

# Bush's 3 Little Words, 1 Big Betrayal

Hal Lindsey - [www.hallindsey.com](http://www.hallindsey.com)

Thursday, June 02, 2005 8:08 PM

The Israelis are reeling from the body blow delivered them by President Bush following his meeting with Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas. In one pronouncement, Bush totally scuttled all the hard-fought, blood-bought gains Israel has made in the three wars forced upon her. All peace negotiations and concessions by Israel in the pursuit of peace with the Muslim Nations and Palestinians since 1949 have been rendered null and void.

President Bush's astonishing and unexpected statement reversed long standing American policy. In his joint statement with Abbas, he declared that any final status changes in the peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians must be mutually agreed to on the basis of the 1949 armistice lines.

To my horror, this statement is the greatest betrayal of Israel committed by any American president in history. It nearly knocked me out of my chair when I considered the implications of Bush's statement. After considering them, I waited for a clarification. I thought, "Surely this president could not have meant what he said. It has to be a mistake." I am still waiting, slack-jawed, for a retraction that evidently isn't forthcoming.

Imposing the condition of mutual agreement and setting the benchmark at the 1949 armistice lines starts the whole process at the beginning. This in effect gives all of the advantages to the Muslims without even sitting down at the bargaining table. Palestinians hold every casual word made by an American president that is to their advantage as the "Law of the Medes and Persians, which changeth not."

It is a dead certainty that the Palestinian side isn't going to agree to a united Jerusalem with Israel. East Jerusalem was in Arab hands in 1949. A return to the 1949 armistice lines puts it in Arab hands again. The Western Wall was in Arab hands in 1949. So was the Temple Mount. Making the 1949 armistice lines the basis for mutual agreement means Israel must negotiate with the Palestinians until they agree to give up their claim to the Dome of the Rock or until Israel agrees to give up its claim to the Temple Mount and all of Biblical Jerusalem. Neither will happen. What is Bush thinking?

Based on this new equation, there is nothing left for Israel to negotiate. Victory: Palestinians. Method: Terrorism. Is it possible that President Bush didn't consider the implications? President Bush gave his support to all key Palestinian demands without Abbas having to do a single thing to get it.

After resetting the negotiations to the 1949 lines, Bush added salt to the cuts: A viable two-state solution must ensure contiguity of the West Bank, and a state of scattered territories will not work. There must also be meaningful linkages between the West Bank and Gaza. This is the position of the United States today, it will be the position of the United States at the time of final status negotiations.

Connecting the West Bank and Gaza effectively cuts Israel in half, making Israel a "state of scattered territories" instead. Such a border arrangement renders Israel totally indefensible. Could the president have misspoken? How could he do such a thing? Especially since it is not Israel that threatens to destroy Palestine, but the Palestinians who – along with the Muslim world – vow to destroy Israel.

Everything about the Israeli-Arab conflict is unique, just as the Hebrew prophets said it would be. When it comes to Israel, the world becomes irrational. For example, it is the only instance in modern history in which ethnic cleansing is a precondition to peaceful negotiations.

Israeli Foreign Service official and writer Yossi Ben-Aharond noted, "Every time an Arab or Palestinian leader arrives in the United States, his emphasis is on criticism of Israel – Israel's conquest, their arrests, demolition of houses, et al. But when an Israeli leader arrives, what does he have to say? "We offer our hand in peace, the Palestinians are suffering, we have done so much for them, we ask the administration to provide them with aid, etc. – and he barely says anything about the PA's violations, the terrorism, the incitement, etc."

Only hours after President Bush gave Abbas the green light to claim most of Israel as Palestinian territory, Abbas was warning that if PA demands were not met, "despair and loss of hope will come back and a return to the old ideas" – of "armed resistance."

The message, "Terrorism pays, negotiation doesn't" was delivered personally to the Palestinians and the rest of the Islamic world by George W. Bush. President Bush did all of this when he uttered those three little words, "1949 Armistice Lines." It might be time for Israel to start looking around for a new peace broker. This one appears to have taken on a new client.

But there is an even graver consequence for the USA. I have believed for decades that God has protected America despite our growing sin. He has done so because the USA has been a base for world evangelism and we have supported Israel's right to exist in the land God promised them. This betrayal, if followed through, will effectively remove God's protective shield. May God help us.

## Nuclear Ban Ineffectual As March Of Prophecy Advances Into End Times

By Bill Wilson, KIN - [www.watch.org](http://www.watch.org) June 2, 2005

WASH—Jun 2—KIN—Representatives of over 160 nations of the world met during the entire month of May to review progress on the United Nations Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty and to develop new steps to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons worldwide. The result of the meeting was, even by the standards of the official world cheerleader, Secretary General Kofi Annan, "regrettable."

