solemnly, till heaven and earth disappear, not one dot, not one little stroke shall disappear from the Law until its purpose is achieved. Therefore the man who infringes even one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be considered the least in the Kingdom of Heaven; but the man who keeps them and teaches them will be considered great in the Kingdom of Heaven”. [Mk. 5:17-19].**

And who is there who can say with authority, as is being attempted here, that a particular purpose *has been achieved* for any of the thousands of images St. John uses so skilfully in his ‘Book of Revelation’, and that from then on the Apocalypse must be declared useless? Cannot Christ say with the same authority about the Book He Himself ordered to be written,: “*Not one little image, not one allegorical reference will disappear from the Book of Revelation until its purpose has been achieved?*”. Yet, the *literal* meaning of all those thousands of images in the Apocalypse have been terminated by Mackey at the year AD70. According to the above-quoted words from St. Mark’s Gospel, the writing by the Holy Spirit of any and every Book of the Holy Bible is for all times, and its full meaning is to be preserved for each and every person who ever lived. Yet single-handedly the *literal* meaning of the Apocalypse has been terminated here for all the generations after AD70 even – as everyone knows – this meaning is couched in *symbols*. This very point is so important that I will elaborate on it.

#### **Mackey’s contrived ‘division’.**

4. Central to the author’s ‘thoughts’ on the Book of Revelation lies the totally artificial and contrived split of dividing not only the period after Our Lord’s Ascension, but also the Apocalypse itself into two parts:

- (i) a narrow strip of roughly 35 years from AD35 to AD70, the year of the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, and
- (ii) the rest of time from AD70 to the end of the world.

Since the author cannot find a trace of this subdivision in the ‘Book of Revelation’ itself, as the destruction of the temple does not rate a mention in the Apocalypse, he is now forced to cram the *whole* of the Apocalypse in the narrow strip of AD35 to AD70 as the *literal* fulfilment of *all* the book’s prophecies, so that there is no more prophecy left for the long time span from AD70 to the end of the world. I find this tying of Almighty God to prophesy only for a certain period of time and not thereafter as something totally abhorrent and so to be totally rejected. Fancy telling God what He can and what He cannot do; where and in what time slot He can prophesy and where He cannot.....

This smacks of teilhardism. Teilhard de Chardin placed himself above God by allocating to God His place in his evolutionary ‘system’ as *the ‘soul’ of the world*. What is being done here is no different!

From here onwards the author no longer searches for the Truth. He allowed a non-Catholic who had forced his will over his own mind without letting his poor mind ask if all this was true, to force his will over Damien Mackey's mind without allowing his mind to search out if all what is now being advanced is true. And from here on the author wants to force his will over *our* minds without giving our minds time to ask if any of these assertions are true....

Mackey wrote:-

Essentially Revelation is about the divorce of one formerly just woman who had gone bad, and the marrying of a new, faithful one. The scroll of Revelation 5:1 is actually a bill of divorce; the divorce being completed in the most emphatic manner with the annihilation of the harlot city, "*Babylon*". I am indebted to Kenneth Gentry Jr. in "*A Preterist View of Revelation*" for spelling this out. E.g. [51-2]:

5. I categorically deny that the destruction of Jerusalem was so *essential* i.e. so rivetted in the minds of the Apostles and in the expectations of the whole Early Church, that it needed the destruction of a whole book of Sacred Scripture, the Book of Revelation, as well as the obliteration of the whole of its purpose.

### **The True Centre of St. John's Apocalypse.**

The centre of the Apocalypse around which all the prophecies of the Book revolve is *not* the destruction of Jerusalem, but *Someone*. Someone infinitely more important than an event declared by Christ to be *a mere symbol and prefiguration* of something still in the future. The centre of the Book of Revelation is the same as the centre of the Universe. it is the little Eucharistic Lamb in the tabernacles of the world. showing in the Book of Revelation He Himself ordered St. John to write, how He uses His Church in time and during the ages to expand His Father's Kingdom against all odds and how in the process He overcomes any and all of His enemies. And He has had some formidable ones from AD70 right up till now, and will continue to have in the future. That is a *purpose* with which every Catholic feels at home.

