After decades in the shadows, Germany’s military is taking on an aggressive global role.
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As other nations refuse to give the U.S. any more military support in Afghanistan, Germany steps up.
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Israel is facing its greatest crisis since being founded in 1948. Its survival as a nation is at stake. It can survive only if Israelis return to their roots.

From the beginning, the Oslo Accord has had a catastrophic pattern of failures. Still, several of Israel’s leaders have refused to learn the obvious lessons.

The Oslo Accord: Israel’s Death Knell

Israelis were inflicted with a terminal wound in 1977, when Israel hosted Egyptian President Anwar Sadat in Jerusalem to begin discussing the possibility of a land-for-peace deal between their two states. These talks led to the formal treaty of 1979 in which Israel handed Egypt a lovely little gift called the Sinai Peninsula in exchange for a promise of peace. This deal set the stage for concessions to the Palestinian Liberation Organization that began in Oslo in 1993.

“Ever since, Arafat has sought his pound of flesh in terms of the fulfillment of the promises which Peres made to him,” we wrote in our March/April 2001 issue. “It is no secret that Shimon Peres … pulled the strings of the assassinated Rabin’s government’s negotiations with the Palestinians. His initiatives led to the exchange of letters between Rabin and Arafat in September 1993, which in turn led to the signing of the ‘Declaration of Principles of Interim Self-Government Arrangements’—termed the Oslo Accord—signed by Rabin and Arafat in Washington that same year. The Oslo Accord became the foundation upon which

the past seven years’ efforts to find a peaceful settlement in Palestine have been built.”

The Oslo Accord specified that the Israeli military withdraw from most of the Gaza Strip and from the town of Jericho in the West Bank.

On Sept. 24, 1995, Yitzhak Rabin signed Oslo ii, agreeing to divide the West Bank into three zones, an act that ended up costing him his life. He was assassinated shortly thereafter, and replaced by Shimon Peres, one of the architects of the failing peace process.

Today, Shimon Peres is the president of Israel, serving under Prime Minister Ehud Olmert. Mr. Peres is once again a key player in the “peace” negotiations. He was there at the beginning of the Oslo Accord, and it appears he will be there at the disastrous end.

From the beginning, the Oslo Accord has had a catastrophic pattern of failures. Still, several of Israel’s leaders have refused to learn the obvious lessons.

One of the cities that Israel surrendered was Jericho. The great Joshua of the Jews’ Bible had no problem conquering Jericho ancienly and ruling over that city. Are there lessons in that example that the Jews must learn?

Most Jews today would find that subject too embarrassing to even discuss. In this modern time, they are deeply involved in the Oslo Accord and in losing battles.

The Cause of Our War Against Terrorism

Now let’s highlight the pinpoint accuracy of a Trumpet forecast from 1993. A few weeks after the Oslo Accords were agreed upon at the White House, I wrote this: “Yitzhak Rabin has stated publicly that Israel must come to terms with the Palestinians sooner rather than later. Why? Because Islamic fundamentalism is on the rise! Surely we must see a certain desperation in this treaty” (November 1993). Rabin and Arafat came together, I went on to write, “because of the same radical Islamic movement.”

Commenting further on the impact this radicalization was having in the Middle East, I wrote, “Today the radical Islamic movement is causing other nations to fear—even motivating peace treaties. But these treaties are destined to fail.”

Why must these peace treaties fail? Because they are dealing with the effect rather than the cause of the terrorist problem. You can’t remove the problem if you don’t remove the cause.

The Jews entered into the Oslo Accord because of a broken will, which is what causes their shameful fear. Who is behind the radical Islamic movement? Iran. We have been saying so for 14 years. The Iranians began state-sponsored terrorism. They continue to fuel the terrorist war in the Middle East. Iran is the head of the terrorist snake!

The only way to win the war on terror is to either subdue or conquer Iran. America and Israel have ample power to do so, but they cower in fear because they lack the will to strike the head of the snake.

Wouldn’t it be far better to act now, before Iran gets nuclear weapons? You can be sure Iran will cause a much more dangerous war in the Middle East when that happens. (Our free booklet The King of the South describes Iran’s dangerous role in the Middle East’s future.)

According to Yehuda Avner, who served on the staffs of five Israeli prime ministers during his political career, the secret negotiations in Oslo in the months leading up to the White House
You’ve come a long way, baby.” So goes the 1989 Virginia Slims jingle for the “women’s own” cigarette. The advertisement contained the usual warning about the contents of the cigarette package having the potential to cause death to the consumer. The same phrase could apply to the rapid rise of the military power of the nation that instigated the most recent world war. But this package does not carry with it an explicit warning that its contents have the potential and proven history to pose death to countless millions. In fact, the world has been sold the message that its death-dealing potential is a thing of the past. This makes its return to favor ever so much more dangerous.

On January 16, Germany’s military force, the Bundeswehr, issued a statement indicating that 250 German troops will be deployed to Afghanistan with a specific combat role. Social Democratic Party chief defense spokesman Rainer Arnold “announced that the German army had begun making preparations for the deployment … adding that the mission, slated to start in July, signaled a ‘new quality’ in the German engagement in Afghanistan. Part of the new mission could include pursuing terrorists ….”

The size of this combat force may seem small. Yet that has been the history of the German military’s return to power: softly, softly—little by little—lest we awaken old memories of darker days.

In fact, the German security and defense services have come a long way from their initial, tentative revival 50 years ago, with the aid of their benevolent English-speaking victors, to their new international peacekeeping role. Indeed, it appears from recent statements by certain German officials that, as other nations withdraw their troops from Afghanistan, Germany
is positioned to take on even greater responsibilities in that theater.

The Bundeswehr also reported, “With 350 Norwegian troops leaving Afghanistan by the middle of the year and Germany heading NATO’s International Security and Assistance Force (ISAF) in the country’s north, it is likely that the Bundeswehr will have to replace the Norwegians. ‘If other countries are no longer available to do this task after September, then we will do it ourselves,’ the head of the German Federal Armed Forces Association, Bernhard Gertz, told the Mitteldeutsche Zeitung. ‘It's in the interest of our own soldiers.’ In a separate interview with the daily Der Tagesspiegel, Gertz added: ‘It is clear that we will take over this task’” (ibid.).

**History of Revival**

Germany’s revived willingness to send troops into combat follows decades of treading lightly following Nazi atrocities. It is interesting to track the return of Germany, after it was vanquished in 1945, to its rearming by stealth with the support of the Western Allies beginning with the creation of the Bundeswehr in 1956. That was barely 10 years after the Allies had declared that never again would Germany be permitted to rearm and pose a threat to world peace.

During the ensuing decades, the Bundeswehr became one of the most efficient and best-supplied conventional armies on the Continent. (We say conventional because, despite several attempts to acquire atomic weaponry, these requests were denied.) However, German military forces were limited in scope by post-war constitutional restrictions and the constraints imposed on them via integration into the NATO alliance.

That all changed with German unification in 1990.

German-Foreign-Policy.com reports, “Upon the end of negotiations for a peace treaty (the ’2 + 4 treaty’) German troops moved forward to the western boundary of Poland (1990). The German military was still prohibited from the manufacture, possession or use of biological, chemical or atomic weapons, and the size of the Bundeswehr was limited (to a maximum of 345,000 persons). These restrictions did not, however, prevent military leaders from formulating far-reaching visions.

With the issue of the ‘political guidelines for defense’ in 1992, the Bundeswehr left its earlier role as a ‘defensive force’ and laid claim to the role of the worldwide representative of a reunified, economically expanding Germany. According to the ‘guidelines,’ military means are a necessity in order to expand the ‘room for political action and the vigor with which German interests can be brought to bear internationally’” (emphasis mine throughout).

Under the new guidelines for the enhanced, post-unification role of the Bundeswehr, the whole pace and extent of German military activity picked up. As Germany’s eastern neighbors were progressively swallowed up by the European Union, Germany took the initiative to start training officers from those candidate countries, taking care to ensure that they depended on German military technology.

In the meantime, on Dec. 23, 1991, Germany unilaterally announced its recognition of the separatist states of Slovenia and Croatia when they declared independence from the Republic of Yugoslavia. Shortly after, the Vatican also announced its official recognition of the breakaway states. The result was the start of the Balkan wars—horrible, bloody, dirty little wars that exploded across the entire Balkan Peninsula, deliberately provoked by Germany’s very first diplomatic initiative since the unification of East and West Germany only a year earlier.

The Balkan wars of the 1990s made fashionable the term “ethnic cleansing” as competing enclaves sought to eliminate each other in distinctive turf battles. It was all very predictable to anyone who knew Balkan history. The term “ethnic cleansing” is an English rendition of a term coined by Croats in their attempt to wipe out the Serbians and other minority groups within their nation.

**Repeating of History**

The movers and shakers in the German government knew their history and had read the outcome of their actions well. The prize would be the capture of the crossroads of Europe—the Balkans. This would allow the EU to move aggressively eastward, right up to Russia’s doorstep, with the NATO alliance not only fighting the wars that Germany had triggered, but even footing the bill and handing the spoils to the German-dominated European Union.

The entire German initiative in the Balkans episode was created to destabilize the region—and then to invite NATO forces to secure the peninsula—so the EU could then be handed the ongoing governance of the nation-states that once comprised Yugoslavia.

The plan worked—perfectly! Germany got what it wanted and more, as the Luftwaffe bombed military and civilian targets on the Balkan Peninsula under the NATO umbrella.

The newly united Germany was bloodied in battle.

Germany had broken the post-World War II spell that had prevented it from entering active combat since its defeat by the Allies in 1945.

For his efforts, Germany’s military commander, Gen. Klaus Naumann, was elected in 1994 by NATO’s chiefs of defense to the senior NATO post of chairman of the North Atlantic Military Committee. He assumed the appointment on Feb. 14, 1996—after the 1995 Dayton Accords that...
Exploiting NATO

THE reunification of Germany in 1990 opened the way for an aggressive expansion of the European Union. Since then the EU has effectively used NATO to further its own ends. The Balkan wars are a classic example. Afghanistan is shaping up to be another.

Though Germany declined involvement in the risky Iraq war, it has committed non-combat troops to Afghanistan. Recently the German government approved the deployment of a small additional force with a potential combat role in Afghanistan. True to past form, however, Germany is publicly resisting pressure from the United States to commit even more troops to that conflict. But this is just a ploy. Germany is playing for much higher stakes than Afghanistan.

German-Foreign-Policy.com observes, “As the German defense minister, Franz-Josef Jung, announced, the German ‘Quick Reaction Force,’ scheduled for deployment, could well take part in combat missions in the south of the country. But the condition is the explicit [approval] from Berlin [not NATO, nor the U.S., nor the EU]. This exposes the German/U.S.-American contention, concerning the deployment in the south, to be nothing more than a power struggle, in which Berlin seeks to strengthen her influence over the way the war is being waged. Up to now this has been decided principally by the U.S. military” (February 8, emphasis mine).

The NATO conference to be held in Bucharest, Romania, in early April may shape up to be one of the most crucial since the fall of the Berlin Wall. Germany, the most powerful nation in Europe, holds most of the aces regarding NATO’s future. It may choose one of two courses of action. It can threaten a rift in NATO between the EU and the U.S.—at a time when the West perceives security risks from both Islamic terror and a resurgent Russia. This ploy may persuade the U.S. to cave in and grant Berlin a greater say in strategy in Afghanistan in exchange for a stronger troop commitment from Germany and its fellow EU nations.

On the other hand, Germany has, by virtue of Berlin’s influence on Brussels, the power to really create an unendable rift in NATO between pro- and anti-U.S. European Union member nations. This rift could reach the point where NATO loses relevance in military affairs, opening the way for the rise of the much-anticipated combined EU military force to replace it, with Germany at the helm.

Ron Fraser

were to settle the wars instigated in the Balkans by German diplomatic action four years earlier. Through his military leadership and careful planning, Naumann had thrust the German military back to the forefront of combat—in the process of supporting an illegal war, a war having no UN mandate, prosecuted by Germany’s old enemies, the United States and Britain, at Germany’s behest, and at substantial cost to Deutschland’s old enemies.

Nuclear Capability?

A few years ago, Naumann sketched out his vision thus: “This huge long-term task of stabilizing the entire region from North Africa through the Levant, the Middle East, Central Asia and the Indian Ocean is tomorrow’s challenge for Europeans and North Americans alike. Both have no alternative but to take it on shoulder to shoulder. This task should mark both NATO’s new vision and NATO’s new frontier” (World Security Network, Aug. 13, 2003).

But the most startling public declaration to date to be made by any member, or retired member—as Naumann now is—of Germany’s modern armed forces was made by Klaus Naumann in the context of the latest NATO manifesto to which he was a prime contributor and signatory.

According to the Guardian newspaper, “Naumann delivered a blistering attack on his own country’s performance in Afghanistan. ‘The time has come for Germany to decide if it wants to be a reliable partner.’ By insisting on ‘special rules’ for its forces in Afghanistan, the Merkel government in Berlin was contributing to ‘the dissolution of NATO’ (January 22). Though these words would have been cold comfort for Germany’s Chancellor Merkel—who was already at odds with her vice chancellor and foreign minister, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, on numerous aspects of German foreign policy—surely they stirred the blood of the German High Command!

But that’s not all. The manifesto recommends that NATO initiate a nuclear first-strike policy—and, unsurprisingly, Naumann supports it. “Proliferation is spreading and we have not too many options to stop it,” he said, adding that NATO needed to show “there is a big stick that we might have to use if there is no other option” (ibid.).

“The nuclear first strike must be in the ‘quiver’ of every escalation strategy,” Naumann wrote in the study, titled “Toward a Grand Strategy for an Uncertain World,” which discusses NATO’s war preparedness. According to German Foreign Policy, the report “has been making the rounds in the EU since January” (February 25).

“The military study demands a total-
maintaining defense preparedness could become indispensable, threaten the authors, *implying media control*. The objective is to use a ‘first-strike media strategy’ to *take over the headlines* (ibid.).

Given the history of the last time such a recommendation was made by Germanic voices, the next statement is quite chilling. “The study proposes that a political directorate, comprised of the USA, NATO and the EU, should control the entire social system. Several European capitals are examining the concept of what amounts to a *military dictatorship* for its feasibility” (ibid.).

That statement should scare all sensible Anglo-Saxons out of their wits!

Herbert W. Armstrong, well over half a century ago, not only prophesied Germany’s return to military dominance in Europe, but also predicted that the Anglo-Saxons would encourage this to the point of handing over weapons of their own manufacture—including nuclear weapons—to Germany’s control, only to find them ultimately turned back on themselves!

**Beyond Europe**

As in the past, the new German general staff has lost no time in working to develop a highly efficient military machine that, in the words of German-Foreign-Policy.com, “now controls an intervention force with continually modernized high-tech weaponry and special units (ksk). It is subject to secrecy. The wars in Yugoslavia, Macedonia and Afghanistan (including the engagement of the German navy off the coast of Africa in 2002) were test runs for the inner state of the Bundeswehr under conditions of battle. The German forces have risen to the point of rivaling the leading armies of Europe.”

Outside of Europe, the German military hierarchy is concentrating on deployment in Eurasia (using Afghanistan as a stepping stone), the Mediterranean and, increasingly, the continent of Africa. Each of these regions is crucial to the continuing development of Germany’s imperialist goals under the umbrella of the European Union. Securing access to oil, natural gas and raw materials nearby the European continent is the prime motive.

Out of the Germano-Vatican-instigated Balkan wars, there has developed a whole new philosophy to justify aggression of one nation against another. One of the most insightful observers of the rise of Germany to dominance within the European Union, British author John Laughland, recognized that in May 1999, “NATO had attacked Yugoslavia on the basis that national sovereignty was no longer the basis of the international system, and that instead there existed a ‘right of humanitarian intervention’—a right for other states to bomb a country if they believe that human rights abuses are being committed there . . . National sovereignty is explicitly cast aside. Many people are tricked into believing that this is a good thing because they believe that states should be prevented from committing abuses. This is true, of course, but the problem is that international organizations can commit abuses too, as NATO unquestionably did in 1999. States are at least potentially subject to control by the populations over which they wield power; international organizations are never subject to any such control. Their power is therefore more, not less dangerous than that of nation states” (ibid., Feb. 18, 2007).

The European Union, courtesy of the Lisbon Treaty, is destined to have its own representative high commissioner, its own Ministry of Foreign Policy. It is destined to have its own diplomatic corps that will supersede the authority of the diplomats of its once-sovereign member nations. It is now slated to have its own security council, comprised of the seven member nations with the most powerful military forces, and ultimately to have its own EU combined military force, superseding, in authority of command, the individual general staff of each EU member nation’s previously sovereign military command.

And guess which nation is in the box seat to take on the leadership of the existing over 2-million-strong combined force that the EU potentially has at its disposal, under its High Command especially resurrected for that purpose.

Yes, the German military has come a long way since its crushing defeat in 1945 and the elimination of its High Command “forever.”

**Prophetic Vision**

But it was all so predictable. In 1945, even before the Allied victory over the Nazi regime, one lone voice was declaring that there were powers within Germany that had already planned for the resurgence of the German nation and military might in consequence of a defeat in World War II. In a letter to his co-workers, dated Jan. 23, 1945, Herbert W. Armstrong had this to say: “But even though the Germans surrender, and we gain another armistice, it will be only another recession! The Nazis will go immediately underground—plotting and preparing World War III. We shall fail to bring about world peace, because we do not know the way to world peace!”

