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Cuba: A Threat to America

How the assassination of President John F. Kennedy proves that foreign intervention in Cuba remains a clear and present danger.

If you were alive in 1963, you probably remember where you were the afternoon of November 22. That is the day you heard the news that United States President John F. Kennedy had been shot. President Kennedy was murdered as he traveled by motorcade in Texas. Since that very day, the truth about the assassination has been a mystery.

Lee Harvey Oswald, a former U.S. Marine, defected to the Soviet Union in 1959 and returned to the U.S. in 1962. Two days after the president’s assassination, he was murdered by a nightclub owner under dubious circumstances. The Warren Commission, which investigated the slaying, concluded that Oswald acted alone. Most Americans still reject this explanation, and new evidence corroborates their suspicion.

On September 16, the Washington Times reported, “Three days after John F. Kennedy was shot and killed in Dallas, U.S. Intelligence officials told President Lyndon B. Johnson that they had confirmed that assassin Lee Harvey Oswald had recently traveled to Mexico City to visit both the Cuban and Soviet embassies, according to a half-century-old briefing memo, declassified on Wednesday.”

The American president was murdered by a Marxist who was in contact with the Soviet Union and Cuba just days beforehand. It took the government 52 years to declassify this relevant information, and still large sections of the document are blotted out. “Oswald’s travel plans were revealed in an unprecedented declassification and released by the CIA in thousands of Presidential Daily Briefings from the 1960s. Though the memos are decades old, about a fifth of their content was still redacted to protect sources and methods” (ibid).

For decades, the government’s own official explanation was that Oswald was just a lone gunman. But the threat to America was—and is—much greater than that.

Did the Castro brothers have a big hand in assassinating the U.S. president? I’m not saying that happened, but with this report it certainly seems like you could make a strong case for it.

President Kennedy caught the Soviets as they tried to deploy nuclear-capable supersonic missiles to Cuba. The Soviets tried to put these missiles at point-blank range, less than 100 miles off the coast of the United States. Once those weapons were launched, they probably would have evaded detection and detonated in Miami, Washington, D.C., and New York City without any warning! The leaders of Cuba and the Soviet Union clearly had designs on destroying America!

Can Moscow reach across the Atlantic and strike America in our homeland? These are very real threats that even our own government wants us to overlook.

Do you suppose the Soviets and the Castros were wrathful against John F. Kennedy? His administration ruined a plan that would have either held America at nuclear gunpoint—or would have destroyed it in gigantic nuclear balls of fire! I would think that would make them very angry and revengeful! Just over a year later, John F. Kennedy was dead.

And now, the current U.S. administration has just flung open the doors to diplomatic relations with Cuba. Today, to make contact with the Communists, you can just go to Havana, 90 miles south of Florida.

Will this new diplomacy change the nature of the Cuban regime? Cuba remains a terrorist-sponsoring nation to this day. In those diplomatic negotiations, Cuba made no concessions. It got everything it wanted from its enemy, the U.S., and gave nothing.

It appears Cuba is still cooperating with Russia. On October 14, Fox News reported: “Cuban military operatives reportedly have been spotted in Syria, where sources believe they are advising President Bashar al-Assad’s soldiers and may be preparing to man Russian-made tanks to aid Damascus in fighting rebel forces backed by the U.S.

“Gen. Leopoldo Cintra Frias, head of Cuba’s Armed Forces, recently visited Syria to lead a group of Cuban military personnel joining forces with Russia in their support of Assad … On Wednesday, a U.S. official confirmed to Fox News that Cuban paramilitary and special forces units are on the ground in Syria, citing evidence from intelligence reports. The official, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said Cuban troops may have been training in Russia and may have arrived in Syria on Russian planes.

“An Arab military officer at the Damascus airport reportedly witnessed two Russian planes arrive there with Cuban military personnel on board. When the officer questioned the Cubans, they told him they were there to assist Assad because they are experts at operating Russian tanks, according to Jaime Suchlicki, the [University of Miami’s Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies] executive director.”

For years, intelligence sources have listed President Assad and Syria as the number two state sponsor of terrorism, after Iran.

Cuba has a recent history with Russia in designing a nuclear attack against America. Is Cuba about to join another world power and complete that design? For the answer to that question, read my article “The Deadly Dangerous U.S.-Cuba Deal” at theTrumpet.com/go/12381. (We will gladly send you a free copy of this article. I also recommend you request our free booklets America Under Attack and Daniel Unlocks Revelation.)

You need to beware of what is happening in Cuba! This is a dangerous world. America is like a silly dove walking right into a deadly trap. Cuba isn’t dead. Communism isn’t dead. And Cuba is reemerging as a clear and present danger to the very existence of the United States!
Europe’s Old Demons Return

The refugee crisis is precipitating a transformative identity crisis in Europe. By Brad Macdonald

You have probably seen footage of helpless refugees pouring into Europe. It can bring you to tears to see photos of drowned toddlers, pregnant women traversing dangerous terrain, and thousands of underdressed, malnourished children.

But there is another important angle to this crisis that hasn’t received nearly enough consideration. This is the impact the refugee crisis is having and will increasingly have on Europe. Not just the immense financial cost, or the potential infiltration by Islamist terrorists, or the inevitable erosion of European culture. These consequences are significant. But something more fundamental, and more alarming, is unfolding.

Europe is experiencing a transformative identity crisis.

In the immediate aftermath of World War II, the most destructive conflict in history, the primary goal of Europe’s postwar architects was to create a system that would guarantee peace and stability. This meant suppressing past demons and founding a system on more advanced values. Postwar Europe was built to value collaboration and cooperation. It was designed to be enlightened, multicultural and tolerant. It has positioned itself as the world’s moral authority: It abhors war; it defends the environment and human rights; it values international cooperation.

The problem—as any history book will show—is that this is not who Europe is. This is not Europe’s DNA.

Perhaps the greatest effect of the refugee crisis, together with Russia’s dramatic resurgence and Europe’s rolling financial problems, is the way it is causing Europe to shed this postwar veneer and return to its past. Being tolerant feels good, until hundreds of thousands of foreigners enter your nation and expect you to foot the bill. Being multicultural is wonderful, until Muslims waving Islamic State flags and eyeing your teenage daughter settle in your village. Being antiwar feels righteous, until Russian tanks roll across the border.

Europe right now is a place where dreams are beginning to meet reality. (This clash is yet to happen in America and Britain to this degree, though it is looming.) Harsh realities are forcing Europeans to substitute postwar values with basic human urges. Tolerance is being replaced by prejudice, multiculturalism by patriotism, the community
simple: The Middle East, especially Syria, remains a war zone. Migrants are flowing into Europe from Afghanistan, Pakistan, Libya, Somalia and other war-stricken countries; potentially hundreds of thousands more could come from these nations. Reports vary, but between 8 million and 11 million Syrians have been displaced since 2008; millions are homeless. One million Syrians have moved to Lebanon. Two million have relocated to Turkey. Another 600,000 are in camps in Jordan.

This is not hyperbole: Unless something changes soon, millions of refugees from the Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia will make their way to Europe in the coming months and years. Given a choice, most will head for Germany.

This crisis is not going away quickly or easily. There is no simple solution, and no way to avoid terrific cost. Europe is in deep trouble and Europeans are beginning to come to terms with this reality. The more they consider the ramifications, the more alarmed they grow.

A Legitimate Threat
It’s not politically correct to discuss, but it is reality: Someone has to pay the cost of sustaining the refugees. Each refugee costs over $18,000 per year, according to estimates from German local governments. This is the cost of accommodation, food, health care and administrative expenses. The 1.5 million refugees Germany will accept this year will cost over $27 billion.

Many experts say that the $18,000 figure isn’t accurate and the true costs are much higher. The Kiel Institute for Global Economics estimates the cost to be $70 billion annually. There’s also the longer-term cost of integrating the refugees, educating them and getting them into the workforce. It’s no secret that Europe isn’t a picture of financial and economic health right now. It is a legitimate concern: Can Europe afford to take care of millions of refugees?

There is also the threat of increased terrorist activity. More than 90 percent of the refugees are Muslim. In September, German authorities arrested an Islamic State recruiter operating in a refugee center in Stuttgart. In another case, reported by the Express, “One [refugee] admitted to helping more than 10 trained [Islamic State] rebels infiltrate Europe under the guise of asylum seekers. He said: ‘I’m sending some fighters who want to go and visit their families. Others just go to Europe to be ready’” (September 10).

One video showed refugees flying Islamic State flags as they disembarked the train onto German soil. Another video showed young men, one only a boy, brushing a finger past their throats, depicting decapitation. Elias Bousaab, Lebanon’s education minister, warned in October that two in every 100 Syrian migrants infiltrating Europe are Islamic State terrorists. That’s 2,000 terrorists for every 100,000 Syrian refugees.

It’s hard to remain multicultural and tolerant in the face of numbers like that!

Statistics also show that criminal activity increases when refugees arrive. In October, the Gatestone Institute reported, “Asylum seekers are driving a surge in violent crime in cities and towns across Germany” (October 11). In September, a leaked report showed that police in Hamburg have stopped confronting migrant youths because they are often outnumbered and overwhelmed. Reports of refugees shoplifting, burgling homes, committing assault and stalking German women have become routine. In some cities and villages, authorities have cautioned native Germans to avoid venturing out at night.

Being open-minded is easy from a distance. It’s much harder when you can’t leave your home for fear of foreigners.

A Serious Backlash
When one feels threatened, it is human nature for resentment and anger to well up. Unsurprisingly, anti-migrant rallies have become increasingly common across Europe. The number of protesters at these rallies is increasing too, and many rallies have a solid contingent of Nazis. At one rally in Germany, protesters were heard chanting, “We will do to you [the refugees] what Hitler did to the Jews.” Violent attacks on migrants
and migrant homes and camps are also commonplace. Germany’s Interior Ministry reported more than 490 attacks between January and October; only 153 were recorded for all of 2014.

During October 17 mayoral elections in Cologne, candidate Henriette Reker was knifed in the throat by a right-wing extremist. The man attacked Reker because of her support of Angela Merkel’s embrace of the migrants. The same day, a school in Sweden that was being prepared to house 80 refugees was torched. Incidents like this are occurring weekly, sometimes daily, in Germany and other nations that have taken in migrants.

The groundswell of anger and frustration is having a dramatic and worrying effect on politics in Europe. The popularity of far-right parties and parties advocating anti-immigrant policies is soaring.

In parliamentary elections in Switzerland in October, the Swiss People’s Party, a conservative, anti-immigrant party, won handily with 30 percent of the vote. (The migrant crisis was the number one concern for more than half of voters.) In Sweden, the Swedish Democrats, a far-right party with neo-Nazi connections, is now the most popular party in the country. During parliamentary elections in 2010, it won 5.7 percent of the vote; in October, polls showed it winning 25 percent of the vote. It’s the same in Denmark, where the Danish People’s Party recently won its biggest share of the vote ever.

The most popular party in the Netherlands, the Freedom Party led by Geert Wilders, advocates confronting Islam in Europe. Wilders regularly warns about the “Islamic invasion” taking place, warning that the refugees are a threat to Dutch “security, culture and identity.”

Europe’s politicians are having to come to grips with the new reality: To thrive politically, they need to be much less concerned about being tolerant and multicultural, and far more concerned about defending their nation (and Europe in general) from the negative impacts of the refugees, Russia’s resurgence, and perpetual financial uncertainty.

**An Existential Problem**

Consider also the predicament the refugee crisis is creating for the European Union. EU leaders and nations are conflicted (and often bickering) about how to handle the refugees. Angela Merkel wants Europe to embrace the refugees; meanwhile, the governments of Hungary and Slovenia are building fences to keep migrants out.

In more ways than one, the refugee crisis has pitted national policies (and national leaders) against EU policies (and EU leaders). At times, nations have ignored EU policies and principles in favor of policies in their own best interest. Take, for example, the Schengen Agreement. One of the EU’s defining characteristics is its open borders and the free movement of people between member states. This was formalized by the Schengen Agreement, a historic treaty signed in 1985 that created a borderless Europe, allowing the free flow of goods and people. During the refugee crisis, border controls, even border closures, have occurred in EU member states in the Balkans, and even in Austria and Germany. When push came to shove, national interest superseded EU policy.

This raises some fundamental questions about the EU. What is its purpose, and how valuable are its institutions, if member states in the event of a crisis simply ignore EU principles and act in what they feel is their best interest?

This doesn’t mean the refugee crisis is going to tear the EU apart. Actually, the clash of interests between EU member states and the conflict between member states and Brussels is provoking some significant discussions about how to augment European unity. Although the refugee crisis has created some fissures in the EU, it is also a prod for greater cooperation.

For example, the refugee crisis is a major incentive, among others, for the development of an EU army. Europeans are beginning to see the value in fixing the refugee crisis at its source. This means greater military involvement in the Middle East and North Africa, and in the Mediterranean Sea. “We are going to move towards an EU army much faster than people believe,” stated Joseph Daul, president of the European People’s Party, the largest European-level political party, on October 15.

Jean-Claude Juncker, the EU Commission president, has made the development of a Common Security and Defense Policy a top priority. “European defense cooperation remains a patchwork of bilateral and multilateral agreements,” read a strategic note issued by the European Commission in June. “It is time for a reckoning: Traditional methods of cooperation have reached their limits and proved insufficient. European defense needs a paradigm change in line with the exponential increase in global threats and the volatility of our neighborhood.”

In layman’s language, the paper, published at the behest of Juncker, is saying that Europe needs an army capable of confronting Russia, getting involved in the Middle East and North Africa, and stopping the refugee flood.
**Political Upheaval in Germany**

The refugee crisis has set off a political crisis in Germany. German politics has been remarkably stable for more than a decade, thanks largely to the consistent leadership of Chancellor Angela Merkel. But Merkel’s leadership, and legacy, are now in serious jeopardy.

Merkel has embraced the refugees and migrants, promising them a home, a fresh start and a new life. At first, the German public, in general, agreed with her. But as the images of hundreds of thousands of Muslims pouring into Europe came out, the German public began to have second thoughts. Merkel did not. She modified her language and dialed back her enthusiasm, but didn’t alter her views. As far as she is concerned, Germany’s borders should remain open. Time will tell, but Merkel’s embrace of the migrants could be her undoing.

Chancellor Merkel’s popularity is plummeting. On October 20, EurActiv reported on polls revealing public confidence in the chancellor at an all-time low. “Her approach to the refugee crisis ... has cost the previously lauded queen of the polls dearly,” the organization reported. “According to data collected by INSA on behalf of Focus Online, around 33 percent of Germans believe that it would be right of her to resign” (emphasis added).

According to Richard Hilmer, the former head of Infratest-Dimap, an electoral research provider, “the feeling is growing that [Merkel’s refugee] policy is out of control.” Merkel is the face of the failure, and she is going to be held “personally responsible for everything that happens from here on in, be it negative or positive,” he said. German paper Die Welt, usually a Merkel ally, reported, “The chancellor is walking on thin ice.”