6. Christ irrevocably rivetted the destruction of Jerusalem to His *second* coming at the end of time. That immediately reduced that earlier destruction, the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, to the *subservient status* of being *merely a symbol and prefiguration* of something infinitely more important still to come. It is inconceivable that the whole prophetic content of the Apocalypse would be wasted on the *shadow*

of an ultimate event to which all the ages flow and for which He had commissioned St. John to flesh out that period in language and style that is accessible to the pure of heart who “*see God*”, but inaccessible to the frivolous, the fornicators, adulterers murderers, thieves, or anyone who, like all the Modernists and all their bullies take unauthorised charge of His Church and Her prophetic mission. It is the destruction at the *end* of time and *not* its prefiguration at the beginning which is of paramount importance to the Church, was of paramount importance to the Apostles and the Early Church, and to each and every individual on earth to whom the Deposit of Faith has been handed over by Catholic Tradition. That St. John, as an accomplished teacher, uses the *shadow*, the *prefiguration*, i.e. the destruction of Jerusalem, to prepare his readers for the *real* thing to come at the end of time, does not allow anyone to make the *shadow* the real and central thing of the Book of Revelation so that there is nothing more left of its prophecy after AD70 to prepare us all for the End.

#### **Another quote.**

“Also I want to clear up the serious problem - *of commentators own making* (Mackey’s stress!) - whereby the Apostles, supposedly expecting Christ’s final coming or *Parousia* in their own day, were mistaken because this has not yet come about. Such an interpretation would suggest that Our Lord had passed on to His intimate friends the wrong time-table, and I find that quite unacceptable. My argument here will be that the Apostles were referring to Christ’s coming in victory in 70 AD, thus freeing the early Christian Church once and for all from its Judaic connections”.

#### **7. “...of commentators own making...”**

If Mackey had been serious about that, he would never have written this paper, being a commentary of his own fancy and so stands condemned by his very own words. It is him who places such importance on the destruction of the mere shadow that *no one*, be they 1<sup>st</sup> century Apostles or 21<sup>st</sup> century Catholics, can use the Apocalypse and its prophetic thrust in preparation for its *real* purpose: Our Lord’s second coming, so as not to be enticed away to unfaithfulness by any *harlot* that will be lying in wait along the way.

**8.** Finally, it must be emphatically denied at this part of the paper, that the Holy Church would *ever* “once and for all be set free from its Judaic connections”. This whole idea is simply absurd. Our Lord was a Jew, Our Lady was a Jewess, and all the Apostles were Jews, even the great St. Paul. According to Our Lord and the Faith of the Church, all believers must still be ranked as “Abraham’s children”. The law and the Prophets would *never* be abolished....

## The ‘driftsand’ of Mackey’s ‘foundation’.

9. We have now arrived at maybe the worst example of twisting, refashioning, reshaping and reformulation of Catholic Truth (Teilhard’s demand) in this document: the treatment handed out to Isaiah’s prophecy of Immanuel.

I quote:-

When we read Isaiah’s prediction that the “*virgin*” will give birth to a child, “*Immanuel*”, we immediately think of Mary and Jesus. And this is as it should be.

But there is more to it than that.

What is not so well known is that this Isaian prophecy was actually fulfilled *literally* at the time of Isaiah. Then, 700 years later at the time of Christ, it was fulfilled *symbolically* - but perfectly. (Damien’s own stress).

What utter rot! Here we truly have sunk to the lowest point of all the twisting and reshaping of biblical prophecy carried out in this paper in an attempt to make it ‘fit’ a totally erroneous preconceived tunnel-vision. For here we are made to believe that a sinful woman born in Original Sin conceived a child *while still being a virgin*, and then gave birth to this child *while still being a virgin*, and that this impossibility must be accepted as the *literal* fulfilment of Isaiah’s prophecy. And then to make matters infinitely worse, Our Lord and Our Lady, the poor ‘also rans’, are again, in true teilhardian fashion, *relegated* to a consolation prize, a mere *symbolic* fulfilment.... Once again God is being allocated His subordinate place in His own prophecy by Damien Mackey! Fancy putting such a corruption in Catholic minds! How is it possible that any of this can come up in a mind professed to be Marian? Here we have the clearest example of an evil will forcing itself over a Catholic mind and over the Catholic minds of his readers so as to make these minds accept the necessity of the complete emptying out of the Apocalypse of all its prophecy after AD70 in order that the *shadow* can dominate that which it is supposed to point to. The proper object of any mind, be it Divine, angelic or human, according to St. Thomas Aquinas is Truth, and the Truth is this:

“‘Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary home as your wife, because She has conceived what is in Her by the Holy Spirit. She will give birth to a Son and you must name Him Jesus, because He is the one who is to save His people from their sins’.