“More and more people all over this nation are beginning to see the stark, solemn, awful fate that is prophesied for this nation! It is a fate we can avoid—if, and only if—we repent of our sins—of our Baby-lonish customs and our ways contrary to God’s revealed laws, and turn unitedly to Almighty God for mercy, for protection, for help, for victory, and for peace!”

Does that sound strange to you?

Well, that’s what they thought of the One through whom those prophecies were originally delivered, and all who have since followed on preaching that message over the past two millennia. Yet the words of those prophecies about our nations are as ringingly true today as they were when they were originally received and declared. The only difference is that today we have irrefutable proof through major world events and the increasingly deteriorating conditions of our society as to their present-day reality!

Write for our booklet titled *Nahum—An End-Time Prophecy for Germany*, and learn more about this powerful nation and the role it is destined to play with increasingly high profile in the current decade and just beyond.
A parent is given care of the greatest creation endowed upon this civilization by its Creator: the human mind.

Neurons have been firing since early in the womb. An amazing intellect has been under construction. Certain parts of the brain that control autonomic functions like heartbeat, reflexes and breathing have been hardwired. But after birth, a seemingly innumerable amount of neurons are awaiting to be wired and programmed.

What will your child’s mind be like?


What are your child’s talents? How can you find out, and what is the best way to develop them?

Turn On Your Talent Radar
Certainly heredity has a lot to do with where a child will naturally excel. But genes alone will not turn your child into a star quarterback or virtuoso violinist. How many potentially great writers, musicians or other creative geniuses never explored their talents because a parent didn’t recognize their aptitudes?

Every parent must invest the time and effort into getting to know his or her child.

Children are predisposed to have certain likes and dislikes, particular interests.
Studies have shown that the “[c]ircuits for math reside in the brain’s cortex, near those for music. Toddlers taught simple concepts, like one and many, do better in math” (Newsweek, Feb. 19, 1996). Experts also suggest that the musical brain has a learning window of ages 3 to 10—as far as learning an instrument and the fundamental concepts associated with music go. You can start before that, singing songs to your child in utero, and then singing with her and exposing her to a variety of music before elementary school. Studies also suggest more highly structured music for young minds aids neurological wiring.

If you think exposing your child to music is only important if he has musical talent, think again. Studies also show that ability to keep a steady beat (a waning ability in the Western world) is connected with fluency in reading. A study by Phyllis Weikert showed that being “able to keep a steady beat helps a person to feel the cadence [rhythm] of language” and can also affect their sense of equilibrium.

The point is, there is only so much time to expose your children to what their talents might be. So, again, get to know your children, encourage them in their interests, and do it early.

Develop Their Talents
So you’ve discovered their interests. Now what? Again, heredity or sheer desire to do something has little value of itself.

Heredity certainly plays a part in a person’s aptitudes. But, as educator Herbert W. Armstrong once wrote, “[T]he biggest factors in determining success or failure in life are motivation, determination, drive, perseverance” (Plain Truth, January 1982). It really comes down to what we do with the talent we’ve been given. We can’t sit back and admire the talent our children have as if it were magic. There is a marked distinction between talent and developed talent—the diligent effort and perspiration required to turn an aptitude into genuine ability and mastery.

Talking about the world’s great performing artists, Mr. Armstrong asked, “Were they specially talented above other people? Undoubtedly, yet everyone began while quite young—and stuck to it with determination day after day, year after year. They didn’t quit. They worked at it. They continued improving. They were not content with mediocrity. They became real ‘pros!’” (ibid.). They couldn’t have attained their level of excellence by just dabbling in their field and then moving on to something else.

The Bible advocates doing whatever your hand finds to do “with your might” (Ecclesiastes 9:10). Teaching our children how to develop their talents will most importantly teach them the lifelong lessons of discipline and hard work. Think of the motivation and restraint required: A young person developing skills must go to the practice room or gym and—no matter the temptation to go off and do what every other kid is doing—stay until achieving what he or she set out to do.

This is not to say that general education and daily chores should be excused in the name of your child exercising his talents. But do avoid putting him in too many extracurricular activities. His general education should provide plenty of opportunities to balance out his personality and knowledge base and to see where he has the highest aptitudes. Then extracurricular activities can more deeply develop one or two of those areas where he has shown an advanced ability.

Develop Their Character
All this takes sacrifice on the part of the child—and the parent who must provide transportation and financial means. But what is it worth for your child to develop the talents he or she has?

God’s way is that of giving and sharing. He wants your child to develop his talents as much as He wants you to understand the importance of such efforts.

Mr. Armstrong related, “I knew a boy who had the talent of a child prodigy on the piano at age 6 or 7. But he tired of that, turned to blowing a trumpet, tired of that, reached maturity unable to do much of anything in any area” (ibid.).

If our children learn to quit when things get difficult, they may never be able to push past the obstacles life in general will present them. This mindset leads nowhere. 1 Peter 4:11 shows that human ability comes from God, and it is to be used to “minister,” or to serve God’s purposes. It also shows that with any such ability, all the glory should go back to the God who gave it.

Though God is most concerned with building holy, righteous spiritual character in us, He is also interested in the skills we develop on the physical level. Not only can God use skilled people, He is particularly interested in how those physical skills directly relate to our ultimate spiritual development.

So it should come as no surprise that the...
During the War of Independence, America learned the painful lesson of reliance on foreign nations. The newborn United States had to rely on France and the Netherlands to supply everything from iron and gunpowder to blankets and clothing, and Britain routinely cut America’s supply lines. Seeing this weakness, America’s founders implemented a national strategy promoting industrial and military self-sufficiency in order to establish the nation’s security.

It seems America has forgotten that lesson. One specific example is in mineral production. America’s leaders have allowed the nation’s once formidable mining industry to erode. Many minerals—including some that are strategically important for the military—are no longer produced in the United States at all. Due to lack of investment, radical environmental activism, and low-cost foreign competition, many of America’s former mining giants have turned off the drills, closed the refineries and sent the workers home, or have chosen to develop new production outside the U.S.

A Warning Unheeded
It’s not that America wasn’t warned.

Back in 1985, the secretary of the United States Army testified before Congress that America was more than 50 percent dependent on foreign sources for 23 of 40 critical materials essential to U.S. national security.

The year before, in a U.S. Marine Corps study, Maj. R.A. Hagerman wrote, “Since World War II, the United States has become increasingly dependent on foreign sources for almost all non-fuel minerals. … The availability of these minerals have an extremely important impact on American industry and, in turn, on U.S. defense capabilities. Without just a few critical minerals, such as cobalt, manganese and platinum, it would be virtually impossible to produce many defense products such as jet engines, missile components, electronic components, iron, steel, etc.

“This places the U.S. in a vulnerable position with a direct threat to our defense production capability if the supply of strategic minerals is disrupted by foreign powers” (“U.S. Reliance on Africa for Strategic Minerals,” April 6, 1984; emphasis mine).

A look at America’s mining production since the mid-to-late 1980s is not just shocking, it is chilling.

Cobalt, for example, is one of the most critical minerals used in America and is considered a strategic metal by the U.S. government, meaning that its availability during a national emergency would seriously affect the economic, industrial and defensive capability of the country. It has many diverse commercial, industrial and military applications including superalloys (used to make parts for jet aircraft engines), magnets, high-speed steels, catalysts for petroleum and chemical industries as well as for paints, varnishes and inks.

Just before America entered World War II, it made a scramble to begin cobalt mining. Production began in 1940 and continued until 1971, when the mines were closed and cobalt mining ceased to exist in America. The most recent data available from the U.S. Geological Survey (usgs) shows that, as of 2004, the over 8,700 tons the nation consumes is 100 percent imported. Cobalt sells for more than $45,000 a ton.

Manganese is another essential mineral America no longer produces. It is essential to iron and steel production by virtue of its sulfur-fixing, deoxidizing and alloying properties. Manganese is also a key component of certain widely used aluminum alloys and of dry cell batteries and plant fertilizers.

In 1918 America produced over 400,000 tons of manganese, which was over 44 percent of global production. By the end of World War II, mining had fallen to only 12 percent of global production, covering just 28 percent of America’s daily needs. Since then, manganese production has steadily eroded; the last domestic ingot of manganese was mined in 1990. Today America imports 100 percent of its manganese consumption.

America no longer produces any chromium either, a mineral the usgs calls “one of the nation’s most important strategic and critical materials.” Chromium is used to harden iron, steel and other non-ferrous alloys.

The list of minerals that America no

Then there is a whole host of other minerals, like iron, zinc and titanium, that America produces at greatly reduced volumes.

Allowing such a wide swath of the nation’s mineral production base to dry up and disappear is a critical miscalculation. You can’t just turn mines on and off at the flick of a switch. “The average person doesn’t stop to think that a process of several years is involved from the point of minerals exploration to on-site development to extraction, smelting and manufacture of the primary products,” former American Mining Congress President J. Allen Overton once noted. “Once lost, it will take years—if ever—to recover it.”

Look Who’s Taking Over the Business

As America has been divesting itself of mineral-producing capacity, other nations have been quick to embrace it. Unfortunately for the U.S., the ability to control global production of strategic minerals is an incredibly powerful political weapon.

China, for example, now completely dominates rare earth minerals—minerals that the U.S. supplied over 20 percent of not long ago.

“The whole family of ‘ums’ like gallium, rhenium, neodymium and indium, is fascinating. And frightening!” reports the Miner Diaries investment bulletin. “They are an essential ingredient in many technology-related sectors and demand is growing at 10-to-15 percent a year.

“Yet it is completely dominated by just one country—around 95 percent of supply comes from China” (Jan. 30, 2008).

Over the past two years, China has begun restricting exports of these materials. The end result is, U.S. manufacturers who wish to stay in business are being forced to move their research and development and manufacturing facilities to China to gain access to rare earth minerals. An example of this was the sale and relocation of Magneqnuch, a company formerly based in Indiana that produced 85 percent of the rare earth magnets used in the guidance systems of U.S. military smart bombs. Without rare earths, you don’t have protective coatings, blast protection, guided missiles, lasers, modern transportation, laptop computers, TVs, or even iPods.

In 1992, China basically admitted to the world what it was planning to do. Chinese ruler Deng Xiaoping coined the statement, “There is oil in the Middle East, there is rare earth in China.” Then in 1999, Chinese President Jiang Zemin said, “Improve the development and applications of rare earth, and change [China’s] resource advantage into economic superiority.”

Meanwhile, America has closed its only rare earth mine (one owned by Unocal, which the Chinese state-owned company CNOC tried to purchase in 2005), has boarded up the Rare Earth Information Center, and has not only ceased stockpiling rare earth minerals but has also largely sold off national stockpiles.

If any doubt exists as to China’s intentions, on February 4 Chinese state-owned companies announced four deals in the resources sector. The deals came only two days after Chinaalco, China’s aluminum company, grabbed a 12 percent stake in Rio Tinto to prevent the Australian mining giant BHP Billiton from gaining control over the $132 billion diversified mining giant.

The Times called China’s action “the first shots in a new economic war.”

And much of the rest of the world, including the European Union, is scrambling to tie up control of strategic minerals in Africa and South America. America is being shut out, and at a time when much of its domestic resource production is hitting rock bottom.

Besieged

If Americans truly understood the implications of being resource-dependent on unfriendly foreign nations, especially at a time of intensifying anti-Americanism, global instability and resource competition, they would be acting quickly. Sadly, this is not the case.

The Bible speaks of a time when America will be besieged by its enemies. America’s over-reliance on foreigners for essential needs is a sign that time is drawing near.

But it didn’t have to be this way. There is a reason America as a nation is blessed with a range of unexploited minerals and other natural resources envied around the world. Why? Our book The United States and Britain in Prophecy explains. Request a free copy.

Abraham Lincoln may have stated it best when he said: “We find ourselves in the peaceful possession of the fairest portion of the Earth, as regards fertility of soil, extent of territory, and salubrity of climate. … We, when mounting the stage of existence, find ourselves the legal inheritors of these fundamental blessings. We toiled not in the acquisition or the establishment of them.”

Later Lincoln said: “It is the duty of nations, as well as of men, to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God … and to recognize the sublime truth, announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord. … We have been the recipients of the choicest blessings of heaven. We have been preserved, these many years, in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other nation ever has grown; but we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious Hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own.”

America is rapidly losing those blessings. The mineral bedrock of our industry, economy and military is crumbling before our eyes. For many years, the Trumpet has alerted its readers that, based on Bible prophecy, the U.S. and other English-speaking nations are headed for a time of national calamity. America must turn to the one true and most important bedrock of any society, the Rock that determines our morals and should govern our lives. Only then will America truly stand on a firm, rock-solid foundation.
Life’s Most Important Questions

How many people even ask them? Yet here is a book that purports to answer them.

BY HERBERT W. ARMSTRONG
Did you ever ask yourself: “Who am I? What am I? Why am I?”

The world about you is a mystery. You yourself are a mystery. You have never seen your brain, the seat of your intellect and all that you are.

Your life is engulfed in mysteries. When you reflect, your very existence is a mystery. Did you simply happen by un-intelligent resident earthly forces without meaning or purpose, or were you intelligently designed and created by an all-powerful God of supreme mind for a purpose that also has been hidden in mystery?

If the all-powerful God was your Maker, and exists as the divine Creator of all that is, then the mystery about God emerges, in order of time sequence, as the first and paramount mystery of all.

Who and what is God? That is a mystery not understood by any religion, not explained by science, untaught by higher education. God reveals Himself in His Word, the Holy Bible, yet almost none has understood it. The Bible, as the writer Bruce Barton said, is “the book that nobody knows.” The Bible itself is the basic mystery that reveals all other mysteries.

If the truth about God is mystery number one revealed in the Bible, assuredly the truth about angels and evil spirits is second in order. Is there, after all, a devil? Did God create a devil? If there are holy angels, what is their purpose and function? The Bible clearly states that this world is actually ruled by unseen principalities of evil spirits. Do evil spirits affect and influence humans and even governments today? Do evil spirits affect even your own life? This question seems enveloped in total mystery.

Certainly third in order is the mystery of your own life—of humanity as a whole. What and why is humanity? Is man an immortal soul? Do the dead know what the living are doing? Is man a flesh-and-blood being with an immortal soul within? Is there meaning and purpose to human life? Did we evolve through unintelligent material forces without meaning or purpose? Why are humans beset with seemingly unsolvable problems?

Fourth in line of the not-understood mysteries is the civilization that has developed in man’s world. How did it develop? Why do we find a world of awesome advancement and progress, yet paradoxically with appalling and mounting evils? Why cannot the minds that develop spacecraft, computers and marvels of science, technology and industry solve the problems that demonstrate human helplessness?

Next, in the development of human society on Earth, is the mystery of the Jew and the ancient nation of Israel. Why did God raise up one special nation of Israel? Why are they God’s “chosen people”? Are they God’s favorites? Does God discriminate against other nations? Is God a respecter of persons? What is Israel’s purpose in the divine order of things?

Come now to the mystery of the church. Why should there be the institution of the church in the world? Is there some purpose for it, not understood even by the religion of traditional Christianity?

Finally, why the mystery of the Kingdom of God? Jesus’s gospel message was “the Kingdom of God.” Is the Kingdom of God something within each person? Is it something that may be set up in men’s hearts? Is it the institution of the church? Or is it something else altogether? Why this mystery of the very gospel of Jesus Christ?

These are the seven great mysteries that concern the very lives of every human being on Earth. The plain truth of all these mysteries is revealed in the Bible, but none of the churches or theologians seem to have comprehended them.

Why? The Bible is the basic mystery of all.

If one begins reading the Bible continuously from beginning to end, one becomes bewildered. The Bible simply cannot be read like any other book. It is a mystery because it is a coded book. It is like a jigsaw puzzle, with perhaps hundreds of various pieces of different forms and shapes that can be fitted together in only one precise pattern. The truths of the Bible are revealed here a little, there a little, scattered from beginning to end, and revealed only through the Holy Spirit within those surrendered and yielded to God, willing to have confessed error and wrongdoing, and yielding to believe Christ, the Word of God. Jesus was the Word in person. The Bible is the same Word in print.

No one can have the Holy Spirit, which alone can open the human mind to understanding of this Word of God, without a complete repentance and an implicit belief in Christ as well as believing what He says. Repentance can only follow admission of being wrong—of wrongdoing and wrong believing. The most difficult thing for any human seems to be to admit being wrong—to confess error of belief and conviction.

Is it any wonder, then, that the Bible is the book that nobody knows or understands—or certainly almost nobody.

God deliberately coded His book so that it would not be understood until our modern time. In the 12th chapter of Daniel we read even that a devoted man of God could not understand that which was given to him to write as part of the Bible. He said he heard, but understood not. The revealing angel said, “Go thy way, Daniel. The words are closed and sealed until the time of the end.”

Today we have reached that time. God has opened to understanding His Word to those He has chosen, who have yielded and surrendered to Him and to His blessed sacred Word. In the 12th chapter of Daniel, it says at this time of the end the “wise” would understand, “but none of the wicked shall understand.” Who, then, are the “wise” who may understand the Bible?

“The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom” (Psalm 111:10) and “a good understanding have all they that do his commandments” (same verse). Yet traditional Christianity has generally denied God’s commandments—says they are done away, nailed to the cross. The clergy and theologians of organized “Christianity,” therefore, cannot and do not understand the Bible.

It is hoped that this book, written since God’s time for it has come, will open many eyes to the truth of these long-hidden mysteries.

