

CAPTURE OF SADDAM HUSSEIN AND THE NEW BABYLON : PT 1

Copyright 1994 - 2012 Endtime Prophecy Net

Published On : December 15, 2003

Last Updated : February 20, 2012

Capture Of Saddam Hussein, Bush's Mushroom Cloud Remark, Fear And Paranoia Tactics, Clear Evidence Not So Clear, Bush The Unilateralist, War Casualties, Iraq Quagmire, A Few Pertinent Questions, Bush's Personal Vendetta, Motivations Behind The Resistance, Hated American Presence, Resistance Is Home-Bred, Iraq's Outside American-Picked Government, Caucus Elections, Bush's False Compassion For Iraqi People, America's Dictator Friends, Pakistan's General Pervez Musharraf, America's Use Them And Abuse Them Policy, Saddam A US Ally During Iran-Iraq War, Osama Bin Laden A U.S. Ally During Soviet Occupation Of Afghanistan, Mirky American Foreign Policy, Saddam's Invasion Of Kuwait, Division Of India And Pakistan, Kashmir, Creation Of Israel Jordan And Kuwait, False Jews, Why A Divided Middle East And Africa, Nation-Carving: America's Real Middle East Agenda, America's Over-Exaggerated Saddam Threat, No Solid Evidence To Justify Iraq War, Paul O'Neill, Premeditated War White House Damage Control, US Withdraws WMD Inspectors Team

As I write this commentary, I can still remember my initial reactions one month ago, upon reading the first news reports regarding the surprise capture of Iraqi president, Saddam Hussein, on the evening of December 13th, Iraqi time, in a small farming community called Adwar, or Ad Dwar, which is located about nine miles southeast of Saddam's hometown and former power base of Tikrit.

At the time, I felt a mixture of surprise, and to be honest, a bit of caution and incredulity; and I truly wondered if the person they had captured was really Saddam Hussein, or perhaps just one of his alleged doubles posing as the Iraqi leader. As some of you will know, we have a whole collection of Saddam images on our "Armageddon" Hotline server, so I am more than familiar with what the man looks like; yet still, even though I was relatively certain that they had captured the Iraqi leader, a bit of doubt did linger in my mind for a short while. However, those doubts were eventually dispelled as more news regarding Mr. Hussein's capture and positive identification was released to the anxious public.

Later in the day, after I had an opportunity to view the initial images which were found on various news sites, in which Saddam appeared dirty, with his hair in disorder, and sporting a greying, lengthening beard, and looking more like a vagrant than a world leader, I couldn't help but think to myself, "So this is the greatly-feared, iron-fisted dictator who ruled Iraq for some two dozen years? This man, who was discovered hiding in a pit in the ground, cowering with fear for his very life, is the bold, defiant Saddam Hussein, who the Bush administration has repeatedly and adamantly claimed was armed with terrible weapons of mass destruction -- or WMD -- which he was planning to use at any moment to attack the

United States of America?". The image of Saddam as portrayed by the Bush Administration and the American mass media prior to the war, was very different from the impression one obtained from viewing those post-capture photographs.

Allow me to refresh your memory.

The general populace seems to have a short memory span, as well as a propensity to easily forgive and forget; and some politicians certainly know how to take advantage of this; but let us not be so quick to forget President Bush's famous "mushroom cloud" remark; along with all of the other fear and paranoia-inducing remarks which were purposely made by him and his cronies, in order to condition and coerce the American public into blindly and patriotically accepting the "Bush War", prior to last year's illegal invasion of Iraq. Bush's PR -- public relations -- team did some rather heavy marketing, and they won; at least with the American public. In case you have already forgotten, allow me to share with you a quote from that famous pre-war speech, given to the American public by President Bush, on the evening of October 7, 2002, from Cincinnati, Ohio, USA. Please notice how Bush subtly employs words and phrases such as "realities" and "clear evidence" in order to add weight to what would later be proven to be utterly false allegations. Contrary to his claims of "clear evidence", in the end, it turns out that his so-called evidence was murkier than the Mississippi River:

----- Begin Quote -----

"Knowing these realities, America must not ignore the threat gathering against us. Facing clear evidence of peril, we cannot wait for the final proof -- the smoking gun -- that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud."

----- End Quote -----

The above quotation is but one example of the fear-inducing rhetoric which President Bush heavily employed in his speech fifteen months ago. If you read the speech in its entirety, and compare it to what the Bush Administration is saying now, and weigh it against the facts on the ground, and what has actually been found in the way of concrete evidence, you will be utterly amazed. Nothing of what President Bush claimed in that speech has been substantiated to date; not the nuclear weapons; nor the "thousands of tons of chemical agents"; or even the thousands of "liters of anthrax and other deadly biological agents". If it really ever existed, where did it all go? Even Bush Administration officials have stated that there is no way that Saddam Hussein could have spirited such large quantities of the alleged materials out of his country without them knowing about it. So isn't the answer rather obvious? Personally, I can only conclude that such materials never existed; at least not in the huge quantities which were being claimed by Mr. Bush and other officials.

When US Secretary of State, Colin L. Powell, presented the American case for war against Iraq before the United Nations in February of last year, he likewise made it clear that the United States believed that Saddam Hussein was in possession of such materials. Please notice how Mr. Powell phrased his

words. He was not saying that Saddam might possess such WMD, he was making it sound as if he already did possess them:

----- Begin Quote -----

"Leaving Saddam Hussein in possession of weapons of mass destruction for a few more months or years is not an option."

----- End Quote -----

In spite of the president's claims, the majority of the rest of the world was not in agreement with his hasty decision to wage war against Iraq. They felt that the UNMOVIC inspectors should have been given more time, as they had requested. This is one of the primary reasons why help in rebuilding Iraq has been so slow in coming from other nations. As he has done on other occasions -- such as with the Kyoto Protocol -- Bush, the unilateralist, stuck his nose up at the world and invaded Iraq. Now that the control and restructure period is turning out to be considerably tougher than he had anticipated, Bush expects everyone to cheerfully pitch in, and help rebuild Iraq, the American way. Never mind that George Bush invaded that country contrary to world opinion. Never mind that Bush kicked out the UNMOVIC inspectors, or at least informed them following the invasion that there was no longer any need for them to return to Iraq. Never mind that the Americans have taken control of the oil fields to do with as they please. Never mind that President Bush clearly stated that awarding contracts in Iraq would be heavily based upon which nations supported his illegal war. This has clearly been an American game from start to finish, yet Mr. Bush expects the world to do its "duty".

Sadly, Mr. Bush seems to think that he can slap the world in the face, and continue to push his weight around, and the rest of the world will still do his bidding. As the United States sinks deeper into the quagmire of its own creation, and as American servicemen continue to die in Iraq, in spite of the capture of Saddam Hussein, hopefully, Mr. Bush is slowly coming to his senses. Undoubtedly, the glaring fact that Iraq has yet to be brought under complete control even after nine months of American occupation, as well as the fact that Americans and soldiers and civilians of other nationalities are still dying there, is another powerful reason why other nations are so hesitant to offer the kind of direct assistance that Bush expects from them. The United Nations and the Red Cross have already been forced out of Iraq by the Iraqi defenders, whoever they may be. Who will be targeted next?

Allow me to ask you the reader a few questions. Was capturing Saddam Hussein as big a prize as the Bush administration has made it out to be? Has Saddam's capture brought the war to an end? Have Americans and others stopped dying over there?

In spite of the Bush administration's heavy pre-war public relations blitz, in which they scared Americans out of their wits with the WMD threat, for some odd reason, the idea of a personal vendetta fails to release its grasp upon my mind. Well, President Bush may now have an inflated ego, because he captured Saddam, and thus avenged the attempt on the life

of his father, as well as accomplished what many felt his father should have done thirteen years ago, but I wonder if even George Bush realizes what he has unleashed by invading Iraq. If this war was just about Saddam Hussein; and if the Iraqi resistance fighters were merely fighting for Saddam Hussein; then one would think that the war would just about be over; but it isn't. This indicates to me that the Iraqis are fighting for more than just for Mr. Hussein. They are fighting for Iraq; they are fighting for Iraqi sovereignty and identity; and some of them are undoubtedly fighting for the causes of Islam as well. In my mind, this is what is really fueling the war, and not just loyalty to Saddam. They want Iraq to belong to the Iraqis, and not to the Americans via a puppet government.

It is interesting to note how for a number of months now, the Bush Administration has been doing all it can, in order to make it appear as if the brunt of the resistance to the American presence in Iraq is coming from outsiders, or from members of the Baath Party who are still loyal to Saddam Hussein. They are trying to create the false impression that the majority of Iraqis support America's invasion of Iraq. The goal of Bush's public relations team is obviously to shift the emphasis from the fact that there are many common Iraqis who are strongly opposed to the continued American presence in their land. They are happy to be rid of Saddam, but now they are saying to the Americans "Thanks for getting rid of Saddam for us, but now it is time for you to leave"; but the Americans are saying "Sorry, but that isn't how we have written the script. We are in control now". Have the Iraqis unknowingly traded one dictator for another?

So in order to downplay the discontent amongst the common Iraqis, the Bush Administration circulates the story that outsiders are sneaking in through the porous borders with Syria and Iran. While this has been true to a certain degree, even American officials are now saying that at best, perhaps a few hundred outside fighters have infiltrated the country. In other words, the Iraqi resistance is for the most part home-bred. Let's be honest here. Do you really believe that anyone, be they foreigners such as the al-Qaeda forces loyal to Osama bin Laden, or Baath Party members, or anyone else for that matter, could possibly organize and launch attacks against the Americans in such high numbers, without the knowledge and consent of the local Iraqis, who are at least partially supporting their endeavors? I don't. In fact, just yesterday, I was reading in the news, that on a daily basis, they uncover several dozen hidden bombs and missile sites. This is not the work of just a small handful of people. It is a widespread, popular resistance against the Americans.

Now, in addition to the Americans, there is most definitely a group of outsiders who have been profiting from America's illegal invasion of Iraq. No; I am not referring to Islamic extremists such as al-Qaeda; although America's aggression is definitely assisting their cause as well. I am referring to some of the men who now sit on the Governing Council in Iraq. While the common Iraqi has suffered during two decades of rule by Saddam Hussein, some of those leaders have lived abroad, in luxury, in the West. Now that Saddam has fallen, those men have returned to Iraq in order to rule the country they abandoned. They were hand-picked by the Americans; they

were not voted into that position by the common Iraqis. It is those very same men who are now working on creating Iraq's new government and constitution, with American approval, of course.

While there have been some contentions between the Americans and some of the members of the Governing Council, in the end, you can be sure that those men will be America's puppets, and will do her bidding, because they owe their position of power to her. They will not truly represent the will of the common Iraqi people. In fact, while Bush has promised the Iraqis an open democracy, as I write this, there is already a squabble over the upcoming elections for the Interim Assembly. Led by their spiritual leader, the Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani, who is considered to be the most influential Shiite cleric in Iraq, many Iraqis desire a direct general election, while the Americans insist on a caucus-style election. A caucus is an internal vote where candidates are chosen by the leaders, and not directly by the general public in a one-man-one-vote type of election. In this particular case, the caucus would choose members for the Interim Assembly, who would in turn appoint officers for the Interim Government. In other words, the common Iraqis will really have no input in the election process.

Now, let us briefly discuss some of the deeper significance of this war, aside from America's obvious motivations for starting it in the first place. Concerning those motivations, as I have stated before, I am convinced that intervention by the Bush Administration in Iraq had absolutely nothing to do with Mr. Bush's so-called "compassion" for the plight of the Iraqi people under Saddam Hussein's rule. Anyone who believes that nonsense needs to have their head examined. They also need a long break from America's favorite propaganda organ: the mass media. There are countries, big and small, all over the world where people are oppressed by dictators of varying degrees; some of whom the United States supports and deals with on a regular basis.

A classic example of this would be General Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan, who we have discussed extensively on our private mailing list. Mr. Musharraf is not a democratically-elected leader; he is a military dictator who came to power by way of a coup during the late 1990's, short and simple. In fact, a few months ago, General Musharraf, ahem, adjusted Pakistan's constitution so that he can remain in power for an additional five years. While he has promised democratic elections, that has yet to materialize. While the general was pressured into becoming America's ally during the recent war in Afghanistan, following the usual American modus operandi of "use them and abuse them", he has since been demonized and vilified, due to the alleged role that Pakistan has played in facilitating nuclear weapons technology to other nations.

