

# He Will Confirm A Covenant With Many...

Contributed by Doug Krieger  
Thursday, 22 December 2005

## The U.S.-Israel Strategic Alliance - Part II

There are forces like those written hereunder which make the heralding of Daniel the Prophet's final week of Gentile World Power all the more irreversible and prophetically intrusive, in spite of the mockers—both secular and religious—who claim these prognostications are fantasy, or just plain fear-mongering among theological misfits who still claim the Bible has something to say about where this world's heading! {mosbotwordcount}

## DRIVING THE U.S.-ISRAEL "STRATEGIC DIALOGUE"

"Strategic Dialogue" talks between the U.S. and Israel—were commenced in earnest at the end of November, 2005 (U.S. State Dept. Bulletin). These "talks" are propelled to their inevitable conclusion (i.e., the U.S.-ISRAEL DEFENSE PACT/TREATY) by Iran's preposterous charges this past week: No Jewish Holocaust under Hitler; Israel is a "Zionist-European Tumor" which, ipso facto, should be excised from the Middle East and transplanted into Germany-Austria; and, "no, we're not making a Weapon of Mass Destruction, even though 'Israel must be wiped off the map!'" (My conjectures.)

{bot\_wrgoogle}

Historic revisionism is alive and well—therefore, do not conclude that this series on the "Strategic and Eschatological Imperatives" embedded in the U.S.-Israel Defense Pact (upcoming) is as naïve as you may have surmised (i.e., pure speculation and benignly obscure Christian fundamentalism gone amok). Israel's audacious materiality—in spite of the Adolf Hitler-Grand Mufti, Haj Mohammed Amin Al-Husseini original Axis of Evil—mocks the secular outrage toward Zionism and declares heretical the blather, and hyper symbolism of Biblical liberalism! (Palestinefacts.org)

There are forces like those written hereunder which make the heralding of Daniel the Prophet's final week of Gentile World Power all the more irreversible and prophetically intrusive, in spite of the mockers—both secular and religious—who claim these prognostications are fantasy, or just plain fear-mongering among theological misfits who still claim the Bible has something to say about where this world's heading!

"They've been wrong before—let them prattle about their future Antichrist all they want . . . it's relatively harmless . . . besides, who's listening; who cares . . . in any event, the Millerites, Mormons, Jehovah Witnesses and wacko-Christian fundamentalists like Hal Lindsey et al, have always dabbled in the ethereal world of prophetic make believe and we're still here, aren't we?"

Friend . . . you'd better get a grip . . . things are changing, faster than you had any idea . . . and their "prophetic alignment" does not bode well for a world utterly unprepared for what's driving the personality behind: "HE SHALL CONFIRM A COVENANT (i.e., "Treaty") WITH THE MANY..." (Daniel 9:27).

As Winston Churchill once said:

"We reject with scorn all these learned and laboured myths that Moses was but a legendary figure. We believe that the most scientific view, the most up to date and rationalistic conception, will find its fullest satisfaction in taking the Bible literally. We may be sure that all these things happened as they are set out in Holy Writ. In the words of a forgotten work of Mr. Gladstone, we rest with assurance upon 'the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture...' Let the men of science and of

learning expand their knowledge and probe with their researches every detail of the records which have been preserved to us from these dim ages. All they do is to fortify the grand simplicity and essential accuracy of the recorded truths which have lighted so far the pilgrimage of man.”

## THE PRINCE OF PERSIA

When I published my article “Behold, the Prince of Persia” (buzzle.com, June 2005), there were fears that a “Nuclear Iran” would galvanize Radical Islam and stiffen the insurgency in Iraq, compel a “democratic takeover” of secular Middle East nations like Egypt and Turkey, and drive Israel (and for that matter the U.S.) to the brink of a unilateral-preemptive strike at Iranian nuclear facilities. Likewise, because of the Iranian-Syrian Defense Pact (early 2005), Syria and the Palestinian Authority, would find themselves pouring into the “cup of trembling to all the nations ‘round about” Israel.

Well, we stand on our “prophetic laurels” and declare the rise of the “Prince of Persia” is all the more enraged through the election and regime of one, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (President of Iran since August 3, 2005) . . . consider this, as the world continues to spin upon this precarious axis of inscrutable uncertainty . . .

Gholamreza Aghazadeh, head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran, Dec. 10, 2005, told the newly-awarded Nobel Prize winner, Mohamed El-Baradei, that his comments to persuade Iran to stop its uranium enrichment program (because its heading toward a nuclear explosion in either Jerusalem or Tel Aviv) the following not-so-ambiguous-mafia-sounding remarks: “He (El-Baradei) knows Iran has not diverted in its nuclear program . . . it would be better for him not to have many interviews.” (Comcast Netnews)

The Iranians, with diplomatic hubris, simultaneously suggested, through Foreign Ministry spokesman Hamid Reza Asefi that the U.S. participates in Iran’s nuclear program to wit: “America can take part in international bidding for the construction of Iran’s nuclear power plant if they observe the basic standards and quality.”