And now, in my 93rd year, I have been led to write this book, to share with as many as care to know, the answers that the great supreme mind of God reveals in His Word—if one is only willing to understand that Word.
Uncovering Ancient Jerusalem

While politicians draw up plans to divide Israel’s capital city, archaeologists are busily digging up Jerusalem’s celebrated past. BY STEPHEN FLURRY

Given the media exposure, Jerusalem archaeology is beginning to receive, it is possible that this city’s past could spark more than just archaeological fervor.

In the Arab village of Silwan, archaeologists are hard at work excavating the original Jerusalem—the City of David. An Associated Press story on February 10 outlined how Silwan is “hard-wired into the politics of modern-day Arab-Israeli strife” and that new digs are cutting to the heart of who owns the Holy City today. “Palestinians and Israelis are trying again to negotiate a peace deal, one which must include an agreement to share Jerusalem,” the report said. “The collision in this neighborhood—between Silwan and the City of David—encapsulates the complexities ahead.”

AP explained that in recent years, the Elad Foundation, an organization associated with the religious settlement movement, has funded archaeological digs in the City of David, which is just outside the walled Old City. The area has expanded to become one of Jerusalem’s most popular tourist attractions, drawing 350,000 visitors a year, most of them Israelis. The archaeological park hosts numerous ongoing excavations both above ground and below. Hezekiah’s tunnel, for example, was cut into the rock beneath the City of David about 2,700 years ago. In 1880, a Jewish boy discovered an inscription carved inside the tunnel that reads, “While the excavators were still lifting up their picks, each toward his fellow, and while there were yet 3 cubits to excavate, there was heard the voice of one calling to another, for there was a crevice in the rock, on the right hand. And on the day they completed the boring, the stonecutters struck pick against pick, one against the other, and the water flowed from the spring to the pool . . .”

According to 2 Chronicles 32, anticipating a siege from King Sennacherib’s Assyrian forces, Judah’s King Hezekiah redirected water from the Gihon Springs by carving the 1,700-foot tunnel. The “ conduit” is also mentioned in 2 Kings 20:20 and is corroborated by Sennacherib’s own written account of his campaign to conquer Jerusalem.

Besides the famous tunnel, many other recent discoveries have been made: palaces, pottery, city walls and bullae. In 1982, for example, the late Yigal Shiloh discovered a collection of 53 bullae (clay discs used to seal scrolls) within a building that would later be called the House of the Bullae. Shiloh assumed the structure must have been some kind of archive building, located close to the palace complex where the kings of Judah reigned.

That palace has now been located, thanks to Elad Mazar’s recent work, and indeed, it’s situated on a hilltop platform just above the House of the Bullae. One bulla from Shiloh’s collection was inscribed with the Hebrew name “Gemariah, son of Shaphan.” Mentioned in Jeremiah 36:10, he was one of the princes of Judah during Jehoiakim’s reign. His father, Shaphan, worked for King Josiah (2 Kings 22:3).

Within King David’s palace, in 2005, Elad Mazar found a bulla bearing this inscription: “Jehucal, son of Shelemiah.” He was a royal officer who worked in the administration of King Zedekiah, Judah’s last king before going into Babylonian captivity during the sixth century B.C. Je(h)ucal is referred to twice in the book of Jeremiah (37:3; 38:1).

“The City of David shows us the history and archaeology of Jerusalem since the day it was founded. Jerusalem’s foundations are here,” archaeologist Eli Shukrun told the Associated Press. “It’s hard to list another city similar to this one,” says Roni Reich of Haifa University. “And this hill is where it all started.” AP notes, “Archaeologists not connected to the City of David digs don’t dispute their importance” (op. cit.).

The location of the archaeological park, though, is what makes it so controversial. It’s imbedded in the low-income Arab neighborhood of Silwan—in the annexed half of Jerusalem that Israel captured in 1967 and which the Palestinians want for the capital of a Palestinian state. Silwan has about 40,000 Arab residents.

While Israel wants to reconnect with its past, Palestinians accuse the Jews of using archaeology as a political weapon. AP says the Elad Foundation has a yearly budget of about $10 million, most of it from donations, “and is buying up Palestinian homes in Silwan to accommodate Jewish families. Around 50 have moved in so far, living in houses flying Israeli flags and guarded by armed security men paid for by the Israeli government.”

January 3, the South China Morning Post also reported on the growing divide between Arab residents of Silwan and the activities Elad sponsors in the City of David: “Abed Shalodi, a Silwan resident who helps the alternative archaeologists conduct their
tours, views Elad as a threat. “They want to take over all the land here. We can’t live with them because they don’t want us here. They want the land without the people.”

The article then quoted Elad spokesman Doron Spielman as saying that while “Our goal is that it should be as strongly Jewish or Jewish-identified as possible,” it is unrealistic to expect the area to become completely Jewish. Spielman says dozens of Arabs in Silwan are in fact employed by Elad, and that the foundation’s activities include projects to beautify the area for Palestinian residents. But, he said, “We do not deny we have a Zionist dream—to reveal the ancient city beneath the ground and create a thriving Jewish neighborhood above the ground.”

Archaeologists working at the site deny any connection to politics, but some of their colleagues charge them with being complicit with Elad’s desire to move Jews into the Arab neighborhood. The City of David dig “is connected by its umbilical cord to politics,” said Rafi Greenberg, an Israeli archaeologist from Tel Aviv University. “No amount of dealing with ceramics and rocks can obscure the fact that the work is being done to establish facts in the present,” he said.

In attempting to delegitimize Israel’s right to exist, Palestinian leadership has been actively fighting on two fronts in order to destroy that link between the Jews and the land of Israel. While they adamantly maintain “that the temple of Solomon was fictitious,” Dore Gold wrote in The Fight for Jerusalem, “they simultaneously [attempt] to destroy any archaeological evidence proving otherwise”—and with little or no resistance from the Israel Antiquities Authority.

On the other side of the struggle, in an increasingly irreligious and secular Western world, about the only things left to re-establish that link are the ancient ruins buried beneath the surface of Israel’s homeland. “In almost every place where archaeological digging is taking place throughout Israel,” CNSNews.com reported, “archaeologists are uncovering Jewish artifacts and history” (Nov. 14, 2007). This past, of course, is grounded in the Hebrew Bible, where Jerusalem is referred to more than 650 times. Founded by King David, Jerusalem became Israel’s capital city one thousand years before the establishment of Christianity—1,700 years before Islam.

These new discoveries are sure to find a more prominent place in Israel’s future political discourse, especially after peace talks with the Palestinians break down.

Bending the World to Its Rules

Europe’s growing ability to dictate global regulations and business practices is worth watching. BY BRAD MACDONALD

REGULATORY WAR HAS ERUPTED between the European Union and the United States. Just ask executives at Microsoft. In mid-January, they were forced to set aside their whiskey sour clubs and dig out their pinstriped suits and law books when EU Competition Commissioner Neelie Kroes initiated a new antitrust investigation into the goliath of American companies.

Kroes’s January 14 announcement was salt on an already painful wound for Microsoft. Barely three months had passed since the American behemoth caved in and ended its opposition to a 2004 decision by the EU that exposed the inner workings of Microsoft’s operating system to European competitors, reduced its royalty collection, and ensured it would pay fines imposed by the EU.

On February 27, Microsoft’s accountants again had to put in extra hours when, for the third time in four years, the EU blasted the corporate giant with another record €899 million fine. All told, Microsoft now owes the European Commission US$2.6 billion—no small change.

Microsoft, however, is only one of several American companies at which the suits in Brussels have pointed their legal cannons. Qualcomm, Intel, MasterCard, Google and Apple have all found themselves subject to claims lodged by EU antitrust regulators.

When Microsoft waved the white flag before the EU last October, the Wall Street Journal said this showed that “Europe now writes the rules for global business across the board—unapologetically to the benefit of its own industry” (Oct. 31, 2007; emphasis mine throughout). Microsoft’s capitulation, and the American government’s impotence in persuading the Europeans to cut it some slack, sent a clear message to U.S. companies looking to conduct business on the Continent: Your only option is to obey.

There is an unnerving reality behind the EU’s efforts to become the global trendsetter in regulations and business practices.

Europe Writes the Rules

It appears the antitrust angle is just a single theater in a much broader war by Europe on American business. “The European Union’s strategy to take the regulatory helm is evident in issues such as climate change, chemicals regulation, genetically modified organisms and antitrust regulation, for which Europe has adopted legislation or enforcement regimes that are stricter than those of the United States—and that, through the ‘California effect,’ are forcing changes globally,” wrote analysts at Stratfor (January 17).

Stratfor’s use of the term “California effect” refers to the American phenomenon in which California, as one of the largest and wealthiest states, can virtually dictate national policy by setting its own state regulations and forcing nationwide corporations to either comply or lose that state’s business. In the same manner that major U.S. companies
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As America’s economic recklessness ripples out to impact European economies, European leaders are brainstorming for ways to regulate, protect and even guide the global economy.

can’t afford to ignore California’s market, few multinational corporations can risk giving up their presence in the massive and highly lucrative European economy by rejecting EU rules and regulations. This explains why Microsoft caved to EU demands last October.

In June 2007, the European Parliament signed into law the Registration, Evaluation and Authorization of Chemicals (REACH) regulation. Ostensibly designed to protect the health of Europeans, it bans certain chemicals, severely restricts others, and requires strict testing, reporting and registration of all chemicals imported into Europe. This single law could revolutionize the global chemical industry. Any company wanting to sell chemicals to Europe will be forced to meet its guidelines. REACH will likely affect American chemical companies the most. They are the largest in the world, and now they are having to spend millions of dollars testing, reporting and registering their products to conform to EU standards.

REACH essentially gives European nations the power to dictate global policy in chemical manufacturing. In fact, its effects ripple beyond the chemical industry. For instance, all foreign cosmetic companies wanting to export to Europe must register all chemicals contained in their products. To be fair, this regulation will also apply to European companies. The only difference is, foreign companies have until June 1 this year to comply, while their counterparts on the Continent have at least three years before they are required to do so.

REACH gives the EU an unmatched ability to exert its influence far beyond its own borders and into the industries—hence the economies—of other countries.

Living by Its Own Rules

The EU’s modus operandi is virtually the same in relation to the highly politicized issue of climate change. On January 23, EU leaders in Brussels announced “a sweeping package of measures to combat climate change that sets a global standard and means major changes for how Europe gets its energy” (Time, January 23).

Problem is, the EU’s strategy for solving climate change is so extreme, some fear that European companies will be driven to relocate to countries with less stringent environmental laws. How does the EU plan to prevent such an exodus? Instead of tempering the policy to make it more achievable, it plans to impose “carbon tariffs on imports from countries that fail to sign up to a global climate change deal, such as the U.S. and China” (ibid.).

Europe has every right to blaze the path toward addressing this illusory problem. But it is doing so by imposing its standards on the rest of the world and proposing to penalize any nation that doesn’t comply—even when European companies say that compliance is impossible!

Then there is the issue of genetically modified foods and crops. In November 2005, the World Trade Organization decided that some European states were breaking international trade rules by not allowing the import of GM crops and foods. The WTO asked the European Commission to bring its member states into line with WTO rules regarding GM crops and foods. After two years, that deadline expired January 11. The European Commission failed to enforce the widely accepted WTO rules; instead it asked the WTO for more time to work with the member states to help them bring national regulations in line with global trade laws. Two years wasn’t enough?

Note the trend: On antitrust issues, climate regulations and its new REACH law, the EU is quite happy to impose new regulations—oftentimes at great cost—on America and the rest of the world. But when it comes to genetically modified foods, the EU lives by its own rules.

More to Come

You can be sure Europe’s regulatory imperialism will only grow more intense.

European stock markets were pummeled mid-January—many suffering their worst single-day drop since 9/11—as a result of growing fears that the American economy is on the precipice of a recession. “As if climate change and chemicals policy regulations ... were not enough,” wrote Stratfor, “the subprime mortgage crisis’s impact in Europe has heightened Europe’s perception of the United States as a laggard. Bankers and regulators in Europe argue that lax U.S. regulation of mortgage-backed securities is responsible for the problems in Europe emanating from the subprime crisis ...” (op. cit.).

As America’s economic recklessness ripples out to impact European economies, European leaders are brainstorming for ways to regulate, protect and even guide the global economy. Surely it won’t be long before we see the EU imposing new laws and regulations to protect its monetary interests and safeguard the global economy. After all, tumultuous times demand far-reaching solutions—and European leaders never miss an opportunity to extend their bureaucratic power.

After the EU victory over Microsoft last year, Mario Monti, the former EU competition commissioner responsible for Europe’s success, told an Italian newspaper that putting such U.S. giants in their place was “the true strength of a united Europe.”

That’s a telling statement. Neelie Kroes, the current European commissioner for competition, celebrated the decision by musing about how low she’d like Microsoft shares to fall.

Americans ought to consider the spirit of these statements. This isn’t a series of independent, unrelated battles between Europe and certain specific companies or industries in America. This is not Europe versus Microsoft; Europe versus Google; Europe versus GM foods, or Europe versus American chemical companies.

This is Europe versus America! Monti and Kroes are not backwoods political renegades; they made these statements while holding the post of EU competition commissioner—the person responsible for shaping the European business environment and managing the ability of foreign companies to participate in the European market. “EU Competition Commissioner Neelie Kroes yields much more prestige and power than her counterpart in the United States,” wrote Stratfor. “The power given to the competition commissioner likely reflects the EU view that such regulatory powers offer political and strategic benefits ...” (op. cit.).

Ultimately, this is the crux of the matter. By using its own economic largesse to set global regulations and define global business practices, the EU is steadily gaining the power to transform the global economy.

History offers a powerful lesson we would do well to remember as we watch this trend continue. The nation controlling the world economy possesses the political and strategic power to shape the world.
Funding the Enemy

BY JOEL HILLIKER

One out of every five cranes in the world is at work in Dubai. This tiny Persian Gulf emirate—one of seven United Arab Emirates—is enjoying a wild binge of expansion. It houses more construction workers than citizens.

Dubai will soon have the world’s tallest building and is constructing another building that will be fully half Again taller than that. The world’s largest amusement park—double the size of Walt Disney World in Orlando, which currently has that title—will soon reside in Dubai. So will the world’s largest airport, the world’s largest shopping mall, the world’s largest automated rail system, the world’s largest indoor skiing facility, and the world’s first underwater hotel.

But Dubai is doing more with its wealth than attracting the international jet set. It is also buying up international stock markets. A mere 30 months ago, the Dubai International Financial Exchange was born. Eight months ago, Bourse Dubai consolidated dirx and Dubai’s other stock exchange. Today this upstart Middle Eastern bourse has completed a series of deals that has left it owning 22 percent of the London Stock Exchange and one fifth of nasdaq—making it the first government-controlled stock exchange to hold a significant stake in a U.S. exchange.

Where is this monster money coming from? Scary question. You already know the answer—but first consider this.

In Isaiah 46:9-10, the God of the Bible claims the singular ability to bring prophecy to pass. “I am God, and there is none else,” He says. “Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.” Fulfilled prophecy is, in fact, one of the strongest proofs of the truth of the Bible.

One way God ensured He could fulfill that promise is through resource distribution. Long ago He carved up the Earth into continents and buried within its soils a specific spectrum of mineral and other natural wealth. The Bible is clear that He had a guiding hand in settling various peoples in specific areas (e.g. Deuteronomy 32:8; Acts 17:26)—thus preparing them via location, geography and custody of strategic resources to fulfill their pre-ordained national roles in end-time prophecy.

The historically unprecedented wealth enjoyed by the United States and, before it, the British Empire that vaulted them to superpower status in recent generations powerfully illustrates this truth. Our free book The United States and Britain in Prophecy provides scriptural proof of how this wealth was prophesied to fall into the hands of these peoples—and to be subsequently lost.

Today we are witnessing another dramatic instance of this reality: the meteoric rise to prominence of a tiny clutch of otherwise inconsequential Middle Eastern states by sole virtue of their possession of what has only recently become the most valuable commodity on Earth.

The world’s crushing demand for oil is rapidly rising. A staggering 95 percent of the world’s transportation sector is petroleum-based. At the same time, production is leveling off. As recently as 1998, oil traded at $11 per barrel. Today that figure hovers around $100. This means that within a single decade, per-barrel oil revenue for these states shot up about 900 percent—$89 more for every barrel. And the world uses 40,000 gallons of oil every second—86 million barrels a day.

Do the math. It adds up to a mind-boggling, historically unprecedented transfer of wealth—about $700 billion more per year than just five years ago, much of it from free societies in the West—into oil-exporting nations. Many of these nations happen to be Middle Eastern, Muslim, and increasingly antagonistic toward the United States and other Western states.

This situation places near-nuclear-bomb-level power in their hands.

All the stock exchanges in the world are worth $57 trillion. At current oil prices, OPEC nations are sitting on $92 trillion.

Some of that oil money is funneling into sovereign wealth funds used to buy up strategic and technologically advanced companies in the U.S. and other Western nations. Some of that money is financing the construction of mosques and madrasas all over the West, including the U.S.

And you can be sure, some of that money is flowing into the production of another highly consequential Middle Eastern export: terrorism.

A common argument is that terrorism grows out of poverty among Middle Eastern Muslims caused by Western oppression. The reality is practically the opposite. One could far more reasonably argue that terrorism would wither on the vine if not for steady infusions of oil money—largely from the West. Imagine the Allied powers during World War II sending a billion dollars per day to Hitler.