For Merkel, the most alarming trend is the growing resentment and opposition coming from her own party. On October 7, 34 regional officials from the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) wrote to Merkel, warning that Germany’s resources were nearly exhausted due to her open borders policy. Within a few days, hundreds of CDU members had signed the letter.

A Wall Street Journal article described an October CDU meeting: “Ms. Merkel had come to the eastern German town of Schkeuditz on Wednesday for a conference with members of her Christian Democratic Union. But what was supposed to be a gathering among friends turned into a blistering indictment of her chancellorship. One after another, the delegates at the Globana Trade Center—town councilors, regional party grandees, and simple members—took turns to criticize her open-door refugee policy” (October 16).

At a protest staged by the German anti-immigrant movement PEGIDA in Dresden, protesters carried around gallows for Angela Merkel.

Although many Germans respect and admire Merkel, and believe she has excelled as chancellor, they vehemently oppose her approach to the refugee crisis. Germany’s chancellor is more vulnerable than she ever has been.

Merkel’s demise would create an enormous opportunity for the right party, and the right individual.

**Watch Bavaria**

Germany is gripped by deep social and political upheaval and is experiencing a transformational identity crisis. A new political experiment is taking shape as Germany’s political parties position themselves to appeal to a German public that is tired of crises, feeling disenfranchised by the perpetual lack of real solutions, and increasingly worried by the influx of refugees.

As Europe’s old demons return and the basic urges of self-preservation and nationalism once again take hold, Germans will increasingly look for a leader and political party willing and
able to lead Germany (and even Europe) through this transformation.

The region to watch right now is Bavaria. Situated in the southeastern part of Germany, bordering Austria and the Czech Republic, Bavaria is the soul of the nation. The region is conservative and staunchly Catholic, and it has a rich history with some of Europe’s most powerful empires and most dangerous regimes. “Bavaria has often been a center for new political experiments in Germany,” explained Stratfor. “In times of deep social upheaval, this involved embracing extreme positions” (October 18).

Bavaria, and specifically the city of Munich, was the breeding ground of National Socialism. The young Adolf Hitler was raised in Bavaria, and made his first attempt to seize power in 1923 in Munich in the Beer Hall Putsch. Munich “had a special place in the Nazi pantheon, and in 1935 Hitler declared it the ‘capital of the Nazi movement’” (ibid).

There is a very good chance that Germany’s next leader will come from Bavaria.

The primary political party in Bavaria is the Christian Social Union. The CSU is conservative and is one of the largest mainstream political parties in German politics. It is also the sister party and historic ally of the Christian Democrat Union, Angela Merkel’s party. Together, the CDU and CSU have been the most influential alliance in modern German politics.

But the refugee crisis has introduced tension and instability into this alliance. The CSU does not share Merkel’s views on the refugee issue; in fact, it staunchly opposes them. (Bavaria is on the front lines of the crisis and has watched refugees pour into Bavarian cities and villages.)

Horst Seehofer, Bavaria’s minister-president and CSU chairman, has been one of Merkel’s loudest critics. In October, Seehofer threatened to take Merkel and the federal government to court over its migrant policies. He also hinted that if Merkel doesn’t change her tune there will be a political crisis between the CDU and CSU. Despite his strong reproaches, CSU supporters are pressuring Seehofer to do even more to oppose Merkel and fix the refugee crisis.

Although the majority of the German public disagrees with Merkel on the refugee issue, most Germans do not want to join the far-right extremist parties of Pegida or Alternative für Deutschland. The German people want a mainstream political party that has the same views on the key issues, especially the refugees. The CSU is positioned to be that party—to capitalize on Merkel’s misstep and potential downfall.

Two People to Watch

But here is what’s really interesting. Horst Seehofer is close to two individuals the Trumpet has long identified as candidates to play a greater role in German politics.

The first is Edmund Stoiber, former leader of Bavaria and former CSU chairman.

Stoiber, like Seehofer, has publicly expressed concerns about the refugees and Merkel’s handling of the crisis. He has warned that this crisis threatens the “dissolution” of Europe; he has questioned Merkel’s views on Islam; and he has reprimanded Merkel for ignoring the concerns of the German people. In September, German news media reported that Stoiber had conducted a secret 1½-hour meeting with the prime minister of Hungary, Viktor Orbán. Orbán is a pariah in Europe because of sentiments he has expressed about the refugees that many consider cruel and heartless. Stoiber, it seems, has no problem talking to Orbán. (It was also reported that following his secret meeting with Orbán, Stoiber invited him to speak at a gathering of CSU politicians.)

Stoiber has a long legacy in German politics and was groomed by German strongman Franz Josef Strauss. (Gerald Flurry explains this legacy in “Has Germany’s Strongman Finally Arrived?”, page 7.) Stoiber and Seehofer are articulating the thoughts and concerns of rapidly growing numbers of Germans and Europeans. Their message is popular and will grow even more so as the refugee crisis intensifies.

The other man to watch is Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg, a native Bavarian and another Strauss disciple. Before he moved to America in 2011, Guttenberg was Germany’s defense minister, the most popular politician in Germany, and the man many expected to be a future chancellor. Guttenberg has a captivating personality. He belongs to German nobility and looks like a movie star. He communicates with force and vigor, but is also a pragmatic, deep thinker. Guttenberg understands Germany and Europe.

Guttenberg is a faithful CSU member, and Seehofer has been begging him to return to German politics for years. For a long time Guttenberg rejected Seehofer’s request. That changed in October when he accepted a job working with Seehofer and the CSU. “This step back into politics seems comparatively small for a man who was minister for economic affairs and defense and even considered a candidate for chancellor,” noted Süddeutsche Zeitung. “But apparently this is just the right entry level Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg wants” (October 1).

Guttenberg will join Seehofer’s CSU advisory team and will give counsel on foreign policy, defense and technology. He will also help Seehofer get the party ready for local, national and European election campaigns, including the 2017 federal elections and 2018 national elections. Guttenberg will work closely with Seehofer, and undoubtedly alongside Edmund Stoiber.

We need to watch this axis of powerful Bavarians!

The refugee crisis is thrusting Germany (and Europe) into a transformational identity crisis. Germany and Europe will look for a leader who understands what is happening. They will seek someone capable of shaping this new identity—someone capable of standing up to Russia, getting tough with the refugees, and finally fixing the economic crises.

This is the new sobering reality: Contemporary Europe is on its way out and Europe’s old demons are returning.
HAS GERMANY’S STRONGMAN FINALLY ARRIVED?

We have been prophesying of this for 70 years. Crises in Germany and Europe are reaching new heights. Watch what happens next. BY GERALD FLURRY

GERMANY IS FACING ONE of the worst crises in its modern history. Refugees from the Middle East are flooding into Europe by the hundreds of thousands, and more are traveling to Germany than to any other nation—an estimated 1.5 million just this year!

This is an emergency with massive implications for Germany. First is the financial cost of assimilating all those people into German society, including the strain on public services and welfare programs. Many Germans are also troubled by the cultural and religious influence of so many Arabs and Muslims. Then there is the very real danger of violent terrorists entering in among the refugees!

German Chancellor Angela Merkel has been very liberal in opening Germany’s borders to this flood of foreigners, and she is quickly losing popular support as a result.

One prominent politician who has strongly criticized Chancellor Merkel for her response to the refugee crisis is Edmund Stoiber. He was once chairman of the Christian Social Union (CSU), sister party to Merkel’s Christian Democratic Union. “Certainly he would ask the question, how many people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds can our country accommodate?” he said, according to Germany’s Der Bayernkurier. “There are limits in transportation and hospitals and soccer stadiums. There are also limitations for our country. … How much foreignness can a country handle?

What do we really mean with ‘integration’? What is the purpose of right to asylum? And how much more immigration is possible?” (September 4, Trumpet translation; emphasis mine).

Mr. Stoiber warned that all Europe faces an oncoming “era of immigration.” He said, “We have watched for too long seeing our external borders cease to exist in southern Europe.” He flatly rejects Merkel’s statement that Islam is a part of Germany. “I’m not adopting this proposal,” he said.

This crisis could alter Germany’s political landscape. It would do so even faster if one of these refugees committed a deadly terrorist attack. Chancellor Merkel already appears vulnerable on
this issue and would become far more so.

And this is hardly the only crisis in Germany and Europe! The whole eurozone faces economic and financial collapse. Russia’s resurgence under Vladimir Putin is deeply troubling to Eastern Europeans in particular.

Together these crises constitute one of the most significant threats Germany and Europe have experienced since World War II, and easily the most significant since German reunification in 1989.

Europe’s greatest need right now is leadership.

Stoiber’s Mentor

Edmund Stoiber’s criticisms are of special interest because of this man’s fascinating history.

The German-language article that reported on his comments was actually about an event Stoiber spoke at commemorating Franz Josef Strauss. Bavarian Prime Minister Edmund Stoiber describes his personal memories of Franz Josef Strauss, who would have turned 100 years old. Stoiber called Strauss ‘the father of the people’s party’ and ‘the greatest political son of Bavaria.’

In the article, Stoiber wrote, “He was a Bavarian in the heart of Germany and European in vision. The modern people’s party was embodied in Franz Josef Strauss. … For me, he remains a teacher and fatherly friend” (ibid).

Mr. Stoiber sees Strauss as a mentor, and seeks to continue his legacy. He was one of the first to support Strauss’s campaign for the chancellorship in 1980 and served as a campaign aide. Stoiber followed in Strauss’s footsteps as minister-president of Bavaria and CSU chairman.

To understand the significance of this association, you must know more about Franz Josef Strauss.

Strauss is a giant in German post-war history. His remarkable political career spanned nearly four decades from the 1950s until his death in 1988. He was literally known in the press as “the strongman of Europe”—not just Germany. They called him “a man for emergencies.” He was unafraid to challenge others. When the first post-Nazi chancellor needed someone to build up West Germany’s military to help stave off Soviet Russia—even though the German military was at that time synonymous with Nazi evil—this seemingly impossible job went to someone tough enough to handle it: Franz Josef Strauss.

In 1965—just 20 years after World War II, when few would have envisioned Germany as a re-emergent world power—Strauss wrote a book titled The Grand Design: A European Solution to German Reunification. It explained how Germany could rise to power again—as part of a federal Europe. The central idea behind Strauss’s vision was what he called “a massive drive to achieve, step by step, a European political federation.” He spoke out for the reunification of Germany, effectively preparing the nation for its unification in 1989, and was instrumental in developing the European Union as a means of achieving German ambitions.

The Herbert W. Armstrong Connection

BY GERALD FLURRY

Franz Josef Strauss was a leader among world leaders. He served as premier of the prominent state of Bavaria, as West Germany’s defense minister, in three other cabinet-level ministerial posts, and as the prominent chairman of the Christian Social Union, a party he helped found, the headquarters of which is located in the Franz-Josef-Strauss-Haus in Munich.

Otto von Habsburg was head of a family that had ruled the Holy Roman Empire from the 15th century to the 19th century. He served as a member of the European Parliament, devoting his life to creating a European superstate. He authored The Social Order of Tomorrow, which espoused essentially the same ultimate vision that Strauss’s The Grand Design did: the creation of a federated United States of Europe, underpinned by Catholicism.

Herbert W. Armstrong was connected to these men in the sense that he saw in them characteristics that matched Bible prophecies about a modern German strongman. But he was also connected to them in another way: They both visited him.

Dr. Habsburg flew to California in July 1983 to meet Mr. Armstrong at the headquarters campus of Ambassador College and the Worldwide Church of God. He addressed the students, toured Ambassador Auditorium, and dined with Mr. Armstrong and other college faculty and church officials. He had a private meeting with Mr. Armstrong and another with the head of the church’s news bureau. After delivering an address in Los Angeles, he flew with Mr. Armstrong on the church’s private jet to Washington, D.C., for another address.
In 1968, Finance Minister Strauss gave an interview to the popular radio and television programs Mr. Armstrong established: The World Tomorrow. In 1969, Strauss went to visit Mr. Armstrong at his home.

The strongman of Europe toured the award-winning buildings and grounds of the Ambassador College campus in Pasadena, which won the Professional Grounds Management Society award three times for best landscaped and best maintained campus in the United States. He met students and faculty members, delivered an address to them, toured a class, and later sat for another interview for The World Tomorrow.

The class he toured was my Comparative Religion class. It was quite an experience to see this man and his entourage come into our class. I could tell the instructor had a little difficulty getting through his lecture with Herr Strauss listening intently for a few minutes. There was a buzz all over campus that day. We didn’t know what the future held for Strauss, but we definitely felt like something unusual and significant was happening.

At the end of Strauss’s first day on campus, he made an extraordinary remark. “[H]e commented that he had just spent the happiest day of his life,” Mr. Armstrong wrote. “The peace and happiness here are contagious! Dr. Strauss drank it in. Herr Strauss said, ‘We need an Ambassador College in Germany’” (co-worker letter, June 28, 1971).

After Strauss visited Pasadena, he flew to the Ambassador College campus in Big Sandy, Texas, and then on to Houston and Washington, D.C. And interestingly, he actually sent his wife back to Pasadena to enjoy one more day on that peaceful, happy, beautiful campus.

Mr. Armstrong wrote that he kept in touch with Strauss and knew him well. Ten years later, they met again—a remarkable relationship, even among the dozens of others Mr. Armstrong had with prime ministers, presidents, kings and other world leaders.

“Incidentally, Drs. Habsburg and Strauss are close friends,” Mr. Armstrong wrote, “and for some reason I do not understand—but may be of God’s designing—both are very friendly to me and to Ambassador College” (member and co-worker letter, July 24, 1983).

God inspired the Bible with accurate prophecies of events that are happening now, centuries after they were written. He revealed those prophecies to Mr. Armstrong. He literally opened to him the office doors of heads of state. Is it possible that He inspired these great German men to come to Mr. Armstrong, and that He has some design for it?

Those men came to Ambassador College with an open mind and were deeply impressed. In the buildings, in the landscapes, in the students, in the faculty, they saw a way of life that worked! These were able men who devoted their dynamic lives to trying to better their country and their world—as they saw fit, using politics, strategy, economics, religion. They came to Ambassador College and saw something totally different, totally unexpected. It was real education that solved real problems. They saw a way of life that worked because it came not from politics or tradition or human reasoning but from the Bible.

When people fulfill their purpose for being created, they are joyful, and the peace and happiness is contagious. God’s way of life was rare in Mr. Armstrong’s lifetime, and it is rare today. But it does live on. It exists here, at Herbert W. Armstrong College.

A great deal of Strauss’s vision has since become reality. Beyond that, the strongman persona he embodied is one that could hold the key for Germany’s future!

A Prophecy About a Strongman
One man who closely watched Strauss’s political career was Herbert W. Armstrong. He was founder and editor in chief of the Plain Truth newsmagazine, forerunner of the Philadelphia Trumpet. Mr. Armstrong observed world events closely, especially in Europe. He devoted much of his work and his message—which reached millions of people worldwide—to analyzing Germany in particular. Why? Because he studied and proclaimed Bible prophecy, and Bible prophecy forecasted not only that Germany would reunite, but that it would lead Europe once again—exactly what we are seeing today.