All this during the same week (December 3-10, 2005) in which these not so subtle remarks were made by the ever-more-resembling the coordinator of the American Iranian Hostage Crisis, Iran’s President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad:

“Some European Countries insist on saying that Hitler killed millions of innocent Jews in furnaces and they insist on it to the extent that if anyone proves something contrary to that they condemn that person and throw them in jail . . . although we (i.e., the Iranians) don’t accept this claim (i.e., the Holocaust—six million Jews perishing in Hitler’s death camps), if we suppose it (the Holocaust) is true, our question for the Europeans is: Is the killing of innocent Jewish people by Hitler the reason for their support to the occupiers of Jerusalem?” (Paul Hughes, Reuters, Dec. 8, 2005)

Of course, all this was compounded by President-American-Hostage-Leader Ahmadinejad suggesting that Israeli Jews be transplanted to provinces in both Germany and Austria to save the conscience of their Nazi past. How fitting that all these remarks were made at the summit of the Organization of Islamic Conference held in the Muslim holy city of Mecca in Saudi Arabia!

Naturally, the U.S.-Israeli reaction was vehement, especially after the October, 2005 “Israel must be wiped off the map” remarks of Mr. Ahmadinejad (The Tribulation Network):

“I hope that these outrageous remarks will be a wake-up call to people who have any illusions about the nature of the regime in Iran” (Israeli foreign

ministry spokesman Mark Regev).

“ . . . an outrageous gaffe, which I want to repudiate in the sharpest manner” (President George Bush).

Finally, the bottom line remarks of White House spokesman Scott McClellan:

“It just further underscores our concerns about the regime in Iran. And it’s all the more reason why it’s so important that the regime not have the ability to develop nuclear weapons.”

Just how outrageous were Mr. Ahmadinejad’s remarks?

“So, Germany and Austria, come and give one, two or any number of your provinces to the Zionist regime so they can create a country there . . . and the problem will be solved at its root . . . you oppressed them, so give a part of Europe to the Zionist regime . . . why do they insist on imposing themselves (the Europeans) on other powers and creating a tumour (Israel) so there is always tension and conflict?”

Now, Scott McClellan’s “all the more reason why it’s so important that the regime not have the ability to develop nuclear weapons” and the innocuous subterfuge of the U.S. State Department’s remarks regarding the U.S.-Israel Strategic Dialogue to wit, “The United States and Israel look forward to continuing this dialogue in the Spring of 2006 in Israel”—demands further “strategic dialogue.”

Trust me—unless you’re in the market for a hot bridge deal—these U.S.-Israeli Strategic Dialogue discussions have not only commenced, they have only intensified as a result of the bombastic absurdities of Iran, along with the rhetoric and actions of Hezbollah, Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and the acceleration of the insurgency in Iraq against Bush’s War on Terror.

The worst fighting in five years between Hezbollah and the IDF took place at the end of November, 2005. This was preceded by a coordinated meeting between Iran’s foreign minister, Manouchehr Mottaki, and leaders of Hamas (Khaled Meshaal), a deputy leader of Islamic Jihad, and Ahmed Jibril, the leader of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. Jibril’s “organic remarks” tie Iran into the recent assaults in Northern Israel and the suicide bombing of a shopping mall in Israel’s Netanya where five Israeli citizens were killed . . .

“We will confirmed that what is going on in occupied Palestine is organically connected to what is going on in Iraq, Syria, Iran and Lebanon” (Jibril) (ICH 12/12/05)

All this in light of Hamas’ most recent victories at the polls . . .

“NABLUS, West Bank - Hamas supporters on Friday celebrated a landslide election victory in major West Bank towns, the strongest sign yet of the Islamic militant group’s growing political appeal ahead of Jan. 25 parliamentary elections. Israel responded with concern, saying a Palestinian government dominated by Hamas—which calls for Israel’s destruction and has killed hundreds of Israelis in attacks— would not be a partner for peace. Thousands of Hamas supporters joined victory marches after Friday prayers. In Jenin, where Hamas won a majority of local council seats, marchers chanted, ‘To Jerusalem we march, martyrs by the millions!’ and held up copies of the Quran.” (AP, Ali Daraghme, Associated Press Writer, Dec. 17, 2005).

UNIT 262, THE F-15I STRATEGIC 69 SQUADRON vs. TOR-M1

As Lebanon, Syrian, Iran and the Palestinian Authority ratchet up the “War on Israel” – Israel has plans of their own . . .

Uzi Mahnaimi of Tel Aviv and Sarah Baxter of the Times Newspapers Ltd. (London) quote a senior White House source saying that the nuclear threat from Iran was moving to the “top of the international agenda and the issue now was ‘What next?’”

PM Ariel Sharon quipped: “Israel—and not only Israel—cannot accept a nuclear Iran.” Sure sounds like the U.S.-Israel Strategic Alliance on parade here!