Along the same lines, let us also not forget that during the bloody eight-year Iran-Iraq War, Saddam Hussein was likewise favored, and was considered an American ally; and was given both intelligence and technology, because Iran was viewed as a more serious threat to Middle East stability at that time, than was Iraq. Of course, in reality, America's real desire is to restructure both Iran and Iraq; but she will play one against the other when it suits her purposes.

In similar fashion, America's feared enemy, Osama bin Laden, was considered an American ally during the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. As I have pointed out before, it is a proven fact that Osama bin Laden led the Muslim rebel forces in the mountains of Afghanistan, and was provided with intelligence, financial aid, and weapons by both Pakistan and the United States of America, in order to drive out the Soviets, which they finally succeeded in doing. If you doubt these claims, then I encourage you to closely examine some of the news reports of the past, in order to verify these things for yourself.

In the murky world of American foreign policy, one of the cardinal rules seems to be that as long as the leader of a certain country will bow to America's will, by promoting and supporting America's hegemonic agenda, that leader is free to govern their own nation as they wish. Be they president, prime minister, king, dictator or sheik, the United States will exercise a great deal of tolerance, and will even cast a blind eye upon any atrocities which that leader may inflict upon his own people, just as long as he quietly acquiesces to America's will. But just let that leader step out of line, or become a little too powerful or independent, and the American Government will begin to press down upon him in the form of trade sanctions, vilification, threats, and if it is deemed necessary, even military intervention.

Saddam Hussein found this out rather quickly when he made his grab for Kuwait some fourteen years ago. While a lot of people disapproved of what Saddam did, and viewed it as an act of war, from a historical and Biblical perspective, Mr. Hussein was only reclaiming what was rightfully his. Does that statement surprise you? Perhaps it wouldn't if you had a better understanding of the history of the area. You see, as I point out in a few of my articles, since ancient times, the country which is now known as Kuwait, was a part of the Babylonian Empire, which was also known as Mesopotamia; that is, "the land between the two rivers"; those two rivers being the Tigris and the Euphrates. To be more precise, Kuwait was probably what is referred to in the Scriptures as "the land of the Chaldees", or the Chaldeans. It was the land of wise men and Babylonian kings. It was also the location of Ur, which was the homeland of the Patriarch Abraham.

Let us move forward a few thousand years. Following WW II, great changes occurred in the geo-political world. Many of these changes occurred in Europe, the Middle East and Asia. These changes did not necessarily occur by the will of the common people who occupied those lands, but rather they were forced upon them by the global powers of that time period.

For example, are you aware of the fact that prior to the year 1947, the country now known as Pakistan did not exist? It was the waning days of the British Empire, when Mahatma Gandhi fought for the rights of his people. Before totally surrendering their mandate in India, the British carved up the country along ethnic lines; that is, Muslim and Hindu. Thus, what was once all of India, became the two nations of India and Pakistan. But, the division was not quite that simple. You see, ever since that time, these two nations have been fighting over who has sovereignty over Jammu and

Kashmir.

As I said, the very same thing occurred in the Middle East. Countries which had not existed before, suddenly came into existence by the will of the global powers of the day, such as the British and the French. The entire Middle East was carved up according to their whim. Nations such as Israel, Jordan and Kuwait suddenly came into existence, without the consent of the local populace, and there have been problems ever since. The British basically gifted Palestine to the "Jews", who moved in from Europe and other areas; but in order to do that, they also had to provide a place for the local Palestinian population. This problem was partially solved with the creation of Jordan. I don't know what the percentage is now, but at one time, ninety per cent of the population of Jordan was Palestinian. At any rate, 1947 was a very interesting year in world history.

So the point is, a lot of people's lives were affected in a negative way almost sixty years ago, by the rich and the powerful, who really had no business doing what they did. It has been said that these elite acted in part, as a result of the guilt they felt, due to the atrocities which had been committed against the "Jews" by the Germans. Many Europeans also wanted the "Jews" out of Europe for reasons which I will not explain at length here. You will find this discussed in more detail in such series as "The International Jew And The Protocols Of Zion". At any rate, the Middle East became the dumping ground, and the Arab populations were pushed out of the way in order to make room for the newly-arrived "Jews". And in case you are wondering, the reason why I have used quote marks around that word, is because many people doubt that the modern "Jews" who now occupy Israel, are the same people as the ethnic Jews of Biblical times; that is, the true descendants of Judah, the son of Jacob, who was later renamed Israel by the Lord.

But getting back to my main point, in reality, Kuwait was stolen from what is now known as Iraq. The British sliced it off from the rest of the country. Hussein merely wanted to get it back. You may not agree with what he did, but that is basically why it happened. If you understand that Saddam viewed himself as Nebuchadnezzar III, and had intentions of uniting the entire Middle East into one powerful Arab/Muslim superstate, then his actions may make a little more sense to you. Muammar El-Kaddafi, the longtime dictator of Libya, has had the same grandiose vision for Africa for many years now. Perhaps that is why the United States has feared him so. You see, a united Middle East, or a united Africa, is not in the best interest of the rich industrialized West. Why? Because then they would not be able to exploit them of all of their vast natural resources, which are so vital for the survival of the extravagant way in which the West chooses to live.

But let us return to the issue of America's intervention in Iraq. In spite of the fact that there are dictators all over the world, some who oppress their people worse than others, for some "odd" reason, President George Bush chose Iraq as his object of "compassion", to exercise his, shall we say, "democracy-building tendencies".

It isn't odd once one understands that "liberating" the

Iraqis, and establishing "peace and democracy", was simply the deceptive cloak which George Bush used in order to gain control of the Iraqi oil fields, to establish an American power base in the Middle East, to rid Israel of one of her most threatening enemies, to avenge his father, etc. As I partially explained a moment ago, the simple truth of the matter is that this war is much bigger than Bush's hatred for Saddam Hussein, and the Arabs obviously realize this. They know that if the Americans are successful, and Iraq is converted into an American puppet state, their own regimes will be seriously threatened, and they could very well be next in America's script called "Nation Rebuilding : The American Way", and they are scared stiff. In particular, I am thinking of the hard-line Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and the mullahs of Iran, as well as Bashar al-Assad of Syria; both of which Mr. Bush has included in his so-called "axis of evil". Could it be that the Americans and the British are in the mood for some modern "nation-carving" of their own?

Having said that, I wouldn't be surprised to learn that in private, some of the other Arab/Muslim leaders are actually rooting for America's failure in Iraq. Furthermore, it would also be within their character to allow some of their own fighters, or even al-Qaeda operatives, to quietly slip into Iraq, for the purpose of foiling America's intentions there. However, as I noted earlier, even if this is true, it does not negate the fact that many of the Iraqis are not happy with America's extended presence in their country, and they, meaning the Iraqis, are leading the resistance against the American invaders. Perhaps some of the other leaders of the Middle East didn't care too much for Saddam Hussein; but on the other hand, a powerful, American-controlled puppet state at their doorstep is even less desirable. Such a powerful state controlled by the American infidels, would undoubtedly be an affront to Islam, and would further fuel the cause, and increase the membership of al-Qaeda and similar radical Muslim organizations in the Middle East.

Returning to the capture of Saddam Hussein and the American deception, in light of those less-than-formidable images of the Iraqi leader which were released following his capture, America's claims of a powerful dictator, armed with WMD, who would be ready to blow up America within a year unless he was stopped, seem all the more ludicrous and unbelievable in my mind. It is abundantly clear now, that the threat posed by Saddam, was purposely over-exaggerated by Bush, for reasons which we have already begun to examine. Not only that, but as you will come to understand as we continue this series, said threat never really existed in the first place. How could the American public have been so deceived by the president? How could they have been so naive as to blindly accept his claim of an "imminent threat"? Are they really that paranoid? Did 9-11 scar the American psyche that deeply?

While President Bush has finally defeated his nemesis, the fact of the matter remains that, after about nine months of searching, the Americans still haven't produced any solid, verifiable evidence to justify their original stated purpose for even attacking Iraq; that is, disarming Saddam of his alleged WMD. Nothing tangible has been found by anyone. The UN team lead by Hans Blix was never able to find any solid evidence to support America's allegations; and now American

military inspectors have met with the very same fate. There is nothing. In fact, with each passing month, more reports and analyses are being released by various organizations and individuals, which paint a rather clear picture that Saddam Hussein was never even close to possessing what the Bush Administration claimed he had, or would have, soon. To the contrary, they state that whatever Saddam did possess, was disposed of during the early to mid 1990's. These reports, such as those I have been reading during the past several days, arrive at the same conclusions we have been seeing for a few months now; and that is that the Bush administration, as well as the intelligence agencies, and a lot of people in between, knowingly and purposely distorted the facts, in order to provide legitimacy for Mr. Bush's illegal war.

As amazing as it may seem, even one of Bush's own ex-Cabinet members, former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill, is quoted as having said that the illegal war against Iraq was already in its planning stages a short time after Mr. Bush entered the Oval Office. According to O'Neill, it wasn't a question of why to attack Iraq, as if there was a moral dilemma, but rather how to legitimize it before the eyes of the American public and the world. In his controversial book "The Price of Loyalty: George Bush, the White House and the Education of Paul O'Neill", author Ron Suskind quotes Mr. O'Neill as having stated the following:

----- Begin Quote -----

"From the start, we were building the case against Hussein and looking at how we could take him out and change Iraq into a new country . . . And, if we did that, it would solve everything. It was about finding a way to do it. That was the tone of it -- the president saying, 'Fine. Go find me a way to do this.'"

----- End Quote -----

Interesting enough, the minute the above information hit the news stands a few days ago, the White House entered into damage control mode, and began to discredit O'Neill. In the news today, it appears that O'Neill has already begun to bow to pressure, and is back-pedaling on the comments he made in the book. He now claims that what was occurring at that time was merely a continuation of the policies which had already been in effect under the previous Clinton Administration. Obviously, we the normal public will never know what is the real truth; but if what Mr. O'Neill has stated in the book is accurate, and I suspect that it may very well be, then it would seem that President Bush was determined to attack and take down Saddam Hussein, no matter what anyone else thought, from very early on in his presidency. In order to win over public opinion to his side, he assigned his underlings the task of finding a justifiable reason for doing so. As we now know, WMD, as well as a connection to the al-Qaeda network, was the ticket Bush and his team apparently settled on. That was the story they would begin to sell to the American public.

Obviously, Mr. Bush already knows that as a result of not finding any evidence of WMD in Iraq, politically-speaking, he is walking on unstable ground. Clear signs of damage

control abound; and it seems that the intelligence agencies may be forced to serve as Bush's scapegoat, whether they like it or not. A January 9, 2004 New York Times article clearly demonstrated that the Bush Administration apparently retains little hope of ever finding massive evidence of WMD in Iraq. That article stated in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

The Bush administration has quietly withdrawn from Iraq a 400-member military team whose job was to scour the country for military equipment, according to senior government officials.

The step was described by some military officials as a sign that the administration might have lowered its sights and no longer expected to uncover the caches of chemical and biological weapons that the White House cited as a principal reason for going to war last March.

----- End Quote -----

A January 9, 2004 New York Times article similarly stated:

----- Begin Quote -----

The administration has quietly withdrawn a 400-member team of American weapons inspectors who were charged with finding chemical or biological weapons stockpiles or laboratories, officials said this week. The team was part of the 1,400-member Iraq Survey Group, which has not turned up such weapons or active programs, the officials said.

----- End Quote -----

What a far cry from the claims Bush made in his October 7, 2002 speech! Logic dictates that if they were truly hot on the trail of finding WMD in Iraq, they would not be making this kind of logistical move, would they? The truth of the matter is that the charade, and the deception is over. Less and less people are believing it with each passing month. It is becoming more and more apparent that Bush and his cronies blatantly lied to the American public, in order to fight a war based upon false allegations, over-exaggerations, and intentionally-cooked intelligence.