Bible prophecy gets specific about Germany’s future. Analysts say that Europe’s political unification project is about to fall apart without really ever having gotten started. But the Bible reveals that Europe will not only unite, but that it will become a superpower! It specifies that it will consist of 10 nations, and that it will be glued together by the Vatican and powered by a political leader in Germany. A strongman.

God revealed symbols of future events to the Prophet Daniel. But interestingly, He did not explain to Daniel what those events would be. The prophecy was sealed until the “time of the end” (Daniel 8:17; 12:4, 9). Compare these events to today, however, and it is clear that these prophecies are for now! Daniel 8:23 describes a “king of fierce countenance” who rises to power not democratically, but “by flatteries” (Daniel 11:21). The Bible prophesies that this powerful leader will reign over the “king of the north” (Daniel 11:40). He will be from a war-making nation descended from ancient Assyria: Germany. Mr. Armstrong prophesied about a fierce king ruling a German-led federal European superpower—beginning in the 1930s! And even when Hitler rose to lead Germany, early on in World War II, Mr. Armstrong said the fulfillment of this prophecy was yet future. Now we are seeing it happen! The future of Europe is tied to this king of fierce countenance. We are watching for him.

Mr. Armstrong watched Franz Josef Strauss, a powerful man and a favorite of the Vatican, to see if he would fulfill the biblically prophesied role of Europe’s strongman. In a 1983 letter, Mr. Armstrong mentioned two “outstanding political leaders.” The first was Strauss; the second was Otto von Habsburg, who led the 700-year-old house of Habsburg, a dynasty that ruled the Holy Roman Empire for centuries. It is one of the most prestigious royal families in Europe. Habsburg was a leading member of the European Parliament who devoted his life to European unification. Both of these men, Strauss and Habsburg, forged personal friendships with Mr. Armstrong (sidebar, above).

Mr. Armstrong wrote, “The world appears bereft of ‘great men.’ But a world-recognized ‘strong man’ in all probability will now very soon appear...
There will be 10 [kings], ruling 10 nations or groups of nations in the area of the once-great Holy Roman Empire. But there will be one super-king over the 10” (Plain Truth, May 1969).

Concerning that super-king, Mr. Armstrong wrote that Europe was “waiting for the confidence-inspiring leader ....” Mr. Armstrong felt Franz Josef Strauss might be that leader. Yet Strauss died in 1988. Habsburg died in 2011. German strength and the dream of European unification, however, did not die with them. When Strauss first published his ideas, he knew he might not live to see his dreams carried out. “... I am under no illusions about the length of time it will take to set this sequence of events in train,” he wrote. “It might take a generation ... If the process is to take time, then it must be time put to good use.”

During Strauss’s day, the groundwork was laid for the fulfillment of the prophecies of a Vatican-German alliance and the rise of a German strongman. Still, those prophecies have yet to be fulfilled. Though conditions weren’t quite ready for such a strongman to emerge then, The stage is set for his appearance today. That man is out there somewhere— ready to take control of Europe and literally shock the world!

Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg

Now, Europe’s refugee crisis is bringing this question to the forefront, a question Herbert W. Armstrong first asked more than 80 years ago: Who will be the strongman of Europe? Europe clearly needs a leader with vision, a leader able to confront these epic problems.

Germany is the strongest, healthiest nation in Europe, and the only nation capable of addressing these crises. The German people also have a history of repeatedly turning to a strongman for leadership in an emergency. Recall Otto the Great, Charles V, Otto von Bismarck and Adolf Hitler, to name a few.

One man we have watched for some years is Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg, another Bavarian political leader. Guttenberg entered the scene as Stoiber was running for chancellor. (Incidentally, just one day after Stoiber nearly became German chancellor in 2002—his party lost by only the tiniest of margins to that of Gerhard Schröder—Stoiber was in Rome for an audience with Pope Benedict XVI, who is also a Bavarian. So Stoiber has a close connection with the Vatican.)

Guttenberg is bright, young, aristocratic and popular. He is the protégé of Stoiber, who is the protégé of Strauss. He is also yet another favorite of the Vatican. Interestingly, part of his family line traces back to the House of Habsburg. Politically, he is descended from the lines of Strauss and of Habsburg.

In an August 17 article headlined, “Guttenberg, the Savior in Demand,” Germany’s Wirtschafts Woche wrote, “Germans are constantly fascinated by every new action of the former defense minister, even after he escaped to a luxury property in New York following his downfall for plagiarism in 2011. This unwavering fascination also explains why yet another traditional German organization is vigorously courting Guttenberg as their savior, the CSU”—the party of Strauss and Stoiber.

When he became defense minister in 2009, Guttenberg was reportedly welcomed by the military as “one of their own,” largely thanks to his centuries-long aristocratic background. The influence of the aristocratic class in the military and elsewhere in German culture has remained strong.

If we understand Germany’s recent military history, that could be a vital piece of information! For example, that nation started World Wars I and II. (Request The Holy Roman Empire in Prophecy for more information.)

Note the full name of the aristocratic Karl-Theodor Maria Nikolaus Johann Jacob Philipp Franz Joseph Sylvester Freiherr von und zu Guttenberg. Freiherr is a title of nobility (also known as reichsfreiherr) denoting a baron of the Holy Roman Empire. Do you think the man who bears that name and those centuries of heritage shares the same deep desire of Strauss, Habsburg and Stoiber? Does he want to unify Europe under the Vatican?

In 2008, Bild.de wrote, “When asked if he felt like a political grandson of Franz Josef Strauss, Guttenberg clearly avows the csu patriarch, even though he was just 16 years old as he died: ‘Strauss has influenced even me. Therefore I feel neither shame nor fear to repeatedly appeal specifically to the impressive legacy of Franz Josef Strauss.’”

Such statements powerfully recall what Mr. Armstrong said about Strauss and the prophesied emergence of a German strongman. We continue to watch Europe the same way Mr. Armstrong did and are seeing prophecies snap into place faster than ever! It is amazing how much of what we see today traces straight back to the vision and even the persons of Otto von Habsburg and especially of Franz Josef Strauss. Clearly, Strauss’s legacy continues through Edmund Stoiber and Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg.

Given the atmosphere of crisis and the political climate in Germany today, we should watch for this prophecy to be fulfilled at any time!

Spiegel Online published an article about the crisis on August 31. Its title: “Dark Germany, Bright Germany: Which Side Will Prevail Under Strain of Refugees?” Will this nation lose control of its borders and succumb to the flood of immigrants until much of it becomes more foreign than native? That is what we are seeing in Britain and the U.S. Or will Germany find some bright, enlightened course of action to solve this crisis?

Or—will it respond with a strongman—and a dark Germany?

Biblical prophecy makes the answer clear. A strongman is on the scene, just waiting for the right moment to emerge in order to realize Strauss’s vision for Germany and for Europe!
Is It Too Dangerous to Send Your Kid to College?

Parents are relieved when they get their child through high school and into college. But is campus living safe?  

By Dennis Leap

What type of environment do you picture college to be? Especially if you are planning to send your child to one, you need to make sure that picture matches reality.

Of the 52 school shootings that took place in 2015 before mid-October, 21 occurred at colleges and universities. The bloodiest took place at Umpqua Community College in Roseburg, Oregon, on October 1. The statistics are chilling: nine people murdered at point blank range; nine others seriously injured. The shooter, also a student, committed suicide. This was the first campus mass shooting to take place in one classroom.

Attending her first week of college, Sarah Cobb, 17, was in the classroom next to the murders. Familiar with hunting, she fully understood what was happening inside the classroom next to hers. She ran through the rest of the building telling others to run from the tragic trouble. “I don’t even know what to think,” she said when asked about surviving the mass shooting. “I’m terrified. I don’t want to go back there for a long time.”

No one living in Roseburg would have believed that something so devastating could happen in their community. But it did!

Within days of the Umpqua killings, two more campus shootings took place. The shooting at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff left one freshman dead and three other young students injured. At Texas Southern University in Houston, two students were shot, one fatally.

Mass shootings at college campuses make big news. However, there are other life-threatening risks your teen must escape to survive college. Here are several that you should be preparing your son or daughter to avoid.

Binge Drinking
College students have come to believe that partying, which often means excessive drinking and dangerous drugs, is an essential part of their higher-education experience. The Princeton Review publishes an annual list of the top party schools in America based on student surveys.

College administrators are not thrilled to have their institution win the top spot. Why? Each year, an estimated 1,825 college students die from alcohol poisoning and alcohol-related injuries; the majority are freshmen. The number one cause is binge drinking. Besides the deaths from alcohol abuse, another 590,000 students are injured each year from alcohol-related accidents, including automobile wrecks and falls from high-elevation balconies.

While some new college students are experienced with drinking alcohol, many are not. It is the young freshman who refrained from alcohol and drug use in high school who is the most vulnerable to the peer pressure to party up. “At least eight freshmen at U.S. colleges have died the first few weeks of this school year,” reported Inside Higher Ed in September 2014. At Texas Tech University, a freshman died of alcohol poisoning at a fraternity party 24 hours before his first day at school. At Michigan State University, an international student died after a night of drinking during the university’s “move-in weekend.” At Towson University, a freshman died after falling into a glass door at a party. These were terrible tragedies for the families, friends, college administrators and other students.

American colleges and universities tout themselves as bastions of personal freedom for young college students. They can be overwhelming places for students who lived a structured and safe life at home. There is only so much that college or university administrators can say or do to warn your child. All wise parents need to make time to educate their college student about the choices he will be forced to make while living on his own.

Rape and Sexual Assault
At many college parties, illegal drugs are often consumed with alcohol. Besides being potentially fatal, experts know that drug abuse is a main factor leading to college campus rape and sexual assault. “The majority of safety-related incidents ... occur when students are under the influence,” warns Connors State College’s eight-page student safety manual. “Many victims and perpetrators of sexual assault are under the influence when an incident occurs. Make smart choices so that your judgment and your safety aren’t compromised by alcohol or other drug abuse.”

The manual makes a few more statements about the dangers of mixing “legal”
Why Jerusalem Is Bleeding

The recent rash of horrific attacks by Palestinians in Israel is not leading to an independent state—it is leading to Jerusalem being cut in half. **BY STEPHEN FLURRY**

**You may—or may not—have heard vague reports of more violence breaking out between Palestinians and Jews. But look in detail at the list of attacks and reprisals, just in the first half of October, and it is horrifying.**

A husband and wife are shot to death in their car by Palestinians, dying in front of their four children, ages 9, 7, 4 and 4 months. Two men on their way to worship in Jerusalem’s Old City are murdered, and a wife and 2-year-old child are wounded by a knife-wielding Palestinian law student. Palestinians in Gaza fire rockets at Israeli civilians. A young Palestinian man stabs an elderly Israeli woman as she boards a bus. A Palestinian driver rams his car into a bus stop and sends bodies flying, then gets out and hacks a victim with a knife. Two Palestinians board a bus and begin stabbing and shooting passengers, murdering one. Palestinian arsonists attack cars and buildings. Rioters attack police and soldiers.

In mid-October, the day-in, day-out list of Palestinian homicidal and arsonist attacks grew almost every single day. Palestinian leaders actually encourage these attacks in order to advance their agenda, whipping up violent fervor with lies about “dirty” Israelis planning to allow Jews to pray on the Temple Mount or to just take it over, depending on whom you believe. Then they praise those who have tried to or succeeded in murdering Jews. They even branded it: a “Day of Rage.” Palestinian leaders want their people to go berserk with racist violence. Meanwhile, one wonders if we are just a “Day of Rage” or two away from another bloody intifada, where Palestinians go all-out and strap explosives and ball bearings to themselves, then search out people on buses or families at cafés that they can murder en masse.

**American Response**

The nation with the world’s largest economy, military and, formerly, political influence has an opportunity to help. What does it do? The United States Department of State responded to these terroristic attacks on Israeli citizens with this: “We remain deeply concerned about escalating tensions and urge all sides to take affirmative steps to restore calm and prevent actions that would further escalate tensions.” In other words, the Palestinians must tone down the violence—and so must the Jews!

Associated Press reporter Matt Lee noticed the State Department’s veiled condemnation of Israel. He quizzed State Department spokesman Mark Toner about it: “Does the [Obama] administration believe that Israel is inciting or not condemning violence?”

“[W]hat we’ve been very clear about saying is that we want to see both sides take affirmative steps, affirmative actions that reduce tensions in the region,” Toner said. He acknowledged the horrific attacks against Israelis but added, “[W]e’ve seen also attacks on Palestinians, [investigations for which] remain ongoing.”

Yes, outraged Israeli settlers have burned olive trees and beaten Palestinians. Yes, Palestinian bystanders have been killed as Israeli police, troops and airmen have conducted raids and strikes against Palestinian terrorists (who not only target Jewish civilians, but also hide among and behind Palestinian civilians).
But why is the State Department equating that with a man who plows his car into people at a bus stop, or a child who stabs away at another child, or terrorists who aim their rockets at civilian areas, or murderers who shoot unsuspecting parents to death in front of their young children?

Lee then asked what the United States expects from the Israelis to reduce the violence in Israel. Toner responded that they should “unhold the status quo in Haram al-Sharif and [the] Temple Mount.” That is exactly what the Israelis have been doing for decades. By emphasizing it, the State Department was responding to, legitimizing and perpetuating a lie from Arab propaganda: that Jews are plotting to desecrate Muslim holy sites and to blow up mosques.

Chief among those Arab propagandists is Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas. He lied before the United Nations General Assembly about Israeli sending Jewish extremists into the al-Aqsa Mosque and said this on September 16 during a speech on Palestinian TV: “[W]e bless every drop of blood spilled for Jerusalem. With the help of Allah, every Jews are plotting to desecrate Muslim United Nations General Assembly about East Jerusalem and the Temple Mount.” That is exactly what the Israelis have been doing for decades. By emphasizing it, the State Department was responding to, legitimizing and perpetuating a lie from Arab propaganda: that Jews are plotting to desecrate Muslim holy sites and to blow up mosques.

Israel has consistently upheld a decades-old policy of protecting and preserving all holy sites in Israel—whether they are Jewish, Christian or Muslim. Contrary to insinuations by the State Department (not to mention Palestinian terrorists), Israel has upheld that status quo since 1967, when it took control of East Jerusalem and the Temple Mount.

But that fact is lost on—or ignored by—the Obama administration. Secretary of State John Kerry similarly attributed the violence in Jerusalem to Israeli policies, saying, “[U]nless we get going, a two-state solution could conceivably be stolen from everybody. [T]here’s been a massive increase in settlements over the course of the last years. Now you have this violence because there’s a frustration that is growing ....”

Secretary Kerry would have you believe that Palestinians are lashing out in violent terrorist acts because they are frustrated at the stalled peace process!