The IDF has placed its military readiness on “G” alert—the highest stage. Israel is now on the highest military alert to prepare for an attack against Iran!

Israel firmly asserts that by the end of March, 2006, things in Iran, and ipso facto Israel, will have reached the “POINT OF NO RETURN!” UNIAEA head, Mohamed El-Baradei, will present his next report on Iran’s nuclear intentions in early March, 2006.

A massive Israeli intelligence probe of Iran’s nuclear capabilities, launched from a site in northern Iraq (no doubt in cooperation with the USA) has already identified uranium enrichment sites previously unknown to the IAEA—there could be up to 50 sites in Iran coordinating the uranium enrichment program to produce a nuclear bomb capable of hitting Tel Aviv/Jerusalem.

Israel's top Special Forces Brigade, Unit 262, and their F-15I strategic 69 Squadron, will ready themselves for a non-stop roundtrip to deliver both air and ground devastation to Iran’s threats to wipe Israel off the map.

This will be all the more difficult if Iran secures delivery of a \$1B anti-ballistic missile system (the Tor-M1) from the Russians. The system is designed to destroy guided missiles and laser-guided bombs from aircraft—likewise, the system can be easily and quickly installed! (ICH 12/12/2005)

Note also: Original Source: The Times of London, Dec. 11, 2005)

“HE WILL CONFIRM THE TREATY”

Let us turn aside, for a moment, shall we, to observe the unvarnished historicity of U.S. Presidential aspirations towards Israel . . . for in this incredible glimpse into the ever-maturing “strategic relationship” between the U.S. and Israel, it has always been her Presidents who have led the way—it is the privilege of the American Executive to orchestrate U.S. foreign policy, and more so, since two World Wars and the Cold War have given birth to the Imperial Presidency; make no mistake to the contrary!

It is this profound political significance between American Presidents and Israel that astounds the world’s diplomats and negotiators—especially, European and Moslem observers. Understanding the evolution of the American Imperium and its unusual, yet clearly observable relationship, between its Chief Executive and Israel’s security, is most remarkable—to obfuscate this unparalleled association (as some religious and secular observers are loathe to do)—damages the academic and so-called spiritual credentials of those who deny this obvious arrangement!

President Harry S. Truman -

President Truman, whose Baptist roots predisposed him to Israel’s rebirth as a nation state for the Jews, commenced a long and ever-deepening relationship between the State of Israel and the USA.

Truman's predecessor, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, appeared to be sympathetic to the Jewish cause (i.e., the State of Israel in Palestine); however, his assurances to the Arabs that the United States would not intervene without consulting both parties caused public uncertainty about his position.

President Harry S. Truman, on the other hand after taking office, made it clear that his sympathies were with the Jews; hence, he accepted the Balfour Declaration (made by the British as a quid pro quo for Jewish support for the Allied cause in World War I), explaining that it was in keeping with former President Woodrow Wilson's principle of "self determination."

In point of fact, Daniel Pipes, in his review of Michael T. Benson's book *Harry S. Truman and the Founding of Israel* states:

"Benson proves that Truman's policies resulted not from nose-counting (the "Jewish vote" in America) but from deeply-held beliefs. His pro-Israel outlook 'was based primarily on humanitarian, moral, and sentimental grounds, many of which were an outgrowth of the president's religious upbringing and his familiarity with the Bible.' Extensive research into Truman's biography and earlier career shows his impressive consistency. Benson, of the University of Utah, establishes Truman as a studious child and deeply religious young man who, when he unexpectedly found himself in the Oval Office, lived faithfully by his precepts. In the case at hand, he expressed sympathy for Zionism as early as 1939 and reiterated his views many times subsequently." (Palestinefacts.org)

Truman initiated several studies of the Palestine situation that supported his belief that, as a result of the Holocaust, Jews were oppressed and also in need of a homeland. Notwithstanding Truman's support for the Jewish state, and throughout both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, the Departments of War and State, recognizing the possibility of a Soviet-Arab connection and the potential Arab restriction on oil supplies to the United States, advised against U.S. intervention on behalf of the Jews.

Britain and the United States, in a joint effort to examine the dilemma, established the "Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry." In April 1946, the committee submitted recommendations that Palestine not be dominated by either Arabs or Jews. It concluded that attempts to establish nationhood or independence would result in civil strife; that a trusteeship agreement aimed at bringing Jews and Arabs together should be established by the United Nations; that full Jewish immigration be allowed into Palestine; and that two autonomous states be established with a strong central government to control Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and the Negev, the southernmost section of Palestine.

British, Arab, and Jewish reactions to the recommendations were not favorable.

In spite of his own Departments of War and State, and of the Brits subterfuge regarding the Jewish State, he immediately recognized the Jewish State upon their declaration of independence—eleven minutes after Israel's declaration of statehood (American Heritage).