As we continue this article in part two, I will be addressing the issue of American hypocrisy. From there, we will examine the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty; plus we will take a look at the nightmarish bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki during World War 2, and determine whether or not it was truly necessary to drop those bombs. Also in part two, we will talk more about different aspects of President Bush's campaign of lies and deception, which he used to try to legitimize his bogus "war against terrorism". Added to the mix will be some focus on 9-11 and the war in Afghanistan, the 2004 election and Bush's chances of winning it, and embarrassing evidence which will further unveil the truth behind the Iraq war, and the psychological manipulation of the American public. I trust that you will join me.

Written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
http://www.endtimeprophecy.net

CAPTURE OF SADDAM HUSSEIN AND THE NEW BABYLON : PT 2

Copyright 1994 - 2012 Endtime Prophecy Net

Published On : December 15, 2003

Last Updated : February 20, 2012

America's Hypocrisy, 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Elite Nuclear Club, Hiroshima And Nagasaki, Dropping Nukes Wasn't Necessary, Recognizing The Emperor, 1945 Potsdam Proclamation, Military Might Over Diplomacy, Enola Gay At Smithsonian Institute, America's Death Technology Business, Rising American Casualties A Liability, 2004 Election Year Blues, Broken Promises, America Abandons Afghanistan, Bush Underestimates Challenge In Iraq, Shifting The Focus, Bogus War Against Terrorism, Deception Begins, Bush Et Al Insist On Al-Qaeda Link, American And Iraqi War Casualties, Colin L. Powell Admits No Proof Of Saddam Al-Qaeda Link, Powell Before United Nations, New Evidence: Saddam And Bin Laden Had No Desire To Join Forces, American War Case Falls Apart Saddam Now A POW, My Views On Saddam, God Raises Up Leaders

As some of my readers already know, one of the things that really irks me regarding this entire affair, is the depth of the hypocrisy being displayed by the United States. Many of you are familiar with, or have at least heard about the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Signed in 1968 by Great Britain, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, the NPT was a global nuclear arms control document, whereby these nations agreed to not transfer nuclear weapons to any other nations, or to assist or encourage other nations to develop their own nuclear weapons. Since the NPT went into effect in 1970, only four nations have not signed it. These are India, Pakistan, Cuba and Israel. Also, as you may have heard, just recently, North Korea decided to pull out of the treaty.

Now, on the surface, we can all agree that this treaty was a wonderful development; but the sad thing about it, is that with each passing year, fewer and fewer nations are honoring it, and are clandestinely going about acquiring, developing, and testing nuclear arms any way they can. But what also bothers me about this treaty, is the fact that its stated purpose, and its true purpose are quite different. I don't believe for a minute that the motivations of the original signatories were completely selfless. I don't believe that their only concern was that the world would quickly become an even more dangerous place in which to live, unless some kind of control mechanism was placed on the acquisition and development of nuclear weapons. I highly suspect that this treaty was specifically designed to keep other nations out of their elite nuclear club. They didn't want anyone else

climbing up their mountain, challenging them, and declaring themselves king of the hill.

I don't know about you, but I find it rather hypocritical that the United States of America is going around using the NPT as a tool to bludgeon other nations in the head, and to pick fights with them, when the USA has not been the most responsible nation in the world when it comes to nuclear technology. Must I remind everyone again that there is only one nation in this world which has ever used its horrible nuclear weapons to murder, maim, scar and deform several hundred thousand civilians in two deadly attacks during the past century? And yes, they were indeed innocent civilians, because they were not enemy combatants. They were everyday people just like you and me, who had children, and who were struggling to survive day to day in this mad world of ours. As a Christian, I may not agree with their main religions, Shintoism and Buddhism, but they were nevertheless people with a desire to live, just like you and me; and they were people who needed to hear about Jesus Christ. Many never did. What they learned about Christian America is that she is one hateful, violent, vengeful nation. They learned nothing about Christian love.

The tragedy here, is that dropping those two hellish bombs was not even necessary in the first place, in order to force Japan to surrender. Following the American victories in the Mariana Islands to the south, which allowed America to make bombing raids over the Japanese mainland, as well the aerial and naval blockades which had been placed around them, the leaders of Japan had already begun to realize that their war was a lost cause. Their primary condition for surrender was that their leader, Hirohito, would continue to be recognized as the Emperor of Japan. While you and I may not agree with it, you must understand that in the Japanese culture, the Emperor was viewed as a god, and their lives revolved around him. To destroy the office of the Emperor, was in essence to destroy the very fabric, the very heartbeat, of the Japanese culture; thus, the Japanese leadership of the time were very adamant about this condition being included in the American's terms of surrender, which it overtly wasn't.

I have read evidence, stated and/or written by government and military officials of the time, which clearly shows that had the Potsdam Proclamation of July 26, 1945 included this clause as a clear condition of surrender, the war could have come to a close before the bombs were dropped. Not only was that term of surrender purposely omitted from the message to the Japanese, but neither were they forewarned of what the USA was about to do to two of their heavily populated cities, if they did not surrender. Furthermore, the US Government did not even wait to see how Japan would react to the first bomb, which had been dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, before it decided to drop the second one on Nagasaki just three days later on August 9, 1945. There is clear evidence which points to the fact that the Japanese were involved in serious talks with the Soviets, in order to try to bring about an end to the war, but these developments were ignored by the American military brass. They were aware of them, as was President Truman, because the messages between Japan and Russia were being intercepted and decoded, but they intentionally chose military might over sound reasoning and patient diplomacy.

What I find very surprising, and even alarming, is that in the United States today, there is still the attitude held by some, that the nuclear strikes against Hiroshima and Nagasaki were both necessary and justified. Can you believe that? In fact, at the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, D.C., there is an exhibit of the "Enola Gay", which is the bomber which took off from an airstrip located on the island of Tinian in the Mariana Islands, in order to drop its deadly payload over Japan. From what I've read about the exhibit, the information it offers contains some serious inaccuracies regarding the attacks; and relates the events from a biased point of view, which seeks to justify America's unforgivable crimes against the Japanese civilian populations of those two cities. Quite frankly, while I can understand that what occurred in 1945 is a part of American history, I think that it is a shame, and an embarrassment to the nation, that such an exhibit even exists; particularly when it intentionally seeks to distort history, so as to make the two attacks appear as if they were unavoidable necessities, which they were most certainly not.

If any world leader were to perform those same horrible acts of violence in our modern day, he would quickly find himself in The Hague, standing before the International Criminal Court, accused of crimes against humanity; yet the United States has never been held accountable for what she did to the innocent civilians of Japan. Not only that, but since those horrific events of August 1945, the USA has continued to develop nuclear, biological and chemical weapons to use against her enemies in the battlefield; such as Napalm, Agent Orange, etc., as well as so-called "bunker busters", cluster bombs, laser-guided missiles, and an array of other devilish weapons. She has honed her ability to kill, maim and poison into a deadly craft, with which no other can compare. Not only that, but she earns billions of dollars every year by selling such technology of death to other nations who are willing to pay the price, and who support her causes.

As a final note on the above topic, almost two decades later, American president, Dwight D. Eisenhower, commented regarding the horrific events of the 1940's ". . . it wasn't necessary to hit them with that awful thing". I couldn't agree with Mr. Eisenhower more.

Let us return now to Mr. Bush's current problems. Add to his WMD dilemma, the rising death toll of American soldiers, and it becomes clear that President Bush is in the proverbial "hot water", as far as the American electorate is concerned. According to a CNN news report, with the latest attack just yesterday, 500 U.S. servicemen have been killed in Iraq. This includes 346 in hostile action. Since Bush made his premature announcement on May 1st of last year, in which he declared the end of major combat, 361 Americans have been killed, 231 of those in hostile action. This must surely weigh heavily upon the president, given that this year is a make-or-break election year for him. Mr. Bush could very easily be out of office soon, unless there is a sudden and drastic change in the tide of events occurring within Iraq; and I don't know if his theatrics, like his "Top Gun" performance" on the deck of a returning aircraft carrier, or his surprise visit to Iraq, will be enough to save him. Like other presidents

before him, Bush is good at made-for-TV shenanigans, which are aired primarily to woo and win the home audience. The rest of the world probably just ignores them, or laughs at them.

So the question is this: Will Mr. Bush survive the political fallout and the accusations of his Democratic presidential opponents? Again, I think a lot has to do with what happens in Iraq during the next ten months. Initially, Iraq was an asset for Mr. Bush, but the rising death toll of soldiers in Iraq, is eroding Bush's popularity, and quickly turning the war into a liability. As one individual recently stated, what is occurring in Iraq right now will be a test of the will of the American people and the Bush administration. If American casualties continue to escalate, and public opinion turns against the war, then I would suspect that Bush would view remaining in Iraq as too much of a liability, and he would seriously consider pulling out before it costs him the next election. Of course, if he were to pull out of Iraq, it would definitely speak volumes regarding his true intentions for going there in the first place. On the other hand, if he were to walk away from Iraq, and were to succeed in winning a second term in office, I think he would still be a happy man. After all, not only would he have won his second four years, but he would also have avenged his father in the process, and neutralized some of the criticisms against his father.

I honestly don't know what Bush is going to do; but if you think it is impossible for him to walk away from Iraq, allow me to make a brief comparison to serve as a wake-up call. As you will know, according to various news reports, there are an estimated 125,000 American military personnel in Iraq at this current time. Of course, I cannot verify that number, but for the sake of argument, let's assume that it is close to accurate. Following the events of 9-11, the United States military invaded and bombed Afghanistan, with the stated purpose of routing the Taliban government, who were hosting al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden, the alleged mastermind of 9-11. Similar to what has occurred in Iraq, with the destruction of much of the Afghan infrastructure by American forces, also came promises from the American government to rebuild the nation in a democratic fashion. All kinds of wonderful promises were made to the newly-installed pro-American puppets.

Now, consider the surprising facts. American promises to that nation, and to the American-supported, fledgling government of Hamid Karzai, have not been fully kept. The nation has not been rebuilt to any significant degree. Only a small portion of the promised financial aid has been provided. The Taliban are gradually returning to power, and have been launching a series of attacks in the southern areas of the country. Osama bin Laden has not been captured or killed. The government of Hamid Karzai really only controls the area which immediately surrounds the Afghan capital of Kabul. The remainder of the nation is more or less "the badlands", and is controlled by various warlords. And last of all, according to a recent news report, only 8,500 American soldiers are currently stationed in Afghanistan, compared to 125,000 personnel in Iraq.

Now, what does that tell you? Isn't it obvious? It tells you

that Mr. Bush basically abandoned Afghanistan after severely punishing that land, and chose to concentrate his efforts on what he probably assumed would be an easier target, Iraq, for the various reasons I have already stated. Given the rugged terrain of Afghanistan, with its steep, dangerous mountains, where al-Qaeda operatives could easily play a game of hide-and-go-seek with the Americans, and where they could easily pluck off American soldiers, just as they had done years ago with the Russians, I don't doubt that President Bush made the false assumption that Iraq, which compared to Afghanistan, is basically flat, would be a much easier place to wage and win war; the hot desert aside, of course. Obviously, Bush didn't count on the resiliency of the Iraqi resistance. Not only did he initially underestimate the cost of the coming war there, but he also committed the error of assuming that it would be over quickly. Let's not forget that May 1, 2003 speech.

But let's briefly return to the issue of Afghanistan. After 9-11, the American public required an object upon which to vent their rage and frustration. They also needed an event which would restore their self-confidence, as well as their global image as a powerful nation, being as they were feeling rather vulnerable, and perhaps a little broken following such cataclysmic events. Thus, even though fifteen of the nineteen alleged hijackers had passports from Saudi Arabia, the United States chose to attack Afghanistan, the home base of Osama bin Laden and the al-Qaeda network. America had chosen her scapegoat; a backward nation which could not possibly fight back in a very effective manner. It was a sure win; or so it seemed; but has it really been won yet? I think not.

As you may already know, to this day, a lot of unanswered questions remain regarding the events of 9-11, such as who was really behind it; why Saudi Arabia has never received any form of American retribution for the part she played in it; how much the Bush administration really knew before the attacks occurred; how the alleged nineteen men were able to totally evade America's high-tech security system and board and hijack the four airliners; why there were news leaks of America's intentions to attack Afghanistan at least several months before 9-11 ever occurred; etc.; but that is not the focus of this article. Perhaps one of these days, I will find time to address these issues in another article.

