

## About This Book

*The Last Peace Treaty* is an exploration of end-times prophecy, using Scripture as its primary foundation. It examines world events through a biblical lens and considers what the Bible may reveal about the days ahead.

These pages explore questions that Scripture itself raises:

- Are we living in the times the Bible describes?
- Could a future peace agreement mark a turning point?
- What do biblical prophecies suggest about the Antichrist?
- How might America fit within the prophetic framework?

This book does not claim to offer absolute answers. Instead, it presents Scripture, examines historical and contemporary patterns, and invites thoughtful discernment.

It is part testimony, part inquiry, and part hope, written to encourage readers to test what they see in the world against what Scripture reveals.

This is not a final verdict.  
It is an investigation.

Drawing from decades of spiritual reflection, personal experience, and in-depth study, I present a perspective rooted in faith, courage, and the enduring promises of God.

Prepare to be challenged.  
Prepare to think deeply.  
Prepare to examine the times with renewed clarity.

This is more than a book.  
It is an invitation to discern carefully.

## Chapter 1: *Nuremberg* – The Similarities

We are living in the midst of a battle for our souls.

A spiritual war is unfolding in real time, not in some distant land, not in ancient history — but here, now, in the modern world. Most people sense that something is wrong. There is uneasiness in the air, a quiet awareness that the foundations beneath us are shifting. Yet few can clearly define what is happening.

We see the division.  
We feel the instability.  
We watch institutions tremble.

But the deeper conflict is not merely political, economic, or cultural.

It is spiritual.

History has shown us before what happens when deception replaces truth, when fear silences discernment, and when entire societies slowly drift from moral clarity. The signs were visible then — though many did not recognize them until it was too late.

The question is not whether a battle exists.

The question is whether we recognize it.

## **The Film *Nuremberg* – The Similarities**

The film *Nuremberg*, released on November 7, 2025, draws unsettling parallels to what many believe is unfolding in America today. It invites us to examine patterns of power, manipulation, and the frightening ease with which a society can be led down a dark path. These echoes demand clear eyes and honest reflection.

Hermann Göring occupies a central place in the story of Nuremberg. Captured alive after World War II, he became the highest-ranking Nazi to stand trial. Throughout the proceedings, Göring sought to manipulate the court, portraying himself as a heroic German patriot rather than a man responsible for mass atrocity. His interviews and psychological evaluations drew worldwide attention because he was charismatic, calculating, and determined to control the narrative.

The film captures this dynamic with chilling accuracy. Göring is portrayed as intelligent, dangerous, and disturbingly charismatic, just as witnesses described him. The story centers on his psychological battle with a U.S. Army psychiatrist, revealing the unsettling intellect behind Göring's public persona.

In the end, Göring was convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity and sentenced to death by hanging. But he cheated the gallows. On the night before his scheduled execution in 1946, he committed suicide by swallowing a hidden cyanide capsule.

## **Hermann Göring (1893–1946)**

Hermann Göring was one of the highest-ranking leaders in Nazi Germany and among Adolf Hitler's closest associates. He was powerful, ruthless, and instrumental in constructing the Nazi regime.

Göring's own explanation of Nazi complicity is deeply disturbing. He insisted that the average German was not inherently monstrous or mentally ill. Instead, he argued, people attached themselves to an ideology that rewarded ambition, obedience, and power. Advancement came not through insanity, but through the chance to gain influence, control others, and crush opposition.

This conclusion aligns with the psychiatrist's own findings. He determined that most Nazi leaders were not psychopaths or madmen. They were opportunists who saw the Nazi system as a vehicle for personal advancement. Once inside it, they surrendered their morality to maintain their position and power.

This is where modern parallels emerge.

When a leader names groups as “Narco-terrorists,” one man’s word becomes the trigger for execution.

The danger of absolute power never announces itself with fanfare.

It arrives quietly—when a single leader decides who the “enemy” is and convinces the public that certain lives no longer deserve the protections of law.

A free society does not collapse overnight.

Its first fractures do not come from tanks in the streets, but from labels.

Imagine a government proudly broadcasting the destruction of dozens of small drug boats in international waters, boasting of a hundred deaths. The human beings aboard those boats were killed instantly—no trial, no investigation, no attempt to capture evidence or learn who they were. They are declared “Narco-terrorists” by one man, and that label alone becomes their sentence.

But who were they?

Hardened cartel soldiers?

Or poor fishermen forced into trafficking under threat of violence, their families held hostage?

Criminals—or victims?

We never find out.

No one intends to.

Killing is always easier than justice.

And this is where the slope begins to tilt.

When a government claims the right to take life based solely on accusation—without proof, without court, without oversight, the line between protecting the nation and ruling by fear disappears.

What begins at sea does not stay there.