This "Presidential Recognition" was, according to Margaret Truman (daughter of President Truman), "the most difficult decision (he) ever faced as president" (Christian Science Monitor). The immediate involvement of the President of the United States—overruling his powerful Secretary of State George Marshall—set a precedence wherein the Presidency and Israel became synonymous in diplomatic parlance. In other words: The President of the United States—not the nation, per se (i.e., Legislative or Judicial branches of government), nor its State Department—became the deciding factor and the fulcrum of the relationship between Israel and the USA.

“Administrative tension” between the U.S. State Department and the President, especially in regards to Israel vis-à-vis U.S. national interest throughout the Middle East, and in particular the acquisition of cheap energy in maintenance of America’s ever-expanding economy, is of no small notoriety; yet, provides ample wiggle room when the President wishes to register consternation if the Executive perceives Israel “has gone too far.”

President Dwight Eisenhower

With the decline of Britain as the self-appointed protector of the Middle East, and the rise of the Cold War, America’s immediate, though periferal role with Israel, was about to change—and change significantly.

Egypt’s Gamal Abdel Nasser seized the Suez Canal in October of 1956—whereupon Britain, France and Israel (as co-conspirators) launched a surprise attack; but, Ike considered the bizarre adventure as a “mid-Victorian form of gunboat diplomacy.”

“I’ve just never seen great powers make such a complete mess and botch of things” – October 30, 1956 (President Eisenhower).

It was the President of the United States who torpedoed the tripartite effort against an Arab nation and won him, at the time, the praise of the UN and as the defender of third-world nations against Israel and the West.

The upshot of Suez, in so far as the U.S.-Israel “Strategic Relationship” is concerned—made the U.S. the dominant player in the Middle East, and, ipso facto, intimately involved with Israel. Furthermore, it brought the Cold War smack dab into the midst of the Middle East.

“The affair (Suez) convinced Eisenhower that a move into the area by the Soviet Union would be disastrous to Europe and Nation, because of oil needs. He announced the Eisenhower Doctrine: The U.S. would send weapons and cash to any Mideast nation threatened by communism” (Christian Science Monitor 10/26/2001).

There’s no doubt that the USA was supporting Israel from the get-go (not just Arab states opposed to communism) . . . but then came . . .

Presidents John F. Kennedy/Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon

Strategic cooperation accelerated with John Kennedy’s 1962 sale of HAWK antiaircraft missiles to Israel—again, over the objection of the “Arabist” State Department.

After Israel’s smashing military victory in 1967 and capture of the Siani, Golan Heights and West Bank—as well as the old city of Jerusalem—Presidents Johnson and Nixon became convinced that the Arabs were not capable of attacking Israel for many years.

A policy of quantitative military equilibrium was in place in the early ‘60s wherein Lyndon Johnson would provide Israel with tanks and aircraft, but would balance these sales by transference of the same to Arab countries. This policy would inhibit any one state from gaining the military advantage over the other. This all changed in 1968 when Johnson committed Phantom jets to Israel. In so doing, he established the USA as the overwhelming arms supplier of Israel and

moved the geopolitical equation from quantitative to Israel's qualitative favor.

Indeed, Johnson's Baptist upbringing affirmed his pro-Israel posture:

"Most if not all of you (speaking to an American Jewish audience) have very deep ties with the land and with the people of Israel, as I do, for my Christian faith sprang from yours . . . the Bible stories are woven into my childhood memories as the gallant struggle of modern Jews to be free of persecution is also woven into our souls" (Jewish Virtual Library).

At this point Israel did not significantly contribute to "Western defenses" in the region because its potential to contribute to a policy of containment was negligible. However, that perception changed when the USA called upon Israel to buttress King Hussein's government and oust the Syrians from their incursion into Jordan in 1970.

Nixon, continued the policies initiated by Johnson, however, it is well known that his affection towards Israel was at best superficial and, for that matter, his predisposition toward being downright anti-Semitic in his private conversations (William F. Buckley, Nixon and Anti-Semitism on the Right, Feb. 10, 1997, National Review) ultimately led, as some surmise, to Israel's horrific losses during the 1973 Yom Kippur War in which Egypt and Syria sought to regain land lost in the '67 War.

Notwithstanding, Nixon came to Israel's rescue and played nuclear brinkmanship with the Soviets, putting them on notice by declaring a worldwide nuclear alert to prevent their intervention on the side of the Arab belligerents. From here the world would witness, for the first time, a new USA involvement into the Middle East cauldron: The Peace Initiatives . . .

President Jimmy Carter

Under Carter (1974-1979) a time of de facto strategic cooperation prevailed wherein Israel was allowed to sell military equipment to the U.S. and, for the first time, joint military exercises were held by the two.

It is here that the "Man of Peace" enters into the fray.