Stepping back and evaluating the causes of this problem, several individual reasons present themselves. The juggernaut U.S. economy has grown to consume roughly a quarter of the world’s energy. Oil has proved to be the most viable source of energy, but America’s domestic oil production peaked during the 1970s and has fallen ever since. Rather than investing heavily into new oil exploration or expensive alternative energy sources, the market met supply shortfalls by increasing its dependence on foreign oil producers. In addition, environmental concerns are restricting access to additional domestic oil sources. Congress...
EUROPE

Kosovo declared independence on February 17. Countries around the world, such as the UK, U.S., France and Germany, recognized Kosovo’s independence. By doing this, they defied Russia’s wishes. Russia promised to stand by Serbia. It backed up this stance by applying intense pressure on two of the most vital buffer states at its borders, Ukraine and Georgia. Both have aspired to join NATO; Ukraine has sought EU membership. By using political threats against Georgia, and playing the energy card against Ukraine through which Russian gas transits to the EU, Moscow signaled that it will play hard ball in the face of any EU takeover in Kosovo. The stage is set for a confrontation between East and West (see article, page 32).

Europe also provoked the Islamic world in February. Geert Wilders, chairman of the recently formed Netherlands’ Freedom Party, called the Koran “an inspiration for murder” and said that if the prophet Mohammed were alive today, he would have him “tarred and feathered as an extremist and deported if he were in Holland.” Then Danish newspapers republished one of the cartoons that sparked Muslim outrage in 2005, in order “to unambiguously back and support the freedom of speech that we as a newspaper have unnoticed problems too. As such, the scam carries shadowy implications for the global banking industry.

The European Union continues to demonstrate its endemic corruption and undemocratic nature. In February, members of the European Parliament from the Budgetary Control Committee voted to keep secret a report on abuse of EU funding. The report uncovered deputaries misusing their staff allowances. However, as MEP Chris Davies said, it wasn’t just “the scale of the abuse that is taking place” that was troublesome, but also “the fact that it has been kept secret.”

In late January, several MEPs attempted to use procedural requests to slow down debate in the Parliament to protest the lack of a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty in most EU nations. Europe’s solution: The parliamentary president was simply given illegal powers to silence the protesters.

In February, news broke of a massive tax-evasion scam in Germany—one of the largest ever in the nation’s history— involving numerous German-controlled foundations set up in Liechtenstein as tax-evasion shelters. Yet more turmoil in Germany’s government surfaced after two of the three parties in the ruling “grand coalition” lost ground in key state elections.

In one state, this resulted in one of the parties considering an alliance with an opposition party, much to Chancellor Angela Merkel’s chagrin. Watch for the Merkel coalition to continue to weaken—and, simultaneously, the right wing in German politics to surge in popularity.

The pope has again demonstrated just how much political power he can wield. By influencing a well-placed Catholic politician, the Vatican brought down the government of Italian President Romano Prodi on January 24. Now it appears that the path has been cleared for a bill promoting stricter laws on abortion, a bill opposed by the Prodi administration. The Vatican’s influence is also being felt in Spain, where Catholic leaders fought hard against the socialist government in the run-up to the March 9 elections. This is about more than merely promoting a Christian agenda in Europe. The Vatican remembers the political power it wielded before the Reforma- tion, and now it wants it back.

MIDEAST

Since U.S. President George Bush’s visit to Israel in January to revive the peace process, trouble in the region has only escalated. The day after he left, Palestinians in Gaza launched a barrage of rockets at Israeli targets—more than 150 in four days.

Then, on January 23, hundreds of thousands of Pales-
tinians—and terrorists and weapons—streamed across the Egypt/Gaza border unhindered after Hamas destroyed two thirds of the border wall—a demolition for which Hamas had been preparing for months. Within two weeks, Palestinian terrorists carried out a suicide attack in southern Israel, leaving one woman dead and slightly injuring 11 other people. Hamas has used the Gaza border crisis to try to force a new arrangement for control of the border and establish itself as a player in such an agreement. Egypt has hosted Hamas representatives for discussions on the issue several times. Israel’s attempts at isolating Hamas are simply not working.

As Israel’s troubles mount, it is becoming increasingly open to a greater European role in the region. “Developing a strong relationship with Europe is becoming the third pillar [in addition to the IDF and the U.S.] safeguarding Israel’s survival,” said a senior Israeli diplomatic official in February. Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert visited Chancellor Angela Merkel in Berlin in mid-February to discuss the rocket attacks from the Gaza Strip and Iran’s nuclear program. Israel’s trust in foreigners has not worked before, and it is prophesied to be the country’s undoing in the future.

Also bad news for Israel, the emerging relationship between Iran and Egypt continues to progress. Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak held talks with Iran’s parliament speaker on January 30, the first such high-level meeting in almost 30 years. Mubarak is probably feeling the pressure of Egypt’s Islamists. After the Gaza border breach, the Muslim Brotherhood staged about 80 anti-government demonstrations. Islamic fundamentalism is rapidly growing more popular in Egypt as it is embraced by the youth. Conditions in Egypt are building toward a radical change in the nation’s politics. President Pervez Musharraf’s allies suffered defeat in Pakistan’s parliamentary elections on February 18. Musharraf has now become a lame-duck president and could be forced from power. If Pakistani society continues to fragment, and there is a period of weak civilian government, Islamic extremists will inevitably grow stronger. You can be sure Tehran would look to exploit such a situation. Already, Tehran is making inroads into Pakistan economically. On February 9, Iranian Consul General Saeed Kharazi called for stronger bilateral links with Pakistan, calling the nation Iran’s top foreign-policy priority.

Further evidence has emerged of Iranian interference in Afghanistan, with 60 Iranian-made mines being discovered in a Taliban compound in western Afghanistan in late January. Tehran is manipulating both sides of the Afghan conflict in order to keep the U.S. bogged down and to enhance its own influence in the country. The strategy is working: An independent assessment by NATO’s former commander says NATO’s forces in Afghanistan are in a “strategic stalemate” as the Taliban’s control grows.

The West’s efforts in Iraq are also being complicated: On February 21, Turkish troops
launched a ground incursion to root out Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) guerrillas hiding in northern Iraq. The U.S. finds itself in a difficult position: It can’t back the Kurds for fear of alienating the Turks, who have been among its few friends in the Middle East. Yet it must be cautious in backing the Turks for fear of further escalating Iraqi tensions.

During a January tour of Persian Gulf states, French President Nicolas Sarkozy signed a deal with the United Arab Emirates president to open a permanent military base in his country in 2009. Then France held a 10-day joint military exercise with the United Arab Emirates and Qatar, the first such war games ever. With Gulf nations seeking to contain Iran, we can expect them to look increasingly to Europe. Bible prophecy indicates a split between Muslim nations in the end time—those that will ally with Europe, and those that will ally with Iran.

On February 12, Imad Mughinyah, a Hezbollah leader who planned attacks that killed hundreds, was killed by a car bomb in Damascus, Syria. Blaming Israel, Hezbollah threatened the Jewish state with “open war” in response.

**ASIA**

The Kremlin is becoming increasingly concerned over the EU’s eastward expansion. The Union has gobbled up most of Eastern Europe’s former Soviet states, fragmenting the regional dominance that Russian ally Serbia one had in the Balkans, and is now working to isolate Serbia and eastern Ukraine from EU influence.

After Kosovo declared independence from Serbia, the Kremlin sent two representatives to Serbia, including First Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev. Medvedev said Moscow would recognize Serbia as a single state with jurisdiction stretching over its entire territory. Medvedev also met with the prime minister of the Serb-dominated Srpska region of Bosnia-Herzegovina to work out a natural gas deal—a move that portends more tension with the EU (see article, page 32).

The EU and NATO seek to expand into Ukraine. Russian President Vladimir Putin warned on February 12 that Russia would aim nuclear warheads at Ukraine if it joined NATO. Russia truly poses a threat to the EU—a threat partner” that would reach “new horizons” of cooperation with Russia in the future. China and India are standing with Russia against Europe and America by opposing Kosovo’s declaration of independence from Serbia.

Former Soviet states Belarus and Kazakhstan entered a customs union with Russia on January 25; five days later, Belarus inked a foreign-policy plan of action with Russia. This plan lays a basis for Russo-Belarusian cooperation and prevents attempts by Western nations to isolate Belarus. China, India, Belarus, and the former Soviet states of Asia are all starting to work together as a counterweight to European imperialism.

Japan is now forming a growing friendship with Russia’s ally China. On February 27, Japan’s defense force chief of staff met with China’s defense minister to discuss military cooperation between the two countries. Japan reiterated its support of keeping Taiwan as part of one China.

Many of the American troops stationed in Japan were originally put there as a quick reaction force against any Chinese move to dominate Taiwan. This alliance is jeopardized by Japan aligning itself with China on the Taiwan issue. Soon Japan will have to choose between America and China—and we expect it to take the latter option.

**LATIN AMERICA**

The moment the U.S. awaited for 50 years finally arrived: On February 19, Cuban despot Fidel Castro announced his resignation. Ever since Castro brought the world to the brink of war by allowing the USSR to install nuclear missiles in his island nation, he has been the poster boy for anti-Americanism. He has also inspired a host of imitators in Latin America, including Venezuealan President Hugo Chavez and Bolivian President Evo Morales. The Cuban National Assembly gave the reins of power to Fidel’s 76-year-old brother Raul, guaranteeing no substantial change in the direction of the country for the present.

At the end of January, Hugo Chavez encouraged fellow Latin American governments to pull billions of dollars from reserves in U.S. banks. He and other leaders have formed a new Latin American bank, Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas, as an alternative. On February 21, he announced that China will loan Venezuela $4 billion—all of which will be repaid in refined fuel. This deal follows close on the heels of President Chavez’s February 10 threats to cut off oil to the U.S. if Exxon Mobil wins a court judgment to seize billions of dollars in assets from the state oil company Petro-leos de Venezuela. Chavez is still in no position to carry out this threat—he is reliant on U.S. oil dollars—but the more foreign deals he can establish, the more his bluster becomes a legitimate concern for the U.S., which receives 12 percent of its oil from Venezuela.

**AFRICA**

Members of the Movement for Democratic Change staged demonstrations in Zimbabwe on January 23 to test the effect of new laws guaranteeing political freedoms—and were promptly tear-gassed; dozens were arrested. “This was a severe test for Robert Mugabe,” said Tendai Biti, sec-
when ex-UN head Kofi Annan continued through February 28, against Mugabe for president. He declared he was running.

South Africa’s power problems blacked out the country’s gold, platinum, coal and diamond production from January 25 to 29. Production resumed at a rationed 90 percent, but the country as a whole continues to suffer from the blackouts. Insufficient government planning means the blackouts will continue for at least five years, according to the Economist.

On February 2, rebel forces seized the capital in Chad. Within two days, government forces defeated the rebels. The government has accused the Sudanese government of supporting the rebels and has threatened retaliation. The EU began deploying 3,700 troops to Chad on February 12. The role that French forces, separate from EU troops (EUFOR), played in defending the capital suggests that the Chadian rebels no longer see any EU troops as neutral. As a result, EUFOR now faces more hostile conditions than originally planned.

Algerian President Abdelaziz Bouteflika visited Vladimir Putin in February. In the midst of heightened cooperation, Russia has agreed to build railroads in Algeria, to start extracting oil in Algeria by 2011, and to increase the number of flights between the capitals. As the race for African resources grows between Europe, the U.S. and China, Russia is strengthening its presence in Africa too.

Violence in Kenya continued through February 28, when ex-UN head Kofi Annan brokered a power-sharing agreement between President Kibaki and opposition leader Raila Odinga. In the two months it took them to reach common ground, 1,500 people died and 600,000 were displaced from their homes (see article, page 22).

**ANGLO-AMERICA**

In February, the British government produced a shocking 138-page report pressuring schools to promote a pro-homosexual agenda, branding those opposed to that agenda as “homophobic bullies.” The report forbids schools to reinforce traditional gender roles, and instructs them to encourage homosexual role models and to positively portray same-sex “parents” in discussions about family.

Meanwhile, many British students have forgotten the reality of their greatest prime minister. A February poll found that one in five British teens believe Winston Churchill was a myth, while more than half believed King Arthur, Robin Hood and Sherlock Holmes were real.

British families are facing a rising tax burden. Due to rising mortgage costs, stagnating earnings and excessive debt, the average annual income for British families has dropped $2,500, while the government faces a mushrooming budget deficit and is sinking further into debt as recession looms. The Telegraph reports that 10 million Britons may default on repayments for mortgages, credit cards or personal loans by the end of the year.

The archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, said in mid-February that implementation of elements of Islamic sharia law was “unavoidable” if social cohesion was to be fostered in Britain. Coming under heavy fire for the remarks, Williams stood by them.

In the United States, the Pentagon declared success when a U.S. Navy operation scored a direct hit on a deteriorating reconnaissance satellite February 20. Although Washington insisted the operation was necessary to prevent debris and dangerous hydrazine fuel from hitting the Earth’s surface, Beijing complained loudly that it was a satellite-destroying show of force that raises tensions between the two countries.

Early February found National Intelligence Director John Michael McConnell admitting to the Senate that Iran “would be technically capable of producing enough highly enriched uranium for a weapon” by the end of 2009.

School-aged children from being exposed to discussion of homosexual “families” in the classroom. Mahammed involved a 5-year-old boy bringing home a book titled ‘Who’s in a Family?’ that portrayed households being led by homosexuals. In 2006, a U.S. district judge declared that public schools are under an obligation to teach young children about homosexuality. The appeals court upheld the opinion.

Meanwhile, economic woes continue. The world’s largest automaker, General Motors, announced in February that it planned to offer voluntary buyouts to its 74,000 union workers after posting its biggest annual loss ever—$38.7 billion in 2007.

In Australia, the new prime minister, Kevin Rudd, is wasting no time jerking the nation’s helm hard left. At the opening of a session of Parliament, Rudd welcomed Aborigines to the floor who danced and sang tribal songs based on pagan tribal rites attached to snake worship and other traditions. Rudd followed the spectacle with an apology on Australia’s behalf to the mythical “stolen generations” of Aboriginals. One problem with the apology is that there is simply no evidence that any Australian government ever had a policy to “steal” children on the basis of them being Aboriginal.
A POP QUIZ for American presidents—and presidential candidates:

In We Trust

BY STEPHEN FLURRY

On a cold, drizzly morning in February nearly 150 years ago, a thousand well-wishers arrived at the Great Western Railway station in Springfield, Illinois, to send President-elect Abraham Lincoln off to Washington. Lincoln had not prepared a statement, but the unexpectedly large gathering inspired him to speak on the platform of the car, Lincoln removed his tall hat, turned and faced the crowd, and said, “My friends—no one, not in my situation, can appreciate my feeling of sadness at this parting. … I now leave, not knowing when, or whether ever, I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington.”

One week later, Jefferson Davis gave his inaugural address as provisional president of the so-called Confederate States of America. In Washington, the man Lincoln was replacing as president had given up hope of saving the Union, even declaring himself to be the “last president of the United States.” So that weighty task of saving the Union rested on the shoulders of Lincoln.

“Without the assistance of that divine Being, who ever attended [Washington], I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail,” Lincoln continued. “Trust in Him, who can go with me, and remain with you and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well” (emphasis mine throughout).

Faith and trust in God—it was a message President Lincoln helped popularize. Later in 1861, a Pennsylvania minister submitted a request to the secretary of the Treasury, Salmon Chase, asking that Almighty God be recognized on U.S. coins. The request prompted Secretary Chase to send this letter to James Pollock, director of the mint at Philadelphia: “No nation can be strong except in the strength of God, or safe except in His defense. The trust of our people in God should be declared on our national coins. You will cause a device to be prepared without unnecessary delay with a motto expressing in the fewest and tersest words possible this national recognition.”

“In God we trust” first appeared on U.S. coins in 1864—the same year Lincoln accepted Secretary Chase’s resignation. Later that year, Lincoln nominated Chase to the United States Supreme Court.

On March 4, 1865, Chief Justice Chase administered the oath of office for Lincoln’s second term as president. After being sworn in, Lincoln delivered his second inaugural address. Like the Gettysburg Address, it was brief yet profound. Packed in those powerful 700 words were 14 references to God. He mentioned the Bible once, quoted it twice (Psalm 19:9; Matthew 18:7) and paraphrased Matthew 7:1. Lincoln referred to prayer on two occasions and talked about God’s aid and assistance, His purposes, His will and His judgment. “[W]ith firmness in the right,” Lincoln famously said, “as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in ….”

A month after that speech, Lincoln was shot dead by an assassin—but it was his unyielding trust in Almighty God that helped save the Union from a sure death. According to the Treasury Department’s website, “In God we trust” was inscribed on U.S. coins “largely because of the increased religious sentiment existing during the Civil War.”

Years later, in 1956, Congress resolved to establish those four words as America’s national motto: In God We Trust.

Trust in Man

The theme of President George W. Bush’s State of the Union address in January was trust—but not in God. His speech was more than eight times longer than Lincoln’s second inaugural, yet God was mentioned only once—when euphemistically used to say good night (“God bless America”).

 “[W]e must trust in the ability of free peoples to make wise decisions,” the president said. His foreign policy is grounded in that concept—trusting that absolute freedom brings out the best in people. Given the chance, he said, people “will choose a future of freedom and peace.”