If an administration can execute boat drivers in international waters, what prevents it—or agencies like ICE—from applying the same logic inside American cities?

If the label is “cartel member” or “illegal alien,” why not extend it to someone selling drugs in Chicago, New York, Memphis, or Minneapolis? If accusation alone is enough, then the difference between a boat in the Caribbean and a car on a city street in Minneapolis, Minnesota, becomes nothing more than geography.

Label first.

Kill second.

Justification comes later.

This pattern is not new.

History has already shown us where it leads.

During the Nuremberg Trials, months of interviews revealed something deeply unsettling: Göring was not insane. He was not a monster from birth. He was something far more dangerous—an opportunist who understood power.

He explained that the Nazi rise did not begin with mass murder. It began with identifying an enemy and teaching the public that those “enemies” deserved different treatment. Once people accepted that certain groups could be controlled, restricted, or eliminated without trial, everything else followed.

Violence became easier each time the public applauded it.

The parallels are not exact, but the psychology is identical.

A nation does not lose its soul in a single dramatic moment. It loses it inch by inch—each time it tolerates killing without justice and accepts death without trial as proof of strength.

When leaders boast about the destruction of human beings as if tallying points on a scoreboard, the nation has forgotten the principles that once set it apart from tyranny.

The true danger is not the drug boats.

The true danger is what we become when we cheer the killing of men whose guilt was never proven, whose stories were never heard, whose humanity was never considered.

For when a nation accepts killing based on labels alone, it has already embraced the principle that empowered Hermann Göring:

That power itself is justification.

History shows brutally where that belief leads.

When we excuse executions by saying, “They were probably cartel members,” we are not making a factual judgment—we are redefining guilt itself. Probability replaces proof. Accusation replaces trial.

Once a government claims the authority to kill based on suspicion and labels, the category expands. “Cartel” stops being a criminal finding; it becomes a political designation.

At that point, nothing prevents a future leader from declaring, “These people sell drugs on American streets. They are cartels. Shoot them on sight.” The logic is already in place; only the targets change.

History shows that state violence never begins with “people like us.” It begins with people described as dangerous, nameless, and undeserving of due process.

If the standard is no longer what was proven but what was alleged, then the difference between justice and execution is not moral—it is merely who holds power.

What is the difference?

Only one thing: the willingness of the people to let one man decide who lives and who dies.

A free people should never cheer such power.

This is not justice.

This is not America.

This is not our Constitution.

This is the very oppression our ancestors fled when they left Europe—rulers who claimed authority over life and death without rights, courts, or limits.

Blowing up boats is dramatic. It generates headlines and applause. But it does nothing to dismantle cartels.

It kills the poorest men at the bottom—the expendable ones, often frightened, coerced, or forced into the role. It creates the illusion of action, not a solution.

When a leader declares, “Only I can save America,” the people become conditioned to accept actions that strip away their own freedoms.

This is how democracies slide into shadow—not through violence alone, but through the applause that greets it. If the people cheer executions at sea, they will soon cheer them on land. Once due process is discarded for convenience, it is lost forever. This is not America. This is not who we were meant to be.

What makes this moment especially dangerous is not only that people are being killed—it is that members of the administration go on television and speak about those killings with pride. They praise the deaths of boat drivers as if execution itself were a moral achievement.

The justification is always the same: drugs have killed 300,000 Americans. The number is real. The grief is real. But grief is being weaponized to suspend judgment. Tragedy is being used to excuse the abandonment of law.

A boat driver is declared a criminal after death, without evidence, without trial, without even a name. Responsibility is assumed, not proven. And once the public accepts that, killing becomes policy—and policy becomes spectacle.

When government officials celebrate death on television, they are not enforcing justice; they are teaching the public to equate vengeance with virtue. That is how a society is trained to stop asking questions.

Yes, drugs have destroyed lives. But if mass death justifies summary execution, then the standard for killing has already slipped from what someone did to what they are accused of representing. The enemy becomes symbolic, not individual—and symbolic enemies have no rights.

This is how lines disappear. Not all at once, but slowly—through applause, talking points, and televised praise. And once the state learns it can kill first and explain later, the explanation will always be expanded, never narrowed.

And if we fail to recognize the warning signs now, we may one day look back and ask how the road to tyranny began—only to realize it began with our applause.

Read this novel. Share it. Examine the evidence presented throughout *The Last Peace Treaty*. What you will find is a serious and unsettling warning about power, deception, and recurring patterns in history.

My greatest fear is not that I am mistaken—but that I may be right about the rising spirit of the final deceiver foretold in prophecy.

Look carefully at the facts. Study the parallels. Ask questions. Speak with others. A free nation depends on informed people who refuse to ignore the lessons of history.

And after examining the evidence, make your voice heard.

Participate. Engage.

And above all—vote.