"Consider the Camp David accords—still the most important Middle East pact to which the U.S. has served as midwife. President Jimmy Carter had taken office promising a new look for U.S. foreignpolicy. The hard realpolitik of the Nixon-Ford era, when everything was seen through the lens of the cold war, would be modified. In its place would be an attempt to deal with regional problems on their own terms. In the Middle East, that meant a comprehensive approach to Israeli-Arab differences, including some sort of solution for the problem of displaced Palestinians." (CSMonitor)

The point to be made in all of Carter's deliberations is the injection of the "Comprehensive Peace Factor" into the equation—it was and is the USA that is at the helm of such peace initiatives; specifically, it is the President of the United States America that is the prime factor, the pivotal figure in any and all such negotiations.

In solidarity with his Baptist roots, Jimmy Carter's support for Israel was unwavering:

"(I) believed very deeply that the Jews who had survived the Holocaust deserved their own nation, and that they had a right to live in peace among their neighbors. I considered this homeland for the Jews to be compatible with the teaching of the Bible, hence ordained by God. These moral and religious beliefs made my commitment to the security of Israel unshakable." (Carter's memoirs)

Notwithstanding Carter's pro-Israel sentiments, he, like virtually all of the U.S. Presidents, have expressed—beneath the

veneer of solidarity with Israel—reservations to one degree or another, especially in response to the “Jewish lobby” (i.e., AIPAC) in meddling with the perceived national interests of the USA.

“President Carter ‘told me in late April that it was striking the degree to which some senators are afraid to stand up for the American national interest and will simply do the bidding of a powerful lobby (i.e., AIPAC)” (Power and Principles by Zbigniew Brzezinski, p. 248).

This “reservation” is deeply ingrained within U.S. Presidents—there’s ample reason for this consternation; and, it is this consternation which Israel and the Jewish lobby know all too well. The question abides: Could it turn on us? If so, when and who will be the President who might play the ultimate Jeckyll and Hyde?

## REAGAN & THE MOUs

The climax of two revolutions: The Islamic—the birth of the first modern Islamic Republic (Iran)—and the Reagan Revolution (with the ascendancy of the Christian Right, as well as the birth of the Neocon-Evangelical-Zionist alliance) placed Dr. Huntington’s “Clash of Civilizations” (Foreign Affairs, 1993) on a trajectory of prophetic fulfillment.

This stimulated the continuance of the strategic cooperation formulated under Carter—notwithstanding a brief rupture during the blowup in 1981 of Reagan’s sales of AWACS to Saudi Arabia. What was different about Reagan is that he, for the first time, saw “Israel as a potential contributor to the Cold War” (a direct participant in communist containment) . . .

“Only by full appreciation of the critical role the State of Israel plays in our strategic calculus can we build the foundation for thwarting Moscow’s designs on territories and resources vital to our security and our nation well-being” (Mitchell Bard, Jewish Virtual Library).

Israel began to reap generous “strategic awards”—notwithstanding the Arab complaint that it was Zionism, not Communism, that was the threat to their region. A “Memorandum of Understanding” was signed between Israel and the USA on November 31, 1981. It was termed “Strategic Cooperation.” Once again the U.S. State Department and “War Department” (i.e., the Pentagon) opposed the arrangement and had it watered down to wit: No joint exercises, no systematic means of cooperation between the two.

Once Israel annexed the Golan Heights (December 14, 1981), the U.S. suspended the MOU—but the precedent was set: Israel was formally recognized as a STRATEGIC ALLY.

By 1983 things had simmered down and a new “Joint Political-Military Group” (JPMG) was signed as a result of a new MOU. A Joint Security Assistance Planning Group (JSAP) was subsequently created, designed to counter Soviet threats in the region, but more so it concentrated on bilateral concerns.

The JSAP responded to Israel’s economic woes in the mid-1980s to bolster military procurements for the IDF.

At the conclusion of the Reagan Era, the U.S. Congress crowned Israel as a “major non-NATO ally”—giving Israeli industries the same competitive edge that NATO nations held; furthermore, Israel commenced absorption of \$3B in yearly grants for both economic and military assistance. This meant one thing: The PREPOSITIONING of U.S. military hardware on Israel proper, joint training exercises, and the joint-development of the

## Arrow Anti-Tactical Ballistic Missile System.

The culmination of the U.S.-Israel strategic cooperation has resulted in Israel's role as the prime ally in the Middle East—The USA was no longer intimidated by Arab states vis-à-vis its lopsided and institutionalized military arrangements with Israel. Moreover, as Mitchell Bard's article blithely states:

“The strategic cooperation agreements . . . shifted at least part of the focus of relations with Israel from Congress to the Executive Branch.”

This alleged “shift from Congress to the Executive” was and is, in point of fact, not a shift at all: The Executive Branch of the United States Government has always dominated the relationship—notwithstanding Congressional pontifications (e.g., declaring Jerusalem as the Eternal Capital of the Jewish State—(Winkepedia)).

The aforementioned military cooperation between Israel and the USA is intrinsically linked to one of the most unusual economic arrangements between any two nations on the earth:

“The dialogue with Israel that began at that time (1984 under Secretary of State George Shultz), and continues to the present on issues such as privatization, represents perhaps the only example of a country willingly cooperating with the United States on the development of its macroeconomic policy.

