

Disclaimer: The purpose of this short essay is not to reveal facts or to dive deeply into any one particular issue, but rather to brush the surface of some key events taking place around the world. I wanted to specifically focus on some things that are under intense fire by the media concerning President Bush and his administrative policies. There is a lot of information available for those who are interested that goes much farther into some of these issues. I acknowledge that these views are solely my own and hope that what I say will encourage you to do your own study of the events currently taking place.

"The State of Affairs: A look at some of President Bush's policies regarding the war on terror and U.S. interests abroad."

George W Bush has received increasing criticism for his efforts in the war on terror, and his approach to domestic issues. Why is President Bush so criticized by the media? Is it simply that society has more access than at any previous time in history, or is this harsh criticism deserved? As people who are directly affected by the President's decisions, it does us well to examine the media's perspective on President Bush and his administration's policies.

Wire-Tapping: It's 2006, and things are a little different now than when the Constitution was written 220 years ago. We can argue for the integrity of constitutional rights all we want, but the stark reality is that we have little choice but to monitor the phone records of known terrorists. Keep in mind that those charged with protecting America are after the bad guys, and law abiding citizens have very little to be concerned over. The right to privacy is far too large a topic to be covered in this essay, and the fear of losing that right is not really central to this debate. Monitoring the phone records of known terrorists here in the U.S. is not the infringement of privacy our forefathers were trying to guard against. We cannot get too wrapped in the philosophical or ideological side of a very real and significant threat being posed by terrorists that are on our very own soil. So I say let the good guys do a little eavesdropping on the bad guys, its ok with me.

Iraq: People blame the Bush Whitehouse for failing in Iraq, but they are doing what they set out to do. America has basically taken the fight to the terrorist's backyard. If they are fighting them there, it means they won't be fighting them in Chicago, New York, or Los Angeles. Even though we don't like the fact that soldiers are dying in Iraq, it is important to note that the death toll for American troops to date is still far lower than the death toll of Americans on September 11th. In my opinion, America is in Iraq for two reasons. One, stability. We

cannot afford to lose control over the tensest region of the world. Not only do we depend on oil, but we also depend on stability in the Middle East to positively affect our economy (the stock market, trade, etc). Whether we like it or not, America's stability hinges largely on whether or not a terrorist wakes up tomorrow morning and decides to strap on a bomb. Secondly, America needs to keep an eye on Iran. The U.S. didn't really need to worry about Saddam Hussein. He was quickly losing control of his country, and his people, and stood little chance of pulling off an attack in the near future on Israel or America. U.S. officials knew he would topple quickly. Coalition forces met very little resistance when invading Iraq, and the little resistance they did face was put up by fighters with little or no connection to the Iraqi dictator.

No, the main objective wasn't really Saddam Hussein, which leads me to...

Iran: It seems that U.S. forces needed to be close to Iran and have a strong presence there in case they tried anything aggressive. As I write this, Iran is trying to bully its way onto the nuclear scene sooner than expected. They made complete fools of the IAEA in acquiring materials to develop a nuclear program, and basically stood quietly by as other nations (namely North Korea) created a distraction. What's interesting about the North Korean crisis is that Iran decided to fund North Korea's missile development program rather than get caught operating one of their own. We as citizens had not heard much about Iran's nuclear capabilities until after the North Korean crisis, and the unveiling of the "Axis of Evil" presented by President Bush. But after Korea successfully developed the technology that Iran needed, the battle fronts changed, and now Iran is garnering the bulk of attention. Oil will continue to be a major issue for years to come, despite the talk of finding alternative fuels. That's why Iran is so important. Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (the one who denies the holocaust, threatens Israel, etc.) is a puppet for the Shiite Clerics who rule Iran (namely the Ayatollah and his fellow religious leaders). Ahmadinejad isn't a free thinker, and since Iran is a theocratic republic (which basically means that a few select religious leaders make all the important decisions), they decide who will be Prime Minister. Putting in Ahmadinejad means they have someone who will "tow the party line". Increasing reports are coming out of Iran that indicate Iranians are dissatisfied with the current state of affairs and don't like the oppressive regime in power (Islamic Clerics, Sharia law, etc.). One assassination, one bomb, or one remark could send the situation into total chaos. America needs to be in Iraq, just in case something unexpected (or something expected) happens in Iran. Iran will get their nuclear arms, and they will be a force to be reckoned with sooner than anyone could have imagined. As it stands now, there is very little that America or the rest of the western world can do to prevent Iran from building a nuclear arsenal. America can only try to maintain a presence, and hope to put on just enough pressure to keep the situation from blowing wide open (to pardon the pun).

The President's Cabinet: Another point of criticism for President Bush is that he has a cabinet hand picked to be aggressive. The fact that Vice President Cheney has connections to Halliburton is very insignificant in the grand scheme of things, but it's been given a lot of attention. Condoleezza Rice is a genius who mirrors her philosophies

towards those of her fellow conservative thinkers such as Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Cheney, etc. Does that make them bad people? No, they all simply share a common philosophy, and that philosophy differs from the mainstream. I believe they are in power for a very specific reason that few outside of the message would understand. I believe that God has placed these specific individuals in power right now to simply be a watchdog for Israel during this time of upheaval in the Middle East. They are mostly neo-conservatives, which is a radical theory in politics that encourages action as opposed to negotiation and diplomacy. Neoconservatives are very pro-democracy, and very supportive of Israel. They lean extremely conservative on social issues, while being very pro-active with government spending (the idea that pumping money into industries and the military will in time benefit the whole economy). Neo-conservatism is tailor-made for handling the situations we now face in the Middle East and Far East Asia.

While I may be going out on a limb, I think the current crisis in Iran is what will eventually shift American sympathies away from Israel. After 2008, events will lead us to the place where America will have to denounce ties with Israel at some point in order to maintain peace with the world's major oil suppliers, most of which are Arab nations. But for now, the President seems to be trying to hold firm on our promise to support democracy in that region, which means we stand by Israel's side. That's why it's important [as believers of the message having access to Bro. Branham's divine insight on the end times] to watch these events and be careful about jumping to negative conclusions on our nation's leaders and the decisions they make. The next U.S. election will be extremely significant, more so than past elections precisely because of issues like this; issues that carry consequences like war, economic collapse, and utter chaos in parts of the world. So the next time you read an article criticizing the President, keep in mind that God has put him there to watch over Israel. Try to look at it from the perspective that He is pro-actively protecting America's interests in an area of the world that America greatly depends upon. And of course, unlike many, it might not hurt to keep in mind that the war on terror is just that, a war.

Recommended Reading:

"Sleeping With The Devil"; Robert Bauer.

"Countdown to Crisis"; Kenneth R. Timmerman.

"House of Bush, House of Saud"; Craig Unger.

"After the Neocons"; Francis Fukuyama.