In shifting the American public's attention to Iraq, Mr. Bush and his administration skillfully relied upon deception and the power of suggestion, in order to meld the Afghanistan war and the focus on Iraq, into the same "war against terrorism". Exactly how did they accomplish such a feat? By alleging that Saddam Hussein's government had intimate ties with al-Qaeda. In short, their objective was to create the impression that Iraq had become the new center for terrorism; and thus, it was only natural to extend the war against terrorism to Iraq. But, just suggesting that Saddam's Iraq was the new enemy was not enough, so President Bush raised the stakes by repeatedly declaring that these new terrorists possessed something which Osama bin Laden did not have: WMD. And thus the psychological transition from Afghanistan to the new demon, Iraq, was made.

However, after Mr. Bush had begun his war, and after months of not having provided any clear-cut evidence to substantiate his claim of a connection between Saddam Hussein's regime and

the al-Qaeda network, President Bush finally admitted this past September, that there was no clear proof of a connection between the 9-11 attacks and Saddam Hussein. However, he, as well as other top level administration officials, still held the position that Saddam Hussein had close ties with Osama bin Laden and the al-Qaeda network. Consider the following quotes taken from a CNN news report dated September 17, 2003:

----- Begin Quotes -----

President Bush said Wednesday there was no evidence that Saddam Hussein was involved in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 -- disputing an idea held by many Americans.

"There's no question that Saddam Hussein had al Qaeda ties," the president said. But he also said, "We have no evidence that Saddam Hussein was involved with the September 11 attacks."

The administration has argued that Saddam's government had close links to al Qaeda, the terrorist network led by Osama bin Laden that masterminded the September 11 attacks.

On Sunday, for example, Vice President Dick Cheney said that success in stabilizing and democratizing Iraq would strike a major blow at the "the geographic base of the terrorists who have had us under assault for many years, but most especially on 9/11."

And Tuesday, in an interview on ABC's "Nightline," White House national security adviser Condoleezza Rice said that one of the reasons Bush went to war against Saddam was because he posed a threat in "a region from which the 9/11 threat emerged."

----- End Quotes -----

As you can see, while Bush and his cronies did not have the audacity to connect Saddam Hussein directly to the attacks of 9-11, they most certainly presented a united front in trying to convince the general public that he had clear ties with al-Qaeda; which made him just as evil, and just as much a serious threat to the United States; particularly due to the false allegation that he possessed WMD, which he was prepared to use at any moment. Let us not forget those oft repeated words "imminent threat". The reason why President Bush and his associates emphasized the alleged al-Qaeda connection, is because as I have already stated, they were purposely playing upon the fears which had been generated by the events of 9-11, in order to marshal support for their illegal and unprovoked war against Iraq. They were playing a sly game of psychological manipulation with the American public; and millions of patriotic American citizens fell right into their basket; thousands of whom have watched as their sons, daughters, husbands, wives, mothers and fathers have marched off to Iraq, where five hundred of them have already died; and the war is not over yet. Sadly, while Americans may grieve over their hundreds of dead, Iraqis are currently grieving over literally thousands of their dead; but of course, this is not overly emphasized by the

American news agencies.

Well, a few months have passed since President Bush made his public admission; and now that Saddam Hussein has finally been captured, we have been given another morsel of truth to digest. First we were told by President Bush that Mr. Hussein could not be connected to the 9-11 attacks. On Thursday of this past week, Secretary of State, Colin L. Powell, chose to amplify that statement, and enlighten us further, by finally admitting that there is no "smoking gun" evidence to point to a link between the ex-government of Saddam Hussein, and the al-Qaeda network. Consider these quotes taken from a New York Times report:

----- Begin Quote -----

Secretary of State Colin L. Powell conceded Thursday that despite his assertions to the United Nations last year, he had no "smoking gun" proof of a link between the government of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and terrorists of Al Qaeda.

"I have not seen smoking-gun, concrete evidence about the connection," Mr. Powell said, in response to a question at a news conference. "But I think the possibility of such connections did exist, and it was prudent to consider them at the time that we did."

Mr. Powell's remarks on Thursday were a stark admission that there is no definitive evidence to back up administration statements and insinuations that Saddam Hussein had ties to Al Qaeda, the acknowledged authors of the Sept. 11 attacks. Although President Bush finally acknowledged in September that there was no known connection between Mr. Hussein and the attacks, the impression of a link in the public mind has become widely accepted -- and something administration officials have done little to discourage.

----- End Quotes -----

Of course the Bush Administration did nothing to discourage such thinking! Not only did they subtly plant the idea in the minds of the American public in the first place, through their many insinuations, but such a belief, be it real or imagined, also served their purposes well in building more support for the war. Exactly what was it that Colin Powell had said to the United Nations in February of the previous year, in order to try to convince them of the necessity to launch an unprovoked, pre-emptive strike against Iraq? Let me again share some quotes with you from the same article. It is amazing how these politicians can make such drastic turnarounds, and the American public will barely blink an eye, as if they are in some kind of hypnotic daze:

----- Begin Quotes -----

[Mr. Powell] said that a "sinister nexus" existed "between Iraq and the Al Qaeda terrorist network, a nexus that combines classic terrorist organizations and modern methods of murder."

"Iraq today harbors a deadly terrorist network, headed by

Abu Musaab al-Zarqawi, an associate and collaborator of Osama bin Laden and his Al Qaeda lieutenants."

"Iraqi officials deny accusations of ties with Al Qaeda. These denials are simply not credible."

----- End Quotes -----

As I noted in part one, with each passing month, more reports and analyses are being released by various organizations and individuals, both official, and non-official, which totally expose the massive deception which was perpetrated upon the American people by President Bush, in order to convince them of the necessity of war against Iraq. To my utter amazement, yesterday evening, while reading the online news, as is my daily custom, I came across yet another piece of powerful evidence, which totally refutes the allegation that Saddam Hussein had ties with the al-Qaeda network. What makes this particular piece of evidence so amazing, is the fact that not only is it coming from official sources, but the origin of the information is none other than Saddam Hussein himself! According to a document found in Saddam's possession at the time of his capture, he specifically warned the resistance fighters to not join forces with the al-Qaeda network. As if that isn't enough, the article goes on to say that American intelligence officials from the CIA discovered that prior to the illegal and unprovoked invasion of Iraq by the Americans, Osama bin Laden had likewise expressed a clear disinterest in working with Saddam Hussein. Following are some excerpts from the January 14, 2004 New York Times report:

----- Begin Quotes -----

Saddam Hussein warned his Iraqi supporters to be wary of joining forces with foreign Arab fighters entering Iraq to battle American troops, according to a document found with the former Iraqi leader when he was captured, Bush administration officials said Tuesday.

The document appears to be a directive, written after he lost power, from Mr. Hussein to leaders of the Iraqi resistance, counseling caution against getting too close to Islamic jihadists and other foreign Arabs coming into occupied Iraq, according to American officials.

It provides a second piece of evidence challenging the Bush administration contention of close cooperation between Mr. Hussein's government and terrorists from Al Qaeda. C.I.A. interrogators have already elicited from the top Qaeda officials in custody that, before the American-led invasion, Osama bin Laden had rejected entreaties from some of his lieutenants to work jointly with Mr. Hussein.

Officials said Mr. Hussein apparently believed that the foreign Arabs, eager for a holy war against the West, had a different agenda from the Baathists, who were eager for their own return to power in Baghdad. As a result, he wanted his supporters to be careful about becoming close allies with the jihadists, officials familiar with the document said.

As President Bush sought to build a case for war with Iraq,

one of the most hotly debated issues was whether Mr. Hussein was in league with Mr. bin Laden and Al Qaeda. Senior officials at the Pentagon who were certain that the evidence of connections between Iraq and Al Qaeda were strong and compelling found themselves at war with analysts at the C.I.A. who believed that the evidence showed some contacts between Baghdad and the terrorist organization, but not an operational alliance.

At the Pentagon, several officials believed that Iraq and Al Qaeda had found common ground in their hatred of the United States, while at the C.I.A., many analysts believed that Mr. bin Laden saw Mr. Hussein as one of the corrupt secular Arab leaders who should be toppled.

----- End Quotes -----

As you the reader can now hopefully see, all of President Bush's accusations concerning connections with the al-Qaeda network, as well as Saddam's alleged active development and possession of WMD, were based upon assumptions, worse-case scenarios, hunches, possibilities and a clear exaggeration of the truth. I suppose we should include bad intelligence as well, but intelligence which was undoubtedly influenced by pressure from the White House to give it what it wanted to hear, so that it could present a convincing case to the American public. There was never any clear-cut evidence to support any of Mr. Bush's claims. The American public was systematically fed a bunch of unsubstantiated allegations; and it was based upon these unproven allegations, that the United States of America, in conjunction with Great Britain, -- who else, of course -- unilaterally attacked and invaded the sovereign nation of Iraq. The USA launched an illegal, pre-emptive strike based upon the flimsiest of evidence, which turned out to be no real evidence whatsoever, by their own admission.

Furthermore, after having illegally attacked and invaded that sovereign nation -- and not for the first time -- she hunted down its leader, in order to either assassinate or capture him, depending on the situation which existed when the moment arrived. Having finally accomplished her goal, she has then kept Mr. Hussein away from the eyes of the world, in a secret location, where she has interrogated him according to her own whim. It was only a few days ago that, probably due to global pressure, she granted Saddam Hussein the wartime status of Prisoner of War, and has agreed to give the Red Cross access to him. As of this writing, I don't know if that has actually occurred yet.

Before continuing, allow me to make an important point. While I am writing rather candidly concerning my views regarding America's unprovoked, illegal war in Iraq, I would like the reader to understand that this should not be interpreted as meaning that I am a fan of Saddam Hussein, or that I think he is one nice guy, because I most certainly don't. If you read some of my other articles where I mention him, you will see that based on the information I have read about him, he very much seems like a tyrant and a thug. However, be that as it may, nevertheless, he was the globally-recognized leader of Iraq, regardless of what questionable means he may have used to come to power, or for that matter, to remain in power. We

must not forget that the Bible clearly states that God is the one who raises up leaders, be they good or evil, and not man. Please consider these verses:

"Lift not up your horn on high: speak not with a stiff neck. For promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is the judge: he putteth down one, and setteth up another."
Psalms 75:5-7, KJV

"Daniel answered and said, Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever: for wisdom and might are his: And he changeth the times and the seasons: he removeth kings, and setteth up kings: he giveth wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding."
Daniel 2:20-21, KJV

"This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones: to the intent that the living may know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men."
Daniel 4:17, KJV

So again, God is the one who sets up world leaders, even if elections, or the lack thereof, may be the mechanism which He uses to bring them to power, in order to perform His Will and Divine Purposes. As I have explained before, some world leaders are specifically raised up to be God's "vessels of wrath", such as the Pharaoh of Egypt, King Nebuchadnezzar, General Titus in 70 AD, etc. If they are evil, then God will judge them in His own time, and in His own way. This is a Biblical fact and principle. Study the Scriptures, and you will plainly see this for yourself.

As we continue this discussion in part three of our series, we will examine such issues as the sovereignty of Iraq, the US campaign against Hans Blix and the UNMOVIC team, Blair's foolish mistake, Bush's "shoot now and ask questions later" policy and the dangers it presents, continuing attacks and rising American casualties, a situation out of control, Bush caught in a quagmire, Israel's nuclear status and America's partiality, the hypocrisy of the elite nuclear club, mistrust between the USA and Russia, the US inability to find WMD in Iraq, unwinding the deception, how much did Bush really know, America's short memory span, possibility of planted evidence, softening up the American public and Mr. Bush's re-election strategies, the UN's hesitation to assist Mr. Bush, US damage control, endtime deception, the Iraq War stain and weaknesses of the Bush Administration. I trust that you will join me, as we still have a lot of information to cover.