“At the same time the United States was ‘bailing out’ Israel's economy, Reagan decided to sign America's first free trade agreement with Israel. This unprecedented treaty opened up the entire U.S. market to Israel and served as the model for later agreements with Canada and Mexico—the Senate vote on the agreement was unanimous” (ibid. Mitchell Bard)

The list is endless, when it comes to joint-economic cooperation and strategic development:

(1) The Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation (BIRD), established in 1977—a multi-million dollar R&D endowment funding over 400 joint high-tech R&D projects.

(2) The Trilateral Industrial Development (TRIDE)—a U.S.-Jordan-Israel joint venture stimulating the three nations' private sectors in cooperative ventures.

(3) The U.S.-Israel Science & Technology Commission (USISTC)—established in 1993 wherein the U.S. Food and Drug Administration now recognizes some Israeli tests of Israeli-developed drugs and medical equipment.

The acronyms are seemingly endless: BSF, BARD, IALC, etc. – no bother to their meaning—they're all designed to cement the ever-burgeoning relationship between the two nations. Yes, scores of MOUs—which are nothing more than little pieces of paper symbolizing mutual interest in cooperation that is broader and deeper than the United States has with any other nation. Even the “Shared Values Initiatives” between the two nations, undertaken through these various MOUs, helps to tangibly reinforce the values the two have on the environment—providing education and promoting health.

Indeed, as the Jewish Virtual Library's reflections confirm:

“The gradual evolution of the relationship from friendship to alliance could not have been achieved without the support of

the American public, the majority of which consistently sympathized with Israel. Americans see much of themselves in the Zionist struggle. Like the early American pioneers, the Jews who originally settled the land had a commitment to manual labor to build the nation. Like newcomers to America, immigrants to Israel have tried to make better lives for themselves and their children. Americans' affinity for Israelis also stems from our shared Judeo-Christian heritage." (Ibid. Bard)

Living within the confines of MOUs, however, confirmed one salient geo-political reality . . .

"The United States Government will view with particular gravity threats to Israel's security or sovereignty by a world power" (MOU signed in 1975 between then Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Foreign Minister Yigal Allon—Dore Gold, Jewish Weekly News, December 22, 1995).

Yet, the ever-elusive DEFENSE PACT was ever on the minds of the Israelis, and some in the U.S. Administration. As the same Jewish Week article contemplates the inevitable . . .

"In the past, Israel had no pretensions of being able to defend itself against the Soviet Union; thus U.S.-Israeli ties complemented the Israel Defense Force's independent military power. But in the context of an Israeli-Syrian peace treaty, a new strategic relationship could evolve into a substitute for Israel's self-defense capability, with enormous implications beyond the peace process itself."

President George Bush Sr.

"Enormous implications" . . . think no further . . . these enormous implications would necessitate far more than external assistance or joint military exercises.

The introduction of U.S. troops into the Middle East quagmire occurred in earnest in Reagan's debacle at the Beirut International Airport (October 23, 1983) in which simultaneous suicide truck-bomb attacks killed 242 Americans and 58 French troops—Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility. U.S. Marines were quickly pulled out of Lebanon.

It was not until 1991 that massive U.S. military might landed in ancient Babylon under the pincer of President George Bush Sr. and stormin' General Norman Schwarzkopf. Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm were a masterful confirmation of modern U.S. military technology—devastating the Iraqis and liberating the Kuwait from Saddam's lethal grip.

More importantly—in that Saddam was left "in place" in Iraq awaiting George Bush Jr.'s preemptive, unilateral, war on terror (March, 2003)—the U.S. justified a massive military build up throughout the Middle East, primarily throughout the Persian Gulf Region which continues to this day:

"The United States has over 700 bases in 130 countries. As of April 2005, 146,000 U.S. troops were actively serving in Iraq, and thousands of special forces were fighting in the 'war on terrorism' in Afghanistan, Pakistan, North Africa and other regions." (Global Policy Forum)

Bush Sr. reluctantly pursued the U.S.-Israel "strategic alliance" which was formalized under President Reagan (Ilan Berman, New Horizons for the American-Israeli Partnership—NATIV Online); however, when Bush Sr. refused to sign \$10B in loan guarantees, the U.S.-Israeli lobby (AIPAC-The American Israel Public Affairs Committee) descended upon Washington and secured not only the \$10B in guarantees, but it can be concluded that Sr.'s obstructions collapsed

his second term as President!

“Bush (Sr.’s) opposition to the loan guarantees was the last straw for the Israel lobby. When he made disparaging comments about Jewish settlements in East Jerusalem in March, 1990, AIPAC had begun the attack (briefly halted during the Gulf War). Dine (Tom Dine) (Executive Director of AIPAC) wrote a critical op-ed in the New York Times and followed that with a vigorous speech to the United Jewish Appeal’s Young Leaders Conference. ‘Brothers and sisters,’ he told them as they prepared to go out and lobby Congress on the issue, ‘remember that Israel’s friends in this city reside on Capitol Hill.’ Months later, the loan guarantees were approved, but by then Bush was dead meat” (Jeffrey Blankfort, *The Israel Lobby and the Left: Uneasy Questions*).

