

GNITN

#1233

NATO Falls. The Antichrist Rises

World Events Are Changing

US President Donald Trump is a lot of things, but one thing he does do is challenge the status quo. He's doing it right now by suggesting the US no longer supports or finances the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or NATO. If you don't know what NATO is, I got this description from their [web site](#):

NATO's purpose is to guarantee the freedom and security of its members through political and military means.

POLITICAL – NATO promotes democratic values and provides a permanent structure for its members to consult and cooperate on defence and security-related issues. Regular consultation enables NATO members to share their views, exchange information, build trust, solve problems and, in the long run, prevent conflict.

MILITARY – NATO is committed to the peaceful resolution of disputes. However, if diplomatic efforts fail, it has the military power needed to defend every one of its members – as stated in Article 5, the collective defence clause of NATO's founding treaty. It can also undertake crisis management operations to help preserve peace and stability on the international stage, alone or in cooperation with other countries and international organisations.

All that sounds good, but why it exists is the main issue over America dropping out. According to the official historical [agency](#) for the US, *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was created in 1949 by the United States, Canada, and several Western European nations to provide collective security against the Soviet Union.* It is run from Brussels and the aforementioned Article 5 has only been invoked once, following the 9/11 attacks. There are currently 32 nations in NATO with English and French being the official languages. But a recent falling out over Trump wanting NATO to help keep the Strait of Hormuz open and their unequal financial support over the years is causing the current talk of America leaving NATO.

Current Tensions

In an [article](#) from *Prophecy News Watch* we're told how things are going with Trump and NATO:

For decades, NATO has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security. The United States has been the alliance's engine, supplying funding, troops, and strategic reach that no other member can match. In return, Europe promised partnership -- not perfect alignment, but reliability. That compact was tested, and in many ways strained, during Operation Epic Fury in Iran.

In recent weeks, Trump and his cabinet members like Secretary of State Marco Rubio have made strong statements about their frustrations with NATO countries not letting the US use the bases in their countries to aid the fighting in Iran among other things:

As U.S. forces prepared to act, several European allies restricted access to bases, limited overflights, or imposed operational conditions. Some stayed on the sidelines, arguing that Iran was not their war. From Washington's perspective, it looked like allies had abandoned the United States at the very moment it needed support. From European capitals, the hesitation reflected domestic politics, public opinion, and a long-standing debate about when Europe should intervene militarily abroad. The tension is real, and it goes beyond rhetoric. The U.S. spends roughly 3.2% of GDP on defense, vastly outpacing most NATO members. Germany, France, and the U.K., despite their political clout, typically hover near the 2% guideline. For

decades, American policymakers have urged Europe to spend more, modernize forces, and assume a larger share of operational responsibility. Yet even with gradual improvements, frustration in Washington has reached a boiling point.

Leaving NATO would hurt the US:

So, what does the U.S. get out of the alliance? A lot. Forward bases across Europe give American forces rapid access to multiple theaters -- the Middle East, Africa, the Mediterranean, and Eastern Europe. NATO allows the U.S. to share intelligence, train with allies, and maintain interoperability that multiplies operational effectiveness. These advantages are real, tangible, and critical for both deterrence and global power projection.

The sticking point is over whether NATO should support the US in the fight against Iran: *Yet the Iran episode raises a thorny question: should an ally be expected to fully support every operation, even one outside their immediate interest, or is partnership more about reliability in principle than agreement in every detail? Europe said "this is not our war," but in another context, these same countries expect U.S. support in conflicts like Ukraine. The dissonance illustrates a fundamental tension in alliances: partners may not always agree on objectives, but they are expected to stand together when stakes are high.*

What Happens Now?

The article offers some thoughts on that:

Washington is reportedly considering several options. One is strategic realignment -- reducing U.S. troop presence in countries perceived as less supportive while bolstering forces in reliable allies such as Poland, Romania, the Baltics, and perhaps Greece. Bases in Spain, Germany, or Italy could face closures, repurposing, or reduced operational access. These moves would send a clear signal about expectations and reliability, without severing the alliance entirely. There are clear benefits and risks on both sides. Maintaining U.S. forces across all of Europe keeps deterrence strong, ensures rapid response capability, and preserves diplomatic cohesion. Pulling back from some regions could incentivize greater European defense spending and more thoughtful burden-sharing, but it risks eroding trust, creating operational gaps, and signaling vulnerability to adversaries.