Written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>

Copyright 1994 - 2012 Endtime Prophecy Net

Published On : December 15, 2003

Last Updated : February 20, 2012

Saddam Was Globally-Recognized Leader Of A Sovereign Iraq, Bush The Unilateralist And Lawless One, America Discredits Hans Blix And UN Inspectors, Bush's Fears Lost Opportunity To Remove Saddam, Tony Blair's Foolish Mistake, Shoot Now And Ask Questions Later, Bush's Dangerous Precedent, Attack At Republican Palace Hotel, Situation Out Of Control, Bush Caught In Iraq Quagmire, Israel's Nuclear Status, America's Blind Eye, Hypocrisy Of Elite Nuclear Club, Mistrust Between USA And Russia, Bush And Putin: The Odd Couple, Did Saddam Really Threaten You?, "What If" Scenario, Opinions Based On Information, US Inability To Find WMD In Iraq, Unwinding The Deception: A Premeditated Plan?, Did Bush Really Know, Short Memory Span, Possibility Of Planted Evidence, Soften Up The American Public, Bush Re-Election Strategies, UN Hesitation To Help Bush, Damage Control, Endtime Deception, Vote Wisely Iraq War A Stain On Bush Presidency, Other Bush Deficiencies

Returning to the political angle of our discussion, as I said a moment ago, regardless of whether he was loved or hated, it doesn't change the fact that Saddam Hussein was nevertheless the globally-recognized leader of Iraq; and Iraq was, and is, an internationally-recognized sovereign nation. Having said that, everything that George Bush has done in regards to Iraq and Saddam Hussein since the war began, has been contrary to International Law; a law which Mr. Bush claims to recognize and uphold. Mr. Bush has unilaterally acted contrary to the general consensus of the world body of nations, which clearly agreed that the UN weapons inspectors, lead by Mr. Hans Blix, should have been given more time to complete their tasks. But as we all know, or should know, that is exactly what Mr. Bush and his team feared the most. Not only did they fight against the inspectors from the very beginning, by showing no faith in them, by trying to discredit their level of expertise, and by criticizing their slow results, but they were also afraid that in the end, Mr. Blix might issue a final report in which Saddam Hussein would be cleared of all charges; in which case the sanctions would be lifted; and Iraq would be welcomed back into full fellowship with the world body of nations, with Saddam Hussein still in power.

Mr. Bush could not take that chance, because he had his own agenda; which as in previous instances, was contrary to the agenda of the United Nations. Thus, President Bush chose to huff and puff and threaten, and apply pressure to the UN, until it finally backed down, the UNMOVIC team left Iraq, and Mr. Bush was allowed to start his war, with Tony Blair faithfully bringing up the rear as he seems to enjoy doing. Well, if you follow the news closely, then you will already know that Mr. Blair has been taking just as much heat back in Great Britain, as President Bush has in the United States, regarding their deceptive game. Blair deserves it for having foolishly followed Bush into an illegal, unprovoked war.

As I have told our mailing list members before, the United

States of America has basically adopted a policy of "Shoot now and ask questions later". That seems to be the essence of Mr. Bush's foreign policy in regards to Iraq, and it is a very dangerous policy; particularly because the leaders of several other nations have since publicly adopted the very same policy. They figure, "If America can do it, so can we". For example, following the Bali attack, Prime Minister John Howard publicly stated that Australia reserves the right to strike preemptively, in order to save Australian lives. Israel has likewise adopted a similar policy with its well-publicized assassinations of Palestinian militant leaders and operatives. In fact, I was just reading yesterday where the Deputy Defense Minister of Israel, Zeev Boim, publicly stated that the blind spiritual leader and founder of Hamas, Sheik Ahmed Yassin, is "marked for death", and had better hide underground; which was obviously a reference to how Saddam Hussein was hiding in a hole in the ground at the time of his capture.

So as you can plainly see, America's leader has in fact set an extremely dangerous precedent, which others are eager to follow. He has opened the proverbial Pandora's Box. If wars can now be initiated based upon mere suspicions and fears, without any real clear-cut proof of guilt, or any evidence of an "imminent threat" and major loss of life, then this world is in very serious trouble, and may God help us all! Sadly, the questions are now finally being asked, but it is a little too late. The war has already been waged, a beast has been let loose, and the so-called "evidence" has been found to be bogus.

The situation is clearly spiraling out of control in Iraq with each passing day, regardless of what the White House may say. Remember; they are in damage control mode and will not tell you the truth. Even as I've been proofreading this series in order to add it to our web site, shocking events continue to occur in Iraq. Major American news agencies are now reporting that early this morning, Sunday, another bomb attack occurred right near the main gate of the American occupation headquarters, which is located in the Republic Palace Hotel, on the bank of the Tigris River, right across from central Baghdad. They are currently reporting at least twenty-three people dead; two or more of them Americans, and the rest Iraqis; as well as at least sixty people wounded; and those figures may possibly change as more information is made available. This attack now raises American casualties in Iraq to over five hundred;; and there is no doubt in my mind that Mr. Bush is deeply concerned.

The minute that L. Paul Bremer III leaves Iraq for a few days, the Iraqi defenders strike right at the heart of the American operations. It is obvious that as long as these kinds of deadly attacks are occurring, there is no way that sovereignty can safely be handed over to the Iraqis by June, as the Americans are promising to do. In fact, they continue to say that the transfer of power will occur on that date, in spite of this most recent attack. As a result of these kinds of attacks, it seems to me that the United States is stuck in Iraq until true peace can be achieved. Mr. Bush has unwittingly trapped himself in a quagmire, and there is no way out at this point, without him looking like a coward, as well as a traitor to the Iraqis. Bush knows that he cannot

promise them a new nation, peace, democracy and freedom, and then just run off and abandon Iraq -- as he obviously did with Afghanistan -- when the going gets rough; even if the 2004 election is drawing closer by the day. He needs to stay the course and fulfill his stated objectives to the Iraqis, even if those objectives were merely a cloak of deception.

Earlier, I rhetorically asked you why, when there are so many ruthless dictators around the world who oppress their people, did the United States of America choose to target Mr. Hussein? Allow me to ask you another pertinent question now; and again, the answer is rather obvious. Why did the USA, without any concrete proof, target Saddam Hussein over the WMD issue, when there are clearly other countries around the world, which do unmistakably possess nuclear technology, and some of which have outright refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty? More specifically, while Israel has never made a public declaration regarding its nuclear status, everyone in-the-know realizes that she does possess such technology. That being the case, why has she never been taken to task by the United States, to give an account of her nuclear inventory? Even though Israel refuses to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the United States just turns a blind eye to the whole affair!

As I said, the answer is rather obvious. Unless it's playing hardball for some particular reason, such as because it wants a concession from one of its allies, the American Government does not normally make it a practice to openly embarrass its nuclear-owning friends; it only likes to expose and attack those nations which it doesn't like, such as George Bush's so-called "axis of evil". It will simply turn a blind eye to the misdeeds of its friends. Why does Israel have the right to possess nuclear weapons, while other nations such as Iran, North Korea, Libya, etc., do not? Is Israel such a peaceful country? Not by any means! Can you see the prejudice and the preferential treatment being given here to one of America's friends and allies?

If the elite nuclear club which formulated the NPT is really sincere about wanting to see the world completely rid of nuclear weapons, shouldn't it begin by cleaning up its own house first? Shouldn't it be leading by a clear example? How can it tell Iraq, Iran, India, Pakistan, Libya, North Korea or any other nation for that matter, to cease and desist, when they, the nuclear elite, are sitting upon the largest and deadliest nuclear, chemical and biological stockpiles in the entire world? I am reminded of some of our Lord's words when He exposed the hypocrisy of the Jewish Scribes and Pharisees of His day. Jesus said:

". . . The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not."

Matthew 23:2-3, KJV

While some of you may not realize this, even the nuclear agreements between the United States and Russia are a big joke, and are really only meant for public consumption. Why? Because while both sides claim that they will cut back their nuclear arsenals by so many warheads by a certain year, the

truth of the matter is that they are not really destroying them, they are only "decommissioning" them. In other words, if a moment of need arrived, the order could easily be given to reactivate them.

So why is it that nations like the USA and Russia don't lead by example by completely eliminating their nuclear weapons? Again, the answer is rather obvious. First, as I've already stated, it is their very nuclear stockpiles which allow them to retain their positions as the "kings of the mountain". In addition to this, in spite of all of the public back-slapping the Odd Couple has done before the cameras, the truth of the matter is that they really don't trust each other as much as they would like everyone to think they do. Considering the Texas oilman's background, and the ex-KGB man's history, is it really any wonder? Deep-seated beliefs and mistrust die hard.

And one final question which I would like to direct to our American civilian readers: Have you personally really ever felt threatened by Saddam Hussein? Have you personally ever woke up in the morning, shaking in your boots, and feeling like Saddam Hussein was going to blow your house off the map at any minute? I didn't think so. Considering that Saddam had highly-inaccurate SCUD missiles over a dozen years ago, which could barely make it to Israel, and that not one shred of evidence has ever surfaced to suggest that he possessed anything much more advanced than that, doesn't the idea of feeling threatened by Mr. Hussein in the continental USA, literally thousands of miles away from Iraq, seem rather ludicrous and far-fetched? Yet many of you agreed to Bush's war for that very reason. You believed the big lie. Shame on you! What in the world were some of you thinking?

Given all of the truth which has been revealed in the last few months, you can't even fall back on the fear that Saddam might have sold part of his nuclear arsenal to al-Qaeda. Why? Because not only did he not possess any working WMD himself, but as we have already seen, Saddam clearly had no desire or intention to even work with al-Qaeda; and Osama bin Laden had similar thoughts regarding working with Saddam, even though his people had approached him about doing exactly that. They had two different agendas. Case dismissed!

Now, it has occurred to me that some of you might possibly pose the question, "What if someday down the road, American forces in Iraq do discover Saddam's hidden nuclear, chemical and biological arsenals? Then what would you say? Would you take back everything you have written here?"

Well, you know, I have given a lot of thought to this entire issue since it first began; and I have considered that kind of scenario. I would respond in the following manner. First of all, everything I have stated here is based upon official government and mass media releases. I haven't just drawn it out of thin air or made it up. The opinions I have expressed here are the result of factual information which any person can find on the Internet with a little bit of effort. Now, if any of that information is inaccurate in any way, or even outright wrong, then I cannot be held accountable for that. I can only formulate my opinions based upon the information that is available.

That issue aside, my view is this: If after some nine months of searching, they were finally able to find Saddam Hussein hiding in a small hole in the ground right under their noses, -- please note that they had searched near that site several times previously -- then I would think that they would have even less difficulty finding, in President Bush's own words, "thousands of tons of chemical agents", as well as thousands of "liters of anthrax and other deadly biological agents", if they really existed. I mean, being a human being, Saddam Hussein possessed the ability to remain mobile. If US Forces got too close to him, he could just move to a new location. As you may recall, according to the American government and news sources, Saddam was supposedly changing location every few hours in order to avoid being caught; yet after a number of failed attempts, they finally caught up with him after receiving an important credible tip.

On the other hand, we are talking about "thousands of tons of chemical agents", and thousands of "liters of anthrax and other deadly biological agents". That material would take up a considerable amount of space, as would a nuclear arsenal, or equipment to build a nuclear stockpile; and it could not just get up and walk away whenever the American forces got too close to it. Furthermore, with the Americans crawling all over the country, neither could it be secretly moved by the Iraqis. As I noted earlier, even the American officials stated that it was impossible for the Iraqis to have simply spirited such a huge amount of material out of their country, without the Bush Administration knowing about it. They have surveillance satellites, and other technologies which would have aided them in discovering any mischief on the ground.

In short, if it really existed in such large quantities as had been claimed by Mr. Bush, if at all, then it would have to have remained in the same location where the Iraqis had hidden it before the invasion began. In spite of months of searching, the UNMOVIC team found nothing. In spite of the American military forces searching since May of last year, they have likewise found absolutely nothing. They can find one man, Saddam Hussein, like a needle hidden in a haystack, yet they cannot locate thousands of tons, and thousands of liters of WMD, even though they possess all kinds of hi-tech equipment which is specifically designed to detect such things. Granted, Iraq is a large country, and there is a lot of desert out there which needs to be searched; but by this time, you would surely think that the UN, or the USA, would have found something; at least the tip of the iceberg; but they haven't. Are you starting to get the picture?