Notwithstanding these ups and downs between the U.S. Presidency and Israel’s security—the “strategic imperative” has been decidedly upward and onward! And, yes, that trend has been greatly assisted by the ever-ascending influence of AIPAC to wit:

“In 1998, Fortune Magazine rated the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) as the second most influential lobby, after AARP . . . The pro-Israel establishment is, however, much larger than AIPAC, it includes innumerable Jewish religious and non-religious organizations, and Jewish and non-Jewish politicians, academics, bureaucrats, celebrities, journalists, corporate leaders, scientists, and students, and a particularly powerful Washington think tank, the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. The vast majority of American Jews, and many non-Jews, especially among Evangelical Christians, are not activist, but are uncritically supportive of Israel for religious, historical, or cultural reasons” (Arthur L. Lowrie, *An Arabist View of the Pro-Israeli Establishment and its Impact on American Middle East Policy*, April 20, 2001—Media Monitors Network)

In summation, from the 1960s to the Clinton Presidency . . .

“From the mid-1960s through the early 1990s, the military alliance relationship between Washington and Jerusalem evolved significantly. At the end of this period, the alliance was characterized by three dimensions:

- (1) Shared threat perceptions and common security interests.
- (2) Institutionalization in the relationship, and the resulting ability to ride-out short term policy disagreements in some areas;
- (3) Symmetry and burden sharing: Israeli reciprocity and support for American objectives in the region

(Gerald M. Steinberg, *Israel and the United States: Can the Special Relationship Survive the New Strategic Environment*, MERIA, November 1998)

President William Jefferson Clinton

In sum:

“Truman and Reagan felt gut-level, emotional sympathy toward Israel, which was translated into landmark decisions that established and strengthened the relationship. Bill Clinton falls into a similar category, and is now considered by many people the most pro-Israel President in history. Nevertheless, he followed Bush’s precedent of interfering in Israeli politics by trying to help the reelection effort of Shimon Peres” (Ibid. Mitchell Bard)

Clearly, Clinton’s pro-Israel persona is not defined so much by what he did for Israel but more by what he did not do—publicly criticize Israel or take punitive measures against it.

Clinton’s eight-year legacy (1992-2000) spans three of Israel’s Prime Ministers: Benjamin Netanyahu, Ehud Barak, and Ariel Sharon. It was during this time that the Presidency saw itself as a “facilitator” or, once again, as peace maker in the Middle East—while steadfastly continuing the strategic relationship with Israel.

The idea of a FORMAL PEACE TREATY, wherein the USA would underwrite Israel’s security, repeatedly surfaced during this era. In Clinton’s mindset, there was the overarching desire to inspire a “comprehensive peace settlement” amongst all parties—in particular, between the Palestinians and Israelis; although Syria was not far behind in his thinking—let alone the entire region.

Clinton’s quest for a comprehensive peace kept the concept on the front burner throughout his administration . . .

“The idea of a defense treaty arose again in the 1970s and in the 1980s. During the Cold War period, the U.S. viewed Israel as a ‘strategic asset’ and a stabilizing influence in the region (thus emphasizing the ‘hard’ factors). Israel clung to this perception in the hope that mutual strategic interests would serve as a foundation strong enough to formalize defense relations between the two countries, despite the absence of a solution to the problem of the territories occupied in 1967. The 1982 Lebanon War and the continuation of the regional conflict, however, prevented such formalization, and it appeared that the U.S. would not be prepared to protect Israel’s borders if those borders included the occupied territories. In the absence of a formal defense treaty, Israel’s status was defined, for the first time, as a Non-NATO Ally in early 1987.” (Yair Evron, An Israel-United States Defense Pact?, October 1998)

Israel initiated the idea of a “Defense Treaty” during the latter part of the Peres administration (April, 1996). Benjamin Netanyahu’s victory, however, in 1996, put the breaks on the Israeli quest for formal security arrangements. It was in the context of the Israel-Syria negotiations wherein the U.S. could be favorably predisposed toward signing such an accord with Israel that America’s designs for a comprehensive peace plan were coupled with Israel’s desire for a Defense Pact. Israeli leadership knew that Clinton was favorable toward a formal Defense Pact with Israel; especially, if they would compromise with the Syrians—resolving decades of war.

Such an agreement would stretch beyond the Israeli-Syrian conundrum by including many nations within its comprehensive scope. This would present the supreme opportunity to confirm and surpass all expectations embodied within the U.S.-Israel special relationship. Yes, it would necessitate the ultimate consignment of Israel’s security to its patron: The United States of America.