Now *all* this took place to *fulfil* the words spoken *by the Lord* through the prophet:-

***‘The Virgin will conceive and give birth to a Son, and they will call Him Immanuel’.*** (Mt. 1:20-23).

There is only ***one*** Woman who conceived and gave birth to a Child while still being a Virgin, and according to the Holy Spirit expressed in this text inspired by Him, She alone is the ***literal*** fulfilment of Isaiah’s prophecy! There is no room left for any other woman....And so there is no room left for any credibility of any further ‘building up’ on the driftsand of a totally erroneous link with the great prophet Isaiah. The line is dead, Damien Mackey! There is no one at the other end....

+ + +

**10.** Now that we have become convinced on this great feastday of the redoubtable St. Thomas Aquinas that there is ***no Wisdom*** to be discovered so far in this paper, there is no need to go any further after we have reached its lowest point. Built on that most unreliable ‘foundation’, the document never rises above it. The only thing left to be done is to collect its contradictions and replace them with Catholic Truth.

From the foregoing the following has been made clear.

- The destruction of Jerusalem and its temple was meant by Our Lord to be nothing more than a mere shadow, a symbol and a prefiguration of what is going to happen at the end of time.
- The deeper the shadow, the more powerful the Light at the other end. The most we can say is, that Christ used this prefiguration (of Jerusalem’s destruction) to *literally* prepare the Holy Church for its ascent to this Light.
- The Apocalypse of St. John neither *was* nor could have been fitted in the 35-year time span to accommodate the shadow at the expense of the *Light* at the end of time to which the shadow is pointing.
- God has resisted any attempt at curtailing His omnipotent power to prophesy where He wants and when He wants.
- It proved impossible to reduce the Apocalypse to a meaningless jumble of allegorical images after AD70 because of the extension in time of the Marian Church and the chiasmic structure of *all* of St. John’s writings until the end of time.

- The Centre of the Apocalypse is **not** the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, but Our Blessed Lord Himself as the Little Eucharistic Lamb in the tabernacle, the true centre of the Universe, using His Church to guide nations and ages towards His second coming.
- Christ has forbidden any attempts at reducing the *purpose* of any books of the bible. “Not one dot, not one little stroke will disappear....”
- Since Our Lord made the destruction of Jerusalem a mere symbol and prefiguration of His future coming at the end of time, the Young Church took its cue from Him and refused to concentrate on the shadow *having no meaning on its own*. Thus an Apocalypse which would be forced to centre on this destruction **as on its ultimate fulfilment** would **not** be a meaningful Apocalypse, as it would be forced to concentrate on something that has no meaning on its own. We will only have a meaningful Apocalypse if its whole prophetic plenitude concentrates not on the shadow but on that to which this prefiguration is pointing beyond itself by the Will of Christ: the end of time and His second coming.

To elaborate on this, the following must be pointed out:-

As is not hard to show, “*The Marian Dimension in the Apocalypse of St. John*”, i.e. the Marian presence in history, spans the ages through which the Marian Church, the Holy Catholic Church, must go “*to be all for all*”. St. John discovered this Marian Dimension to exist in history when he was allowed to view the future through the fathomless eyes of the Immaculate Conception while he was privileged to look after Her. This Marian Dimension, being part and parcel of the prophetic mission of the Book of Revelation, of necessity did not come to an end at the destruction of Jerusalem, just as it survived after the great Apostle’s death.

It would be inconceivable that Pope John Paul II who taught us with authority that the Holy Catholic Church was *Marian* before She was *Petrine*, would know more about the Marian aspect of this Church than St. John who skilfully wove the Marian Dimension into his Apocalypse for us to discover it there. It must be obvious to any serious student of Scripture that this Marian Church must be part of a *meaningful* Apocalypse, and not of a Book that has been pre-empted of all its meaning at AD70. This Marian aspect of the Catholic Church was finally brought to its conclusion by Pope John Paul II in his Marian encyclical “*Redemptoris Mater*” in which this great Pope taught that Mary is “the *beginning* of the Church”. This begin-ning can never be divorced from this Church and will lead to Her Marian ending.

Also, the Second Vatican Council, in refusing to use a separate schema on the Mother of God divorced from the one 'On the Church', taught us with the same authority to see Mary *in* the Church and the Church *in* Mary. Here again, this can only be done if at the time of the Apostolic College this truth was woven into the fabric of Catholic Tradition, and from the above we can see at least one book in which this was done. And the same remark as the one expressed above applies here: this interplay between the Mother of God and the Church created in Her image and likeness must play itself out in history from the pages of a *meaningful* Book in which this interplay is alive.