Perhaps we need to ask ourselves: Why is all of this info coming out right now, which is an embarrassment to the Bush Administration? Personally, I am beginning to wonder if it wasn't planned in advance. It is just a personal speculation on my part, but maybe it is true; you never know. What I mean is this: The White House knew all along that they were highly exaggerating the truth, and deceiving both the world and the American public; but they were willing to play the game if it would give them the opportunity to invade Iraq and take down Saddam Hussein. But they also knew that the time would come when they would have to slowly let the cat out of the bag, and reveal the truth, because such things eventually leak out

anyway. It would obviously be risky business; but if they had already accomplished their primary goal in Iraq, as they now have, by taking down Saddam, then it would be time to slowly start taking themselves off the hook, before it got too close to the 2004 election; and that seems to be exactly what they may have been doing over the past several months. They seem to be unwinding the deceptive web they wove many months ago.

Carefully consider the following facts.

Contrary to popular perception, President Bush clarifies that Saddam Hussein cannot be directly linked to the 9-11 attacks. A few months pass by, and then Colin L. Powell announces that there was never any hard evidence which might substantiate a connection between Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden and the al-Qaeda network. Next a document is discovered in Saddam's possession, which conclusively proves that he was hesitant to work with Osama bin Laden. Finally, we are informed that bin Laden likewise had no interest in joining forces with Saddam Hussein. Can you see a subtle pattern of events? The primary two reasons which were put forth for going to war are slowly being destroyed. We are slowly but surely being weaned from the deception, as if a pre-determined script is intentionally being followed. Maybe I am just a crazy conspiracy theorist with a good imagination; or maybe there is some truth to what I have just proposed. We may never know.

The only other alternative, is to accept that Mr. Bush truly believed that the intelligence he was receiving was accurate, and was therefore convinced that Saddam really did possess tons of WMD. Now if that is indeed the case, then the fact that none have been found to date, in spite of the fact that almost two thousand qualified people from both the UN and the USA have been looking for them for many months now, makes Mr. Bush look rather stupid; and it also makes his intelligence people look very inept. Personally, I have a difficult time accepting this alternative. As the president, I think that Bush knew the facts all along; and that he went along with the deception from the beginning; and may have even put it in motion, as Paul O'Neill stated: Bush gave the order, and his people found the way to carry it out.

One thing that is true, is that the election is not that far away; so if Bush and his team did want to take themselves off the hook, now would certainly be the time to do it. Please remember what I said earlier in part one. The American public has a short memory span and a tendency to forgive and forget. In spite of everything that Bush and his cronies have done to deceive the American people into accepting his war, there are still a lot of people who like Mr. Bush, and who would, and will, vote for him in November. If the Bush Administration is truly weaning the American public from the deception right now, I wouldn't be surprised if they take it so far as to one day say, "Oops! Sorry! We goofed! Our intelligence was wrong. Saddam never had any WMD as we supposed; but it is a good thing that we got rid of him anyway, because he was a tyrant to his own people". Given the nature of the American people, I think a lot of them would accept that and not blink an eye, and still vote for Bush this coming November.

To complete my answer regarding the possibility that they may still find some WMD in Iraq, allow me to add these final

thoughts. Given that the UNMOVIC team never found anything; given that the US teams have never found any WMD after nine months of searching for them; given that the USA has even begun to pull out part of their search teams; and given that the American military has had so much time to do whatever they want in Iraq beyond the eyes of international scrutiny, it would require a lot to convince me personally, of any evidence which might surface at this late date. My skeptical nature would cause me to strongly wonder if it might not have been planted; either to save the election for George Bush, or perhaps for America to save face before the world. Quite frankly, I don't think that they even really care what the world thinks. They didn't care when they illegally attacked and invaded Iraq, did they? They took down Saddam Hussein as planned, so they got what they wanted. Whether or not they will get the rest still remains to be seen. As I said before, over five hundred American casualties, and still rising, must surely worry President Bush. He may have his Viet Nam.

Mr. Bush still has nine months left to soften up the American public, and make them forget his deceptions; that is, if the Democrats will let him, which I doubt. They are going to be hitting the president hard in every way that they can. If you read the news a lot as I do, then you can see signs of the Bush re-election strategy everywhere. For example, have you noticed how they've been working really hard to tell us that the status of the American economy is improving? Don't be surprised if that kind of talk continues all the way up to the election. Unemployment and a weak economy are some of the things which are dragging down Bush's points in all the opinion polls; although I personally don't put much faith in those polls, being as they are so manipulated, and based on such a small percentage of the general populace.

Have you also noticed how Mr. Bush has been wooing his big rich friends with the controversial tax cuts? Or how about the fact that he is also wooing the much-needed Christian Right with his talk of having a marriage clause amended to the Constitution of the United States? Of course, you will also notice that he has not made a firm commitment to do that, but has only more or less threatened to do it, if the gay and lesbian community continues to push for legalized marriage for gays and lesbians. Yet at the same time, in a recent remark, Mr. Bush also seemed to be straddling the fence, because while he stated that he is of the opinion that marriage is a sacred institution between a man and a woman, he also said that people can do what they can do legally, as long as it is according to the laws of their state. So Bush is really sending mixed signals there.

And don't forget the Latinos. Oh yes, Bush is trying to win them as well. What do you think giving temporary work visas to millions of illegal migrant workers from Mexico is all about, if not winning the vote of America's large Mexican population? Between that, and Bush's recent trip to Mexico, plus the fact that Mexican-Americans seem to idolize General Sanchez, the man who is leading the forces in Iraq, Bush may very well have the Latino vote in his pocket.

The new urgency with which the Bush Administration is trying to turn over sovereignty to the Iraqis is another sign that they are becoming nervous as the election draws closer. For

months and months, Mr. Bush snubbed the United Nations and the opinion of the world; but as I stated earlier, now that rebuilding Iraq is proving to be a lot more difficult of a challenge, with the Kurds making demands, and the Shiites making demands, and the Sunnis making demands, and American soldiers still dying over there, the President is suddenly appealing to Kofi Annan and the United Nations, to step in and offer some assistance with the upcoming caucus-style elections. However, until now, Mr. Annan has been rather cautious regarding intervening at this particular moment.

The UN Secretary General's concern seems to be three-fold. First of all, as a result of the devastating attack on the UN headquarters in Baghdad this past summer, which, as you may recall, left twenty-two people dead, he is obviously concerned about the continuing security situation. The fact that American soldiers, Iraqis, and personnel from other countries continue to die, certainly doesn't help to build his confidence. Second, Mr. Annan is concerned about the very nature of the electoral process being proposed by the Bush Administration. Not only is it very complex, but the bottom line, as the Iraqis understand, is that it will not be a true democratic election by any means. Thus, Mr. Annan is hesitant to offer UN involvement at this time, as it will appear as if he is rubber-stamping the American deception. Third, Mr. Annan does not wish for the United Nations to be used by the Bush Administration as another tool for them to win the presidential race; and that is exactly how it would appear, were the UN to concede to Mr. Bush's wishes. As you may have heard, just a few days ago, there was a very large protest in the southern Iraqi city of Basra -- a city which is mentioned in the Scriptures by the way -- in which tens of thousands of Iraqis participated, under the inspiration of Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani. As I noted earlier, they are insisting on open, democratic elections.

So my point is, the Bush team is very busy right now, doing damage control over the Iraq dilemma, as well as trying to consolidate Bush's support base all across the country.

If you, the reader, are a citizen of the United States of America; and if you voted for George Bush during the last presidential election; and if you have been so naive as to support his current war in Iraq, then I truly hope that this series is serving as a wake-up call for you. I hope that your desire to know the truth is stronger than your American patriotism. I hope that you can now see how your president has lied to you, and deceived you, and manipulated you since this whole sad affair began. Again I am reminded of a verse from the Scriptures which perfectly describes the Endtime when it says:

"But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived."
2 Timothy 3:13, KJV

If you are politically active, and if it is your intention to vote this coming November, then I hope that you will vote wisely, and choose a man who is known for his honesty, his integrity, and his Christian values, if such an individual exists in the current presidential race. That is for you alone to determine. Personally, I do not consider myself a

part of this world according to the Scriptures, so I do not participate in the election process. If you do vote, don't be swayed by mere words and political rhetoric; because as I am sure you realize, politicians will say anything before a camera in order to win your vote. They will tickle your ears and promise you the world, and then give you none or very little of it. Promises last about just as long as the election does.

Before switching gears in this series, allow me to add just a few more comments. I am sure that it's rather obvious that I strongly disagree with Mr. Bush regarding his decision to go to war against Iraq. I am convinced that he deceived the American public, either knowingly, or possibly due to his own ignorance, because he is manipulated by others. While he has made a few decisions, or taken a few stands with which I can agree, nevertheless, he is not without reproach; and the Iraq war will be a stain on his presidency, just as war was a stain on the reign of King David of old. It was because he was a man of war, the Scriptures tell us, that the Lord did not allow David to build the temple, as we see here:

"Then David the king stood up upon his feet, and said, Hear me, my brethren, and my people: As for me, I had in mine heart to build an house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the LORD, and for the footstool of our God, and had made ready for the building: But God said unto me, Thou shalt not build an house for my name, because thou hast been a man of war, and hast shed blood."
1 Chronicles 28:2-3, KJV

Aside from the illegal war in Iraq, Mr. Bush has not shown sufficient interest in caring for the poor, but rather has bowed to the pressures of special interest groups, and has favored the rich and the elite through tax cuts which will further fill their pockets while doing nothing to help the little man at the bottom. The Bible clearly states:

"If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, And one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works."
James 2:15-18, KJV

"Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."
James 1:27, KJV

So the point is, Mr. Bush needs to put more actions behind his words, and behind his verbal display of Christianity, as otherwise, he is just another hypocrite. As a result of his ties to the oil and gas industry, Mr. Bush's environmental record also leaves a lot to be desired. Pulling out of the Kyoto Protocol was a real tragedy, and has had a negative reciprocal effect. Following America's lead, others nations have also begun to back-pedal on their commitment to ratify and abide by the terms of the Kyoto Protocol, and it is now

all but dead. In the Book of Revelation, we are told that God will destroy those who destroy the Earth; and some of the activities being championed by Mr. Bush are doing just that:

"And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth."
Revelation 11:18, KJV

As we conclude this series in part four, we will begin to address the important issue of how American intervention in Iraq, and the capture of Saddam Hussein, affects our current understanding of Endtime prophecy. This will include looking at such issues as the Beast of the Book of Revelation and the King of the North found in the prophecies of Daniel; the deadly wound of the Beast; Turkey and Syria's possible roles in Endtime events; the bold move towards democracy in Iraq; America's Middle East agenda; the dangers faced by Syria and Iran; the possible destruction of America; possible delay in the Endtime Countdown and the not-so-imminent Return of Jesus Christ; the "Pre-Tribulation Rapture" theory; the destruction of Babylon the Great by the Beast and the Ten Horns; theories concerning Babylon's possible identity of Babylon; the power of the oil weapon; the globalists and their New World Order; John Lennon's "Imagine"; the birth and destruction of "New Babylon"; and our duty to God as Endtime Christians. I trust that you will join me for the conclusion of this series.

Written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>

CAPTURE OF SADDAM HUSSEIN AND THE NEW BABYLON : PT 4

Copyright 1994 - 2012 Endtime Prophecy Net

Published On : December 15, 2003

Last Updated : February 20, 2012

Saddam Hussein As The Beast, Our Job As Prophecy Teachers, Beast of Revelation And King Of The North, His Deadly Wound Healed, Syria As King Of The North, Turkish-Syrian Relations The Turkey Question, Saddam's Capture A High Point, Iraqis Emboldened For Democracy, USA Emboldened To Implement Middle East Agenda, Iran And Syria - Possible Targets, My Prophetic Dilemma, America Hindering Endtime Countdown, Jesus' Return Not Imminent, Minimum Of Seven Years Left, Not A Pre-Tribber America's Destruction A Catalyst For Endtime Events, Babylon Destroyed By Beast And Ten Horns, Identity Of Babylon, The Oil Weapon, America's Use Them And Abuse Them Tactic, Name Change For Baghdad, New World Order, John Lennon's Imagine, True Peace Through Christ, America's Globalist Vision, Buzz Words - Freedom Liberation Democracy, The Spirit of Newness, Birth Of New Babylon, Power Of Oil, "New Babylon" Despised

Hated And Destroyed, Personal Speculations, Don't Limit God, God's Plan In Motion, God Sets Up Leaders, Watch Pray Witness

Having now thoroughly discussed the political aspects of the war in Iraq, let us turn our attention to the recent capture of Saddam Hussein, and how it effects our understanding of Endtime prophecy. As some of you who have studied my articles will already know, in such commentaries as "The Seven Heads", due to the fact that the USA was unable to remove Mr. Hussein from power for more than a dozen years, in spite of military attacks, UN sanctions, no-fly zones, etc., I posed the theory that Saddam, or one of his sons, Uday or Qusay, might be the Biblical Beast of the Book of Revelation. As I explained in part two, it is God who raises up leaders; and for some time, it seemed that despite the US's best efforts to remove Saddam from power, the Lord might be keeping him in power for a very specific reason. Please note that I was by no means alone in this view. Other Bible teachers considered this possibility as well. After all, that is our job; to read the Scriptures, and then, using sound judgment and spiritual discernment, try to apply the proper interpretation to them, based upon what is occurring in the world at present. It is not an easy job.