They just want a state so they can live peacefully alongside Israel.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s statement is more in line with the visible, horrifying facts. “Terror,” he said, “comes from the desire to annihilate us.” Commentary’s Jonathan Tobin wrote, “While the narrative about this latest outbreak of violence from critics of Israel is that it is all about the sins of the ‘occupation’ and Israel denying hope to the Palestinians, what we are hearing from them is a very different story. Read any of the accounts of the motivations of the people going into the streets to stab random Jews they encounter or the mobs in the West Bank who are seeking to set off confrontations with Israeli troops, and you don’t hear much about frustration about the peace process. ... What you do see are accounts of Muslim religious fervor that is drenched in the fever of martyrdom and faith-based hate” (October 12).

The Palestinians themselves have called this upheaval the “hibat al-Quds”—the “Jerusalem awakening.” The terror is coming as a response to a false conspiracy about a Jewish takeover of Muslim holy sites. At its core, it is a religious war based on hatred of the Jews!

OCTOBER 12 WAS A NORMAL DAY for a 13-year-old boy in Jerusalem as he got on his bicycle for a ride through his neighborhood of Pisgat Zeev. Then, suddenly, two people rushed up and began to stab him.

This was the third knife attack of the day around the Holy City, and the 22nd over a span of 13 days. But the most startling fact was the age of the child’s would-be murderers: two Arab cousins, just 13 and 15.

Police confronted the 15-year-old, who was still holding the machete. He charged, and was fatally shot. The 13-year-old was hit by a car. As he lay on the pavement, squirming in blood, paramedics tried to save his young life. An Israeli passerby videoboy the boy shouted, “Die! Die! You son of a whore!”

How has it come to this? Why are two children who should be doing homework or chores attempting murder instead? How much more saturated in hatred can Jerusalem get?

What motivated these children to kill? Was it their parents, absorbed in Palestinian media that distorts events and demonizes Israelis? Was it propaganda in their schools? Was it the children’s television program with the Mickey Mouse-like character who praises “martyrdom”? Was it the Facebook and Twitter images vilifying Jews and glorifying their murderous “martyrs”? Was it the religious establishment implying, or stating, that “protecting al-Aqsa” means killing 13-year-olds?

Most likely, it was the accumulation of all these influences. This shocking attack reveals something larger: A whole generation of young Palestinians is saturated in hate.

But what about the Israeli who saw a heap of quivering, broken flesh crumpled on the street and shouted at him to die? His outrage is understandable. But his reaction reveals that he too carries a terrible hatred.

Will “peace in the Middle East” ever be more than a cliché? Isn’t this problem beyond the ability of clever politicians to solve?

Don’t we need a healing of minds in the Middle East?  

BY BRENT NAGTEGAAL

“The Holy City’s Child Terrorists

“Impressable young Palestinians have been persuaded that their [g]od requires them to kill, and if necessary be killed, to ‘protect al-Aqsa.’”

—Daniel Horovitz, Times of Israel

Aftermath: Volunteers clean up the scene of a bus attack in Jerusalem on October 13.
Jewish Lives Matter
International coverage has been muted if not outright biased. It has primarily focused on the number of deaths on either side of the conflict, or on the “disproportionate” Israeli response. But what proportion do you use, exactly, when people are inspiring their children to pick up a knife and go after your children?

Even after 150 terrorist attacks within 48 hours, “somehow the international community is silent in the face of this terror onslaught against my people,” Arsen Ostrovsky, a Jewish human rights lawyer, wrote. “Is our blood cheaper? Do Jewish lives not matter? Let there be no mistakes, ifs, buts or maybe. We are being targeted for one reason and one reason only: We are Jews.” — ARSEN OSTROVSKY

“Do Jewish lives not matter? We are being targeted for one reason and one reason only: We are Jews.” — ARSEN OSTROVSKY

The very real, very active Satan the devil. Wouldn’t you describe a 13-year-old Palestinian trying to murder another 13-year-old simply because he is Jewish as satanic?

Satan hates God, hates His plan, and hates the people He commissioned. He inspires anti-Semitism. And he wants that hatred to explode.

Jewish Response
Following the October attacks, Israeli civilians began purchasing stun guns, clubs and every available can of pepper spray. They enrolled in classes to learn military-style hand-to-hand combat. Jerusalem’s mayor called for gun-permit holders to carry guns in order to hopefully deter future attempted homicides.

Israel’s Central Bureau of Statistics says the country now has a shortage of private security guards because of increased demand. And those guards are now officially approved by the Economy Ministry to work overtime.

The Israeli government has put more police and soldiers onto the streets. It has deployed soldiers to Jerusalem, a very rare occurrence. It has taken the major step of setting up checkpoints in East Jerusalem and reportedly may close those routes completely. Soldiers are guarding buses. Troops are on the streets. Palestinian areas are being partially blocked off.

What is this leading to?

The Israelis don’t know. The Palestinians don’t know. The media don’t know. But the Bible reveals where this is heading. We are about to see Jerusalem split down ethnic lines between east and west! These are the early stages of that division.

This booklet explains how (and we will gladly send you a free copy upon request). Who would hate something like that? The more you scrutinize Bible prophecy, the more you realize how timely and accurate it is about the situation in Jerusalem.

The violent trend we see today is leading to the fulfillment of a critical and surprisingly specific prophecy in Zechariah 14:1-2: “Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided among the number of thy gods; and thy cities shall be full of the slain.”

The Trumpet has publicized this prophesied development for years. When there were flare-ups between Israel and Hezbollah in the north, and then between Gaza and Israel in the south, Gerald Flurry explained that the West Bank would be next, and finally, Jerusalem. “We will see [the] prophecy in Zechariah 14:1-2 fulfilled very soon,” his booklet Jerusalem in Prophecy explains.

Studying that prophecy in combination with several others, you see that this event will plunge the Jewish state and many other nations into a crisis more horrifying than the Holocaust. It will be a tragic period when Jewish lives won’t matter.

But there is hope for Jerusalem. While the time ahead “will involve some sickening atrocities and bloodshed,” that booklet continues, “it is directly connected to the greatest news this world has ever heard!” In the same way that the Bible was right about the events we see exploding in Israel, the Bible is right that they are leading to the return of Jesus Christ to Earth—to Jerusalem!

Christ will end the days of people viewing those of another race with hatred and contempt. Because of Christ’s coming rule—and only because of that—the “Days of Rage” in Jerusalem are about to become days of peace.

Half of Jerusalem is about to fall.

The present violence is a foretaste of a prophesied takeover of half the city.

To learn more about this staggering prophecy, request our free booklet Jerusalem in Prophecy.
The world is becoming a more dangerous place, and the blame largely rests with America. **By Richard Palmer**

**Is the world more dangerous than ever before?** You might read a columnist or hear a presidential candidate make the assertion that it is. But how do you prove the truth of it? One trend that gives a good indication is military spending.

In 2011, the world was spending nearly as much on its military as it was at the height of World War II. We have remained around that historic peak in the years since. Even adjusted for inflation, the world is spending more than at any other time in history—during the Cold War, World War I or any other time.

It would be simplistic to say that the more money we spend on weapons, the more dangerous our world is. It also matters who is spending it. And when you look at those facts, the picture becomes even more disturbing.
Last year, Russia increased its defense budget by 8 percent; this year, it has said it wants to raise it by 15 percent. This move by Russia has prompted some dramatic jumps in European military spending.

Latvia is boosting its spending by 15 percent; Lithuania, by 50 percent. Ukraine, still warring with pro-Russian separatists—and even Russian forces—is expected to double its military spending this year.

Further west, the increases are also dramatic. Poland pledged to spend an extra $38 billion between 2013 and 2022. This year, France promised a $7 billion increase by 2019. Sweden says it will spend an extra billion. Norway and the Netherlands both announced increases in the hundreds of millions.

The most important thing about these statistics is not the numbers themselves, but the direction of the trend. For years, Europe’s militaries have been shrinking. Not anymore.

“These decisions present fundamental revisions of long-standing military spending practices in most of the countries that saw their defense budgets in more or less constant decline since the end of the Cold War,” wrote the Royal United Services Institute, a UK-based think tank. “The recent developments might therefore be regarded as being indicative of a substantial change in the countries’ defense discourse both at the political level and within the broader public debate” (May 1).

The most significant example of this is Germany.

Last year, several news outlets, including the Trumpet, noted that some German leaders were talking about increasing the defense budget. Just the fact that people were talking this way was news—for years, the goal had been to cut the budget.

At first, former Defense Minister Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg was one of the only high-profile people calling for an increase in military spending. “It is appalling that Germany recently decided to cut military spending by about €800 million (US$1.05 billion) in 2015,” he wrote in the Wall Street Journal in September 2014.

Soon after, others started joining him. The New York Times wrote that in response to the German military stumbling in operations in Iraq and Africa, German politicians were “pondering aloud the possible revision of what has long been a political no-go: raising the budget for defense spending” (Sept. 29, 2014). German defense expert Thomas Wiegold said, “Now I am being asked whether we should spend more money. That has never happened before” (ibid).

This year, the spending has begun. In March, Germany announced an €8 billion (US$9.1 billion) boost in military spending. That’s an increase of 6.2 percent. Such an increase went from unthinkable, to unpopular, to becoming reality—in around a year.

Now some Germans are calling for even more. The outgoing German Army chief of staff, for example, has called for an increase in spending of around $23 billion. The new parliamentary ombudsman for the armed forces, Hans-Peter Bartel, has called for billions more to be spent.

Three other countries in the region—Poland, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom—also announced increases in their defense budgets. The United Kingdom has announced an extra billion. Norway and the Netherlands both announced increases in the hundreds of millions.

The most recent example of the surge in military spending is Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia is the world’s fourth-largest military spender. And its spending has exploded. Over just the past 10 years, it has more than doubled its military expenditure. In 2014, it rose 17 percent, the largest increase in any of the world’s big spenders.

The Saudis are set to boost their defense budget by another 27 percent over the next five years, according to IHS Jane’s Aerospace, Defense and Security. The United Arab Emirates and Qatar are also planning to up their spending. Qatari officials announced $23 billion worth of potential deals last year, in what IHS Jane’s...
called an “unprecedented increase in investment in the military” (June 1).

The Financial Times noted that these countries are all “seeking more advanced weaponry from the U.S. to counter what [they fear] could be an emboldened Iran” (June 2).

Over the summer, the Pentagon disclosed that Saudi Arabia wants to spend $5.5 billion on advanced Patriot missile launchers. If it follows through, it will wield enormous power in the skies above the Persian Gulf. Saudi Arabia was recently forced to announce cuts to government spending because of low oil prices. But even though defense spending is one third of its budget, it is not cutting that. Economic realities may still curb some of the Saudis’ ambitions, but they are placing a higher priority than ever on the military.

All these figures refer only to conventional military spending; they do not include nuclear weapons. As nations throughout the region are well aware, the Iran deal will allow Iran to get a bomb. Tehran can break the deal and rush for one now, or stick to the deal and get one legally in just a few years. This raises the specter of a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

The Saudis’ desire for a bomb of their own has been well documented. In May, the Sunday Times quoted an American intelligence official as saying, “We know this stuff is available to them off the shelf.” As to whether the Saudis had decided to become a nuclear power, the official responded, “That has to be the assumption.” The Times also quoted Prince Turki bin Faisal, the former Saudi intelligence chief and ambassador to London and Washington, declaring, “Whatever the Iranians have, we will have, too.”

This trend is much harder to get concrete, reliable information on. The Saudis won’t be publishing regular updates on their progress toward a bomb. But in June they did sign an agreement with Russia for civilian nuclear power development.

Related to this region is Africa, with North Africa closely connected to events in the Middle East. Here, in 2014, military spending was up 6 percent, with Algeria and Angola leading that increase.

In Asia, military spending has undergone some major shifts in the past few decades. Since 2005, it has risen 62 percent. From 2013 to 2014, it rose 5 percent.

In February 2014, consulting firm McKinsey & Company published a report, “Southeast Asia: The Next Growth Opportunity in Defense.” It said, “[A] profound shift in economic power is reshaping the global landscape of defense spending. For the first time in more than two centuries—since the start of the Industrial Revolution—the majority of the world’s economic growth took place in the developing world, driven in large part by China, India and other emerging economies.

“Emerging markets are now spending more on defense than ever before. Countries such as China, Brazil and India have doubled or even tripled their defense spending during the past two decades. Southeast Asia—Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam—is now among the top defense spenders globally. These countries have collectively doubled their military spending between 1992 and 2012.”

China is the world’s second-largest military spender. In 2014, it is estimated to have spent $216 billion on its military, an increase of about 10 percent over previous years. As the McKinsey report notes, this trend began decades ago. But there is also the much more recent trend from China: its island grabbing and island building in the South China Sea.

In May, CNBC published an article titled “Asia Defense Spending: New Arms Race in South China Sea,” which said, “The Philippines, Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and Taiwan are beefing up their military in the face of increasingly bold incursions in the region by China. But most of that spending is not going to weapons makers in the United States.” The statistics back up CNBC’s claims.

Over the next year, Asia’s major powers are planning bigger defense increases. China plans to increase its spending by 10 percent. India is planning an 11 percent jump. At the start of this year, Japan approved its largest ever defense budget, at around $42 billion—the third straight year of increase. IHS Jane’s forecasts that the Philippines will double its spending by 2021.
Nations around the globe are arming themselves for world war. For the last four years, global military spending has approached its all-time peak during World War II. And it is about to rise even further. The situation brings to mind the chilling end-time prophecy of Joel 3:9-10, where the battle cry is sounded: “Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up: Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruninghooks into spears ....”

Building to a climax

Year-by-year global military expenditures since the beginning of the 20th century show that Cold War spending dwarfed that of what was called “The Great War” at the time—World War I. Those decades of arms build-ups far exceeded even the historically unprecedented calamity of World War II. Spending dipped after the Soviet Union fell in 1990, but now the world has entered a dangerous new era: Year after year, routine defense budgets and military expenditures roughly match the brief spike that constituted the most destructive war in human history.

(U.S. dollars, adjusted for inflation)

Shifting power

Note the breakdown of global spending at crucial points during the 20th century. The earlier years were dominated by Britain. Before each world war, Germany vaulted itself into position as the top spender. America never became a major arms spender until well into World War II.
Comparing arms spending worldwide in 2000 to 2014 reveals a stark picture. The United States dramatically outspends every other nation on Earth, making its declining global influence even more stunning. Meanwhile, Russia and China are rapidly closing the gap. Their combined spending in 2000 represented 17.3 percent of America’s defense budget; just 14 years later, it almost tripled to nearly half of U.S. spending. Also noteworthy is Europe’s substantial yet singularly static defense spending. It is facts like these that are causing European leaders to urgently demand more weapons. (U.S. dollars, adjusted for inflation)
Russia Outmaneuvers the United States in Syria

How President Obama’s redline debacle gave way to Putin’s adventurism in the Middle East. BY BRENT NAGTEGAAL

For the first time since the breakup of the Soviet Union, Russian forces are involved in a combat mission in the Middle East. Moscow says it is basically doing what the United States has sought to do there: destroy the powerful extremist terrorist entity that calls itself the Islamic State. Yet the facts on the ground indicate Russia’s real ambition: to replace the United States as the dominant power in the region.