Palestinians were given that chance in 2005—and within months, they chose a Hamas administration. This, however, did not phase the Bush administration’s foreign policy. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, during her 4,000-word speech at the World Economic Forum in January, didn’t mention God once, except in a joke about fools, drunks and Americans. Rice said the problem in Gaza is not that a group like Hamas won a free election; it’s that “the leaders of Hamas still refuse to make the fundamental choice that is required for any democracy to function: You can be a political party, or you can be a terrorist group, you cannot be both.”

Hamas campaigned on the promise to destroy Israel. That political party won 44 percent of the popular vote—more than that received by any other party, giving it 56 percent of parliamentary seats. How can anyone view that reality as a refusal of only a few leaders to make a fundamental choice? Almost half of the Palestinians chose the most extreme terrorist wing of all the political parties on the ballot! And American leadership today responds by trusting them with their own state—a state that would exist side by side with the very nation it vows to obliterate.

For the economy, the president has a similar plan for the “period of uncertainty” we are in. “[W]e must trust people with their own money and empower them to grow our economy.” So one of his proposals is to print money the government doesn’t have in order to give a $150 billion rebate to taxpayers. On the brink of economic Armageddon, consumer spending on credit is what keeps the fake money flowing through the economy. The “stimulus” package is meant to encourage more spending—not pay down debt or to build up savings. Just print more money and
then trust the people to spend it—brilliant!

“Just as we trust Americans with their own money, we need to earn their trust by spending their tax dollars wisely,” the president continued. “The people’s trust in their government is undermined by congressional earmarks—special interest projects that are often snuck in at the last minute, without discussion or debate.” For six years, though, the president never complained about pork-barrel spending when Republicans held a majority in Congress. That tends to undermine his newfound disdain for pork-laden bills.

In fact, the president’s own budget proposals tend to undermine his message of fiscal conservatism. “Next week,” he said in his State of the Union address, “I’ll send you a budget that terminates or substantially reduces 151 wasteful or bloated programs, totaling more than $18 billion.” As it turns out, the budget he submitted to Congress tops out at a record-high $3.1 trillion—a 58 percent increase over what it was seven years ago ($1.96 trillion).

As for every other hot-button issue, all you need to know is this: Trust the people. You want quality health care? Let doctors and patients decide how. Education reform? Just trust that students will learn if given a chance. The ever-widening trade deficit? Trust American workers. The energy crisis? Empower American researchers and entrepreneurs with more freedom. Then, trust them.

And on it goes.

“So tonight,” the president concluded, “with confidence in freedom’s power, and trust in the people, let us set forth to do their business.”

It’s a far cry from without the assistance of Almighty God, we cannot succeed—with His assistance, we cannot fail.

Cursed Be the Man

In his first inaugural address on April 30, 1789, President George Washington said, “[T]he foundations of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality.” This was not a peripheral issue for the Founding Fathers. Private morality was the foundation of national policy.

America’s second president, John Adams, said, “Statesmen … may plan and speculate for liberty, but it is religion and morality alone which can establish the principles upon which freedom can securely stand.”

In his Notes on the State of Virginia, President Thomas Jefferson asked, “[C]an the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God?”

President James Madison said, “We have staked the whole future of American civilization, not on the power of government … [but] upon the capacity of each and every one of us to govern ourselves … according to the Ten Commandments of God.”

The Founding Fathers knew that unless religion and morality restricted human behavior, the American experiment would not work. Without individual character, the very liberties Americans champion would eventually result in anarchy. They grasped this concept in part because of mankind’s abysmal track record and partly because of what God says about the human mind. “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?” the Prophet Jeremiah asked. Desperately wicked means to be dangerously or incurably sick. In the New Testament, the Apostle Paul described man’s inherent evil nature this way: “… the carnal mind is enmity [or hostile] against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be” (Romans 8:7). This is why Jesus said we need a “physician”—because the human mind must be healed of its sicknesses: selfishness, vanity, lust, greed, envy, strife and bitterness.

The Founding Fathers grasped this fundamental truth, at least in part. Most leaders today, on the other hand, have been educated in a system established on this false, basic premise: that the human mind is basically good and trustworthy.

“By trusting the people,” President Bush said before Congress, “our founders wagered that a great and noble nation could be built on the liberty that resides in the hearts of all men and women.” In fact, it was because of these many liberties that religion and morality had to be the foundation. That’s what America’s founders believed.

“[S]o long as we continue to trust the people,” the president said, “our nation will prosper, our liberty will be secure, and the state of our Union will remain strong.”

And God says as long as we continue trusting in man, our nation will be cursed (Jeremiah 17:5), which is why Abraham Lincoln was right. Put “God” in the blank. Without His assistance, we cannot succeed. But with His direction and help, we cannot fail.
For weeks on end, the blood of 25 fresh corpses a day soaked into Kenya’s soil. Following a fraudulent election on Dec. 27, 2007, violent protests and deadly attacks forced 600,000 Kenyans from their homes, wiped out hundreds of thousands of jobs, and ruined the national economy.

In February the death toll in the violence passed 1,500 people. Both sides in the conflict formed militias, possibly aided by organized crime. Two opposition lawmakers were assassinated. In the name of political freedom, Kenyans burned each other’s businesses and hacked each other to death with machetes.

“Kibaki’s government will never work in Kenya,” said one protester of the president he now views as illegitimate. “We will paralyze them even if they kill our leaders.”

As hope for a return to normalcy evaporated with the smoke rising from the Kenyan landscape, anxious outsiders threatened to “impose a solution.”

Betrayed promises

Though you wouldn’t know it from mainstream press coverage, Kenya’s political problems predated the recent violence. True, the nation’s previous election, in December 2002, in which 24-year dictator Daniel arap Moi was thrust from power, was hailed as a democratic success story. Mwai Kibaki rode a wave of popular support into office as a reformer who would clean up endemic corruption and greed that had kept the ruling class wealthy and the people impoverished. But instead, Kibaki set about cementing his own continuous rule using the same Big Man tactics his predecessor did: purchasing loyalty and silencing enemies.

As for the economic prosperity that Kenya has enjoyed—a 6 percent increase in gross domestic product for the past two years—it has not filtered down to the people. In 1990, 48 percent of the population lived below the poverty line. Today that figure is nearly 55 percent—a majority of Kenyans living on, at best, a couple dollars a day. Growing unemployment sends more restless people to the streets, fueling tribal tensions.

When an election approached and voters had an opportunity to hold Kibaki accountable for these failings, polls showed his opponent—Raila Odinga, from a rival tribe—in the lead. Hope for change turned to anger, however, when, after various reports of vote fraud emerged (some constituencies had suspiciously remarkable voter turnout, for example—115 percent in one case), Kibaki was declared the winner and hastily sworn into his second term that very day. Soon, the streets exploded with violence.

Sadly, Kenya is just one in a litany of stories across Africa that all have the same moral: Democracy is betraying its promises. In country after country, this betrayal creates disillusionment and despair, which then give way to mayhem.

Andrew Feinstein declares, in relation to the most successful of African nations, South Africa, that “the country is in desperate need of focused, enlightened and efficient government to address the linked catastrophes of AIDS, poverty and crime” (Prospect, January 2008).

Enlightened observers of the African scene similarly agree that the problem—continent-wide—is a lack of effective, efficient, responsible governance.

The time is fast approaching when that government will be imposed from the outside.

Cancer spreading on the continent

There is truth to the idea that the world tends to overlook Africa’s crises. In recent African hotspots, slow Western reaction enabled problems to balloon into catastrophes. Think Rwanda, Congo, Darfur.
However, Africa is at or near the top of a number of international to-do lists, and it is claiming more attention all the time. United Nations’ peacekeeping forces are crawling all over Kenya’s troubled neighborhood. The UN sponsors a remarkable eight missions in Africa, and the growing numbers of blue helmets are already at record numbers. Africa presently demands the attention of two thirds of all UN forces in the world.

And these struggles won’t simmer down anytime soon. Political instability and tribal conflict seem to be spreading across Africa like cancer, generating fresh supplies of migrants, refugees and dead bodies on what seems like a monthly basis. The Darfur disaster, despite the presence of nearly 20,000 peacekeepers, has spilled into neighboring nations, aggravating existing troubles in Somalia. Over 200,000 Sudanese refugees have also fled into Chad and the Central African Republic; the resulting violence has opened the door for the European Union to start building a 3,700-member peacekeeping force in those two nations. Foreign peacekeepers also find themselves trying to keep a lid on political turmoil in Côte d’Ivoire, and on rising border tensions between Ethiopia and Eritrea. Foreign deployments patrol disturbances in Western Sahara, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Liberia. Sub-Saharan Africa hosts 10 foreign military bases and training missions, six of them belonging to France alone.

The calls for intervention we heard regarding the situation in Kenya were the latest in an astonishing trend. After decades of independence following colonial rule, Africa is in danger of being reconquered.

The humanitarian duties being undertaken by today’s peacekeeping forces may have an aura of benignity, even righteousness. But history teaches a brutal lesson: Peoples weakened by division and infighting invite foreign conquest.

A Black Gold Mine
Look around. The same forces that fueled past imperialistic adventures are alive and well in human nature today. Chief among these is the lust for resources. And in our voracious, globalized modern world, this powerful motivator is at historically epic heights.

Africa holds an estimated 30 percent of the world’s mineral reserves. It produces over 60 metal and mineral products. A number of the world’s most important metals and minerals—gold, diamonds, uranium, manganese, chromium, nickel, bauxite, cobalt, platinum—are produced in Africa. But the biggest prize: Crude oil is being discovered in massive amounts. The Corporate Council on Africa reports that Africa contains over 90 billion barrels of proven oil reserves, representing 9.1 percent of the world’s total reserves. Africa has greater oil production potential than Russia. To outsiders, it looks like a black gold mine.

You can be sure, this makes Africa a major strategic concern.

Clearly, outside nations—particularly China and those in Europe—are doing all they can to charm African states out of their wealth using purely economic incentives. Trade is flourishing, investment is building African infrastructure. Louis Michel, the EU’s commissioner for Development and Humanitarian Assistance, said in December, “Africa is no longer perceived as a burden but rather as an opportunity.”

That opportunity can be seized peacefully as long as those African states are stable and secure. But when chaos erupts such as that in Kenya, other nations see two things that compel them to intervene: loss of value in their investments, and an opportunity to assert control and stake a greater claim.

It is within this context that the competition for Africa’s rich resources and cheap labor force is heating up. There is a new scramble for Africa. It is a new wave of colonization, first through aid, economics and diplomacy, then by force of arms.

And from any objective point of view, Africa is in no condition to resist what’s coming.

Recolonization
Europe in particular has a storied history of exploiting the African continent for its wealth. “Europeans overwhelmed [Africa] in the last quarter of the 19th century, looking for loot,” wrote Blaine Harden. “Total conquest took all of about 25 years” (Africa: Dispatches From a Fragile Continent).

In colonial days, an “imperial contract” existed between Europe and Africa: Europe plundered Africa’s wealth, including raw materials and labor, in exchange for continental “civilization.” During World War I, Hitler’s economy minister looked to revive and expand that contract, calling it “Eurafrique,” or Eur-Africa. Mussolini and France’s Vichy regime also used the term. It was buried in the 1970s. Memories of that unsavory past came to life just last year, however, when French President Nicolas Sarkozy revived the concept as part of his foreign-policy vision. South Africa’s Sunday Independent reported, “Sarkozy may have used the term Eurafrique out of ignorance of the past, but it represents a lingering state of mind that many hoped was gone forever” (Dec. 9, 2007). Hope as many might, the Eurafrique concept does linger in European minds. And it will grow as the need for resources grows.

Note the following comments from a February interview with a German diplomat conducted by one of Germany’s foremost news sources. Deutsche Welle stated, “Europe is paying more attention to both the potential and the problems of Africa. … Horst Köhler recently made his fifth trip to Africa as Germany’s president. … Germany has been very present in Africa and is increasing its activities there.” German Foreign Undersecretary Georg Börmagarden commented, “[I]n the future we’ll be increasingly connected to [nations in Africa] by the need for natural resources and other interests. In terms of development, we’ve been active for a long time in Africa. But in 2008 we’re beginning a special program. … [W]e’re looking for more dialogue with Africa” (February 17).

Journalists at the German Foreign Policy agency recognize Germany’s heightening interest in Africa. They say the German Foreign Office’s Africa policy demonstrates a desire to expand its imperialist interests into that continent. “The German Foreign Ministry has presented a new continental political program to aid in its struggle to obtain hegemony over Africa. Over the past three days, the €20 million program ‘Action Africa’ was introduced in three West African states. The program consists of proposals in the realm of education, culture and sports and will contribute to Germany’s advantage over its rivals among the world powers on this continent rich in resources” (February 13).

This time, the competition for Africa’s resources is not so much among individual European powers as it is among China, Russia and the European Union, spearheaded by Germany. Of these three powers, Germany is most determined to lead in the race for Africa’s raw materials and cheap labor pool. As German Foreign Poli-
It will Never Happen Here

The most chilling prophecy to be fulfilled in the near future, as the Trumpet has repeatedly proven, is that of a final resurrection of the Holy Roman Empire in Europe. Detailed passages in the book of Revelation describe the nature of this mighty kingdom of the north. This German-led empire will become infamous for its voracious appetite for resources (e.g. Revelation 18:12-13). It is prophesied to corporately reinvent its old African colonial possessions, pillaging resources to feed the furnaces and drive the machinery that will turn out tools of war for a remilitarizing imperialist power. Shamefully, among those resources will be a slave market of unprecedented proportions.

The affluent, complacent West looks at Kenya and thinks, It will never happen here. Biblical prophecy shows that assumption is flat wrong.

“Kenya’s struggles to implement a functional democracy are nothing new on the African continent.

In Nigeria, national elections in April 2007 were plagued by fraud. It was hoped that elections in 1991, the first in 16 years, would introduce a new democratic era. That optimistic idea suffered a bad bruising in last year’s elections. Human Rights Watch observers reported widespread problems including intimidation of voters, vote-rigging and -buying, and bloodshed. European Union observers said the election process “cannot be considered to have been credible.”

While the election for leadership of South Africa’s African National Congress in December ousted a man who failed to deliver on his promises to his people, it brought to power a man with questionable character who faces criminal charges. And though some may laud this leadership change as democratic progress, South Africa itself is more or less a one-party state, with theANC elites quickly running the country into the ground.

The ruling party in Zimbabwe, which has been in power for 28 years, also had a congress in December, in which Robert Mugabe’s candidacy for this year’s presidential election was endorsed, making an utter mockery of democracy. The Zimbabwe Independent reported, “Mugabe secured his endorsement after distributing cars and farming equipment to traditional chiefs and party members and used war veterans through their leader Jabulani Sibanda last month to organize the so-called million-man march to garner support for him” (Dec. 21, 2007).

In theory, democracy should protect against such political strong-arming. In Africa, though, democracy—or the trappings of it—generally only protects the flow of foreign aid into government coffers. And it also spins nice new invisible robes of legitimacy for the continent’s emperors.

The picture that Aidan Hartley portrays of political campaigning in Kenya is depressing in its continuing repetition elsewhere across Africa. “In the election campaign rallies I attended there were no debates about policies, despite the huge health, education, security and poverty problems. The Big Men arrived in helicopters hired at £1,000 an hour to address voters in slums and forest clearings … Praise singers kowtowed to the Big Men, who dozed, talked on their mobile phones and then waddled back to their helicopters, which blew dust into the faces of the poor on take-off” (Spectator, January 9).

Examples of free and fair elections facilitating the peaceful transition of authority from one leader to the next—the basic promise of a functional democracy—are simply dwarfed by examples of this fragile process being thwarted by various forms of corruption. Many are the ways in which those hungry for power—particularly those determined to retain power—can vigorously manipulate and exploit this system in their own self-interest.

Little wonder, then, that a brief stint of democracy in Kenya did not bring the freedom people wanted. That is why, in Nigeria, just 35 percent of the people support democracy. It is also why, out of the 48 countries in sub-Saharan Africa—although all but five had at least one multi-party election in the decade leading up to 2004—not one could inarguably be considered a successful, functioning democracy.

The most common form of governmental change among these nations, in fact, has been the coup. Only one—Côte d’Ivoire—has been free of a coup attempt. In the post-colonial generation between 1957 to 1990, Blain Hadden reported in Africa: Dispatches From a Fragile Continent, “Not one African head of state, even in nations that tolerate a measure of democracy, has permitted voters to end his reign. … Excepting four civilian presidents who chose to retire and a handful who were lucky enough to die in office of noncoup causes, all the others have been assassinated, jailed or exiled.”

Democracy is a concept that no African nation has been able to effectively embrace. In essence, post-colonialism has failed in Africa.

JOEL HILLIKER

The Failure of African Democracy

KENYA’S struggles to implement a functional democracy are nothing new on the African continent.

In Nigeria, national elections in April 2007 were plagued by fraud. It was hoped that elections in 1991, the first in 16 years, would introduce a new democratic era. That optimistic idea suffered a bad bruising in last year’s elections. Human Rights Watch observers reported widespread problems including intimidation of voters, vote-rigging and -buying, and bloodshed. European Union observers said the election process “cannot be considered to have been credible.”

While the election for leadership of South Africa’s African National Congress in December ousted a man who failed to deliver on his promises to his people, it brought to power a man with questionable character who faces criminal charges. And though some may laud this leadership change as democratic progress, South Africa itself is more or less a one-party state, with the ANC elites quickly running the country into the ground.