Nothing happened after an entire month of discussion. This, against the backdrop of intense negotiations by France, Germany and Britain with Iran and a star-studded cast of diplomats focused intently on reigning in North Korea. Annan, after opening the conference on May 2 with great fanfare and eloquent words, understated the obvious, saying, ""Regrettably, there are times when multilateral forums tend merely to reflect, rather than mend, deep rifts over how to confront the threats we face."

Annan had praised U.N. nuclear watchdog Mohamed ElBaradei in his opening remarks at the beginning of May for expediting "agreement to create incentives for states to voluntarily forego the development of fuel cycle facilities." And he said, "Nuclear weapons have not spread to dozens of States. Indeed, more States have given up their ambitions for nuclear weapons than have acquired them." Like so

many words Mr. Annan speaks, they sound nice, but rarely do they truly have any traction. The obvious is not sublime. Countless small poor countries like Tanzania are unlikely to ever have the resources or the will to pursue nukes, it's the ones that do, such as Iran and North Korea that deserve the attention.

ELBaradei said last November that he could not verify that Iran had a nuclear weapons program. He said that for him to verify an established nuclear program in Iran there must be a nuclear weapon being built and a delivery system for which to use it. Short of that, ELBaradei said he had no evidence of a weapons program in Iran. Meantime, he and his appeasement buddies at the United Nations and throughout the European Union have embarked on a very dangerous, yet favored, diplomatic effort to use incentives to make sure Iran has nuclear fuel, but not nuclear weapons—the same strategy that worked so well with former U.S. President Bill Clinton in North Korea.

Meantime, Iran is accepting all incentives in international negotiations while continuing to build its nuclear program. President George W. Bush conceded to allow Iran to apply for World Trade Organization status in hopes the gesture would move Iran toward a diplomatic solution in its nuclear quest.

Iran answered, however, with an announcement that it successfully tested a solid-fuel engine that could be installed in the Shihab-3 intermediate-range missile—translated, that means Iran now has the capability to deliver warheads into the heart of Israel and at U.S. military installations within 2,000 miles from the launch site. This, coupled with the Russian scientists who have been helping Iran build a missile payload large enough to carry a nuclear weapon and the Chinese who are supplying missile technology and the Russians who are supplying nuclear technology, Iran is quite close to having a nuclear weapon and a means to deliver it—all for peaceful purposes, of course.

Bottom line is diplomacy requires a certain amount of trustworthiness from the involved parties. Iran and North Korea have proven countless times they are not to be trusted. And the ineffectual, fervent actions of unrighteous men leads down the path of destruction. The world is winding tighter toward confrontation with Israel—North Korea will sell nuclear technology to any rogue state that would buy it (as evidenced by the train explosion of missile technology last year headed to Syria); and Iran has openly said it seeks the destruction of Israel and the United States.

We do not quite know how the anti-Christ will rise to power other than it appears he will come out of conflict to broker peace. The inept and corrupt United Nations and/or the fragmented European Union could be the launching pad for such an ascension. We can see that forces of evil are aligning even closer with exceptionally lethal tools. The Apostle Paul writes in *2 Thessalonians 2:2,3*, "*That you not be soon shaken in mind, or be troubled neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.*" So don't be troubled, nor deceived for all these things must take place. But do be ready.

## Iran's Push For Nukes Leaves Conventional Forces In The Dust

Geostrategy-Direct

Despite its nuclear and missile program, Iran has failed to modernize its

conventional military... The Center for Strategic and International Studies said Iran has been unable to rebuild much of its forces following Teheran's war with Iraq, which ended in 1988. The Washington-based center said in a new publication that Iranian military platforms were obsolete and could not compare with many of the arsenals of Middle East states.

"They have a 340,000-man army, but 220,000 of them are 18-months-conscripts," said Anthony Cordesman, author of a book on Iran. "Its artillery is old and worn and its 1,600 tanks and about 300 airplanes are outdated even by Middle Eastern standards."

Cordesman's new book is titled "Iran's Developing Military Capabilities." A former Defense Department official, Cordesman asserted that Iran has declined in conventional military capability since the 1970s. "Iran is a far less modern military power in comparative terms than it was during the time of the shah or during the Iran-Iraq War," he said. "Nevertheless, it is slowly improving its conventional forces, and it is now the only regional military power that poses a serious conventional military threat to Persian Gulf stability."

Iran's military has moved from conventional to asymmetrical warfare and nuclear weapons. Cordesman said Teheran could employ guerrilla tactics to attack U.S. troops in Iraq as well as in Gulf states. The most capable of the forces was the 120,000-member Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps.

"These are pretty capable forces," Cordesman said. "They could very quickly move large numbers of people to a country like Bahrain." The book warns that Iran appears to be developing "both a long-range missile force and a range of weapons of mass destruction." Iran would likely "continue to covertly seek nuclear weapons."