Protecting an Ally

For over four years, a devastating civil war has raged within Syria, causing the greatest migration of people from a war zone since World War II. It started when Syrian President Bashar Assad resisted the revolutionary fervor that swept other dictators from power across the Middle East in early 2011, putting down dissenters with overwhelming force.

At the time, Western nations—including the U.S., the main power broker in the Middle East since the late 1970s—called for Assad’s removal from office. A United Nations Security Council resolution was drafted in October 2011 calling for sanctions on Assad if he continued to kill his own people. Two permanent members of the Security Council—Russia and China—blocked the resolution.

It was a sign of things to come. At every turn in the four years since, Moscow has sought to subvert Washington’s efforts to remove Assad from Syria.

U.S. Played on Chemical Weapons

Following its unsuccessful bid for international sanctions on Syria in 2011, the U.S. continued to call for Assad to step down. Months dragged on, and it was clear that it would take more than American rhetoric to remove Assad.

The existence of large stockpiles of chemical weapons in Syria was well known to international agencies. U.S. officials believed Syria maintained about 1,000 tons of mustard gas, Sarin and VX nerve agents in its arsenal. In August 2012, President Barack Obama said Assad would cross a “redline” if he used chemical weapons on his own people—an implicit threat of force. This threat relieved many of America’s Mideast allies, especially the Gulf states; it indicated that after so many debacles in the region, the U.S. still had some backbone.

In August 2013, Assad did use chemical weapons on rebel-held areas on the outskirts of Damascus, killing hundreds of his own people. Graphic images of dead corpses circulated through the media. The redline was crossed. The U.S. would have to act.

Before any military action took place, U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry was asked by a reporter in London if there was anything the Assad regime could do to prevent an American attack. Seamlingly off-hand, Kerry responded that if Assad “could turn over every single bit of his chemical weapons to the international community in the next week,” that could do it.

With that comment, the Russian bear’s ears pricked up. In less than a week, Moscow approached the U.S. with a proposal to remove Assad’s chemical weapons. Not eager for military action, Washington embraced the idea and accepted the agreement—even while Russia stipulated that if Assad didn’t comply, there would still be no UN mandate for military action against him.

Secretary Kerry called the chemical weapons agreement with Russia “groundwork for more cooperation” between the former Cold War enemies. The event was sold as a great foreign-policy success for the Obama administration—a sign that the “reset” with Russia might actually have worked. In reality, Russia was simply acting to preserve its ally in the Middle East; removing the chemical weapons was just a distraction to keep Assad in power.

The redline that wasn’t a redline was a watershed moment for Russia’s geopolitical calculus in the Middle East. Russia now understood that America would rather face a major humiliation and loss of credibility among its allies and its enemies in order to get out of deploying its military against Assad—especially since that would jeopardize another key foreign-policy objective of the Obama administration: reconciliation with Iran.

Suleimani’s Surprise

With the redline in Syria largely forgotten, the rise of the vicious Islamic State diverted the world’s attention from Assad’s atrocities. Realizing Syria’s armed forces were stretched thin, Iran instructed Assad to pull back from Syria’s eastern border. This allowed the Islamic State to gobble up more territory. It also allowed Assad to devote more resources to battle the more immediate threat to the north, the “Syrian rebels.”

Supported financially and militarily by Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Turkey, rebel factions were having limited success at taking territory from the Syrian regime. Realizing Assad’s dire situation, Iran summoned Lebanon-based
terrorist group Hezbollah to join the fight. This stemmed regime losses, but only for a time.

Moscow kept a close eye on the situation. Its only warm-water naval base, located on Syria’s Mediterranean coast, would be in jeopardy of falling to the rebels if Assad’s losses continued.

In April this year, Assad looked to be on his last legs. The regime controlled little over 20 percent of Syrian territory. The Kurds controlled the north, the Islamic State controlled the east, and the rebel factions were pushing west toward the Mediterranean Sea while knocking on Damascus’s back door.

Fearing it was about to lose its ally, Iran dispatched its Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) Quds Force commander, Gen. Qassem Suleimani, to Syria in early June. In the months before, Suleimani—who reports directly to Iran’s ayatollah—was seen on the Iraqi battlefield leading Shiite militias in the fight against the Islamic State. During his few days in Syria, Suleimani announced that “the world will be surprised by what we and the Syrian military leadership are preparing for the coming days” (Al-Quds al-Arabi, June 2).

In late July, despite a United Nations travel ban imposed on the Iranian general for past terrorist activities, Suleimani visited Moscow and met with Russian President Vladimir Putin. While the U.S. State Department dithered on whether or not Suleimani broke the law, Iran and Russia were hatching a plan for Syria.

Just days before, President Obama said Putin had called him and they had an encouraging talk about solving the Syrian crisis. Mr. Obama suggested that Moscow “could be enlisted in a diplomatic settlement to the Syrian civil war along lines Washington and its Arab allies support” (Washington Post, September 8). But within a week, Suleimani was in Moscow unrolling a large map of Syria, showing how a series of setbacks could be turned into victory—with Russian intervention, of course.

When Suleimani returned to Tehran, Iranian state media trumpeted that the meeting had concerned the sale of military hardware to Iran. Now we know that Suleimani’s visit was to plan Russia’s move into Syria to bolster its ailing ally.

Once again, the U.S. was hoodwinked.

Fighting the Islamic State?
As was the case with other recent Russian military interventions such as in Ukraine, in late August unconfirmed reports started to appear that Russian advisers had been spotted with Assad’s troops. At first, Russia denied having troops on the ground in Syria. But in early September, when satellite imaging captured a forward operating base in western Syria that was accommodating Russian fighters, helicopters and tanks—Russia had to come clean.

On September 28, President Putin used his first address to the United Nations in 10 years to call on the international community to stand behind Syria’s government for the sake of undermining the Islamic State.

However, a look at where Russian fighters have attacked so far indicates that Russia is going less after the Islamic State than it is the anti-Assad rebels. At the start of October, fewer than 10 percent of Russia’s missiles had struck the Islamic State or al Qaeda-affiliated targets, according to the U.S. State Department. “It’s clear that Russia’s strategy in Syria is to make the conflict binary by giving Syrians only two choices: Assad or ISIS,” said John Schinder, former U.S. intelligence analyst (Daily Beast, October 8).

What’s worse, many of those rebel groups are backed by the U.S. It’s a common sight on the Syrian battlefield today to see American-made antitank missiles being fired by CIA-approved rebel factions against Russian-built Soviet tanks.

Then there are reports of American fighter jets over Syrian skies. On October 20, U.S. pilots were warned by their top commanders not to react to any Russian military planes. This is just another sign of Russia’s brazen confidence, knowing America will avoid conflict at all costs.

Four years ago, the U.S. said “Assad must go.” Ever since, Russia has outmaneuvered the U.S., to where Washington is now “flexible on the timetable” for Assad’s departure. How long before America completely abandons its position and agrees with Putin that it would be best for Syria if Assad remained in power?

In the Syrian battle of wills, Russia has beaten the U.S. Whether or not Putin decides to stay in the Middle East does not really matter: The damage to American prestige is done. American power no longer dominates the Middle East.

America’s traditional allies in the Gulf, as well as Israel, are taking notice and will have to look elsewhere for the protection once guaranteed by America.

A Surprise for Putin
Through all the gamesmanship between the U.S. and Russia, one more non-Middle East power stands to be affected by the situation in Syria: Europe.

Europe is trying to decide what to do with the hundreds of thousands of Syrian migrants that have arrived at its borders. However, many realize that solutions will fall short unless something is done at the main source: Syria.

Earlier this year, Europe, like the U.S., was hoping that a change in the Syrian regime was near. Now, with Russia’s intervention, European hopes have been dashed. And undoubtedly, Russia isn’t too disturbed by how the immigration crisis will weaken Europe.

As it stands now, Europe is not united enough, strong enough, and does not have enough political will to confront Russia in Syria. Indeed, Europe is barely able to form a united front against Russia in the European border nation of Ukraine.

But while most commentators will scoff at the idea of European intervention in Syria—especially now that Russia is there, and the U.S., its NATO ally, is weakened—Bible prophecy says that is exactly what will happen.

Putin’s power play in Syria will not last but, in fact, will be short-lived. According to a prophecy found in Psalm 83, the Syrian people won’t look to Russia as an ally, nor to Iran. Ultimately they will look to a German-led Europe!

That is when you will really begin to see power exerted over the Middle East.
How the incredible history of a Persian king can change your view of the Bible  

**BY BRAD MACDONALD**

**The Startling Truth About One of History’s Greatest Kings**

**EVEN TODAY, MORE THAN 2,500 YEARS after his death, Cyrus the Great of ancient Persia remains one of humanity’s most brilliant and outstanding monarchs. There is much to learn and admire about King Cyrus, and no dearth of knowledge on this subject.**

But the most interesting feature about this man and his towering accomplishments is also the most obscure. It is also profoundly inspiring.

**Who Was Cyrus?**

Cyrus II ruled the Persian Empire from 559 to 530 B.C. The history of his life and accomplishments is well documented by Greek and Roman historians and by archaeological evidence. Among his many feats, Cyrus conquered the invincible Babylonian-Chaldean Empire and established Persia as the world power.

Under Cyrus, the borders of the Persian Empire rapidly expanded to create the largest empire humanity had ever seen. Under his leadership, ancient Persia’s borders stretched to Central Asia (Russia’s southern border today); as far east as the Indus River (the Pakistan-India border); as far north as the Danube, including Turkey, Crete and the southern parts of Greece and Bulgaria; and as far south as Libya.

But Cyrus was much more than a prodigious conqueror. He heralded a new breed of leadership and politics. Unlike the Assyrians and others before him, he did not rule exclusively by sword and spear. Subjects were not beaten, tortured and killed into acquiescence and cooperation. In fact, many consider this king the world’s first true humanitarian.

“Cyrus was an outstanding soldier and statesman,” the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says. “He founded an empire that stretched from the Indus and Jazartes to the Aegean and the borders of Egypt and left behind him a reputation for justice and clemency…” (emphasis added). *The Mainstream of Civilization* says, “Cyrus created a new type of empire. Under the close supervision of his government, he permitted the conquered peoples to retain their own customs and religions and their own forms of government.”

For a world inured to cruel, forceful governance, King Cyrus’s disposition was revolutionary and much welcomed. His subjects tended not to revolt, hence the staying power of the Persian Empire.

**The World’s Greatest City**

In the time of Cyrus, Babylon was extraordinarily well fortified, teemed with top-notch Babylonian soldiers, and had a well-earned aura of impenetrability. It was the greatest city in the world.
Originally constructed by Nimrod soon after the Flood, the city had experienced a massive makeover by King Nebuchadnezzar II in the late seventh and early sixth centuries B.C. Laden with materials and manpower plundered from neighbors, Nebuchadnezzar spared nothing in expanding, fortifying and beautifying his city. Babylon’s legendary hanging gardens, built for the queen who missed her lush, mountainous homeland in Media, were an engineering marvel, one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World.

Herodotus records that Babylon covered 196 square miles and was protected by an outer wall that was 311 feet high and 87 feet thick. The walls were so thick, even at the top, that chariots could be driven on them. Controlling access through this barrier were more than 100 bronze gateways.

The Euphrates River meandered through Babylon, much like the Thames through London. Inside the outer wall, the riverbanks were lined and walled with brick. In the wall on either side of the river were 25 gates. There was a bridge 1,080 yards long and 30 feet broad across the river. At either end of this bridge was the royal palace. The more magnificent of these palaces was surrounded by three walls. The middle wall was 300 feet high, with towers 420 feet in height. The inner wall was yet higher. The two inner walls, Cterias tells us, were of colored brick. Upon them were portrayed hunting scenes—the chase of the leopard and the lion (A Handbook of Ancient History in Bible Light).

Cyrus sought to do the impossible: to conquer this impenetrable fortress. His strategy was brilliantly simple. First, he dug trenches upstream and diverted water from the Euphrates into a large reservoir. Once the water level had dropped, and under the cover of darkness, Persian soldiers slipped into the knee-deep water, marched up the riverbed, and snuck under Babylon’s giant gates.

Although the soldiers had infiltrated the outer gates, there were still brass and iron internal gates controlling access out of the riverbed and into the city. If they couldn’t get through the gates, the soggy riverbed would turn the Persians’ tactical advantage into a massive kill box. All the Babylonian soldiers had to do was rain spears and arrows down on them. In fact, if they could block the Persians’ retreat, the Babylonians could conceivably kill every last Persian soldier, to a man—like shooting fish in a barrel.

But strangely, on the night of the invasion, there were no soldiers, and the internal gates were wide open. King Nabonidus, his son Belshazzar, the imperial guard, the soldiers, and many of the people of Babylon were partying! Consumed with drinking and games, they had failed to close the gates and to station guards. Having quenched the Euphrates and penetrated the outer gates, the Persian soldiers were able to stroll through the internal gates, taking the city—including the shocked king—by surprise!

It was a magnificent victory, bordering on—and crossing into—the miraculous! Greek historians Herodotus and Xenophon recorded the history-changing event. King Cyrus’s conquest of Babylon in 539 B.C. was one of his most notable accomplishments. By conquering this mighty city, he toppled the world-ruling Babylonian-Chaldean Empire.

Cyrus the Humanitarian

In 1879, British archaeologists digging in Iran discovered a barrel-shaped cylinder made out of clay. Inscribed on the cylinder in ancient cuneiform was a decree by King Cyrus of Persia. In the 40-line decree, the king recalled his defeat of Babylon and clearly outlined a number of policies designed to defend the rights of the conquered.

You can find this incredible artifact, called the Cyrus Cylinder, in the British Museum. This cylinder confirms the historical records showing that King Cyrus displayed a tremendous and heretofore unprecedented respect and tolerance for the peoples he conquered. The United Nations says the Cyrus Cylinder is the “world’s first charter of human rights” and is proof that King Cyrus was one of mankind’s first great humanitarians.

Cyrus’s governance really is remarkable. For a man with so much power, he displayed incredible tolerance and even respect for the religion, customs and politics of the people he conquered.

His greatest and most famous humanitarian act was releasing the captive Jews in Babylon and allowing them to return to Judea to rebuild the temple and the city of Jerusalem. This decision by Cyrus is well known and well documented by Greek and Roman historians, as well as Josephus, the most recognized Jewish historian. Many believe the text on the Cyrus Cylinder alludes to the king’s decision to release the Jews.

King Cyrus issued his decree releasing the Jews in 538 B.C., about a year after he conquered Babylon. Zerubbabel, a leading Jewish figure in Babylon at the time, became responsible for mustering the party and leading it back to Jerusalem. There, they set about rebuilding Solomon’s temple. One of the most astonishing features about this decree is that there was no cost or price to the Jews. In fact, the king of Persia actually financed the Jews’ return to their homeland, their reconstruction of the temple, and their reconstruction of Jerusalem!