As you may also know, it has been my belief that the Beast of the Book of Revelation, may be synonymous with the King of the North, mentioned in the prophecies of Daniel, who invades the land of Israel. As I point out in that series, in the Scriptures, King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon was in fact referred to as a great power coming down from the north, in order to invade Israel. Obviously, with both Uday and Qusay Hussein now having been killed by American forces in Mosul, -- which is located near ancient Nineveh -- and with Saddam in captivity, it would definitely seem that the Hussein regime is finished. Short of a miracle, and I do mean a direct act of God, it is highly unlikely that Saddam Hussein will ever return to his position of power in Iraq. In fact, most people believe that once the United States is finished with him, and Saddam is turned over to Iraqi authorities -- assuming that Bush keeps his word on this -- he is a dead man.

Update: As I explain in my five-part series "Saddam Hussein's Execution and the Euro Dollar War", Saddam Hussein was in fact executed by hanging on December 30, 2006.

Despite the fate which was met by Saddam Hussein and his sons, nevertheless, we know from the Scriptures that when the Beast does make his appearance on the world stage at some point in the future, he will appear to fall from power in some way, only to rise again, as we see by the following verses that are found in the Book of Revelation:

"And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him? . . . And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth,

that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live."

Revelation 13:3-4, 14, KJV

So just when the world has assumed that the Beast has been militarily defeated, it appears from the Scriptures that he is going to astound the world and rise to power again. As I explain in the aforementioned series, this, I believe, is the proper interpretation of the Scriptures. Contrary to the popular notion, which is promoted in a number of movies, as well as in a lot of Christian evangelistic materials, I do not believe that the Beast is going to be actually wounded in the head, and then be brought back to life again, as if by a miracle, be it medical, spiritual, or otherwise. While such an amazing event might convince many ignorant people of the Beast's immortality or divinity, it would also set off a lot of alarms amongst those who know the Scriptures, and who would thus realize who he really is. Let us not forget that deception is the name of the Endtime game. In my opinion, the Beast will slyly and deceptively rise to power, and few people will realize who he really is, until it is too late.

But for the sake of argument, let us assume that Mr. Hussein is not the one whom we have been waiting for, and that the final chapter of his life is soon to be closed. If that is the case, what does that mean for us? Where does it leave us in regards to our understanding of Endtime prophecy?

In my view, what this may mean, is that perhaps we need to refocus our attention back on the original ideas which I expressed in the article "The Kings of The North And The South". It is in that article that I explain how I believe the Lord showed me verse by verse from the Scriptures, that Syria holds the highest possibility for producing the King of the North, or the Beast if you prefer. However, please note that this does not completely rule out Turkey and Iran, which also hold some possibilities for producing the Beast and the False Prophet of Revelation chapter thirteen; as I also point out in "The Seven Heads" series. Nevertheless, with the Hussein sons now dead, and Saddam in captivity, Syria does return to the forefront of Endtime prophecy in my mind, as far as being the potential place of origin of the King of the North, who will eventually wage war with Egypt, and invade Israel.

As an additional note, it might interest you to know that even though Turkey has a military alliance with the nation of Israel, in recent months, Syria and Turkey have begun to warm up to each other again, following a cold spell which resulted from their differences of opinion over the war in Iraq, as well as other issues, such as water supplies. Let us also not forget the fact that in the elections which were held in Turkey last year, Islamic fundamentalists made some important gains in certain key provinces. While the military still remains in control of Turkey, you just never know what the future might hold. The tide of Islam might some day take hold of that country again. If that were to occur, and if Turkey and Syria continue to patch up old wounds, you just never know. Under the influence of the Islamists, Turkey may in the end betray Israel, as I have long suspected that she might do; but this is just a personal speculation on my part. Time will certainly tell what road she will eventually take.

I must admit, however, that I am troubled with the idea of the Beast arising from Syria, even though that is what the Scriptures seem to indicate is going to happen. Why? Allow me to explain. With the capture of Saddam Hussein, the Bush administration has achieved a powerful psychological victory in Iraq. The Americans even admitted this; and stated that following a month of heavy casualties in November of last year, Saddam's capture was a high point for them. Of course, with the rising casualty rate for both Americans and Iraqis, I am beginning to wonder how much of that euphoria really remains. At a glance, Saddam's capture does not seem to have improved the situation by very much, if at all.

Saddam's capture was likewise a high point for the Iraqis. Many Iraqis were very hesitant to offer their open support to the Americans, because there was always the fear of "What if the Americans fail and Saddam returns to power?". With Saddam seemingly out of the way now, many of his underlings captured, and the remaining elements of his Baath Party now fragmented, the Iraqi people have become more emboldened in their march towards a democratic government; even if that government turns out to be a puppet government ruled by the Americans from afar. The recent protest in Basra was a clear sign of normal Iraqis strongly expressing their will, as well as their growing impatience with their American occupiers.

But another by-product of these recent events, may be that the Americans will become emboldened to carry out their full plans for the restructuring of the entire Middle East. As we have already discussed, an accelerated effort to turn over more power to the Iraqis by June 30th is already in motion. Whether that push is a calculated move which is being fueled by the approaching election in the United States, or whether it is due to the rising unrest and discontent in Iraq, and a concern over where it may possibly lead if it's not arrested soon, the push to transfer power is nevertheless happening as we speak. Assuming that all goes well, and some form of semi-democratic government is put in place by June 30th, in spite of the continued resistance in the so-called Sunni Triangle, then what? What will be America's next move?

Enter Syria and Iran.

From their perspective, these two nations are now in more danger than ever before. As I have stated before, for months now, the USA has been vilifying Syria and Iran, and applying increasing pressure to both countries; and if the Americans finally manage to bring Iraq under control, possibly with UN help, will it be long before they begin to carry out their plans for Iran and Syria as well? With the center piece of the puzzle under American control, that is, Iraq, how much more time will pass before the two end pieces, that is, Iran and Syria, will fall as well? The tiny nations of the Gulf Cooperation Council are already basically under the American umbrella. In fact, the Iraq operation is being managed from Qatar, and Bahrain I believe. The Saudis would be foolish to resist the USA after seeing what they are doing in Iraq. In fact, Saudi Arabia might be an eventual American target as well. Let us not forget that the 9-11 score has never been settled, as I noted earlier in this series. Once America has a firm control on the Iraqi oil flow, and is no longer

so dependent on Saudi oil, who knows how she may react towards the al-Saud dynasty. What is left of that once cozy relationship may be over. Again, time will certainly tell.

At any rate, that is where my personal dilemma arises. You see; as long as the United States is entrenched in Iraq as it currently is; guaranteeing the survival of Israel; and successfully moving full-speed-ahead with its hegemonic agenda in the Middle East; and is not being challenged by anyone; it is difficult for me to see how an Islamic Beast, as well as an Islamic False Prophet, could possibly rise to power, and thus fulfill the final prophecies of the Endtime, which includes the invasion of Israel. At this current time, the local environment in the Middle East isn't conducive for such Earth-shaking events; and unless America is stopped by someone, it won't be for a long time to come. In short, the presence of the American military in Iraq and neighboring nations, seems to be retarding the final Endtime countdown; at least the way in which I personally understand it.

In fact, upon pondering this present situation further, in my mind, it forces me to consider the possibility that the Return of Jesus Christ may not be as imminent as we would like to think. For those of you who are familiar with my work, you will already know that unlike a lot of popular Bible teachers, I have never been a "at-any-moment" kind of preacher. Ever since I began this ministry, I have always maintained that until certain events occur in the Middle East, primary of which is the signing of the Holy Covenant between the King of the North and the King of the South, as per the prophecies of Daniel, we have at least a minimum of seven years to go until the glorious Return of Jesus Christ. I am simply not convinced that the Lord's Return is going to occur at any moment, as that would be totally contrary to my current understanding of Endtime prophecy.

As I point out in my series "The Great Tribulation and the Rapture", I do not adhere to the "Pre-Tribulation Rapture" theory. I believe that many of us, including the saved Jews of Israel, will go through the Great Tribulation, and will come out on the other side as victors, at the Return of Jesus Christ, as per the following verses:

"Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."

Matthew 24:29-31, KJV

So what I am saying now, is that taking into consideration the current developments in the Middle East, with the Bush Administration's aggressive restructuring plan in operation, it seems that these final events of the Endtime, which will culminate with the Battle of Armageddon, and the Return of Jesus Christ, may not be quite as close as we had hoped for. I am no longer a young man; and I have already been waiting

for the Return of Jesus Christ for over thirty-two years. My only hope now, is that that Blessed Event will still occur during my lifetime.

It is for the reasons which I have just explained to you, that for some time now, I have been seriously contemplating the thought, that the only way in which the final prophecies of the Endtime can come to fruition sooner, at least as I currently understand them, would be if the USA were suddenly neutralized; either through her complete destruction by one of her enemies, or perhaps a group of enemies, or as a result of her own internal corruption, similar to what occurred with the Roman Empire. Of course, I realize that my suggesting this will be pleasing to those of you who view the United States as being Babylon the Great, which will be destroyed by the Beast and Ten Horns, or world powers, which will temporarily give their power to the Beast, as we see here:

"And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast. These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast . . . And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire."
Revelation 17:12-13, 16 KJV

Please understand that I am not saying that I believe that the United States of America is Babylon the Great. At this point in time, I honestly do not know with one hundred per cent certainty who Babylon is. I offer my own speculations regarding the mysterious woman who sits upon many waters in the article "Revelation's Babylon the Great", but they are by no means written in stone; I could be wrong. What I am saying, is that I simply don't see how these key Endtime prophecies can be fulfilled in the Middle East, as long as the United States retains its dominant military and economic position in the world. As long as America is able to protect Israel, the Islamic forces simply cannot make their move against Israel, and expect to survive. American and Israeli forces would be very quick to squash them. Their might is primitive compared to the combined technological might of Israel and the United States. Just look how quickly Baghdad fell once the Americans initiated their illegal attack.

Of course, what I have just stated is under the assumption that I am correct in my belief that the Beast and the False Prophet will be of Islamic origin. I could be wrong. Maybe I am missing a part of the puzzle. After all, I am by no means infallible, as certain religious leaders and teachers like to claim for themselves.

Returning to the theme of the possible identity of Babylon the Great, while I have already written the aforementioned article where I discuss this issue, these recent events in the Middle East are forcing me to consider more seriously another possibility which I mention in that article. Allow me to explain.

Let us suppose for a moment that America is successful and achieves her objectives in Iraq. Let us also suppose that under American guidance and control, Baghdad arises to the

status of a prominent world trade center; particularly as a result of the Iraqi oil reserves, which the Americans are doing their best to control and manipulate at this current time. As I have said before, whoever controls the oil, has their hands around the industrialized world's throat; and I strongly suspect that the United States of America has every intention of using the oil reserves as a weapon to force its will upon the world. If you doubt my word, consider the fact that until just recently, the United States was refusing to offer business opportunities in Iraq to the four countries which strongly opposed the Iraq invasion; that is, Russia, China, Germany and France. As I noted earlier, only now that the situation is becoming rough, and out of control in Iraq, and America is in need of help, has she begun to soften her stance.