The ruling party in Zimbabwe, which has been in power for 28 years, also had a congress in December, in which Robert Mugabe’s candidacy for this year’s presidential election was endorsed, making an utter mockery of democracy. The Zimbabwe Independent reported, “Mugabe secured his endorsement after distributing cars and farming equipment to traditional chiefs and party members and used war veterans through their leader Jabulani Sibanda last month to organize the so-called million-man march to garner support for him” (Dec. 21, 2007).

In theory, democracy should protect against such political strong-arming. In Africa, though, democracy—or the trappings of it—generally only protects the flow of foreign aid into government coffers. And it also spins nice new invisible robes of legitimacy for the continent’s emperors.

The picture that Aidan Hartley portrays of political campaigning in Kenya is depressing in its continuing repetition elsewhere across Africa. “In the election campaign rallies I attended there were no debates about policies, despite the huge health, education, security and poverty problems. The Big Men arrived in helicopters hired at £1,000 an hour to address voters in slums and forest clearings … Praise singers kowtowed to the Big Men, who dozed, talked on their mobile phones and then waddled back to their helicopters, which blew dust into the faces of the poor on take-off” (Spectator, January 9).

Examples of free and fair elections facilitating the peaceful transition of authority from one leader to the next—the basic promise of a functional democracy—are simply dwarfed by examples of this fragile process being thwarted by various forms of corruption. Many are the ways in which those hungry for power—particularly those determined to retain power—can vigorously manipulate and exploit this system in their own self-interest.

Little wonder, then, that a brief stint of democracy in Kenya did not bring the freedom people wanted. That is why, in Nigeria, just 35 percent of the people support democracy. It is also why, out of the 48 countries in sub-Saharan Africa—although all but five had at least one multi-party election in the decade leading up to 2004—not one could inarguably be considered a successful, functioning democracy.

The most common form of governmental change among these nations, in fact, has been the coup. Only one—Côte d’Ivoire—has been free of a coup attempt. In the post-colonial generation between 1957 to 1990, Blain Hadden reported in Africa: Dispatches From a Fragile Continent, “Not one African head of state, even in nations that tolerate a measure of democracy, has permitted voters to end his reign. … Excepting four civilian presidents who chose to retire and a handful who were lucky enough to die in office of noncoup causes, all the others have been assassinated, jailed or exiled.”

Democracy is a concept that no African nation has been able to effectively embrace. In essence, post-colonialism has failed in Africa.
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handshake were Rabin’s way of establishing common ground between Israel and its “inner circle” of neighbors—nations he believed were equally threatened by that outer circle. Rabin was trying, Avner said, to “find some kind of dialogue with the secular, nationalist movement, as opposed to those who are doing their level best to theologize the conflict.”

That might sound reasonable, but Mr. Avner completely misses the point! The real story from 1993 is not that Rabin identified the outer circle as Israel’s greatest security threat. It’s that he turned to the inner circle for help—to Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Authority in particular.

“Why would Israelis trust the greatest terrorist in the Middle East, Yasser Arafat, to protect them from terrorism?” I asked in April 1996. “They have more than enough power to protect themselves. But they lack the will to use it!”

Look at what negotiating with Yasser Arafat has brought upon Israel. Giving the Palestinian Authority self-governing powers in the West Bank led to the second intifada, forcing Israel to begin constructing a 465-mile security barrier. The Lebanon withdrawal triggered the Second Lebanon War and Israel’s embarrassing retreat in the summer of 2006. And pulling out of Gaza cleared the way for the violent emergence of “Hamastan,” which rules the Gaza Strip today.

The Israeli government says it must negotiate now because of the meteoric rise of radical Islam. It wants to make more peace pacts with less-violent terrorists like Fatah. But how important are those peace agreements? The Palestinians have broken virtually every one of them!

How pathetically weak is Israel to trust its enemies by giving them land for empty promises.

There is a Wondrous Hope
The Jews have given Hebron to the Palestinians. King David ruled there during his first seven years as king. He ruled his remaining 33 years in Jerusalem.

Jewish leaders have discussed giving up East Jerusalem to the Arabs. That would even include the City of David, just south of the Temple Mount. It certainly seems that some Jewish leaders would even be willing to surrender that area from where David ruled Israel.

David’s throne was in his massive palace. In the last two years, the walls of that palace have been uncovered by Dr. Eilat Mazar. In some places the walls are 16 feet thick!

There is proof galore that the great King David really lived and won his many wars!

He didn’t enter into one peace pact with his vile enemies. By faith, he conquered his warring adversaries!

And here is the real shocker. The Old Testament teaches us that David is about to be resurrected in these latter days and rule over Israel again! (Jeremiah 30:9).

Does Israel—or America—believe that astounding history and prophecy? Most people are intensely embarrassed by such teachings.

Therein lies the problem! The suffering won’t stop until we have more of the faith that David had.

It is not that difficult to prove that the Bible is God’s inspired Word. But who believes it?

The history of David reveals how to solve the terrorist problem. It contains a message of splendid hope. In 1948 many Jews believed in their Bibles. Few do today. They often scoff at the words in their own Bibles. Their faith is degenerating before our eyes. The Oslo Accord is a classic example of their lack of faith. Before long, their faith will be restored. But they will have to suffer until they learn that lesson. It is what their trials today are all about.

Are we too sophisticated today to choose King David and his way of life? Presently, America and Israel are choosing the Oslo Accord and the way of death.
Was the decision to invade Iraq
America’s Foreign-Po Blunder?

IRAQ WAS THE SINGLE worst strategic mistake in American history.” So says former American Vice President Al Gore.

Victor Davis Hanson points out several similar statements by high-profile U.S. leaders. “Senate majority leader Harry Reid agrees that the war he voted to authorize is ‘the worst foreign-policy mistake in U.S. history,’ and indeed is already ‘lost.’ Many of our historically minded politicians and commanders have weighed in with similar superlatives. Retired General William Odom calls Iraq ‘the greatest strategic disaster in United States history.’ Senator Chuck Hagel (who voted for the war) is somewhat more cautious; he terms Iraq ‘the most dangerous foreign-policy blunder in this country since Vietnam . . .’” (Claremont Review of Books, Winter 2007/08).

Well—is Iraq the single worst mistake in American history, or are these opinions the result of a failure to grasp just where the Iraq war fits within the context of the total, albeit brief, history of the greatest single nation on Earth?

We put forward the case that the Iraq war and its unfortunate outcome are but the effect of a greater cause. We posit that the apparent cause of this war and of much of what then led to the present difficulties in the Middle East was in fact a foreign-policy blunder by the United States made in the mid-20th century. The eventual outcome of that error will render insignificant the war instigated by the U.S. on Jan. 16, 1991, whose effects continue to ripple on at massive expense to the American nation 17 years later. In fact, we propose that the continuing conflicts in the Middle East result from the fulfillment of an ancient biblical prophecy.

A Turning Point
Cast your mind back to 1956. At that juncture, Britain was still struggling to put its economy back together following the ravages of two world wars fought within 21 years of each other at massive cost in both lives and treasure. In 1947, India, the “jewel in Britain’s crown,” became independent from the British Commonwealth and Empire. In 1948, the 11-month siege of Berlin by the Soviet Union had the world’s attention riveted on the escalating tension between the Western allies and the USSR. In 1950, Asia became the focus, as the Korean War ravaged the Korean peninsula for the ensuing three years. In 1954, the seeds of an even worse war in Vietnam were sown as France’s Asian colonies collapsed into disorder in Indochina and the U.S. began aiding the South against North Vietnam. In 1955, the Warsaw Pact was signed by the Soviet Union and other socialist states, beginning a 35-year standoff with the NATO alliance. In 1955, the Alabama bus boycott triggered great social disruption between black and white in America.

At this point, the U.S. was well and truly engaged—its military strength shoring up the West in Europe, training the South Vietnamese Army in Asia, and still deployed in strength in Japan and the Philippines, and its National Guard beginning to be rolled out to contain racial disruption at home.

Then on July 26, 1956, Gamul Abdul Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal. This is the vital choke point through which much of Middle Eastern oil transits to the Northern and Southern Hemispheres. Israel, Britain and France invaded Egypt in response. The USSR threatened to intervene on the
side of the Egyptians. President Eisenhower threatened a nuclear retaliation if it did. But Eisenhower was an anti-imperialist, intent on seeing Britain, the last of the great colonial powers, divest itself of its empire. Instead of backing his British, French and Israeli allies, Eisenhower forced a cease-fire upon them, thereby yielding up control of the world’s most vital sea gate to a declared enemy of the West.

Ever since, the Middle East has been a theater of escalating conflict, embroiling the U.S. in continuing aggressive and often misguided diplomacy to this very day.

One has to wonder, if America had backed its allies at that crucial moment in history when Suez was up for grabs, would the U.S. and Britain be involved in Iraq, let alone in Afghanistan, and worrying about the intentions of Iran and Syria today? Would Israel have had to fight a war in 1967 and again in 1973 in order to survive as a nation? Would the U.S. have reneged on its commitment as an ally of the shah of Persia and let him be deposed, thereby sowing the seeds for the rise of a nuclear-powered Iran set to control the Middle East in the not-too-distant future, to the great peril of Israel and the West? Would we have ever heard of the Palestinian Liberation Army, Hamas, Fatah, al Qaeda and all their clones? Would we even have a need for a theater of escalating conflict, embroiling the U.S. and Britain be involved in Iraq, let alone in Afghanistan, and worrying about the intentions of Iran and Syria today?

One has to wonder, if America had backed its allies at that crucial moment in history when Suez was up for grabs, would the U.S. and Britain be involved in Iraq, let alone in Afghanistan, and worrying about the intentions of Iran and Syria today? Would Israel have had to fight a war in 1967 and again in 1973 in order to survive as a nation? Would the U.S. have reneged on its commitment as an ally of the shah of Persia and let him be deposed, thereby sowing the seeds for the rise of a nuclear-powered Iran set to control the Middle East in the not-too-distant future, to the great peril of Israel and the West? Would we have ever heard of the Palestinian Liberation Army, Hamas, Fatah, al Qaeda and all their clones? Would we even have a need for a theater of escalating conflict, embroiling the U.S. and Britain be involved in Iraq, let alone in Afghanistan, and worrying about the intentions of Iran and Syria today?

Almost 4,000 years ago, Almighty God prophesied that the British would possess the major sea gates of the world. Then, well over 3,000 years ago, He prophesied the subsequent loss of those sea gates due to the failure of the recipients of His blessings to acknowledge their source and submit to the law that would have guaranteed their continuance. These pivotal biblical prophecies are explained in The United States and Britain in Prophecy.

Both of those prophecies have been fulfilled.

Beginning with its victories in the great sea battles against the Spanish and French in the 17th and 18th centuries, Great Britain went on to rule the waves in the 19th and early 20th centuries by virtue of its possession of every major sea gate on the planet. By the end of the 20th century, apart from Gibraltar and the Falkland Islands, Britain had lost control of those vital sea gates.

Yet the greatest strategic loss, not only to Britain, but to the rest of the free world, was the loss of the Suez Canal. With that loss came the loss of any prospect of peace in the Middle East.

"Shrill Captives of the Present"

Either ignorant or forgetful of that history, not even aware of the inevitable impact those powerful prophecies have had on world events of today, we remain fixated on the daily news from Baghdad, unable to really figure why we are there, how we got there, and what the true outcome will be. As Hanson opines, "[W]e seem to think our generation is unique in experiencing the heartbreak of an error-plagued war. We forget that victory in every war goes to the side that commits fewer mistakes—and learns more from them in less time—not to the side that makes no mistakes. A perfect military in a flawless war never existed—though after Grenada and the air war over the Balkans we apparently thought otherwise. Rather than sink into unending recrimination over Iraq, we should reflect about comparable blunders in America’s past wars …. Without such historical knowledge we are condemned to remain shrill captives of the present" (ibid.).

Thus it was that America gave away its greatest sea gate, the Panama Canal, almost half a century after its failure to help secure Suez. The U.S., and indeed the whole world, will live to regret those two great foreign-policy tragedies. The failure to learn from the Suez blunder led to the Panama debacle. The loss of that sovereign American territory is bound to have consequences similar to those of Suez in the near future.

So it is that we continue making the same old mistakes, condemning our enemies on the one hand, appeasing them on the other. Our past foreign-policy errors led to a compounding of those errors in the present, in turn leading to inevitable failure in the future.

Will we ever learn the way to peace?

The plain answer, according to biblical prophecy, is a resounding YES! As usual, we shall have to do it the hard way. Yet in the end it will be worth the ordeal. But first we shall have to endure the heartbreak of seeing our free nations descend into unspeakable conditions at the hands of the tyrant. It’s going to be a hard history we write through this decade and into the next. Yet, it will end with an unbelievably positive outcome.

To come to grips with the history of the past, to really appreciate what is occurring on the volatile world scene today, and to fully grasp the potential the future holds, request your own free copy of The United States and Britain in Prophecy. That book will open your mind, allowing you the opportunity to change from being a mere “captive of the present” to one who has real confidence in the marvelous future that lies ahead of the present global world disorder. It points to a vision of real hope that will take your breath away!
Less than a year before he died, Mr. Armstrong summed up his prophetic message in a letter on Feb. 25, 1985. "For more than 40 years now the Plain Truth has been proclaiming an outstanding series of Bible prophecies of something due soon to occur in Europe that will change the whole world and shake up the lives of every one of us." He continued, "Daniel's prophecy in chapter 2 pictures 10 nations in Europe in our time right now, as the 10 toes on the two feet of the great symbolic image. Five of those toes picture five nations in Western Europe and five in Eastern Europe. Then is pictured a great stone, representing Christ at His soon Second Coming, smiting those toes, and coming to rule in the Kingdom of God over all those and all other nations on Earth. This is further explained in the 17th chapter of Revelation, depicting those 10 nations of Europe uniting under the Roman Catholic Church. In the last decade certain leaders in Europe have been working feverishly to bring about such a reuniting of Europe."

The prophesied rise of a European beast power—a teaching that embarrassed the Tkaches—was the beating heart of Mr. Armstrong's prophetic teachings. He continued in that same letter, "For some reason God has been holding back the fulfillment of this prophecy—but it is certain to occur!” God had been holding back the final development of this Euroforce, according to Mr. Armstrong. He then wrote, "Meanwhile God’s work is growing now as never before… I am now hard at work on a new book. It probably will be the largest and most important book I have ever written. The title is Mystery of the Ages."

While events were held back in Europe, they had accelerated in the church. Mr. Armstrong was hard at work on the most important book of his life.

In Mystery of the Ages, Mr. Armstrong set out to explain the biblical truth about seven great mysteries man has not been able to solve: the mystery of God, the truth about angels and evil spirits, the mystery of man, of civilization, Israel, the true Church and, finally, the mystery of the Kingdom of God. "These are the seven great mysteries that concern the very lives of every human being on Earth," Mr. Armstrong wrote in the preface of the book. “The plain truth of all these mysteries is revealed in the Bible, but none of the churches or theologians seem to have comprehended them.”

"Why?” he asked. Because “the Bible is the basic mystery of all.”

In April 1985, Joseph Tkach Sr. told the ministers he believed Mystery of the Ages would "prove to be another major step forward for God’s Church and the spreading of the gospel around the world.”

That same pgr also reported that Mr. Armstrong’s February 25 letter brought in the "highest response in several months." According to Richard Rice, many recipients wrote Mr. Armstrong to tell him they were eagerly looking forward to reading Mystery of the Ages.

Mr. Armstrong finished writing Mystery of the Ages on May 14, 1985. A few weeks later, on June 7, Mr. Tkach told ministers that they needed to constantly review the doctrines that had been restored to the church through Mr. Armstrong. He then referred to Mystery of the Ages and said "this is a book that should be reread as soon as we finish it the first time, in order to really soak up what God is teaching us.”

When Mr. Armstrong handed out new copies of Mystery of the Ages to the sophomore class at Ambassador College in Sep-
At the end of his life, without question, Mr. Armstrong considered **Mystery of the Ages** the most important and significant work available within the Worldwide Church of God. Even Mr. Tkach said so for at least a year after Mr. Armstrong died.

“He met with several people from Editorial periodically to review the design, the paper stock, the typestyle and finally, the cover.” Mr. Armstrong considered these details extremely important because of his expansive plans for the book. For the cover jacket, he wanted something that looked regal, so he chose a deep shade of purple that had to be specially mixed at the printer. The title was printed with raised lettering, embossed in gold. The church printed 150,000 copies of the hardback version and hired a New York publishing house—Dodd, Mead—to coordinate the book’s distribution.

The hardback copies were distributed to wcg members as well as regular donors and co-workers who supported the church. The church also produced a paperback version and advertised it in the *Plain Truth*, which had a circulation of about 8 million. It offered free copies by letter to 480,000 Good News subscribers as well as to viewers of the *World Tomorrow* television program. A condensed version (and corrupt, we later discovered) of the book ran serially in the *Plain Truth*’s seven different language editions.

To reach an audience outside the church’s sphere of influence, Mr. Armstrong offered the hardback version in bookstores for $12.95. “This presents the book to an audience that possibly would not read or treat seriously literature received free of charge,” wrote Michael Snyder in the *Worldwide News*. The church then spent $400,000 to advertise the book—the largest advertising campaign ever for any church literature. It placed full-page ads in 27 major newspapers, including the *Wall Street Journal*, *USA Today* and the *Saturday Evening Post*. It also advertised in *Newsweek* and several other magazines and journals. The ad explained “why *Mystery of the Ages* could be one of the most important books of our day” and informed readers that the book was available in bookstores.