Any historian will agree: Such magnanimity and benevolence from a man with supreme power is extremely rare! Cyrus the Great was truly an anomaly among world leaders.

Biblical History

All of this history is well documented by secular historians and archaeological evidence. But there is another source that records these events in detail: the Bible. In Ezra 1:1-4, for example, we read of Cyrus’s decree releasing the Jews to return to Jerusalem. These scriptures in Ezra were recorded a few decades after the event. More records about King Cyrus can be found in Jeremiah 25 and 2 Chronicles 36, both of which were written after Cyrus was on the scene.

A passage in Isaiah 44 also discusses Cyrus the Great—and this is where the history gets exciting.

Isaiah 44:24 reads: “Thus saith the Lord, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the Lord that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself.” Here God is establishing His supremacy, even over the daily affairs of mankind.

Isaiah continues: “[God] saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid” (verse 28). Isaiah is writing about how King Cyrus would be an instrument
in God's hands—"my shepherd"—and explaining how God would inspire Cyrus to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple.

The thought continues in Isaiah 45:1: "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." Isaiah is saying that God would empower King Cyrus, even helping him "subdue nations" and make massive territorial goals.

The narrative becomes even more specific: "I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight: I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron" (verse 2). If you study this passage and Bible commentaries, you will easily see that these scriptures are specifically discussing King Cyrus's conquest of Babylon. Notice, God says He will help Cyrus rupture the "gates of brass" and "bars of iron."

Isaiah's account is similar to the accounts in Ezra and 2 Chronicles. Except for one critical factor.

The book of Isaiah was written about 150 years before Cyrus the Great was born!

It's true. King Cyrus, his rise to power, his defeat of Babylon, his humanitarian legacy, his name—even Babylon's gates of iron and brass—were all prophesied by God about one and a half centuries before Cyrus's birth!

Slow down and think about this. This is awesome proof of God's existence and the veracity of the Holy Bible.

How do we know Isaiah was written before Cyrus was born? It's not hard to prove. Isaiah 1:1 says: "The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah."

This verse clearly says that Isaiah was alive and writing during the reigns of four kings of Judah: Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah. Biblical history, as well as Jewish history and established historical record, clearly show that these all reigned in the eighth century b.C. This is nowhere disputed.

Bible commentators agree that Isaiah was on the scene for about 50 years, roughly between 760 and 710 B.C. For example, Isaiah 38:3-8 show that he prophesied during the reign of King Hezekiah.

Critics of the Bible despise Isaiah 44 and 45. Over the last century or so, numerous theories have emerged to explain how this passage of scripture was written after King Cyrus. The most prominent theory says that the book of Isaiah has multiple authors, and that some parts of the book, mainly the latter chapters, were written at a different time and much later than the first part of the book. According to this theory, the book of Isaiah was compiled into a single book around 70 B.C.

But this theory has been proven false. A copy of the entire book of Isaiah was discovered as part of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The scrolls on which the text of Isaiah was discovered were dated to around 200 B.C., proving that the entire book of Isaiah was completed well before 70 B.C.!

Consider too: Josephus recorded that King Cyrus actually read this prophecy about himself in the book of Isaiah! If the prophecy in Isaiah 44-45 was written after Cyrus lived and by another author, how could King Cyrus have read about himself?

Perhaps this explains why Cyrus was so benevolent and so enthusiastic about releasing the Jews. After reading Isaiah's prophecy, he realized that he was predestined to make this wondrous decision!

But how did Cyrus gain access to Isaiah's prophecy? We don't know the specifics, but we do know that King Cyrus knew the Prophet Daniel well. Daniel was well versed in Isaiah's prophecies and probably owned a copy of Isaiah's text. Daniel lived in Babylon. After Cyrus took Babylon and toppled the Babylonian Empire, Daniel became a high-ranking official in Cyrus's Medo-Persian Empire.

All Hail King Cyrus

Take some time to really think on this, and to study Isaiah 44 and 45. The evidence is irrefutable.

First, it is obvious that Isaiah 44:28 and 45:1-4 are talking about King Cyrus. He is mentioned by name!

Next, consider Cyrus's relationship with Jerusalem. Isaiah 44:28 records Cyrus "even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid." The temple in Jerusalem hadn't even been destroyed—and here was God prophesying that it would be rebuilt!

Verse 28 also explains the origins of Cyrus's humanitarianism. Cyrus treated all his conquered peoples much the same way as he treated the Jews. Cyrus didn't just allow the Jews to practice their religion: He released them from captivity, loaded them up with wealth and treasures, gave them letters of endorsement, and sent them home to rebuild the temple and Jerusalem!

Surely this is one of the greatest humanitarian acts in history.

And to think, it was prophesied to happen 150 years before it actually did! Isaiah 45:1 says Cyrus would "subdue nations before him." Study the history books: Cyrus conquered more than 15 different peoples—all the way from Egypt in the south to Turkey to Central Asia to the Indus River.

Verse 1 also says God would "loose the loins of kings" before Cyrus. The Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Commentary states: "The loose outer robe of the [kings], when girt fast around the loins, was the emblem of strength and preparedness for action; ungirt was indication of feebleness [and weakness]." This is a perfect description of Belshazzar the night of Babylon's fall!

In addition, verse 1 says God would "open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut." The history of Babylon's destruction shows that the king of Babylon left some of the internal gates of the city open that night! "In the revelry in Babylon on the night of its capture, the inner gates, leading from the streets to the river, were left open ... which, had they been kept shut, would have hemmed the invading hosts in the bed of the river, where the Babylonians could have easily destroyed them. Also, the gates of the palace were left open, so that there was access to every part of the city" (ibid).

Look how specific God is—even prophesying the exact gates that would be left open in Babylon the night of its capture!

In verse 2, God says, "I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight: I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron. The strongest doors in Babylon were not able to withstand the army of Cyrus that night. Again, God prophesied the exact material that the gates of Babylon would be made of! Herodotus
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recorded that the gates of the inner walls were made of brass and some were reinforced with iron!

This is some of the most moving and powerful history you can study. Why?
Because it proves the existence of God and the veracity of His Word!

God Reigns Supreme

Why would God prophesy the life and accomplishments of a Persian king 150 years before his birth? The answer to that question is the theme of Isaiah 44:46. In Isaiah 45:3, God says, “And I will give thee [Cyrus] the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that I, the Lord, which call thee by thy name, am the God of Israel.”

God makes the purpose of this prophecy abundantly clear: The life and work of King Cyrus prove the existence of God!

Cyrus himself understood this. “Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and he hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah” (Ezra 1:2). This great king knew God existed, and he knew that God reigns supreme in the world of man.

The history of Cyrus the Great is interesting and inspiring—but it is also much more. This history proves the authority of the Holy Bible! It shows that this Book of books is true and accurate. It shows that it is authored by an omnipotent God who can prophesy what He will do and bring it to pass!

For anyone willing to study and prove it, this history shows that the Holy Bible is the true Word of God!
**Worldwatch**

**EU to Britain: Get on board or get out**

Europe must integrate much more closely, and Britain must either join in or leave, French President François Hollande said on October 7. Speaking in a rare joint appearance before the European Parliament with German Chancellor Angela Merkel, Hollande laid out his vision of what amounts to a European superstate. “We need to keep our eyes on the long term, for the federation of nation states, which must remain our horizon,” he said.

He called for Europe to form a common defense policy and coast guard, a joint asylum system, and new eurozone institutions.

Reacting to criticism of European integration from United Kingdom Independence Party leader Nigel Farage, Hollande said, “If we don’t want to strengthen Europe, then there’s only one road ... the only road for those who are not convinced of Europe is to leave Europe.”

---

**Germany to Afghanistan:**

**You’re not alone in anti-terror fight**

The Germans and the Afghans are “old friends” whose friendship “has no end date,” German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier told Afghanistan on August 30 during a visit to the war-torn country.

Arriving at the airport in Kabul, Steinmeier wore a bulletproof vest and a helmet, and traveled to Afghan President Ashraf Ghani’s palace by helicopter, since driving in the capital city is considered more dangerous.

Steinmeier used his visit to celebrate 100 years of German-Afghan friendship. The German representatives on the Niedermayer-Hentig expedition traveled to Afghanistan in 1915 to convince the Afghans to support Germany in World War I. The two nations signed a Treaty of Friendship early the following year.

“The people in Afghanistan can continue to count on Germany’s solidarity,” Steinmeier later said, “through our varied involvement in civilian reconstruction and development, our contribution to the training and advice mission Resolute Support, and our financial support for the Afghan security forces.”

Germany has 850 troops in Afghanistan, the largest contingent besides the United States. It is the third-largest financial contributor after the United States and Japan, providing about $4.7 billion for civilian reconstruction and development since the U.S.-led invasion of Afghanistan in 2001.

Why is Germany interested in Afghanistan?

“Look on the far side of Iran,” Trumpet editor in chief Gerald Flurry wrote in 2013, “and you see 4,400 German soldiers staying in its eastern neighbor, Afghanistan, even while American troops pull out. Washington is eager to get out—but Berlin has something else in mind. ... Germany has surrounded Iran and radical Islam, just as God prophesied it would. Soon that whirlwind is going to start rotating and whirling against the king of the south like a well-armed—probably nuclear-armed—vortex!” Read the full article, “The Whirlwind Prophecy,” at theTrumpet.com/go/10678.

---

**South China Sea ‘belongs to China’**

Chinese Vice Adm. Yuan Yubai, commander of the People’s Liberation Army Navy’s North Sea Fleet, insisted on September 14 that the South China Sea belongs exclusively to China.

“The South China Sea, as the name indicates, is a sea area that belongs to China, and the sea from the Han dynasty a long time ago where the Chinese people have been working and producing from the sea,” he said at the First Sea Lord/Rusi International Sea Power Conference in London.

Yuan’s statement came in response to criticism about China’s land reclamation activities in the South China Sea. With this ongoing project, China is building artificial islands in disputed territories throughout the South China Sea and converting them into small military bases.

China’s land reclamation project has fueled tensions in Asia, which have contributed to a region-wide arms buildup. Yuan’s emphatic comments indicate that those tensions will not soon subside.

---

**EU to Britain: Get on board or get out**

Europe must integrate much more closely, and Britain must either join in or leave, French President François Hollande said on October 7. Speaking in a rare joint appearance before the European Parliament with German Chancellor Angela Merkel, Hollande laid out his vision of what amounts to a European superstate. “We need to keep our eyes on the long term, for the federation of nation states, which must remain our horizon,” he said.

He called for Europe to form a common defense policy and coast guard, a joint asylum system, and new eurozone institutions.

Reacting to criticism of European integration from United Kingdom Independence Party leader Nigel Farage, Hollande said, “If we don’t want to strengthen Europe, then there’s only one road ... the only road for those who are not convinced of Europe is to leave Europe.”
China to forgive debts of least-developed nations

Chinese President Xi Jinping said on September 26 that Beijing would forgive debts owed to China by the world’s least-developed nations, and will give billions of dollars to poor nations to hasten their development.

Addressing a United Nations summit on development goals, Xi said China also plans to assist in no fewer than 600 overseas projects in the next five years.

“To solve various global challenges, including the recent refugee crisis in Europe, the fundamental solutions lie in seeking peace and realizing development,” Xi said. “Only the development can eliminate the causes of the conflicts.”

Analysts say the moves help China to deflect criticism regarding its heavy and often exploitative trade with developing nations in Africa and elsewhere. It will also help China to bolster its influence in resource-rich regions. The strategy is also designed to portray the emerging Chinese superpower as a more generous alternative to the United States.

Japan to let soldiers fight overseas

Japan’s parliament passed a landmark law on September 19 that allows the Japanese military to fight in foreign conflicts for the first time since World War II.

Before this law, Japan’s military was constitutionally forbidden to take part in any actions not related to the direct defense of Japanese territory. The new law allows Tokyo to send troops to international conflicts where they can cooperate with the United States and other allies.

The legislation passed despite heated objections from several parliament members and much of the Japanese public. Some critics of the law say it violates Japan’s pacifist constitution, which renounces the use of force as a means for Japan to settle international disputes. Other opponents fear that the new law will make Japan America’s “deputy sheriff,” allowing Washington to drag Tokyo into America’s numerous “self-serving” conflicts.

The law is likely to be challenged in the courts, but authorities expect it to pass the hurdles. Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and his political allies want Japan to become a full-fledged military power once again, and the new law is a major stride in that direction.

Iran adds precision to missile program

Iran fired its first precision-guided ballistic missile on October 11, just hours before its parliament approved the generalities of the nuclear deal struck in July. (The legislators have been denied access to the specifics of the deal.)

The Emad missile is an advanced form of Iran’s Shahab 3 and can strike the periphery of Israel and Europe.

In an August 29 television address, Iranian President Hassan Rouhani declared that his nation “is not committed to the restrictions on its missile program” that the United Nations Security Council has put in place to govern Iran’s ballistic missile program.

Following the Emad launch, Iran Defense Minister Hossein Dehghan reiterated his nation’s intent to ignore the UN resolution: “We don’t ask permission from anyone to strengthen our defense and missile capabilities.”

Pro-Palestinian EU to brand Israeli goods

The European Parliament is closer to fulfilling its long-standing threat to label goods produced in the West Bank. On September 10, Parliament officials passed a non-binding resolution “on EU-wide guidelines on the labeling of Israeli settlement produce.”

The resolution passed with a sweeping majority—525 voted for it, 70 voted against, and 31 abstained.

Unemployment in the West Bank is 25 percent, and about 25,000 Palestinians work for Israeli companies. An EU official referenced by Army Radio acknowledged the harm that the resolution would have on the Palestinians if implemented, but said it would be balanced by the harm inflicted on the Jews.

Israel condemned the resolution and challenged its legality under international trade law. The Israeli Foreign Ministry said, “The process of labeling is discriminatory and reeks of boycott.” Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said it harms peace rather than advancing it. “The roots of the conflict are not territories, and the roots of the conflict are not the settlements,” he said. “We already have a historical memory as to what happened when Europe marked products of Jews.”

In August 2001, the Trumpet wrote this about Europe’s rising influence in the Israeli peace process: “What should be obvious to objective observers, and what Trumpet readers must understand, is that Europe is no casual third party trying to find the best solution for both sides of the conflict. And where America has been mostly talk, Europe is sure to be hands on.”
Worldwatch

Still suffering from thousand-year rainfall

South Carolina is facing failing dams, contaminated water, billions of dollars in damage, rebuilding—and more predicted flooding after more than 20 inches of rain fell on the state in early October, with some areas receiving as much as 40 inches. At one point, half the state was flooded.

The Weather Channel reported, “The official statewide 24-hour rainfall record was exceeded in several locations, and the unofficial state record for five-day total rainfall, which had stood for 107 years, has been surpassed at more than a dozen reporting sites” (October 6). Meteorologists declared the disaster a once-in-a-millennium storm.