## Nuke Warheads On China's New Ballistic Missile Sub Capable Of 'Destroying The United States' Several Times Over

[East-Asia-Intel.com](http://East-Asia-Intel.com)

A Chinese press report reveals that the new Type 094 ballistic missile submarine that was launched recently will have multiple warheads on its new JL-2 missiles. The submarine hull was anchored at an open-air wharf at China's No. 431 shipyard at Bohai.

According to the report, the submarine will be equipped with multiple nuclear warhead missiles having "the capability of destroying the United States for several times." The shipyard also has been building large underground berths for building nuclear submarines, the report said. The North Sea fleet also has been building an underground base for the deployed nuclear submarines.

The submarine will carry 16 JL-2 missiles that can attack 48 targets with a nuclear warhead in a short period of time. The JL-2 is a sea-launched version of the DF-31 ICBM. The report said China plans to build at least eight Type 094s. The report compared the submarine to the U.S. Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine.

Will China's Lust for Power Bring War to America? By Dale Hurd

CBN.com – WASHINGTON - What will America do if someday China attacks Taiwan? Beijing recently authorized the use of force if Taiwan ever declares its independence. America has a defense treaty with Taiwan, but honoring that treaty would likely mean war with China.

Even though the Taiwanese have never been ruled by the People's Republic of China, the mainland has made absorbing Taiwan a national crusade. And China's new anti-secession law now gives the Chinese military the green light to attack Taiwan if the island pursues formal independence.

Taiwan says the new law is tantamount to preparation for war. And that could mean war for the United States, which has pledged to defend Taiwan. Although most analysts say the U.S. would defeat the Chinese in a conventional conflict, the fighting might not remain conventional.

Defense expert John Pike, director of [GlobalSecurity.org](http://GlobalSecurity.org), said, "At the end of the day, China may gamble that it cares more about Taiwan than the United States does, and if the United States is faced with a choice between backing down on Taiwan and seeing Chinese atomic bombs detonating over American cities, that the United States will back down."

How might a Chinese attack unfold? The prospect of a giant Normandy-like invasion has been jokingly dismissed as the "million man swim," because China does not yet have enough naval vessels to transport a large invasion force across the Taiwan Strait. Experts say a quick decapitation strike is more likely.

Pike commented, "China's strategy, I think, would be a missile attack on Taiwan's airfields, which are not well defended, hoping to seize air dominance." This would allow for the insertion of Special Forces, who would seize key command and control sectors. The publication Jane's Defense suggests that Chinese sleeper cells, already on the island, would move into action, assassinating key leaders and attacking radar and communication facilities.

It says that China might even preemptively hit U.S. bases in the Pacific, believing war with the U.S. is inevitable. Chinese forces would then seek to install a new government within a week, one that would tell the U.S. Navy to go home.

Dan Blumenthal was Senior Director for China and Taiwan under Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld. Now with the American Enterprise Institute, Blumenthal remarked, "Beijing strategists are thinking about it this way: Taiwan will fold quickly. You can make them come to their knees quickly, not necessarily by invading Taiwan, but by launching ballistic missiles at Taiwan, there are many, many pointed at Taiwan right now -- by trying to bring down their critical infrastructure, by making it seem like the Taiwan government has lost control. [And by] using information and computer network attacks, and blockading the island, starving it from its economic resources."

Pike said, "I think that Taiwan's military strategy is to hold out for the week that it would take American forces to arrive in large numbers. China's military strategy has to be to have a government in power in Taipei before the end of that first week, [one] that tells the American military to go away -- we're happy that we've rejoined China."

But China also hopes to win without ever firing a shot. The Chinese military classic,

"The Art of War", says that the height of military skill is to conquer without the use of military force, and that seems to be precisely what China is trying to do to Taiwan. China employs a skillful version of the carrot and the stick, aiming 700 ballistic missiles at the island, while building trade and cultural ties with it. Some feel that time is on Beijing's side, and peaceful unification is inevitable.

But from a military standpoint, Taiwan is too strategically important to simply give to China. And if the U.S. does not intervene on Taiwan's behalf, there are growing indications that Japan just might. Blumenthal says that the U.S. needs to make sure such a war never starts in the first place. He said, "Making it clear to the Chinese that this is a disastrous course for them, if they want to become a great power, a great economic power. This will backfire on them in a very big way."

And it could backfire in a way most analysts never expected. Beijing has made unification such a big deal, that if it fails to defeat Taiwan and the United States, its tremendous loss of credibility in the eyes of its own people could shake the nation to its very core.

Blumenthal does not mince words, "If the Chinese government goes down this path and loses, I think that it's likely that the government will fall." And Taiwan might not be the pushover that Beijing assumes it is. Taiwan has some of America's best weaponry, and has vowed a counter strike against Chinese cities if it is attacked.

Pike remarked, "There's always the possibility that somebody on one side or the other is going to misread the situation, and suddenly we find ourselves in a much more serious crisis than anybody had anticipated." Washington hopes that Beijing is aware of the risks, because experts say a war over Taiwan is simply too dangerous to be fought.