In the church’s 1985 *Behind the Work* video, the narrator noted, “Every effort is being made to make *Mystery of the Ages* available to the widest possible audience.” This is what Mr. Armstrong wanted for a book this important. He wrote to church members and co-workers in September 1985, “We want to reach the largest audience possible with this book. I know you will feel the same way when you read it.” For a short while at least, it seemed like Mr. Tkach felt that way as well.

**“MUCH WIDER AUDIENCE”**

For at least 12 months after Mr. Armstrong’s death, Tkach Sr. heaped praise on the book. On Jan. 16, 1986—the day Mr. Armstrong died—Mr. Tkach told members and co-workers, “Even in the last year of his life, with declining strength, he completed with God’s help, his most powerful and effective book, *Mystery of the Ages.*” Later that year, Mr. Tkach wrote in the *Plain Truth*, “Although in declining health, and for all practical purposes blind, Mr. Armstrong persevered during the last year of his life to complete this, his last book.

---

**“LARGEST AUDIENCE POSSIBLE”**

“You could say that Mr. Armstrong was the art director as well as the author,” said Greg Smith, the book’s designer.
One of his last public appearances was to present it to the students of Ambassador College.

“But he also wanted to make it available to a much wider audience. He decided *Mystery of the Ages* should be published by installments in the Plain Truth—a parting gift to the millions he had served through radio, television and the printed word during his long life.”

Mr. Tkach acknowledged that Mr. Armstrong wanted the book distributed far beyond church boundaries—that he viewed the book as a parting gift for “millions.” So Mr. Armstrong approved the serialization project and also the bookstore distribution, the advertising campaign, the press release and the direct mail and *World Tomorrow* offers. Tkach continued, “Shortly before he died, he said he had understood more in the last 10 years of his long life than in all the previous decades.

“*Mystery of the Ages* is the product of that understanding. Mr. Armstrong did not underestimate the importance of this last work, for it contained vital keys to understanding the plan of God as revealed in the Bible. *Mystery of the Ages* in a very real sense was a last will and testament, to be passed on to those who would value it. As we come to the last installment of this remarkable book, we gratefully acknowledge our indebtedness to Herbert W. Armstrong, and his dogged search for the truth. He freely shared his understanding with us, and we have been privileged to make it available to you. He loved and respected his readers and, in a figurative sense, he remembered you in his will.”

A year and a half later, Mr. Tkach retired the book from circulation permanently and trashed 120,000 copies left in storage. But not for the Philadelphia Church of God, today Mr. Armstrong’s last will and testament would be all but obsolete.

**OUR BIG DAY**

When Mr. Armstrong handed out new copies of his book to the sophomore class on Sept. 9, 1985, he nearly shed a tear as he asked, “Will you forgive me if I get a little bit of a thrill that this book is done—that this book is out now? Today is a pretty big day in my life, when I can hand copies of this book out to each of you.”

Our “big day” came 11 years later, on Dec. 20, 1996, when we received our first copy of *Mystery of the Ages*—reprinted for the first time by the Philadelphia Church of God. For about a year, my father had seriously considered the move. He had discussed the subject with a few of us ministers at PCG headquarters in Edmond.

He advised me to contact a Washington, D.C., copyright attorney who had been referred to us by the husband of our television time-buying agent. I contacted him by phone in November 1996 and explained our situation as thoroughly and succinctly as possible. I told him that we would most likely move forward on the project, but wanted to get some legal advice before proceeding further. While he didn’t offer his opinion on the legalities of printing a discontinued work we didn’t technically own, he did tell us that if we chose to move forward, we should prepare for the possibility of litigation.

I asked him how we should handle the copyright notice at the front of the book, which read “© Worldwide Church of God.” For obvious reasons, we didn’t want to print it that way. The attorney said that the copyright notice itself was of no special significance. The only issue, he told us, would be that of false attribution. In other words, by putting the PCG on the copyright notice, they could argue in court that they were falsely attributed to the reprinting project. We were happy with that since we didn’t want their name attached to the project anyway. But neither did we want to give the impression that we owned the copyright (although we certainly believed we were the rightful owners of the material spiritually), which is why we didn’t want to include the PCG’s name on the notice. So we opted for “© Herbert W. Armstrong.”

A few weeks after that phone call, my father and I met with Mark Carroll, the prepress production manager for the church’s publications at that time. He worked for a printer in Arkansas, and my dad wanted to know if he would be interested in accepting the project. Mr. Carroll, a PCG member, was thrilled by the prospect of resurrecting Mr. Armstrong’s body of literature. He gladly accepted and, by the end of that meeting, we ordered 20,000 copies of the book. We told Mr. Carroll to be discreet about the project, as we wanted to catch the WCg by surprise and make as big of a splash as possible at the start.

We didn’t have the money to produce a hardback version, but we modeled our softbound after Mr. Armstrong’s hardback in size and in number of pages. And, of course, we used the text from the hardback version as well, since the Tkaches had corrupted the softbound and serial versions.

The day we received our first copy from Mr. Carroll, we happened to be finalizing edits for the January 1997 *Trumpet*. We didn’t count on the *Mystery* print run finishing as soon as it did, so we didn’t have anything prepared for that January issue officially announcing this tremendous step forward for our work. We decided at the last minute, however, to at least produce a back cover ad offering our readers, for the first time ever, a free copy of *Mystery of the Ages*. It was Headlined “Solve the Mystery!”

Mr. Carroll told us the *Trumpet* would not arrive in mailboxes until mid-January. So we had a couple more weeks until we absolutely had to say something. Our own church members, let alone the Worldwide Church of God, had no idea all this was going on.
At church services on Jan. 4, 1997, my father held up a large book and excitedly told our brethren, "This is the Mystery of the Ages—our version of it." As he proceeded to tell the members about the ad to appear on the back page of the next Trumpet, gasps of amazement rippled through the meeting hall. He said, "Today we have decided to print that book and give it away free, and just simply take the consequences—if there are any. And that will be, of course, entirely up to God." Later, he told members he was more concerned about the consequences for not printing the book than he was for printing it. This is a theme that would surface time and again over the next six years: taking the battle to the wcg with offensive strikes. "We will do what has to be done," my father said, "and then the ball is in [the wcg's] court, as they say.

The other theme that would play out during that same period was faith. My father said in the sermon, "I feel that Jesus Christ is not going to tolerate that book not being printed any longer. I believe that. And I'm willing to base a lot on that." Later, he exclaimed enthusiastically, "That book belongs to us! God says so. And God will back and support us. He's promised to do that." From the beginning, my father charged ahead with the full assurance that God was on our side. Added to that, we firmly believed that by suppressing the work of Mr. Armstrong, the wcg's actions violated the Constitution. But however this might unfold in a court of law, it was secondary to the premise underlying our action from the beginning—that God wanted Mr. Armstrong's teaching disseminated.

The Trumpet at that time had a modest circulation of nearly 60,000. Once subscribers started receiving their issue in mid-January, the requests for Mystery started pouring in. In the first week after the ad hit, we received 2,000 requests for the book.

Soon after the Mystery ad first appeared on the back cover of the Trumpet, we prepared something much more substantial for our seven-year anniversary issue in February. We put a picture of the book on the cover, over the headline, "Where We Are Going!" My father titled his Personal "The Largest Audience Possible." In it, he described a "new phase" for our work, where the focus of our message would now be aimed primarily at the world, as opposed to members and former members of the Worldwide Church of God. He wrote, "Mystery of the Ages was like the magnificent summary of all Mr. Armstrong’s work—the accumulated knowledge of his entire ministry. This book, more than any other piece of literature, was what Mr. Armstrong and God’s work were about. … Mr. Armstrong wanted it to reach 'the largest audience possible.'… I believe 'the largest audience possible' should become our battle cry today! … This is our most critical hour. We must pick up the dropped baton and finish the gun lap! We must stretch and strain to win the greatest race we will ever run!” (emphasis in original).

This became our battle cry in 1997: THE LARGEST AUDIENCE POSSIBLE. It was what Mr. Armstrong wanted all along. To think about what might have been, had the Tkaches just followed in Mr. Armstrong’s footsteps, as the elder Tkach said he would do at Mr. Armstrong’s funeral. It agonizes us to think about what the wcg could have done—with Mr. Armstrong’s well-established, decades-long track record and all the personnel, resources, tools and income the church had at its disposal when Mr. Armstrong died. As it was, Tkachism quickly turned all the advantages of that multi-million-dollar media empire against its founder’s message—even to the point of destroying Mystery of the Ages within 32 months.

Delivering that message to the largest audience possible was now left to a faithful few who sought refuge from Tkachism inside the Philadelphia Church of God. Our work in 1997—even after seven years of steady, upward growth—was a microcosmic version of the work Mr. Armstrong gifted to Mr. Tkach in 1986. Reaching the whole world using only a fraction of the resources and power the church once had in Mr. Armstrong’s day would not be easy. And making matters more difficult, every step of our progress would be met with angry, hostile resistance by those bent on destroying Mr. Armstrong’s legacy and betraying his ideals.

WE WERE AT WAR! But we knew what we were fighting for. And we had a battle cry.

"Are you ready? Am I ready?” my father asked in his Trumpet Personal. “We have an unparalleled opportunity. In terms of numbers of people, we can be the fewest people to do the greatest work ever on this Earth!"
AFTER MONTHS OF SUSPENSE, KOSOVO finally declared independence. In a special session on February 17, the Kosovar parliament voted 109-0 in favor of severing ties with Serbia. “From now onward, Kosovo is proud, independent, sovereign and free,” said Prime Minister Hashim Thaci, a former anti-Serb guerrilla leader.

After the declaration, Thaci personally signed 192 letters to nations around the world asking them to recognize Kosovo as a sovereign state. Several nations accommodated his bold request. Others flatly refused.

The issue is far from being resolved. In fact, it contains the seed of a dramatic conflict between rising world powers.

Russia’s Response
Serbia remains strongly opposed to Kosovo’s independence. Serbian President Boris Tadic said that “Serbia will … do everything in its power to revoke the unilateral and illegal declaration of independence.” In its attempts to reverse Kosovo’s declaration, Serbia is relying mainly on Russia.

A week after Kosovo’s unilateral declaration, the Kremlin sent two representatives to Serbia to implement what could be a major move by Moscow against the West over Kosovo’s independence. The representatives weren’t lightweights, either. The first was Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov. The second was Dmitry Medvedev—who is now president-elect of Russia.

“Serbia is a single state whose jurisdiction is stretching through its entire territory,” said Medvedev during a meeting with Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica February 25. “We will stick to this as our principle in the future.”

In keeping with this Russian principle concerning the Serbian state, Medvedev not only reiterated Moscow’s refusal to recognize Kosovo, he and Lavrov stood right beside the Serbian prime minister as he declared Serbia’s intention to rule the parts of Kosovo where “loyal citizens” still looked to Belgrade for governance.

The “loyal citizens” that Kostunica referred to are most likely in Kosovo’s provinces of Leposavic, Zvecan and Zubin Potok. These provinces contain a Serbian majority, they directly abut Serbian territory, and they are largely separated from the rest of Kosovo by the Iber River (see map).

Lavrov followed Kostunica’s declaration with a warning to the West: Supporting Kosovo’s Albanians “will only lead to the creation of one more frozen conflict and will push the prospect of stabilizing Europe, and primarily stabilizing the Balkans, far away,” he said.

Russia and Serbia are sending a strong message to the European Union and the United States: If the West supports independence of Kosovo’s Albanians from Serbia, Russia will support the independence of Kosovo’s Serbs from Kosovo.

Bosnian Secession
Both the EU and NATO would be reluctant to see Kosovo split, but all in all the transfer of three small counties from Kosovo back to Serbia would be a relatively small retaliation for the humiliation both Russia and Serbia received when Kosovo declared independence.

But Moscow may have another more drastic option up its sleeve.

Since its 1992-1995 war, the former Yugoslav republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina has been composed of two largely autonomous states: the Serbian-run Republika Srpska and the Muslim-Croat Federation.

After February 17, more than 10,000 Bosnian Serbs took to the streets of their Bosnian stronghold, Banja Luka, to protest Kosovo’s declaration of independence. Most Bosnian Serbs now feel that they should be allowed to secede from Bosnia-Herzegovina and rejoin their Serbian motherland.

The protesters in Banja Luka cried, “We will not give the Serbian soul to the devil” and, “We want independence for Republika Srpska!”

These protests had far deeper roots than just mob indignation. Srpska Prime Minister Milorad Dodik fully supported the protest, telling the demonstrators, “This is a democratic, human revolt!” The Bosnian Serb parliament also came out against Kosovo’s independence and stated that Republika Srpska should secede from Bosnia if a significant part of the United
Nations and the EU recognize Kosovo. EU ambassadors to Bosnia strongly rejected such rhetoric, saying that these Serbs have no right to secede from Bosnia-Herzegovina under the peace deal that ended Bosnia’s war.

Nevertheless, Dodik made it a point to attend the February 25 meeting between Medvedev and the Serbian prime minister.

At that meeting, Medvedev stated that Serbia’s participation in Russia’s planned South Stream gas pipeline to southern Europe was an act of Russian support for Serbia over the Kosovo issue. “It is an element of our support—moral, material and economic—to a state which has found itself in a very difficult position and which—unfortunately, due to the will of some other countries—is being doubted as a single territorial entity,” he said.

Medvedev affirmed that Srpska—not all of Bosnia-Herzegovina, just Srpska—would be included in the Russian buy-up of most of the Serbian energy sector and in the proposed South Stream pipeline.

According to Stratfor, Srpska is a net energy exporter and really has no need for Russian gas. The fact that Dodik traveled all the way to Serbia to meet with Medvedev about a gas deal he does not need, combined with the fact that Dodik has expressed approval over Srpska secessionist the Serb-dominated counties of Kosovo with their Serbian motherland is a chance for Russia to get even with the EU and America over Kosovo’s declaration of independence.

EU’s Strategy: Divide and Conquer

Germany has been the driving force behind the dismemberment of Yugoslavia. In late 1991 and early 1992, Germany and the Vatican opposed the U.S., the UN and the European Economic Community and formally recognized the Yugoslavian breakaway states of Slovenia and Croatia. In 2003, Germany contributed more troops to NATO’s Bosnian peacekeeping force than any other nation.

After Yugoslavia lost Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia and Bosnia, Germany was still unsatisfied. It was intricately involved in the 1999 NATO bombings that gave Kosovo de facto independence. After Kosovo’s declaration of independence on February 17 this year, Germany was one of the first states to recognize Kosovo. Now most of Europe is following Germany’s lead.

“Why encourage separatism with the goal of creating a unified Europe?” Lavrov said after the secession.

Germany wants to get the former Yugoslav republics inside the EU. Berlin, however, could have brought Serbia into the Union without recognizing Kosovo’s independence. In fact, recognizing Kosovo’s independence has only made Serbia’s integration process harder, because many Serbs now fear the EU as a fascist entity trying to act against their interests. Recognizing Kosovo has only driven Serbia toward Russia.

But this is exactly what happened during World War II. Yugoslavia was divided over whether or not to support the Nazi regime. When the government, under heavy pressure, signed a pact with Hitler’s Germany, the people staged a coup, overthrew the government and set up an anti-fascist state. Hitler then invaded and conquered Yugoslavia. But he did not stop there. Germany ripped the nation into pieces, formed northern Yugoslavia into the Nazi-puppet state of Croatia, annexed Kosovo to Albania and imposed a German military command over Serbia. In short, he conquered Yugoslavia and divided it into so many pieces that he ensured it would no longer pose a threat to his regime.

The similarities to what European leaders are doing today—though far more subtly—are eerie. The EU is avoiding annexing Yugoslavia as one big chunk, preferring instead to once again rip it apart bit by bit and then swallow the chunks one by one. This way, when all the former Yugoslav states are finally part of the EU, none of them will have the power to cause undue trouble for Brussels—or Berlin.

German fascism is again conquering the Balkans. To some extent, Russia knows it. That explains why the Russians are so intent on supporting Serbia. If they can annex Serbian zones of former Yugoslav republics back to Serbia, they can make a run at forestalling Europe’s rise to power.

Sectarian violence will increase in Serbia, Bosnia and Kosovo as Russia and Europe compete for influence. But at the end of the day, Europe is already too entrenched in the former Yugoslav republics to lose out. Russia’s effort may pay off in other ways, but the European Union will remain the conqueror of the Balkans.

For more information on Germany’s role in the conquest of the Balkans, request your free copy of The Rising Beast—Germany’s Conquest of the Balkans by Trumpet editor in chief Gerald Flurry.
has blocked efforts to open up Alaska to oil drilling and placed a moratorium on new offshore drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. This is essentially neo-paganism masquerading as environmentalism—valuing animal life and raw wilderness over human welfare.

On top of these factors is the West’s sense of justice and fair play. To this point the West has chosen to accept paying oil-producers their asking price—however steep—without putting up a fight, despite its military superiority. Thus, Middle Eastern states are the beneficiaries of the Western liberalism they often so vehemently denounce.

All of these specific causes contribute to the crisis. But the reason they add up to the epic realignment of global wealth and power we see occurring today depends largely on the resource distribution we spoke of earlier.