But don't think for a minute that America is really being humble by petitioning the UN for help. She is merely playing the same old game of politics, and relying upon her tactic of "use them and abuse them", and Kofi Annan obviously knows this. Personally, I am not the least bit surprised by the pressure tactics being employed by the hawks who manipulate President Bush; with his consent of course. Once again, Bush is revealing what a unilateralist he has been all along. What world sympathy the USA may have garnered following the 9-11 attacks, has surely eroded since then, as a result of Bush's wayward and stubborn policies; and as I said earlier, this is why he is now finding it difficult to solicit help from other nations in rebuilding Iraq. They know that America is empire building, and they are not too keen to be a part of it.

But returning to my main point, what would you think, if by God's Design, Baghdad were to eventually return to the former glory which Babylon had achieved several millennia ago, under King Nabopolassar and his son Nebuchadnezzar? What might this tell us? Taking this speculation a step further, what if, to everyone's surprise, Baghdad were to undergo a name change? This has happened untold times before throughout history, and even during our modern day, hasn't it? Have you ever heard of Byzantium? How about Constantinople? And Istanbul? If you are familiar with the history of western Asia, then you will have already realized that they are one and the same place.

Now, you might be asking yourself, "Why would anyone want to change the name of Baghdad?" Here is my personal theory; and it is just a theory. Ever since the first President Bush, we have become familiar with the term "New World Order". Some people, such as we Christians, cringe upon hearing the term, while others are rather delighted, and eagerly look forward to this promised utopian world. In fact, did you know that in an initiative which was sponsored by the United Nations, on John Lennon's fiftieth birthday in October of 1990, the song "Imagine" was not only played at the United Nations, but was in fact aired by more than a thousand radio stations in over fifty nations around the world? Not only that, but at the end of the Summer Olympics in 1996, American artist Stevie Wonder performed the final song at the event. It was likewise "Imagine", and millions of people were mesmerized by it, and its promise of a godless world filled with peace.

So while John Lennon may have become strongly disliked by many American Christians following his controversial "more

popular than Jesus Christ" remark several decades ago, it is obvious that many other people, including many individuals in very high places in the world's governments, appreciated the message of worldwide peace, unity and brotherhood, which is contained in the lyrics of Lennon's song. Is it possible that some day "Imagine" might even become the international anthem for the New World Order? They certainly seem to be preparing people for such a possibility, don't they?

As I explain in the in-depth series "John Lennon's Imagine and Secular Humanism", it isn't the desire for peace, unity and brotherhood that is wrong; it is the fact that Lennon apparently believed that such a world could be obtained by removing God from the equation. That is where Lennon erred; not only on a personal level, but by foolishly leading an entire generation astray. Even today, several decades after his death, there are people who not only strongly defend Lennon, and his song "Imagine", but who view him as if he were some kind of a saint, or perhaps even a messiah. The reason why I know this, is because I personally have been the recipient of some of their hate mail quite a few times as a result of my "Lennon" series. We simply cannot obtain true lasting peace, without the Spirit of the true Prince of Peace and Messiah, Jesus Christ, ruling in our hearts, minds and lives. Human love will eventually fail. Only God's Love, through Christ, can truly prevail.

But returning to the Bushes, Bush Senior, Bush Junior, and other globalists just like them, obviously believe in this vision of a New World Order. Not only do they believe in it, but they are energetically working towards bringing the NWO into existence, the American way. They realize that someone has to obviously head such a One World Government, and they have every intention of being the ones to do it. Russia and China have already aired their objections to the American vision, but the USA has no intentions of turning back from the road it has now chosen. These globalists are convinced that this is their destiny.

As I have already explained earlier in this series, that is one of the motivations behind their invasion of Iraq, right? Mr. Bush, and similar-thinking men like him, want to totally reshape the arena of the Middle East, based upon America's will and social values; including the democratic way. In the process of restructuring the Middle East, they will not only take control of Iraqi oil, but they will also end up with a powerful American base of operations there, from where they can continue to threaten, and dictate their demands, to the rest of the nations in that area. But as always, they need to cloak their true intentions under a different guise; and as I pointed out earlier, that is where buzz words such as freedom, liberation and democracy enter the picture. After all, who could possibly be against such things, right? Sadly, a little too late, the Iraqis are suddenly realizing that what they were promised, and what they are actually going to get, is not the same thing; and that is why they are quickly growing weary of the American presence, and have begun to rise up in protest, such as through the recent protests in Basra.

In short, the Americans have promised, and have repeatedly emphasized to the people of Iraq, that they are there to

free them from tyranny, and to give Iraq a new beginning; and it is from this central idea of newness, that other things have already sprung. For example, do you recall what was one of the first things that the Americans did after taking over Baghdad? It made worldwide headlines. With the help of some of the Iraqis, they tore down a huge statue of Saddam Hussein situated in downtown Baghdad. That was one powerful, symbolic gesture of the new beginning which the United States wants to bring to Iraq. Of course, it was also a powerful message to Saddam Hussein -- who was still in hiding at the time -- to the insurgents, and to anyone else who might be opposed to America's actions in Iraq.

So beginning with that statue, and to this very day, with the help of the Iraqis, all signs of Saddam's former grip on that country are slowly being removed by the Americans. But that isn't all. Have you heard of the latest development in the "Erase All Memories Of Saddam Hussein" campaign? In case you haven't heard, all national currency with Saddam's image on it is being replaced. There was a photograph in one of my news bundles the other day where they showed bundles of the old currency stacked up in the Central Bank of Baghdad. So you see, it is another sign of a new beginning. The plan is to keep pushing the idea of a new beginning for the people of Iraq, which will ultimately culminate in a new government. Never mind that their new government will not be as freely elected as had been promised to, and expected by, the Iraqis.

That thorny issue aside, in the name of the spirit of newness that has been repeatedly promoted, is it possible that as yet another symbolic sign that Iraq has become a new nation, that someone might propose the idea of changing the name of their capital city to something else? How about "New Babylon"? Of course, this is not really a novel idea on my part; others have proposed it before me; but until now, I had never really given it any serious consideration. Perhaps it is just a wild theory and will never happen; but what if it does? If we take that theory, and extend it further, we arrive at some rather interesting possibilities, don't we? Of course, I am referring to one commonly-held belief which suggests that Baghdad, Iraq might possibly be symbolic of the Biblical Babylon the Great. While I don't believe that Baghdad currently fulfills that role, being as she by no means has the status which we find attributed to the Babylon the Great described for us in the pages of the Book of Revelation, with American help, that could possibly change with time.

Don't forget that oil is a powerful weapon which can bring nations to their knees if wielded in a wise fashion. Due to man's own foolishness in not developing other alternatives, the industrialized world would come to a serious standstill in a relatively short period of time, perhaps six to twelve months, if a sufficiently large percentage of its oil supply were to be cut off. After all, national reserves can only last for so long. Without oil, there are no lubricants for machines, vehicles of any kind, etc. Without oil, a lot of clothes could not be made. Without oil, millions of plastic items would cease to be produced. Without oil, there is no gasoline, no diesel, no jet fuel, etc. Many of the world's weapons of war would be useless toys. The point is, the "New Babylon" does possess a weapon which it could use to catapult itself to world prominence; particularly if other

oil-producing nations were to begin faltering in their own supplies for some reason.

If the Americans do retain their grip on Iraq, and thus on this "New Babylon", even if it is through Iraqi surrogates who will do America's bidding, is it possible that "New Babylon" will slowly grow in strength and prominence, until she reaches a point where she is confident enough to begin making demands on the surrounding Arab/Muslim nations? Will she perhaps even oppress them, to the point that they will begin to hate her very presence in the Middle East, just as some of them had previously loathed Saddam Hussein? Will they begin to hate "New Babylon" the whore?

Allow me to also remind you that when America arrives bearing gifts, those gifts include some things which strict Muslims consider offensive, as well as contrary to Islamic law, such as drinking alcoholic beverages, the emancipation of women, sexual immorality, etc. Is it possible that "New Babylon's" spiritual degradation, and negative influence on neighboring Muslim countries, will cause her to be despised by them, to the point that they will wish to see her destroyed? Taking this thought even further, is it possible that a leader will arise, who will possess sufficient power, and charisma, so that he will be able to convince ten of these countries to temporarily join him, in order to bring "New Babylon" to her knees via nuclear fire, exactly as John seems to describe it in the Book of Revelation?

If you've already read my article on Babylon the Great, then you will already know that some of the ideas I have proposed here, run contrary to some of the views which I express in that article. Please understand that none of this is written in stone; and I am not definitively saying that this is what is going to happen. I am merely posing some theories, based upon what we see occurring in Iraq at this current time. As I have told my readers before, until the Endtime prophecies actually play themselves out, we honestly don't know. We can theorize all we want; and offer our personal speculations; but when these events described by the Apostle John actually occur, then we will finally know without a doubt which is the correct interpretation. Everything will be made plain to us in God's perfect time.

By exercising a degree of speculation here, I am not throwing out everything that I said in the aforementioned article; I'm merely leaving open the window of possibilities. As you may recall, I offered several different possibilities in my other article, and I then informed you which of them seemed to make the most sense to me, based upon my understanding of God's Word. What I am doing now, is showing you how one of those other possibilities, that is, Baghdad possibly being Babylon, might have more relevance now, given the developing situation in Iraq. We simply cannot put God, or His Word, in a box, and say "This is it. There are no other choices or possibilities". So, maybe Jerusalem really is the spiritual Babylon as I suggest in that article; or maybe I was off the mark and the real Endtime Babylon will be Baghdad, with the possible new name of "New Babylon". Or maybe it is neither one of them. As I point out in that article, some people are convinced that it is New York City, while others are convinced that it is Rome. In different ways, all four of these cities partially

fit the Biblical description of Babylon the Great; but in reality, none of them fulfill every single requirement; at least not at this time, in my view.

So that is it. That is an up-to-the-minute update regarding my current views on the war in Iraq, the capture of Saddam Hussein, and the possible identity of the mysterious Babylon the Great of the Book of Revelation. I hope that you enjoyed it, and that you have learned something from it. God remains in absolute control, as He always has been. Regardless of what man may do, or not do, God's Plan for humanity will be fulfilled. Each piece of the puzzle will fall into its proper place in God's time. As I stated earlier, whether they be good or evil, whether they be just or unjust, whether they be righteous or unrighteous, it is God who sets up leaders, and it is God who places desires in their hearts, in order that they might fulfill His Divine Will. As the Scriptures state:

"The king's heart is in the hand of the LORD, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will."
Proverbs 21:1, KJV

And please remember that just because a leader is permitted to come to power, does not necessarily mean that he is good. God allowed a Pharaoh to come to power in Egypt who knew not Joseph. He was an evil ruler who afflicted the children of Israel; yet all of these events occurred by Divine Will. God hardened Pharaoh's heart time and time again, in order that His Might could eventually be manifested through the Plagues and the Hebrew's liberation from bondage. In similar fashion, we may not like or agree with what Bush has done, but we must recognize that God has apparently allowed it for some reason. Only time will reveal God's reasons for allowing the capture of Saddam Hussein, and the fall of his Baathist regime. As I have speculated here, perhaps from the ashes of tyranny, will arise the "New Babylon". We shall see.

So as Christians, what is our place in all of this? Simply put, it is our responsibility, as Jesus said, to be alert, to pray, and to watch for the day of our Redemption, when the Lord will return in the clouds of heaven, with great power and glory, in order to call His children home. If we are watching and praying, and not falling asleep, or being deceived by the lies of the world, then by God's Grace, we will hopefully begin to see, and to understand, when these things begin to happen before our very eyes. It is also our responsibility to remain faithful witnesses of the truth to others for as long as we can. As the final events of the Endtime begin to unfold upon the Earth, we cannot cower in fear, and hide our lights under a bushel. As I point out in "Are You A Burning Ember For The Lord?", it is our duty to shine brightly, as spiritual darkness overcomes this tired, old, sin-laden world. As Jesus said:

"Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."
Matthew 5:16, KJV

"And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come."
Matthew 24:14, KJV

"Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels."

Mark 8:38, KJV

My prayer, as it has always been, is that the Lord's Return will occur in my lifetime; and I am sure that your prayer is the same. May God bless you with the truth; and I know that He will, if you truly seek it, and desire it, with all your heart. I pray that this series has been a blessing, as well as an enlightenment, to many.

Written by the WordWeaver

webmaster@endtimeprophecy.net
<http://www.endtimeprophecy.net>