There have been at least five other once-in-a-thousand-year rainfalls in the United States since 2010. Steve Bowen of Aon Benfield, a global reinsurance firm, said that “any increasing trend in these type of rainfall events is highly concerning.”

Our free booklet Why ‘Natural’ Disasters? explains the primary cause of catastrophic weather.

Half of marine life has died since 1970

New research from the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) released on September 15 indicates that half of the world’s marine life has been killed off since 1970. Some of the greatest declines were in fish types critical to human consumption and came from overfishing.

“In the space of a single generation, human activity has severely damaged the ocean by catching fish faster than they can reproduce,” said Marco Lambertini, director general of WWF International.

Pollution, overexploitation and recreation has led to dramatic declines in mangroves, sea grasses and coral reefs, which French biologist Gilles Boeuf said harbor a third of ocean species.

The family of fish that includes tuna and mackerel has declined 74 percent since 1970. A quarter of shark and ray species face extinction. Four shark species in the Mediterranean have not been spotted in 30 years.

Scientist Philippe Cury said that 50 percent is a critical threshold for loss of marine life. “When you go below 50 percent,” he said, “ecosystems begin to malfunction.”

Sierra Nevada’s snowpack at 500-year low

The Sierra Nevada snowpack, which accounts for more than one third of California’s water supply, has receded to its lowest level since the Middle Ages, according to a new study released on September 14.

Measured on April 1, when it generally reaches its greatest depths, the snowpack was only 5 percent of the 1950-2000 average, making it the smallest in 500 years. The measurement was confirmed 10 times in a study of the growth patterns of 1,500 ancient blue oak trees in the Central Valley.

Snow levels indicate how much water will be available later in the season. Snowmelt gradually feeds rivers and streams, supporting fish and other wildlife, replenishing soil moisture, and filling reservoirs.

California has been suffering a severe drought for four years, leaving more than 120 of the state’s reservoirs less than a fifth full. The lack of moisture has allowed rampant wildfires to destroy more than 100,000 acres, hundreds of homes, and numerous businesses. With a diminished snowpack, the region’s strained agriculture sector, drinking water and hydroelectric power are now under even more stress.

The study’s lead author, Valeri Trouet, said, “We should be prepared for this type of snow drought to occur much more frequently because of rising temperatures.”
Number of sanctuary cities rise as immigration laws go unenforced

The number of sanctuary cities across the United States is growing. There are now 340 jurisdictions that are obstructing immigration enforcement, according to a report released by the Center for Immigration Studies in October.

Another report prepared by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) showed that each month the sanctuary cities are releasing approximately 1,000 alien offenders that ICE seeks to deport. Of those released, 62 percent “had significant prior criminal histories or other public safety concerns even before the arrest that led to a detainer.”

The murder of Kate Steinle by an illegal immigrant in San Francisco on July 1 brought sanctuary cities back on to the political scene. The man charged with her murder had been deported five times and had seven prior felony convictions. ICE, which had asked to be notified of his release, was never informed.

Rep. Luis Gutiérrez, during a congressional hearing, accused the Republicans of “exploiting” the death of Kate Steinle for political purposes. Republicans replied that her death was easily preventable. It boiled down to one thing: following the law.

Local sanctuary cities are failing to consistently enforce federal law. Some sanctuary city sheriffs claim they should not receive the label since they participate in the administration’s new Priority Enforcement Program (PEP). But the Center for Immigration Studies report explains: “PEP explicitly allows jurisdictions to obstruct immigration enforcement by ignoring detainers or barring ICE access to jails. Under PEP, immigration officers also issue ‘requests for notification’ asking local authorities to tell them when a criminal alien in their custody will be released so ICE can attempt to take custody for deportation. Local agencies are free to ignore these notifications.”

When a nation’s own law enforcement agencies pick and choose which laws to enforce, the nation is in a dangerous situation.

What do gamblers and compulsive texters have in common?

Compulsive texters exhibit behavior similar to gamblers, a study published October 5 says.

The authors, who surveyed over 400 eighth and 11th graders in a Midwestern town, found that many teenage texters lose sleep, have problems cutting back, and lie to cover up their habits, much like gamblers.

The research showed that compulsive texting involves more than just the frequency of texting; it has more to do with the individual’s inability to pull away from their phone.

While gamblers lose thousands of dollars due to their addiction, compulsive female student texters lose academic performance and friendships, the study showed.

The researchers cautioned that this part of the study was based on self-reporting, but said it confirmed other studies that show the correlation between lower grades and texting while doing homework.

One in six adolescents admits to stealing within the past year

A study has found that one in six young Americans has stolen something within the past year. The study, published in the Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization in November was based on self-reported theft by 12-to-16-year-olds from 1997 to 2011.

The study found that thieves had lower earnings later in life, after most had already stopped stealing.

According to another study published in the American Journal of Psychiatry, a history of shoplifting increased association with all antisocial behaviors measured, the strongest of which were with increased antisocial personality disorders, substance abuse, pathological gambling, and bipolar disorders. Further studies have linked stealing among adolescents to poor grades, alcohol and drug abuse, sadness and hopelessness.

The National Association of Shoplifting Prevention estimates around $13 billion worth of goods are stolen in the United States each year.
Pope Francis, President Obama and Their Adoring Press

BY STEPHEN FLURRY

Pope Francis visited the United States for the first time in September. You may have noticed.

Everywhere he went, he attracted worshipful throngs. If you watched on television, you saw many of them stretching and straining to touch any part of his body, to grab hold of his garment. Parents pleaded for the pontiff to kiss their sick and disabled children. On Capitol Hill, House Speaker John Boehner was so overcome with emotion during the pope’s address, he was seen repeatedly wiping away tears.

After that speech, one congressman rushed to the podium and grabbed the pope’s unfinished glass of water. He wanted to drink—and have his wife and children drink—from the same cup. Perhaps he drew inspiration from the account in Matthew 20, where Jesus asked if His disciples were willing to drink from the same cup from which He would drink.

Devout Catholics see Pope Francis as the Vicar of Christ. The definition of vicar does not mean a mere representative of Christ—it means the pope is in place of Christ. When you see people weeping over this man, thronging into the streets to see him, reaching out to touch him, adoring him, hanging on his every word and rushing the stage to touch their lips to the same cup, it sure does seem like they are treating this man as if he were Jesus Christ.

And judging by the wall-to-wall, 24-hour, five-day coverage of the pope’s visit—served up by an openly adoring press—you could be forgiven for assuming they drank from the same cup of pope worship.

After all, how does the major media normally treat religious people?

Let’s say you’re a county clerk (a lifelong Democrat, actually) who refuses to sign a marriage license for homosexuals because of your religious beliefs. Journalists will automatically attack, agreeing that you should immediately be jailed and that Americans in general should learn of your personal failings and sins. Let’s say you are a bakery owner who declines to cater a ceremony for two grooms. Journalists will ambush you and shade their coverage to favor those howling for the courts to shut you down.

Let’s say you are a conservative politician drawing inspiration from God and the Bible. They will ridicule you as primitive and unfit for office.

If you’re a private person who opposes a movement openly based on aberrant sexual desires, the press, social media and even businesses will hush, ridicule or smear you. If you’re Muslim, you may get a pass. But if you’re a Christian, you better be ready for some persecution.

Except if you are Pope Francis. Then they adore you.

Why Such Adulation?

How unusual was the way the pope was treated during his five-day tour. His every movement was broadcast in real-time on multiple, if not all, major networks. You could sit for half an hour watching CNN broadcasting a few cars on a roped-off Philadelphia street in the dark and hear commentators go back and forth with frequent speculation on whether the pope had or had not in fact left his car to go into the building and go to bed.

The press went to huge lengths to capture these minute details. During his five-day American tour, everything he did was so meaningful, so profound—he was so sincere, had so much love for people, and such spiritual depth.

Such adoration is unusual in public discourse in America. The papacy has had a corrupt and bloody influence on European history, and America’s English ancestors largely broke free of papal control. America was founded free of Vatican interference, but with full toleration and acceptance of Catholics, a religious minority. America developed greatly free of the papacy, and it thrived, unhindered by much of the obeisance, intrigue, persecution, corruption and even war.
that the ancient church sparked among our country’s European ancestors. To have popes visit the United States has not been unheard of, but American history is notable and unique for its independence from Vatican influence.

Add to this the simple fact that the pope is, obviously, religious. Like other churches, his organization holds that there is a God, that there is good and evil, that human beings are sinful, that a God came to this planet as a human being to die for those sins, and that among those sins are the practices of homosexuality and abortion. State those same beliefs to the presidents of ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN and MSNBC to their face, and they will laugh you out of the room—or throw you out. Do it while wearing a cassock, and they won’t even let you in.

The networks would never give you or even the country’s most prominent Christian leaders the airtime they gave to the pope, even though there are twice as many American Protestants as there are Catholics. They won’t give that kind of coverage to rock stars or athletes, or even other heads of state.

So why did they so passionately embrace this religious leader?

In part, it is because over the last 30 months, he has outspokenly supported a number of issues on President Obama’s left-wing agenda.

Issue After Issue

Last year, Pope Francis helped President Obama reestablish full diplomatic relations with the Castro regime in Cuba. He offered strong support for the administration’s nuclear deal with Iran in May. He recognized the Palestinian “state” in June, a policy President Obama favors.

Francis has become known for his radical economic ideas. Soon after becoming pope, he began a campaign against excess and compulsive consumption, the sins of “savage capitalism.” He’s on a crusade for the poor, and his main target is America’s free market economy—specifically the idea that the person who should decide whether you should buy or sell is you. Francis wants heavier government involvement in those transactions, and a redistribution of wealth from those who have it to those who don’t. Much like President Obama.

Francis is also aggressive in his stance toward the environment. “Climate change is a problem we can no longer leave to our future generation,” the pope said at the White House during his U.S. visit. His position goes far beyond advocating ways to reduce pollution. He wants much more drastic changes, and he wants America to take dramatic steps that are risky to the U.S. economy and national security. No wonder the Obamas wanted to give him a personal greeting on the tarmac at Joint Base Andrews upon his arrival in America.

When it comes to immigration, the president once again finds staunch support coming from behind the five-story walls of Vatican City. Pope Francis has called on America to keep its borders open—to welcome the migrants and refugees seeking a better life. When introducing Pope Francis at the White House on September 23, President Obama said, “You remind us that the Lord’s most powerful message is mercy. That means welcoming the stranger with empathy and a truly open heart. From the refugee who flees war-torn lands, to the immigrant who leaves home in search of a better life.”

The liberal press see a kindred spirit between these two. That is a core reason why the coverage surrounding the pope’s visit was so positive. Through it all, the press ignored the fact that this same pope refused to visit with political dissidents in Cuba, people who would really like to live under something besides a dictatorship. The news anchors said nothing about this pope propping up a tyrannical Castro regime. They ignored the fact that the economic policies this pope is advocating are the same ones that bankrupted his home country of Argentina—a nation that used to be one of the leading economies in the world!

Never mind any of that! On the more important global issues of our day, Pope Francis might help to advance President Obama’s liberal left-wing agenda. Francis, Obama and most of the media share the same agenda. That is why you saw all the flashbulbs, the minute details and the fawning interviews. Much as you did with the Obama campaign.

‘I Wondered With Great Admiration’

POPE FRANCIS IS NOT THE ONLY POPE TO SPARK A MEDIA FRENZY. THE FUNERAL OF POPE JOHN PAUL II IN 2005 AND THE SUBSEQUENT ELECTION OF POPE BENEDICT XVI also consumed hundreds of hours and millions of dollars of airtime. The world—and certainly the media in the United States—was absolutely fixated by the spectacle of somber processions, engraved accouterments and cassocked clergy intoning Latin utterances. This fascination would be more or less expected in Catholic-dominated countries. But why in the United States?

The Catholic Church has commanded admiration and fear for two millennia. Its power has waxed and waned and waxed again depending on a combination of its sway over Catholic adherents, its absorption of other religions, its wealth, its intelligence gathering and its interweaving with political leaders—and their armies. But it has endured.

A few years after He died, the resurrected Jesus Christ showed the Apostle John a symbol of a great church that would be a political power, interrelate with the governments of many nations, adorn itself richly, ally with the beastly Roman Empire and actually persecute non-Catholic Christians as heretics. And even John himself marveled at this church, and recorded this vision in the book of Revelation.

Why? Because of its power. Because of its ability to exert its will.

Were the gushing journalists you saw covering the papacy moved by the doctrines of the pope and/or the Vatican? Do they respect the belief that the Earth was created by God? Do they get misty-eyed thinking about how God came to Earth and became a man? Do thrill run up their legs over the Catholic tenet that only those who come to God through Jesus Christ can be saved—and all others are damned to eternal hellfire?

Or are they paying lip service to the beliefs and words of this man because of the thing that really matters to them: that he commands 1 billion people. Is it because of his power?

BY PHILIP NICE
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America's retreat has some nations thinking that now is their chance for a shot at the top spot. Others see the instability on the horizon and are preparing for it. But Britain and America do not care. The world is no longer their concern.

dominance,” explained IHS Jane’s. “Now, however, the international system is shifting to equilibrium, under which one single state does not so massively tip the scales in its own favor” (June 25, 2014).

By 2019, for the first time in history, NATO will not account for the majority of worldwide defense expenditure, having accounted for almost two thirds of global spending as recently as 2010,” it also wrote (Dec. 18, 2014).

This dramatic shift away from America’s super-dominant military spending points to the common reason behind the jump in arms spending everywhere else. America is retreating. Its allies don’t trust it. More aggressive nations around the world are becoming emboldened.

Take Europe. Russia has been acting aggressively for some time. In 2008, it invaded Georgia. This invasion, however, did not prompt an explosion in defense spending from other nations. Eastern Europeans were scared, but instead of spending more, they turned to America for help. They asked America to station missiles on their territory. These permanent bases would help guarantee that America would come to their aid if they were attacked.

America has since backed away from those missile bases. It has consistently refused to stand up to Russia. Moscow recognized this as an invitation to act even more boldly. So now, it is spending more and becoming more aggressive. At the same time, Europe got the message that it cannot depend on America. After Russia invaded Ukraine, European nations looked to European planes, tanks and troops—not American ones.

The story is the same in the Middle East. America has never done enough to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear bomb; however, by negotiating the nuclear deal this past year, it essentially made a public declaration that it will never stand up to Iran. Unsurprisingly then, Iran has become more aggressive, and Saudi Arabia and other states have concluded that they cannot trust America and had better prepare themselves for war.

This storyline is also playing out in Asia. The Chinese have watched how America dealt with Russia and with Iran and concluded that they can act aggressively without fear of America standing up to them. Other Asian nations are concluding that they cannot rely on America.

These three global arms races and the instability they are bringing are all directly caused by America’s retreat from policing the rest of the world.

This points to the most worrying aspect of the decline in America’s military spending. It is not that America needs to spend more to maintain its position as the world’s dominant military power. It does not. Even with the recent cuts, it spends more on its military than the EU, China and Russia combined.

