

# Brazil School of the Prophets: January-February 2019

## Class 17-02-2019

The restriction of radical Islam

There's a relationship between 1798 and 1840. It's 1A and 1E. As soon as we do that, we pass thread of history. The way we approach 1840, is we say it's the restrain of radical Islam. We make an application to 911, and their ability to travel and they closed their bank accounts (their liberty restrained). But in 1840 there was 4 powers that intervened in a conflict between 2 Islamic powers. We picked up the restraining of Turkey to 4 powers. We ignore the details. That's the place we actually depart from what really happened in history, because today (2001) the group who was restrained were the radicals. If you go to 1840, the group that was being restrained and were becoming radicalized was Egypt, not Turkey. So we conflate two stories together. If we want to mark the restraining of radical Islam we should mark Egypt not Turkey because in 2001 there's was no benign Islamic country restrained. So you can see straight away that 1798 and 1840 don't have the same thread, at least as how we approach it. So are we missing some piece of information or is this all noise that shouldn't worry us?

The thread of this history

Why would we focus on Turkey in 1840? What's that fixation? Because of Rev 9. We understand that 1840 became a fulfillment of prophecy, given in 4 steps: hour, month, day and year (391 + 15). We see this structure and see an alpha and omega, our symbol for the structure being the second woe. But what is it a story of? Who do we say gets restrained in 1840? We need a story about something or someone: the Ottoman Empire. We drop the word Turkey, because in some way that's noise, because it's not really about Turkey itself but the Ottoman empire. When we tell the story we don't use the word restrain, but use 'the rise and the fall of the Ottoman empire'.

When we talk about the rise and fall of nations, say like Russia. When is its fall? Panium. But what does Panium look like? Are Americans going to win the battle, get rid of Russians and move over?

In 1839 there was a sultan ruling in Turkey, and after what we mark the end of the 2nd woe, August 11, the same sultan was ruling in Turkey afterwards! It was not like a Prussian prince? No! But the empire as it was functioning begins to collapse. But the empire still continues on.

We've got another theme: Egypt is being restrained in 1840. And another theme is that Turkey is being restrained. Turkey is doing it voluntarily, and Egypt is by force. So it's not so straight forward as saying 'the restriction of Islam'? One of them is a prophecy which takes us to the rise

and fall of Turkey. But the restriction of a radical part isn't a prophecy, it's about Egypt.

Then shouldn't our focus on 911 be different than it currently is? We can see radical Islam being restrained, but is that the prophecy part?

In 1798 France comes into Egypt, it's a strategic move to deal with north Africa and control the Mediterranean part of Europe. We know there was war between France and England. Egypt had the mamluks, who were like slaves, or soldier. They are used by Egypt to push back against the French. According to Millerite understanding of that history, Dn 11:40, Egypt would win, largely because of this mamluk ('property').

| |

Alpha and Omega

There's a structure that more often than not is a prophecy, there's a story, and history. We can now use Is 28:10,13,17 to see we have a start and end, and we need to understand what those 2 are teaching us. The way we do that is understanding the history.

So we should look for an Islamic power that submitted voluntarily to the west (if we see Islam as the east). In 1840 with Turkey, what we did is look at the cause of the fall, but the cause is not in prophecy.

In 1840 if we follow the thread of the prophecy how would we even get to 911? Because it's the voluntary submission of an Islamic power. We should see two Islamic powers, like Iraq and Iran.

Back to the history

1798, we have the Mamluk. Egypt wants to rebel against Turkey. It's not a normal rebellion, their mission is take over Turkey, why does everybody love Turkey? Why Constantine move there? It was a nice place. It's a strategic point to connect two countries. And if you wanted to invade a country, it's extremely hard to do it by boat. So Egypt wants to take the world (Europe), it's not America. Europe is the world, and the only you're going to do it is by a land attack. They have a two fold strategy. If they take over Turkey (kill people on the top), you multiplied your army (get the Turkish army) and have a formidable army. That's why the Europeans are scared, not because there's war in the middle east, but because someone wants to come to conquer them.

The geography model

We are not used to use it to understand end time prophecy. It's a valid model. The geography directs our understanding.

Would you be happy if I said this is a story of president Trump?

1. Cyrus
2. Cambyses
3. Smerdis
4. Darius
5. Xerxes = Ahasuerus

So it's the story of Esther. He used the geographical model to make the story

The radicalized people of Egypt in 1840 were from the same tribe (Wasabi). They are hired mercenary, may be 'property', the mamluk. The mamluk in 1798 and the Wasabi in 1840.

The more you look the stronger the evidence between 1798 and 1840, which is what we'd expect.