And what is required for the Apocalypse to be *meaningful*?

Required for a *meaningful* Apocalypse is that, instead of wasting the prophetic impact of the whole work on a mere shadow *before* AD70, the Book be allowed to prepare the whole Church for that Final Reality: the Last Day of Judgement and the real Parousia, to which the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem can only point by way of a symbolic prefiguration by the irrevocable Will of the Son of God.

Contrary to the opinion expressed in Mackey's document: that the young Church was alive with expectations of an imminent *parousia* of the Son of God, we know from the writings of at least two of the Apostles, *St. Paul* and *St. Peter*, that they warned the early Christians not to be misled by any foolish talk about an impending parousia, or appearance of Our Lord.

St Paul:

**"To turn now, brothers, to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and how we shall all be gathered round Him: please do not get excited too soon or alarmed by any prediction or rumour, or any letter claiming to come from us, implying that the Day of the Lord has already arrived. Never let anyone deceive you in this way. It cannot happen until the Great Revolt has taken place and the Rebel, the son of perdition has made his appearance. This is the Enemy, the one who claims to be so much greater than all that men call 'god', so much greater than anything that is worshipped, that he enthrones himself in God's sanctuary and claims that he is God. Surely you remember me telling you about this when I was with you? And you know too what is holding him back from appearing before his appointed time. Rebellion is at work already, but in secret, and the one who is holding it back has first to be removed before the Rebel appears openly. The**

**Lord will kill him with the breath of His mouth and will annihilate him with His glorious appearance at His coming.**

**But when the Rebel comes, Satan will set to work. There will be all kinds of miracles and a deceptive show of signs and portents, and everything evil that can deceive those who are bound for destruction because they would not grasp the Love of Truth that could have saved them. The reason why God is sending a power to delude them and make them believe what is untrue is to condemn all who refused to believe in the Truth and chose wickedness instead" [2 Thess. 2:1-12].**

Clear and unambiguous language even for modern ears.

St. Peter:

**"We must carefully remember that during the last days there are bound to be people who will be scornful, the kind who always please themselves what they do, and they will make fun of the promise and ask: 'Well, where is this coming? Everything goes on as it has since the Fathers died, as it has since it began at Creation'. They are choosing to forget that there were heavens at the beginning, and that earth was formed by the Word of God out of water and between the waters, so that the world of that time was destroyed by being flooded by water. But by the same Word the present sky and earth are destined for fire, and are only being reserved until Judgement Day so that all sinners may be destroyed .....The Day of the Lord will come like a thief, and then with a roar the sky will vanish, the elements will catch fire and fall apart, the earth and all that it contains will be burnt up"**

[2 Peter 3:3-7,10].

What these two letters describe did *not* take place at the destruction of Jerusalem, which goes to show that a mere shadow of these momentous happenings is not a worthy terminal to waste a whole book of the New Testament on. So what the Apocalypse is referring to is still in the future. And if after these two authoritative warnings *not to* expect an early parousia some individual disciples may still have kept their private hopes, the Church itself had never encouraged it.

Finally, God Himself has reduced to zero any attempts at restricting His omnipotent power to use the prophetic plenitude of the Book of Revelation for a mere 35

year time span, by allowing two of His creatures the full use of that plenitude hundreds of years after AD70.

The first of these is *St. Vincent Ferrer* who declared during his extensive travels to exhort the French people to return to the practice of their God-given Faith, that he was the Great Eagle of the Apocalypse, flying high overhead announcing the triple “Woe”. For confirmation of this claim he raised a dead woman to life.

The other Saint is *St. Louis Grignion de Montfort* who made two prophecies in relation to Antichrist in his book “True Devotion to Mary”:-

In one of these he declared that the evils of his own days would not come to an end but would increase in intensity until they culminated in Antichrist.

And in the second one he prophesied that in the defeat of Antichrist the ancient promise of the crushing of the head of the serpent would be fulfilled.

It is inconceivable that mere creatures are allowed by God to use the Apocalypse for prophecy on what will happen in the future, when according to Damien Mackey God cannot use the Apocalypse for genuine, real prophecy after AD70.

*And just to get a taste of how far Mackey is prepared to twist facts in order to make them suit his own fiction, he tells us at the top of p. 17 that we do not have to go to Rome for the martyrdom of Sts. Peter and Paul. According to his ‘research’, they were murdered in Jerusalem. (And their bodies flown to Rome?).*