The Muslim world has inherited its prosperity by providential design—in order to facilitate its biblically prophesied rise to global prominence. Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Egypt—these nations would never have registered a blip on the radar screen in modern times if not for their God-given oil wealth. Read our booklet The King of the South to see what a pivotal role they are prophesied to play in the time just ahead.

For the same reason, efforts to solve the problem by reversing Western dependence on foreign oil will always prove inadequate. At this stage, it is simply too little too late. The die has been cast. The situation is rapidly moving toward the biblically prophesied financial besiegement and subsequent collapse of the United States and Israel.

The material factors contributing to this crisis are underpinned by a spiritual reality. Likewise, the ultimate solution is not material, but spiritual. It lies not in ethanol and electric cars, but in repentance toward the God who prophesied catastrophe as punishment for disobedience to Him—including a devastating dependence on foreigners that would lead to ruin (e.g. Deuteronomy 28:43-44, 52).

Ultimately, the solution lies in the coming of the Messiah to build a new civilization from the ground up—a civilization free from the greed and rot that permeates the one we have built without His direction. That too is prophesied. And as the God of the Bible says, “My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.”

---

**FUNDING from page 15**

**United States**

- **Nationwide satellite**
  - Galaxy 3 Trans. 21 11:30 am ET, Tue/Thu; Galaxy 5 Trans. 7 8:00 am ET, Sun
  - **Direct TV DBS** WGN Chan. 307 8:00 am ET, Sun
  - **Direct TV DBS** ION Ch. 305 6:00 am ET, Fri
  - **Dish Network** ION Ch. 181 6:00 am ET, Fri
  - **Dish Network DBS** WGN Chan. 239 8:00 am ET, Sun
  - **Nationwide cable** WGN 8:00 am ET, Sun
  - **Alabama, Birmingham** WPXM 5:00 am, Fri
  - **Alabama, Dothan** WBD 8:30, Sun
  - **Alabama, Montgomery** WBMY 8:30, Sun
  - **Alaska, Anchorage** KWBX 8:30, Sun
  - **Alaska, Fairbanks** KWFA 8:30, Sun
  - **Alaska, Juneau** KJWA 8:30, Sun
  - **Arizona** Co 1 Channel 7, 10:00 am
  - **Arizona, Phoenix** KPPX 5:00 am, Fri
  - **Arizona, Yuma** KWB 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Arkansas, Fayetteville** KFVT 8:30, Sun
  - **Arkansas, Fort Smith** KWFT 8:30, Sun
  - **Arkansas, Jonesboro** KFOS 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Arkansas, Rogers** KWFT 8:30, Sun
  - **Arkansas, Springdale** KWFT 8:30, Sun
  - **California, Bakersfield** KFWB 9:30 am, Sun
  - **California, Chico** KIWB 9:30 am, Sun
  - **California, El Centro** KUB 9:30 am, Sun
  - **California, Eureka** KWWW 9:30 am, Sun
  - **California, Los Angeles** KPXN 6:00 am, Fri
  - **California, Monterey** KMVB 9:30 am, Sun
  - **California, Palm Springs** KCBW 9:30 am, Sun
  - **California, Redding** KIWB 9:30 am, Sun
  - **California, Sacramento** KSPX 6:00 am, Fri
  - **California, Salinas** KFWL 9:30 am, Sun
  - **California, San Francisco** KPPX 6:00 am, Fri
  - **California, Santa Barbara** KWWA 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Colorado, Denver** KPXC 5:00 am, Fri
  - **Colorado, Grand Junction** KNJG 10:30 am, Sun
  - **Colorado, Montrose** KWWJ 10:30 am, Sun
  - **Connecticut, Hartford** WHCP 6:00 am, Fri
  - **Delaware, Dover** WBD 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Florida, Gainesville** WBFL 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Florida, Jacksonville** WPXJ 6:00 am, Fri
  - **Florida, Miami** WPXM 6:00 am, Fri
  - **Florida, Orlando** WOPX 6:00 am, Fri
  - **Florida, Panama City** WPBC 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Florida, Tallahassee-Thomasville** WBXT 9:30 am, Sun; WTXL 7:30 am, Sun
  - **Florida, Tampa** WPX 6:00 am, Fri; WTTA 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Florida, West Palm Beach** WPXP 6:00 am, Fri
  - **Georgia, Albany** WBSS 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Georgia, Augusta** WBAU 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Georgia, Brunswick** WPX 6:00 am, Fri
  - **Georgia, Columbus** WBG 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Georgia, Macon** WBMN 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Georgia, Savannah** WBHV 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Hawaii, Hawaii Na Leo** Chan. 54 6:30 am, Sun; 8:30 am, Wed
  - **Hawaii, Kauai Ho’ike** Chan. 52 9:30 am, Tue
  - **Hawaii, Maui/Lanai/Molokai/Niihau/Akaku** Chan. 52 6:30 pm, Sun; 3:30 am, Mon
  - **Idaho, Boise** KWOB 10:30 am, Sun
  - **Idaho, Idaho Falls** KWPB 10:30 am, Sun
  - **Idaho, Pocatello** KWIB 10:30 am, Sun
  - **Idaho, Twin Falls** KWT 10:30 am, Sun
  - **Illinois, Bloomington** WBFE 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Illinois, Chicago** WCHI 9:30 am, Sun; WCXI 5:00 am, Fri
  - **Illinois, Peoria** WBPE 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Illinois, Rockford** WBF 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Indiana, Fort Wayne** WBF 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Indiana, Indianapolis** WPEF 6:00 am, Fri
  - **Indiana, Lafayette** WBFE 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Indiana, Terre Haute** WBF 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Iowa, Cedar Rapids** KPRX 5:00 am, Fri
  - **Iowa, Des Moines** KPPX 5:00 am, Fri
  - **Iowa, Keokuk** WEW 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Iowa, Kirkville** KWOT 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Iowa, Mason City** KUB 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Iowa, Ottumwa** KWOT 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Iowa, Rochester** KWB 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Iowa, Sioux City** KXPC 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Kansas, Joplin-Pittsburg** KXSF 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Kansas, Lincoln** WKL 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Kansas, Topeka** WBKS 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Kentucky, Bowling Green** WBW 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Kentucky, Lexington** WUPX 6:00 am, Fri
  - **Louisiana, Alexandria** KAXN 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Louisiana, El Dorado-Monroe** KWM 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Louisiana, Lafayette** KLB 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Louisiana, Lake Charles** WBLC 8:30 am, Sun
  - **Louisiana, New Orleans** WPXL 5:00 am, Fri
  - **Maine, Bangor** WBAN 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Maine, Presque Isle** WBPO 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Maryland, Salisbury** WBD 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Massachusetts, Boston** WBFP 6:00 am, Fri; WZMY 8:00 am, Sun
  - **Massachusetts, Holyoke** WWQB 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Massachusetts, Springfield** WBQT 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Michigan, Alpena** WBAA 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Michigan, Cadillac** WBVC 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Michigan, Detroit** WPFD 6:00 am, Fri; WADL 10:00 am, Sun
  - **Michigan, Grand Rapids** WZPX 5:00 am, Fri
  - **Michigan, Lansing** WBL 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Michigan, Marquette** WBD 9:30 am, Sun
  - **Michigan, Traverse City** WBVC 9:30 am, Sun
Misreporting Kosovo

“Misreporting Kosovo” (March) is objective and factual. The KLA was listed by the U.S. government until Clinton found it convenient to remove it from the terror list so that he could bomb Serbia to assist German ambitions in the Balkans. Slobodan Milosevic was acquitted of involvement with atrocities in Bosnia-Herzegovina by the International Court. Yes, atrocities were committed in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo—but mostly by the Croatians, Bosnian Muslims and Kosovar Muslims. Bosnian Muslims bombed their own people three times in marketplaces after pre-placing Western journalists nearby in order to blame it on [the] Serbs. The story about the massacre of 100,000 Kosovar Muslims is now known to be German intelligence disinformation. It’s sickening to think that America advanced German interests for the return of the fascists to Croatia and Islamic jihadists to Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. All this will be lost on Muslims that are wrapped up in their Islamic strategy of taqiyya (concealment of malevolent intentions to advance Islam). —Arius

Good article, Brad Macdonald. In Mary Mostert’s web column, “Banner of Liberty,” she publishes the confession of a Croat terrorist who was part of a cell focused on torture and murder Serbs in Croatia in September 1991. I couldn’t help noticing that he says his cell leader operated with a cache of 100,000 German marks! I have wondered ever since where this came from. … The entire Western establishment continues to impose one of the most massive and grotesque deceptions in human history; in fact, I don’t think that there’s really any precedent for it. —Robert Carl—United States

Thank you a million times for writing this article. I congratulate you as one of the only journalists to think with your head instead of all of the usual knee-jerk responses we have seen in the press in recent years regarding the breakup of the Balkans. I am a journalist and author of five books on the Balkans, including my 1992 book Kosovo, the first book published in the U.S. on this region of the world, when most people could not pronounce the word or find it on a map. I am also a publisher who produced and published Kosovo Crisis: A Study in Foreign Policy Mismanagement by Dr. Vojin Joksimovich, and most recently, Media Cleansing: Dirty Reporting … Journalism and Tragedy in Yugoslavia by award-winning journalist Peter Brock. … Brock’s book … has been muzzled by the mainstream media. In 20 years as a publisher I have never seen someone so successfully blacklisted. I have not been able to get this author on radio or television interviews and Peter has not been able to find employment in his field now for over four years, since word got out that he was writing this book. Several of the 34 journalists he interviewed for the book said if he printed their remarks they would sue him. This is a journalist with 30 years of experience in foreign reporting, and a dozen years as foreign editor of the El Paso Herald, plus 17 major journalism awards including runner-up to the 1989 Pulitzer. What a disgrace and shame on America for betraying one of our most precious freedoms, the right to free speech. … Maybe your article will awaken the dead on the issue of Serbia and their “equal human rights”?

William Dorich—California

Your Daughter’s Eyes

How true your article is (“Through Your Daughter’s Eyes,” March). I am the proud father of two daughters whom I love with all my heart. I am nothing special and make all the usual mistakes a man makes. The one thing I believe is that the relationship I have with my daughters is the relationship they will expect to have with their partners one day. The first relationship a girl has with a man is with her father, and it is that which she will take into her own relationship one day. Another important factor is how I treat my wife. What I do and say to her is the way they will expect their partners to treat them. …

Warwick Gibson—South Africa

Wow, that’s so true. I wish more fathers knew the influence they have on their daughters and how important they are to them. It’s sad to see fathers brush off their children or get angry with them for no important reason. I wish every father knew how to love his daughter like the Bible says—but that would be in an ideal world only.

Chloe—Canada

British History

I am a Canadian—a proud member of the British Commonwealth, which seems to be coming to a close. I claim a strong sense of loyalty to the British Crown, but none to a European Union. I think your article (“The Inspiring History Britain Should Never Forget,” March) could not be truer. God has used Great Britain to rule the world, to instill peace where it was not, to protect the innocent and rule justly over a great company of nations. I pray for our times that even though the nation has forgotten Him, that Almighty God will not totally forget us, but we will be brought to Him again. I encourage you to continue speaking the truth as it should be spoken.

Matthew Saunders

Australia’s New PM

As an Australian, I’m very worried where my country is headed when we have a prime minister who wants to sever ties with mother England (“Meet Australia’s New Prime Minister,” February). With this in mind, this country will be set back 65 years and may never recover … The world will look at Australia differently with a prime minister untested by real pressure with the world. And surely leaving mother England means leaving America as well. … I may not have liked Mr. Howard, but I respected him very much in the way he and the treasurer brought this great country out of the mess the last nightmare leadership gave us. I can’t stress how much we need the nations that helped us in the past! … This country will change, and it won’t be for the better. Time will show Prime Minister Rudd’s true colors.

Dominic Bianco—N.S.W., Australia

Right on the Money

This is truly an incisive article … (“Right on the Money,” January). This article is worth sharing with all who earnestly seek an understanding of the financial crises that are facing the modern world, and who also seek a more absolute answer to mankind’s spiritual, as well as economic, woes. Keep up the powerful job that you’re doing for the Lord!

Anthony Brumble—Arima, Trinidad

Comments?
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A Keen Sense of Crisis

It can make the difference between life and death.  BY BRAD MACDONALD

The ability to sense danger is a life-saving quality. We see this lesson everywhere in nature. Take the herd of antelope grazing peacefully on the sun-soaked prairies of Africa. Danger surrounds them. They are the filet mignon of lions, cheetahs and sundry other carnivores prowling the plains in search of fine dining. For the antelope, staying alive is a function of their ability to sense danger and react quickly.

Perhaps you’ve seen a documentary of this scene: A herd of antelope is grazing blithely, seemingly unaware of the lip-licking lion nearby in the tall grass, stealthily stalking, crafting his assault, contemplating the best attack route, the timing, the target. Suddenly, the peaceful colony becomes restless. Heads dart up, ears twitch, noses whiff the ominous scent, alert eyes scan the horizon. A few beasts begin to move, then suddenly, though the lion remains hidden, the herd stampedes.

The outcome of this story varies. Sometimes the antelope dodges death, sometimes a comrade is taken. Whatever the case, the herd’s reaction limits the potential for casualties and makes the attack infinitely tougher for the lion.

The lesson is, while it is the act of running that reduces the antelope’s chances of being mauled, that action is motivated by a sense of crisis. Anyone who hunts has witnessed this: Sometimes even the faintest sound or scent of a human is enough to arouse a sense of danger in a deer that stirs it to flee the crosshairs of a poised rifle.

In the animal world, life and death are often separated by a keen sense of crisis. How keen is our sense of crisis? How acutely do we perceive the dangers facing our lives, our families and our nations? Does an accurate sense of crisis underpin your actions and drive your life forward? Our planet faces catastrophic dangers that threaten our very survival. Does this create within us a sense of crisis so deep that we are motivated to learn how to escape the danger?

At the Trumpet, we talk about the multitude of dangers besieging America, Britain and Israel. You can learn about why we focus on these nations by requesting a free copy of The United States and Britain in Prophecy. We write often about the threat of economic Armageddon lingering over Britain and America; the spiritual and moral disintegration in these societies; the weakness of their national leadership; their geopolitical impotence; the danger they face from crime, disease epidemics, immigration, and the list goes on.

Despite these dangers, these nations have little sense of crisis, nationally or individually. Why?

First, human nature dislikes the truth when it threatens to disrupt one’s own interests, desires and lifestyle. We will go to great lengths to hide from the truth or to color it in our own terms if the truth demands that we act counter to our desires.

A sense of crisis provides no leeway for inaction. When a human is frightened or faces immediate danger, the brain demands fight or flight: A person will either stay and fight, or quickly take flight. Either way, the sense of crisis demands a reaction.

But with no sense of crisis, no need is felt to react! British and American societies thrive on inaction, passivity and a don’t rock the boat mentality. These nations manage external threats by relying on diplomacy and appeasement rather than action; they create environments that encourage economic irresponsibility rather than curb it; they pass laws that condone moral depravity or illegal immigration because that’s easier than enforcing laws that would prevent these crises.

Having a weak sense of crisis, or having none at all, leads to passivity, procrastination and weak solutions. When we bury our heads in the sand, personally or as a nation, we ignore the need to confront danger.

This individual and collective lack of a sense of crisis is the result of a culture of self-gratification and pleasure. Wrapped up in materialism and an unbalanced desire for satisfying the senses, our peoples have lost touch with reality.

This is a deadly state of mind. An accurate sense of crisis is healthy and important, nationally and individually. Like the antelope on the prairie, it can help us deal with danger before it strikes. A sense of crisis is a precursor to action; it is one of the factors that drives us to react, to respond, and to act. Without it, passivity prevails while the danger grows larger—until one day it explodes in our faces.

Ancient history shows what happens when people become consumed by materialism and self-gratification, and lose the capacity to sense crisis. Read Matthew 24:36-39, a passage describing the time of Noah, when people focused on satisfying fleshly lusts and were shocked when the heavens opened and the Flood came. Notice the context of that passage: It’s a prophecy for today (verse 27).

How acutely do you perceive the dangers facing you, your family and your nation? We all need a reality check from time to time. Take the time to conduct an honest, open-minded analysis of world events. Be prepared—the picture is not pretty. As your mind grows more outward focused and takes on a newly invigorated sense of crisis, you may be flooded with questions. Why are the dangers occurring? Can they be prevented? How can you escape them? What happens after the crises have come and gone?

Be assured, when these questions arise, the Trumpet will be here to show you the answers. They are thrilling beyond belief! Request a free copy of Mystery of the Ages to get a head start on discovering those answers.
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ARE YOU ASKING THE BIG QUESTIONS?

WHO AM I? WHAT AM I? WHY AM I?
You are a mystery. The world about you is a mystery. Now, you can understand!

This remarkable work by Herbert W. Armstrong clarifies the most important yet most elusive knowledge ever revealed. *Mystery of the Ages* reveals the true biblical answers to seven of life’s most puzzling mysteries:

1. Who and What Is God?
2. The Mystery of Angels and Evil Spirits
3. The Mystery of Man
4. The Mystery of Civilization
5. The Mystery of Israel
6. The Mystery of the Church
7. The Mystery of the Kingdom of God

Request your FREE copy today!

TO REQUEST MYSTERY OF THE AGES

Read it now, download a PDF or request online at MysteryoftheAges.com

In the U.S. or Canada, call 1-800-772-8577

THE PHILADELPHIA TRUMPET
Post Office Box 3700
Edmond, Oklahoma 73083 U.S.