The threat of totally leaving NATO would be more than a small change:

A more extreme scenario -- a partial or full U.S. withdrawal from NATO -- would be seismic. NATO without America is still an organization of armies and flags, but it loses the overwhelming logistical backbone, intelligence networks, and strategic credibility that only the U.S. provides. That could embolden adversaries and force Europe to reassess its own capabilities in ways that are politically and militarily fraught.

The argument is not as black and white as it may appear:

At the same time, Europe is not the enemy. Its caution is rooted in domestic politics including the reality of a growing Muslim population, historical experience, and a desire to avoid unnecessary conflict. Allies have legitimate reasons to differentiate between threats that directly endanger them and operations that are more peripheral. The challenge is reconciling those perspectives with America's expectations of alliance reliability.

Things do have to change and the Iranian conflict only brings things to a head:

Ultimately, the U.S. faces a critical choice: continue carrying the alliance in its current form, reshaping it quietly but pragmatically, or take bolder steps that force Europe to shoulder more of the burden -- whether through spending, capability, or political alignment. Each path carries risk, but inaction is not risk-free. America cannot continue operating as NATO's guarantor while frustration, disappointment, and strategic misalignment grow.

There Is A Prophetic Angle

Now we have the current events detailed, but I see a bigger picture for those of us who study Bible prophecy. You see I believe that the Antichrist will be from Europe and he will rule from there as well, possibly even from Brussels, Belgium although Rome is another place bandied about. This is based on [Daniel 9:26](#) which says the people connected to the coming prince destroyed Jerusalem and the temple - a destruction carried out by Rome. If NATO falls, the issue will not just be who protects Europe - the issue may become who rules it. Out of the ashes of transatlantic collapse could rise a new European military system, forged in fear, urgency, and the demand for peace through strength. Daniel foresaw a final kingdom unlike the others, and from it a blasphemous ruler would arise and subdue powers beneath him ([Daniel 7:7-8, 24-25](#)). Many prophecy watchers believe that points to a revived Roman sphere, which is why some hold the view that the Antichrist could himself be European - not merely ruling Europe from the outside, but rising from within it, emerging out of its political chaos, its cultural heritage, and its desperate cry for order. Revelation shows the beast rising to worldwide prominence with astonishing authority and military might, so terrifying that the world asks, *"Who is a match for the beast, and, Who can make war against him?"* ([Revelation 13:4, AMPC](#)). That sounds like more than diplomacy. It sounds like command. It sounds like consolidation. It sounds like a man stepping into a ready-made war structure at the perfect moment of crisis. NATO's dissolution could help clear the ground, and Europe could forge the war machine. Then the Antichrist - perhaps European himself - could rise from the chaos, seize that machinery, and turn Europe's cry for security into the iron rule of the beast.

We Are Living In Biblical Times

While America isn't clearly seen in Bible prophecy nor is Trump we can see that God uses nations and their leaders to shape things the way He wants them to look. With Trump also forming a 10 nation Board of Peace to deal with the Gaza war and now pulling out of NATO we are seeing the scenarios seen in the Bible that allow a one world government and the rise of the Antichrist right before our eyes. No other generation has as clear of a view these things as we do. Which also means that the Rapture of the Church and the Tribulation are also closer than ever and that my friends means that we need to be very evangelistic. Extremely evangelistic. As one pastor I know tells us, friends don't let friends go to hell. The Great Commission says this: *And Jesus came up and spoke to them, saying, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to Me. 19 Go, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, 20 teaching them to follow all that I commanded you; and behold, I am with you always, to the end of the age."* ([Matt 28:18-20, NASB](#))

The implications are profound. The power to do it unlimited. And the time to do it is now. As for panicking well, Jesus tells us in [Luke 21:27-28](#) to look up, stand tall when we see this happen. And as we used to say when I was a young believer, *Maranatha* which an [article](#) in [gotquestions.org](#) explains well:

Today, believers in our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ live our lives in the light of the knowledge that He can come at any time. We are to be ready when the call comes. Every day we should expect Him to come, and every day we should long for Him to come. Maranatha reminds us to keep our eyes on the eternal things of the Spirit. To dwell on material things is to be in constant mental turmoil. Looking down, we see the earth; looking around, we see earthly things. But looking up, we see the hope of the soon coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. To those who are

discouraged today, Maranatha! To those who are worried today, Maranatha! To those who are filled with anxiety over the problems they are facing, Maranatha! Our Lord is coming!