“A U.S.-Israel defense pact would be likely to serve Israel politically,

strategically, and militarily. First, it would amplify Israel's deterrent capability. Second, it would not only strengthen, but also formally institutionalize, the strategic relationship between the two countries. This would be particularly important if, at some point, the U.S. commitment to Israel or involvement in the Middle East were to weaken. Third, a defense treaty would contribute to regional strategic stability if nuclear capabilities in the region will proliferate. Fourth, it would be apt to serve, under certain circumstances, as an important component in a regional security system, should one be established." (Ibid. Yair Evron).

Yet, the formal declaration—sought by Israel and the USA—eluded its parties once again.

Nevertheless, these numerous quotes, primarily from Israelis and members of the pro-Zionist American Jewish community, are significant in that they repeatedly project the clarity, hopes, and ultimate aspirations—as well as reservations—conferred by Jews upon such a DEFENSE PACT between the United States of America and Israel. Likewise, they succinctly interpret the catalyst of such a conclusive agreement in the context of the American Presidency—without

equivocation, all concur the implementation of such a DEFENSE PACT must find its final recourse domiciled in the office of the President of the United States of America.

Our succeeding articles will amplify the final Presidency, George Walker Bush . . . for there is no other Presidency who has so extended itself into the affairs of Israel, into the Middle East, into the land of ancient Babylon . . . on behalf of "peace and justice" . . . for democracy and human rights . . . against the enemies of freedom, against the heretics of Islam, against terror and for the triumph of good over evil. No, never has the Presidency of the United States been so absorbed in a quest to secure for itself and for the world—the wealth and riches of ancient lands which fuel the engines of earth's most dominant and dynamic civilization: The West.

No, never has there been such a time as this when the stakes have been so high—yet . . . no price too great to pay . . . for freedom's rewards come not from terror's intimidations, nor from quislings who compromise before dictators and zealots who deign to hold civilization hostage by fulfilling the nightmare of their religious distortions and heretical creeds . . . to all Americans and to the world he says:

"We will never back down. We will never give in. And we will never accept anything less than complete victory." (President George Walker Bush, U.S. Naval Academy, November 2005, the White House).

Finally, for those of you who wish to connect the dots—to the will of him who seeks to do us harm—ponder the words spoken through Daniel the Prophet, Paul the Apostle, and John the Beloved . . .

"And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors have reached their fullness, a king shall arise, having a fierce countenance, who understands sinister schemes. His power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; he shall destroy extraordinarily and shall prosper and thrive; he shall destroy the mighty, and also the holy people. Through his cunning he shall cause deceit to prosper under his rule; and he shall exalt himself in his heart. He shall even rise against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without human hand" (Daniel 8:23-25).

“ . . . the prince who is to come . . . he shall confirm a covenant with the many for one week; but in the middle of the week he shall bring an end to sacrifice and offering, and on the wing of abominations shall be one who makes desolate, even until the consummation, which is determined is poured out on the desolator” Daniel 9:27)

“And I looked, and behold, a white horse. He who sat on it had a bow; and a crown was given to him, and he went out conquering and to conquer” (Revelation 6:2).

“The coming of the lawless one is according to the working of Satan, with all power, signs, and lying wonders, and with all unrighteous deception among those who perish, because they did not receive the love of the truth, that they might be saved” (II Thessalonians 2:9-10)

“Then the king shall do according to his own will: he shall exalt and magnify himself above every god, shall speak blasphemies against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the wrath has been accomplished; for what has been determined shall be done . . . Thus he shall act against the strongest fortresses with a foreign god, which he shall acknowledge, and advance its glory; and he shall cause them to rule over many, and divide the land for profit” (Daniel 9:27; 11:36, 39).

“He shall also enter the Glorious Land, and many countries shall be overthrown . . . but news from the east and the north shall trouble him; therefore he shall go out with great fury to destroy and annihilate many. And he shall plant the tents of his palace between the seas and the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and no one will help him . . .

“Then I wished to know the truth about the fourth beast, which was different from all the others, exceeding dreadful, with its teeth of iron and its nails of bronze, which devoured, broke in pieces, and trampled the residue with its feet; and the ten horns that were on its head, and the other horn which came up, before which three fell, namely, that horn which had eyes and a mouth which spoke pompous words, whose appearance was greater than his fellows. I was watching; and the same horn was making war against the saints, and prevailing against them, until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was made in favor of the saints of the Most High, and the time came for the saints to possess the kingdom” (Daniel 11:41a, 44-45; 7:19-22).

Please view full article/graphics/links @ <http://www.the-tribulation-network.com>

## About The Author

Doug Krieger is a member of the "Last Days Network" . . . a group of evangelical pundits providing news and analysis on Religion in Politics. "Applied Biblical prophecy," apostasy and deception, the impact of the American New World Order System, and the influence of the Religious Right and Left upon

American culture--are topics discussed by the group. He is an educator in the public schools (California) and an administrator. Doug's articles can be found all over the net—but anchored @ <http://www.the-tribulation-network.com> (a real upbeat web site, given the name).