It’s not about the money—it is about America’s attitude and outlook. America’s cuts in spending are worrying because they are a symptom of a much deeper problem: In a dangerous new bout of isolationism, America is retreating from the world.

For the last two centuries, Britain and America have been a significant stabilizing force in the world. The spikes on history’s graph of global arms spending demonstrate this: British might and then American might were deployed to oppose the tyranny of Kaiser Wilhelm, Adolf Hitler, communism and radical Islam. In the latter case, much of the effort has been wasted. But history shows that these two powers have resisted civilization’s deadliest enemies.

America, however, is once again turning inward, in the same way Britain did before World War I and before and after World War II. The Americans are done intervening.

“The world is at its most peaceful when great powers are under no illusions as to where they stand in the global pecking order,” wrote British historian Andrew Roberts in his book A History of the English-Speaking Peoples Since 1900.

America’s retreat has some nations thinking that now is their chance for a shot at the top spot. Others see the instability on the horizon and are preparing for it. But Britain and America do not care. The world is no longer their concern.

The post-Cold War era, and even post-9/11 era—characterized by what some have called American hyperpower—has come to an end. Not because the Americans aren’t spending hundreds of billions on their military, but because their will to lead and their will to fight is broken. This global outbreak of military spending is part of the rise of a new multipolar world, where power is not so concentrated with the United States.

Historically, the rise of Britain and America led to a lengthy era of relative peace. That era is ending right now. To understand why, read our free book The United States and Britain in Prophecy by Herbert W. Armstrong.
Pangs of hunger. Most of us get them first thing in the morning. And within hours of eating a hearty breakfast, we get hungry all over again. Skip a couple meals and your energy drops off right away. Go without physical sustenance long enough and your body begins to break down.

There is a reason our bodies need to be regularly strengthened and revitalized with physical food. There is a reason hunger pangs are the strongest and most frequent desires we have in life.

God uses this physical reality to teach us that spiritual strength and health require a balanced diet of nutritious spiritual food.

In their wilderness wanderings, the Israelites were totally dependent on God, even for physical food. In Exodus 16:4, God told them He would rain manna from heaven every day at a certain rate in order to “prove them”—to see if they would obey His laws.

The Israelites’ physical sustenance was a miraculous gift from God! God provided it, but they had to go out and gather it daily, then work to prepare it for consumption. Numbers 11:8 says they ground it up and made cakes out of it. This was a laborious, time-consuming process—and absolutely vital for their physical well-being and health!

Jesus told us why God made them do it this way. It was for our learning! Jesus said, “Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you ...” (John 6:27). He explained that while ancient Israel ate “bread from heaven,” in their physical world, God says we are spirit, and they are life” (John 6:63). This is the manna we need daily. It does take laborious work to gather and prepare these precious, life-giving words for our spiritual consumption. But it’s well worth the effort. This is, after all, food that endures unto everlasting life!

Are you filling up on this life-saving food? Jesus said, “Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled” (Matthew 5:6). The Greek word for filled means to satisfy—to gorge! If we fill up on this, we’ll never go hungry.

In one of his earliest articles, Herbert W. Armstrong wrote about the failure of churches to face the problems plaguing our youth. He said churches used to be a balancing, restraining influence on young people. But in 1927, Mr. Armstrong wrote that the average sermon was lifeless and boring—lacking in spiritual firepower. As a result, young people were giving up on religion.

Of course, other factors have contributed to youths’ waning interest in the Bible—like lack of discipline, the negative influence of modern education, and the pulls of worldliness. But when preachers cave in to these societal pressures and water down the truth of God, Mr. Armstrong wrote, it makes matters much worse!

The Apostle Paul told his evangelist Titus that to convince the gainstayers, he needed to use “sound doctrine” (Titus 1:9). He wanted Titus to give them something healthy and nutritious that they could sink their teeth into. That’s what the word sound means in that verse—to be healthy and in good working order. This is what families and congregations desperately need to be healthy and fit: good, strong doctrine (see also Hebrews 5:12-14).

In 1 Timothy 4:8, Paul also wrote that while physical exercise profits for a short time, “godliness is profitable unto all things.” Just as it takes a healthy diet and regular exercise to maintain physical fitness, so it takes a steady diet of nutritious doctrine and spiritual workouts to maintain vibrant health spiritually.

“If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained” (verse 6). God says we are nourished, strengthened and made healthy by words of faith and good doctrine.

“Beloved, I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth” (3 John 2). To be in health comes from the same Greek word translated “sound” in Titus 1:9. Again, God uses physical fitness to symbolize our spiritual health.

When we break physical laws, we always pay a price in sickness, injury or death. The penalty for spiritual sin is eternal death (Romans 6:23), along with its related sickness and disease. Jesus taught that if you’re healthy, you don’t need a physician. It’s the sick and infirmed who need to be healed, He said (Matthew 9:12-13).

Compare that with Jeremiah 17, where it says the human heart is wicked and deceitful. The prophet describes the heart of man as being lifeless and sick! This is what we are, apart from God. This is why we need to be healed by the blood of Jesus Christ—and then sustained by His life-giving words (Ephesians 5:26).

Hunger for the nourishing words of God every day. Fill up on it first thing in the morning. And keep coming back for more. As Jesus said in John 6:58, “[H]e that eateth of this bread shall live for ever”!
Our October cover story, “Currency War: Dragging the World Toward World War III” (theTrumpet.com/go/13073), discussed dangerous moves in the global financial system that parallel those that led to the Second World War. “How the Global Financial Crisis Will Produce Europe’s 10 Kings” (theTrumpet.com/go/13072) tied this development into a crucial end-time biblical prophecy. Other articles examined developments in clean energy, the Planned Parenthood scandal, and a lesson from the dodo bird.

“I love reading all your articles and news of what’s happening in our world day by day—and we are getting all this from the best source, and very few are receiving this amazing information. We are getting the truth. And we know how it’s going to end, which to me is very comforting. I love the way you always end the article with a wonderful positive ending that leaves me filled with excitement that we are really close to that glorious day when Jesus comes.”

Josie Mazzone
NORTH CAROLINA

Your article reminded me of the words of Mrs. Thatcher when she said, “You have not anchored Germany to Europe, you have anchored Europe to a newly dominant, unified Germany. In the end, my friends, you’ll find it will not work.” America’s war on Iraq and Afghanistan resulted in a stronger Iran. Now America’s banking and debt crisis will result in a stronger, unified Europe anchored to Germany.

Brian Sherwood
AUSTRALIA

“History is repeating itself, but our leaders are choosing to ignore it. Many of our leaders do not know history, and the great majority of them do not know Bible prophecy. This lack of concern and knowledge will lead us to World War III. Thank you for your great article with its great historic value.”

Angelo

Supplement your news intake with the Trumpet Daily Radio Show. Trumpet executive editor Stephen Flurry covers the world’s most significant events that mainstream media often ignore. Connecting their relevance to Bible prophecy, this program will help you understand your world. Visit www.KPCG.fm to listen in. Programs are posted Monday through Friday.

I love reading all your articles and news of what’s happening in our world day by day—and we are getting all this from the best source, and very few are receiving this amazing information. We are getting the truth. And we know how it’s going to end, which to me is very comforting. I love the way you always end the article with a wonderful positive ending that leaves me filled with excitement that we are really close to that glorious day when Jesus comes.

Mary Raston
AUSTRALIA

Evil is in
Your subhead “America Divorced From Reality” was correct (“The Europe of the Bible Takes Shape,” theTrumpet.com/go/13082). America is no longer reliable. It has lost its will to lead. Debt will bring America to its knees. People are more interested in sports and vile entertainment. That filth Hollywood puts out is not even fit for a dog’s breakfast. What is good is now illegal. What is filth is deemed correct. Thousands of years ago, there was child sacrifice. We still have it in 2015! But now, it is called abortion. Do you have another planet I can go to?

Stuart Sjalund
CANADA

Straight life
This is precious encouragement and a way of thinking so needed in this selfish generation (“The Straight Life,” theTrumpet.com/go/13078). Of course it’s not easy, but it is well worth it—to save a marriage, to save a family. The easy selfish way leads nowhere. Oh, the bliss of God’s way of love.

Vicki Baker
ARKANSAS

Get your daily dose of understanding

Murder for money
This was so disturbing to read, but it had to come out into the open (“Trafficking Aborted Baby Body Parts,” theTrumpet.com/go/13084). America, what a shame! You pay to have your children murdered—another sign that the end of the age is near. Thank you for bringing this article to us. Maybe some of the blind will realize that all it takes for evil to prosper is for the good to do nothing.

Miriam Manning
FLORIDA

This certainly is an eye-opening article! We really do live in a sick, sick world with what man is doing with the lives of babies for the sake of money. Thank God that Christ is about to return and kick Satan off of his throne very soon!

Mary Raston
AUSTRALIA

Goliath’s gate
Thank you for this exciting article (“Massive Gate Found in Goliath’s Hometown,” theTrumpet.com/go/13087) that makes these people and places so vivid.

Wendy Miletich
AUSTRALIA
Commentary

Are You Confident in America’s Political Process?

Is American greatness just one election away? BY JOEL HILLIKER

Polls show 71 percent of Americans are unhappy with the country’s direction; many are openly frustrated.

A year ago, Republicans gained control of the Senate and their largest majority in the House since 1928. Republicans enthused that they would reverse President Barack Obama’s unpopular policies. They promised to defund or repeal Obamacare, shrink illegal immigration, stand up to unlawful executive orders, and check America’s runaway debt.

They have done none of these things. Congressional Republicans have shown a stunning lack of will—even when it came to opposing a nuclear deal with the world’s biggest sponsor of terrorism. All the optimism surrounding last year’s election has proved completely ill-founded.

Now here we are in the midst of another presidential election cycle. In many ways, this wild campaign reflects Americans’ frustration.

The top Republican contender would not be considered a serious candidate under normal circumstances. But people appreciate him because he appears to be everything the Republican establishment is not: a pugnacious, unbribable, politically incorrect, tough negotiator who puts the liberal media in their place. He says he’s a winner who will strengthen the military, build a border wall, and make America respected again. This man is also arrogant, narcissistic and at times nasty, but people are so disenchanted with politics that they are willing to overlook his flaws. The next top Republican candidate is also a political outsider. After two elections lost by middle-of-the-road, mainstream Republican candidates, voters are clearly fed up.

On the Democratic side, the top two candidates are a woman whom a large majority of Americans don’t trust—thanks to years of scandals and an open FBI investigation—and an avowed socialist whose gigantic government spending plans would cost $18 trillion according to the Wall Street Journal.

Can any of these candidates actually solve America’s problems? The debates are crowded with candidates trying to make a witty comment, giving the sound bite that will boost their poll numbers, jabbing at and accusing each other, boasting about themselves, contradicting each other over supposed facts—a bizarre mix of arrogance and distractions that do nothing to reveal leadership credentials. Yet CNN’s recent Republican debate snagged the biggest ratings in its history. And that is what CNN cares about.

“If you are not informed, then the most patriotic thing you can do on Election Day is stay home,” Thomas Sowell wrote. “Otherwise your vote, based on whims or emotions, is playing Russian roulette with the fate of this nation” (September 15).

Do Americans really know how to elect a leader? Are the qualities that cause someone to stand out on a debate stage really the same qualities that qualify someone to lead?

Are arrogance and narcissism good qualities in a leader? I would argue that we have tremendous evidence to the contrary in America’s government today. Yet the polls suggest that many Americans still believe they are tremendous political virtues.

Do Americans really know anything important about their candidates? Two presidential elections ago, voters bought into an idea of hope and change; seven in 10 Americans thought the new president would improve race relations in the U.S. Meanwhile, they ignored several disturbing facts. Tom Brokaw admitted that the media didn’t vet this man. Will another election solve our problems? Another cycle of uninform ed citizens voting based on a political process distorted by money, by biased media coverage, and by lies peddled by the candidates about themselves and about each other?

And in the end, even if you do get the victories you think will benefit the country, you may still end up with a feckless Congress like the one America has now.

In The Wonderful World Tomorrow—What It Will Be Like, Herbert W. Armstrong wrote that government is often selfish, greedy, vain, ambitious men lusting for rule and operating via secret deals, graft, immorality, deception and dishonesty. They promise peace and declare war. They promise prosperity and deliver debt, taxation and poverty. “We fail to find in human government any knowledge of life’s purpose, or dissemination of the true values.”

America’s form of government is perhaps the best on Earth for constraining tyranny and corruption and maximizing freedom. However, abuses of power are undermining the benefits of America’s government and turning its political process into a farce.

In Leviticus 26:19, God said to the ancient Israelites and their descendants who sinned: “I will break the pride of your power.” America is among those descendants—it has sinned, and its power is broken. But God doesn’t blame the leaders. He says the real problem is with the people. Our sins have brought these curses! Americans want to blame our problems on politicians—but the fact is, WE PUT THEM IN OFFICE.

The boilerplate campaign refrain is. If we can just get these bums out, we’ll solve everything! When will we acknowledge that our problems are bigger than that? And when will we accept responsibility for our part in the problems?

America is suffering a broken will, lawless leaders, social breakdown, racial strife and economic disaster. These are curses that God is bringing upon us—not because we’ve voted for the wrong candidates, but because we have turned our backs on Him.

How well do you suppose a politician today would fare who brought a message like that?
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Consider This
It is estimated that there are more than 1,000 suicides on American college campuses per year. Experts attribute student stress over the need to achieve to be the leading factor of suicide.

Educators and parents put a lot of pressure on students to be the best and the brightest. In some colleges and universities, the competition to be the best is vicious. At most colleges and universities, academic achievement is all that matters—although “liberating” yourself sexually, narcotically and intellectually would be a close second.

So, what is the real source of all the life-threatening, personally injurious problems taking place on our college campuses? Few would suspect that it could be our education system. But modern education has done little to solve the world’s problems that are ever growing worse. And we are seeing some very ugly sides to what are supposed to be enlightened centers of learning.

Something is missing in our education system. You can see it in the materialistic emphasis. You can see it in the prevalence of drug use and the epidemic of rape. The missing dimension is instruction in character—how to live the right way: morally, cleanly, at peace with others. This is the greatest danger on college and university campuses. Our lofty educational institutions fail to teach our young people about God and the productive, successful life that can only be gained by living by His Ten Commandments. These eternal laws teach young people how to make right choices in life (Deuteronomy 30:19).

There is a way you can protect your college-age student from the dangers of campus life. Provide him with right education. Please request a free to you copy of our booklet Education With Vision. It is one of the best sources you can read to help your child attain life-building academic success.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBS United Kingdom Station</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBS Action</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>8:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS Drama</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>8:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS Reality</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Brutal terrorist attacks are taking place all over Israel, especially in Jerusalem. Why is the Holy City so plagued with violence? How can this crisis ever be solved? Request our free booklet *Jerusalem in Prophecy* to learn how this violent city actually has an exciting future!